

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 6 February 2024

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.

Members

MEMBER FOR DUNSTAN, RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER (11:01): Before I call the Clerk, I have today received a letter from the Hon. Steven Marshall resigning his seat in the house. I will meet as soon as reasonably practicable with the Electoral Commissioner, who is for the moment in an Electoral Districts Boundaries Commission hearing. I will take all necessary advice, including from the commissioner, and return to the house at 4pm this Thursday 8 February 2024, with a writ for a by-election in the electoral district of Dunstan and, for the avoidance of doubt, will publish the by-election date at that time.

This statement to the house triggers certain provisions of the South Australian electoral law, particularly the need for certain parties to file certificates to access public funding by 5pm today, and I emphasise the importance of that deadline.

Bills

BOTANIC GARDENS AND STATE HERBARIUM (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September 2023.)

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (11:02): I rise to make a contribution on the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2023, and I indicate to you, Mr Speaker, that I am the lead speaker on this bill in my capacity as the shadow minister for environment.

The Botanic Gardens in South Australia are a remarkable community asset. They are an asset with historic significance to our state, particularly the Adelaide Botanic Garden within our capital city's central business district, but they are also an environmental asset, an asset that enable members of our community to take time out with their families and friends, to enjoy, to immerse themselves in nature, to get away from the busyness of life. In some cases, many people in South Australia have chosen them as a destination, as a location for significant family events, in particular for weddings, to celebrate birthdays and anniversaries, and to get engaged in.

Our Botanic Gardens—whether the Adelaide Botanic Garden or the two other gardens within the Botanic Gardens estate, the Wittunga Botanic Garden in Blackwood or the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden in the Adelaide Hills—add to an estate which is much loved and greatly celebrated by South Australians.

I thought I would take a moment to talk a little bit about the history of our Botanic Gardens. Again, the most significant history rests in the Adelaide Botanic Garden, which was opened in 1857 and encompasses some 50 hectares of stunning gardens and unique architecture. When visitors go to those gardens, they will see places that are not only of environmental significance to the state but also places that now have been given immense heritage protection as well. I am talking about places like the Bicentennial Conservatory; the former Municipal Tramways Trust depot, now known as the

Goodman Building and Tram Barn A; the entry gates and stone wall which flank the gardens along North Terrace; the Palm House; the East Lodge and North Lodge; and the Simpson Kiosk.

The Wittunga Botanic Garden was added to the estate in 1975, and although more modest in size it is no less loved by its community. At 13 hectares, the gardens offer an important collection of waterwise plants and a unique collection of plants from both Australia and South Africa, including extensive collections of plants from Kangaroo Island and the Fleurieu Peninsula.

The Mount Lofty Botanic Garden was opened more recently in 1977 and is now the largest of the gardens at 97 hectares. It is a spectacular area of gullies and gardens that was established as a cool climate arboretum and offers spectacular views across the Mount Lofty Ranges and, in some spots, back towards metropolitan Adelaide. Those gardens were, of course, very significantly impacted by the Ash Wednesday bushfires in 1983. Much of the garden was rendered to ash but was able to be restored. There is very little sign of that destruction today, but it does form part of the collective memory of those who love and cherish those gardens and who carefully restored the collections after the 1983 bushfire.

These places are all ingrained in the memories—whether childhood memories or adult memories—of many South Australians, and that is for good reason. They are places of wonder and imagination. They are places where you can get lost within a jungle of trees in some cases. You can wind through myriad paths which crisscross various landscapes. They are unique and they are special.

During my time as South Australia's Minister for Environment and Water, responsible for the Botanic Gardens of South Australia, I was pleased to be able to commence a significant program of works across all three Botanic Gardens. Those works reached a value of some \$9.2 million. They included upgrade works at the Adelaide Botanic Garden which comprised the restoration of the Goodman Building and Tram Barn A, which provides a home for the administrative wing of the gardens and South Australia's State Herbarium, the place where a collection of over one million dried plant specimens is located. The upgrades included new toilets and the installation of LED lighting, as well as other less glamorous upgrades, perhaps, but ones that were required to waterproof the building and ensure that those collections could be maintained in the best possible condition.

At Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, the upgrades included the creation of additional car parking and improved visitor facilities, upgrades to trails and significant upgrades to toilets and new signage. Some of those works are still to be completed. It was good to be able to visit the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden earlier in the new year and view some of those works.

The works at Wittunga Botanic Garden were the first significant works to occur there since the gardens were completed and open to the public in the 1970s. That \$750,000 upgrade, which was in significant part delivered with funding through the Adelaide City Deal, enabled the provision of a new lakeside path and viewing platform along with a brand-new nature play area for young people to come and experience the garden.

It provided a significant drawcard to pull people into the gardens at Wittunga, from which they could explore and experience somewhere that in many cases they had driven past before but not had perhaps the interest or inclination to explore beyond the fence. That nature playground significantly increased visitation to Wittunga Botanic Garden and, as a consequence, allowed a whole new group of people to explore what the garden had to offer.

We know that South Australians love to visit their Botanic Gardens. The visitation numbers speak for themselves. It has well over two million visits per year, and that has been steadily growing in recent years. The gardens were largely able to remain open during the darkest days of the COVID-19 pandemic, meaning that, with only the exception of Mount Lofty Botanic Garden which closed briefly, these places were locations and destinations that people could safely visit while socially distancing.

I like to think that that contributed towards the overall mental health and wellbeing of South Australians during that difficult period—the very intentional decision that we took to keep those gardens open. Not only did we keep them open but also, with the exception of a short period when Mount Lofty Botanic Garden was closed, we actively encouraged people to visit the gardens. We

encouraged people to visit the gardens in a safe way, in a way that did not necessarily see them drive a significant distance from home, but it gave people the opportunity to get into nature. The same was encouraged with national parks and our coastal beaches as well, giving people that opportunity to get into nature and get away from the troubles of the world during that time.

By investing in these places on a continual basis, we will encourage and attract repeat visitation and give South Australians the unique opportunity to get into places which are quite different from any of our other parks and provide an opportunity for people to get into green space, to learn about plant life and to learn a little bit about history and heritage within our state as well.

The gardens in recent times have enhanced their cultural experiences and their storytelling around the plants that have a significance to Aboriginal South Australians. We have seen a very successful kitchen garden established at the Adelaide Botanic Garden. There has been the opportunity also at the Adelaide Botanic Garden to establish a stormwater harvesting and wetlands site, which again allows the public to see a practical demonstration of how high-quality stormwater harvesting and storage can be used to reduce water reliance and the overall environmental sustainability of the gardens, which obviously are significant users of water in their own right in order to keep the gardens surviving and thriving.

The previous government was proud to lead a reactivation of the Botanic Gardens through the upgrade of facilities and, of course, the provision of events from time to time as well. One of those events which was and continues to be very successful at a citywide level was Illuminate Adelaide, which launched in 2021. It saw more than 500,000 visitors during winter to enjoy the installations and experiences.

These were, of course, broader than just the Botanic Gardens across the city, but the Botanic Garden was a key site and demonstrated how the gardens can be activated, again, to draw more people in than those who might normally be visitors to the gardens. The opportunity to have events and activities in the gardens that draw people in who may discover the gardens for the first time and then form a tradition of visiting again and again and again certainly should be explored and, where that works well in a sensitive manner with those fragile landscapes, should be celebrated.

The opposition does remain exceptionally supportive of finding novel and important opportunities for the Botanic Gardens to expand the breadth of their commercial operations so that they continue to maintain and invest in the gardens and broaden their income stream and the sustainability of their financial status. We will continue to support activities that do this. We understand that the amendment bill before the house does seek to ensure that the legislation that underpins the management of the gardens in South Australia does so in a way that enables that broadening of investment and commercial opportunities. We do understand that the existing legislation is quite restrictive in regard to that.

We heard from the minister during her second reading speech on 14 September 2023 that the intent of the government's bill was to find opportunities for the Botanic Gardens to supplement its funding from government with additional sources of revenue so that it can deliver important new scientific conservation and public engagement projects. The board of the Botanic Gardens—who I have been able to work with closely over the years, particularly during my time as minister—have identified that their capacity to generate additional revenue is constrained by the current provisions of the 1978 version of the act, as I just foreshadowed.

Again, I repeat that we are supportive of legislative reform that would provide appropriate, expanded opportunities for the Botanic Gardens to be able to generate additional income, facilitating important investment and the maintenance of the gardens. However, the opposition has publicly raised concerns about the government's intention to generate income through the introduction of paid parking at the gardens on Sundays and public holidays. Those days are currently free within the way that the gardens are administered.

In her second reading speech, the minister explained that this would be an option as a future possibility, in line with similar changes occurring across the City of Adelaide. The opposition does not support this change—not now nor enabled in the legislation as a future possibility. We also think that it is relevant that the bill would not restrict the introduction of paid parking to the Adelaide Botanic

Gardens, but it would also equally apply to Mount Lofty and Wittunga which are, of course, administered under the same act.

The opposition wants to ensure that these days continue to be preserved as a day in the week when a family can come together at any of those gardens at no additional cost. They are precious places and it is important that we maintain accessibility for everyone in our community, regardless of their financial means. The cost of living is a significant issue for many, many households at the moment and the opposition is committed to opposing the introduction of unnecessary additional fees and charges upon South Australians when proposed by the government. This includes the option of broadening this legislation to enable paid parking on public holidays and on Sundays.

In response to the concerns that we have raised about these charges, we understand that the government has acted. I understand that the government have prepared their own amendments to their own bill to now exclude the introduction of paid parking on Sundays and public holidays. We have not yet seen those amendments but remain extremely willing to support those once we see them. We have prepared our own in case they are not forthcoming and will be delighted to introduce those should that be needed.

We are delighted that the government plans to respond to our concerns and the concerns of many thousands of South Australians who have contacted the opposition, and we look forward to the committee stage of the bill, when we will be able to discuss those clauses in further detail. If we assume that the government does move those amendments, we will have achieved a win for South Australians to facilitate more opportunities for the Botanic Gardens to independently raise funds through commercial activities and hopefully broaden their financial sustainability while not causing added impost to members in our community.

Our Botanic Gardens are for all South Australians, regardless of their financial means. It is important that they do not become places that are elite enclaves and are instead welcoming to all. I look forward to the progression of this bill and welcome those amendments being tabled in the very near future.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:21): A lie is an assertion that is believed to be false, typically used with the purpose of deceiving or misleading someone. The practice of communicating lies is called lying. A person who communicates a lie may be termed a liar. Without naming names, there has been a campaign of misinformation and, not only that, a purposeful ambition to mislead South Australians and even worse the community that I represent, that I live in, that I have spent all but two years of my life living in.

Though knowing full well that the information being distributed would lead to unrest and concern, those opposite and their counterparts in the other place pretended to be part of a community that showed their party the door at the last election, and all they have for them is lies. Those opposite have spent their summer not lying by the pool but lying to the people of South Australia. Even after being scolded by the Botanic Gardens board, they continued to spread misinformation. Not only have those opposite and their colleagues in the other house shown absolute disrespect to the board of the Botanic Gardens and their staff, who have had to field concerns from South Australians about some sham picnic tax, but they have continued to lie to my community.

The amendment bill before us was never intended to cause the issues it has. Even more interesting information to add to the purposeful deceit from those opposite is that the reforms being sought here were started by the now opposition leader, who was responsible for the environment at the time. Many may suggest a title more fitting was 'the minister for Glenithorne' or 'the minister not for the Murray River', but you heard correctly: these reforms were started when he was the responsible minister.

It is the case that on 17 September 2021, under direction from the then environment minister, the board of the Botanic Gardens were asked to pursue commercial opportunities to supplement their state appropriation within the extent of their powers. The board found that the 1978 act is limiting in what they thought they may like to pursue and as such have done the necessary work to update the act to be fit for purpose for the future. So it is a bit rich to have the Leader of the Opposition out spreading misinformation about the ambitions of the amendments.

In a letter that Judy Potter, Presiding Member of the board of the Botanic Gardens, wrote to the opposition leader on 15 November in response to his lies, she clearly reminded the opposition leader of the fact that his staff and the member for Bragg were briefed on the changes; in fact, she said they carefully explained that the board has never had any intention to levy a general entry charge to the Botanic Gardens and has no intention of doing so in the future.

Given the member for Bragg was in the room at this briefing, it was surprising to then see him proudly standing out the front of the Botanic Garden on 12 November, spreading lies and misinformation with the new candidate for Dunstan. I wonder if the good people of Dunstan are aware that their local candidate for the Liberal Party is involved in a campaign of misinformation. It is not really a good start. Maybe they need to be reminded of this.

Ms Clancy interjecting:

Ms HUTCHESSON: True. On the member for Bragg's Facebook page on 13 November, he continued with his deceit, where he said, and I quote:

Well, parliament is sitting again this week and we expect Labor to progress their picnic tax legislation. This is a new proposal by Peter Malinauskas that would see new entry fees to enter the Botanic Gardens and also new paid parking on weekends. There are over two million visits to the Botanic Gardens every year but the key to their popularity and their accessibility is their affordability. During a cost of living crisis, I just don't understand why Peter Malinauskas thinks it's a good idea to tax the family picnic. So the Liberal opposition are going to try to stop this picnic tax in parliament this week and we'd love your support, if you could sign our petition.

Actually, all the Liberal opposition are picnicking on is our community's personal information by data harvesting and lying—not really something to brag about, is it? Worse than just bragging about their lies on Facebook, they also pulled together a very sad looking flyer and were letterboxing it.

Fortunately, many in my community raised their concern—not with the detail but with the misinformation. My community are outraged, alright. They are outraged at the barefaced lies the opposition have been telling them and that their data has been falsely acquired. But rest assured, they know I stand up for them, stand up to the opposition and their lies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: One of my community commented on a Facebook post about the deception, 'desperate people will do desperate things', and another:

...we really need truth in politics or else we will all be led up the garden path, lies need calling out, and [as] a consequence David Speirs...I'm calling you out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: Further, a community member said, 'Nonsense, man, the libs are truly scraping the bottom of their very shabby barrel.' In fact, the back page of the *Blackwood Times* in January stated 'Wittunga entry fee claims refuted', followed by a well-written article by James Swanborough, with the opening sentence announcing:

A RECENT campaign of misinformation has left confusion and anxiety amongst some members in the community regarding the future of entry to Wittunga Botanic Gardens.

With a letter from the board quite clearly stating that the picnic tax was offensive and untrue, did the opposition stop there? Why, of course not, because all they have for my community is misinformation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: In fact, as recently as Thursday (just over a week ago), we were blessed with a visit from the Hon. Nicola Centofanti from the other place and her staff. The opposition leader was supposed to be there as well but, by all accounts, only turned up in the last 10 minutes—but that is a story for another day when we talk about his interest in Waite.

It was reported to me by a concerned community member that staff members of the Hon. Nicola Centofanti claimed, 'They are going to charge for car parking at Wittunga.' When the staff member was asked, 'Who are they?' the staff member said, 'I don't know.'

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: Now, not only are her staff still spreading lies but they don't even know what the lies are about.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: Truly in touch with the Waite electorate, clearly. Not only were they upsetting my community verbally but they were continuing to distribute a flyer on the table which contained all sorts of paraphernalia. The leaflets in question are still being distributed. This ongoing deceit and defamation of the Botanic Gardens—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: —and, more specifically, of my community, the Wittunga Botanic Garden, pushed the board to write to Mr Speirs again last week. Judy Potter, Presiding Member of the Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium again wrote to the Leader of the Opposition, and I would like to quote her directly here to avoid doubt of the intention of the bill we are here to debate. She states:

I refer to the Board's letter to you on 15th November 2023 regarding your campaign around entry and parking charges at the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium sites. It has come to our attention that, in spite of the Board clearly setting out the fact that this campaign is promulgating misinformation, there are still leaflets being handed out containing such misinformation and suggesting that general entry and parking charges are being planned for the Wittunga Botanic Garden.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: She continues:

To be absolutely clear, there is no plan from either Board or Government to introduce any such charges at this garden.

Mr Whetstone: 'We have made it three times worse.'

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

Ms HUTCHESSON: She continues:

Any suggestion to the contrary is false.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Adelaide! Member for Chaffey!

Ms HUTCHESSON: The letter continues:

I can also state that suggestions that we have seen in the media that either the Premier or the Deputy Premier have sought to have general entry charges introduced to any of our sites are also incorrect.

The Board is particularly concerned by the continuation of this campaign of misinformation, after I have both briefed your office on the actual intents of the Board, have written to you to formally correct the record, and have flagged the negative effect this is having on our community, visitors and staff.

The Leader of the Opposition has not even had the decency to reply to the board's first letter. I am exhausted, having to call out the poor behaviour of those opposite. We are here today to debate the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, so let us get some truth, shall we?

The current act provides little opportunity for the board to pursue commercial opportunities like many other comparable bodies have access to, such as the Museum and the Art Gallery. We know that places like these do well when they are able to create funding opportunities that lie outside the state appropriations. As is the case with many of our cultural institutions, the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium sought to find ways to raise additional money to support their organisation.

This bill will enable the board to raise money that is needed to update and maintain the gardens and their assets and to fund new projects and events and services. I can see it now: a Wittunga botanic gin, or some wattleseed biscuits, or a quandong dessert sauce—the opportunities are endless and will result in the Botanic Gardens having money to pursue and support research and conservation projects, like all cultural and collecting institutions can.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey!

Ms HUTCHESSON: This amendment is not about car parking; in actual fact, it already costs money to park in the city on weekends—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

Ms HUTCHESSON: —and, yes, even on Saturday, for a grand total of 80¢ an hour. But to really protect the garden from any more reputational damage caused by those opposite, we are going to further assist—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HUTCHESSON: —and will lodge a government amendment to enforce that no changes will be made to the board's current capacity to manage car parking at its sites. This means that the status quo remains and no charges will occur for Sunday car parking, either for general parking or for special events.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! The leader is called to order.

Ms HUTCHESSON: It has also been the case that the gardens could charge an entry fee for admission to parts of its sites, such as the Bicentennial Conservatory, and to exhibitions, programs, special events and special after-hours activities, and this provision will continue. This bill does not seek to charge general entry fees to the Botanic Gardens. The Botanic Gardens have always been and will always remain free to enter. A further government amendment will ensure that general admission to the Botanic Gardens, including Wittunga, will continue to be permanently free of charge.

It is sad that all the opposition have for my community is misinformation. They lied about this so blatantly, and after being scolded by the Botanic Gardens board so clearly, they continued. They cannot be trusted.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Flinders!

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (11:31): I rise to speak on the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill—or the picnic tax legislation as it has become popularly known, or perhaps very unpopularly known. We have seen a lot of anger from the member for Waite just now, but I can tell you it is not nearly as much anger as we found at the Wittunga Botanic Garden and at the Adelaide Botanic Garden when we told people about the member for Waite's plans to introduce this new picnic tax, including paid parking on weekends at the Botanic Gardens—which, by the way, the minister mentioned herself in her own second reading speech.

Ms Clancy interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder!

Mr BATTY: We have a lot to say about this picnic tax, but let's take this in turn because this is an important piece of legislation. It is a piece of legislation that seeks to update the powers and functions of the board of the Botanic Gardens, which is a very worthy aim. The Botanic Gardens are one of our state's greatest assets, managing three botanic gardens across South Australia, including the iconic Adelaide Botanic Garden just down the road, the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden not far from my own electorate and the member for Heysen's electorate, and of course the Wittunga Botanic Garden—which we have heard a lot about already from the member for Waite—which is beautiful and should remain open and free to the public.

We should push back against any proposal to introduce new car parking fees on weekends. These sites have been enjoyed by generations of South Australians. We are so lucky to have them on our doorstep, and we need to protect and preserve them and keep them open and accessible. So of course the Liberal Party supports any action that is going to safeguard the future of their operations, including some of the clauses in this bill that seeks to safeguard some of their operations into the future. Indeed, we put our money where our mouth is. We take a very different approach: rather than cash grabs from South Australians, we actually actively invested.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BATTY: We actually actively invested in our Botanic Gardens. If we look at the Adelaide Botanic Garden, there were millions of dollars' worth of investment by the Marshall Liberal government, which saw ageing public amenities being revitalised, saw the heritage restoration of the historic Goodman Building and saw an upgrade of irrigation lines in Botanic Park. All of these infrastructure upgrades actually allowed the Botanic Gardens to remain open for longer. We increased the opening hours of Botanic Gardens because we want to attract people into our gardens; we do not want to deter them from visiting, like the proposals from those opposite.

At the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden, we saw the replacement of car parking amenity blocks and we saw the upgrade of key trails across the garden to improve access to horticultural displays and scenic visits. This approach of actively investing in our public gardens that we love contrasts very strongly with the Malinauskas Labor government approach, the member for Waite's approach, of greedy cash grabs from South Australian families who are simply trying to enjoy the Botanic Gardens.

I acknowledge that public institutions are generally expected to supplement their funding from government with their own additional sources of income and I acknowledge that the act as currently drafted somewhat hamstrings the Botanic Gardens board in doing this. There is limited capacity to pursue commercial activity. There is limited capacity to enter into joint ventures, for example, unlike other arts and cultural organisations.

So, to this end, I do not take issue with clauses that will enable the board to enter into these various commercial partnerships and joint ventures to try to make our Botanic Gardens even better places to visit. Indeed, it would seem to simply confirm work that is already happening in our Adelaide Botanic Gardens. The most recent annual report of the board of the Botanic Gardens states, 'Through partnerships with the arts and culture sector, our public engagement offerings have grown'.

It goes on to list a number of partnerships and events that take place in the garden, whether it is WOMAdelaide or *Light Cycles* or the Wildlife Photographer of the Year. It also goes on to list existing commercial sponsorship arrangements, including with the likes of Santos. So we actually see this sort of work already occurring and it is not a bad thing because we want to attract these events to the Botanic Gardens. We want, say, the Adelaide Botanic Garden to be visited by many, many South Australians. We want to enliven our CBD and make it a vibrant place to visit.

What we cannot support, though, are measures in this bill that amount to simply a cash grab from South Australian families trying to enjoy the Adelaide Botanic Garden, the Wittunga Botanic Garden and the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden at a time of sky-high cost of living. This bill that has been introduced into the house amounts to a picnic tax. The key to the popularity of the Botanic Gardens—and indeed we see over two million visitations to Botanic Gardens sites every single

year—is their accessibility and their affordability and there are aspects of this bill that seek to rip away those aspects of the popularity of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens.

There are two key concerns that the opposition have been voicing, alongside the local community, since this bill was introduced by the Minister for Environment a few months ago. The first relates to paid parking on Sundays and public holidays, for which I think I have just been labelled as a liar for suggesting might occur and we can take that up next time. But what we do know is it was not just an opportunity; it was in there. It was in there.

Currently, car parking is free on Sundays and public holidays at the Botanic Gardens, so South Australian families can come to our Botanic Gardens and enjoy them on the weekend for no charge. I have been told that I am a liar for suggesting that this bill is seeking to introduce paid parking on Sundays and public holidays at the Botanic Gardens.

Can I take you to clause 4 of this bill before the house, which might appear quite innocuous. Perhaps the member for Waite did not read clause 4 of this bill. Perhaps, she has not actually read the bill, or she did not go back and have a look at the legislation itself because clause 4 appears quite innocuous when you read it at first blush. Perhaps, you only had a brief glance at the bill, member for Waite. It states, 'Section 27(3)—delete subsection (3)'. Did the member for Waite see that? That means we need to go to section 27(3) of the act, which states:

- (3) No regulation under this Act may impose, or authorise the imposition of, a fee... in respect of the parking or standing of a vehicle on a Sunday or a public holiday.

Ms Hutchesson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite is warned.

Mr BATTY: That is being removed by the Malinauskas Labor government, by the member for Waite, in this bill. It would enable car parking to be charged on Sundays and public holidays. If the member for Waite does not believe me, she could have a chat to her own minister.

I refer to the second reading speech of the minister a couple of months ago. It was a very short second reading speech. I have about half a page here. One aspect that the minister saw fit to point out at that time was the introduction of new paid parking on Sundays and public holidays, and I quote, 'the option to introduce paid parking on Sundays and public holidays'. It is in there in black and white, and the minister goes on to say that these changes are in line with community expectations. We might explore how she reached that conclusion a little later on and why, indeed, if they are in line with community expectations, this new amendment is being introduced to remove this new paid parking charge that they tried to introduce by stealth.

So I suggest, before labelling me a liar next time, the member for Waite goes and has a look at the legislation before the house, reads the legislation and sees what her very own government was trying to do to the good people at the Wittunga Botanic Garden. We are not going to be bullied into going and talking to South Australian families who are trying to visit our Botanic Gardens on the weekend. I have gone and done it and I suggest those opposite do the same. They would have realised why this was such a bad idea: the popularity of our gardens depends on their accessibility and their affordability. So we cannot stand for this new picnic tax from those opposite.

The second issue that we have been talking about is the imposition of entry fees at the Botanic Gardens. This bill does enable a number of new fees to be introduced. They are proposed by the Malinauskas Labor government in section 13(2)(he), which allows the board to regulate and control admission to venues for events. Section 13(2)(hf) allows the board to 'charge and collect fees and charges for admission to exhibitions, events or activities'. We also see that existing section 27(2)(c) allows the regulations to 'prescribe and provide for the recovery of charges for admission to the gardens'. We might explore in due course what sorts of special events and special occasions the minister envisages where we might see charges for the Botanic Gardens.

Make no mistake, unless the amendments that have been foreshadowed now—only today by the way before this house; this is the first time we have seen these amendments before this house—unless those amendments are supported and passed today, entry fees can be charged at the Botanic Gardens: at the Adelaide Botanic Garden, at the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden and at the Wittunga Botanic Garden. Make no mistake, that can happen unless we amend the bill today. That

is what the Liberal Party has been advocating for months alongside the local community and that is what the Liberal Party will be urging this house does today, because we just cannot abide this new picnic tax from the Malinauskas Labor government and the member for Waite.

The opposition has been campaigning against it since it was introduced in this house. We have been down at the Botanic Gardens talking to many families on a Sunday. On a Sunday they all park for free, of course, as the act prescribes for now. We met many families from my own electorate and from the former member for Dunstan's electorate. We have been to the Wittunga Botanic Garden and we have met many constituents from the member for Waite's electorate. What we heard from them is how this new legislation is really going to impact them and their families during the midst of a cost-of-living crisis. The Liberals stand shoulder to shoulder with these communities. We have collected thousands of signatures—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr BATTY: —on petitions—

Ms Savvas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland!

Mr BATTY: —to send a message to this minister, to the Malinauskas Labor government, that we do not want this new picnic tax and it seems, remarkably for once, the Malinauskas Labor government might have actually listened to us and the community because the minister has realised perhaps she has not got away with this new picnic tax that she was trying to introduce by stealth through this piece of legislation. Days after the opposition call a press conference to raise our concerns with this matter we apparently see this amendment filed.

What did we highlight in that press conference? First, we highlighted our concern with new paid parking on Sundays and public holidays. Secondly, we highlighted our concern with entry charges at the Botanic Gardens. What two things does the amendment that will soon be before this house, we hope, cover off only days after our press conference, with the Leader of the Opposition and myself speaking to families at the Botanic Gardens? Well, we see them removing their new paid parking on Sundays and public holidays that were apparently in line with community expectations, of course. We have seen that disappear, which is a very good thing, and we have seen a prohibition being introduced on general entry fees at the Botanic Gardens.

We are very pleased with this humiliating but happy backflip from the Malinauskas Labor government. It is the right thing to do, and it is the right outcome that has been secured by the South Australian Liberals' advocacy over the last few months and that of many, many thousands who have stood with us to urge this government to stop this picnic tax.

Finally, I do want to take an opportunity to thank the board of the Botanic Gardens not only for their fabulous work in running one of our most prized assets but also for their very generous and thorough briefing from Judy Potter as well as the director of the Botanic Gardens. The board have said very publicly now that they apparently had no intention of levying general duty charges in the garden or necessarily immediately charging for parking.

We say that makes them on a unity ticket with us. That makes them on a unity ticket with the South Australian Liberals—with us, too—because they are two things we have been trying to stop, alongside the board, perhaps, for these last few months. It has been the Malinauskas Labor government that has perhaps had other ideas on this front. It has been the Malinauskas Labor government that has thrust this, perhaps, on the board of the Botanic Gardens, but we stand with them, as well. We do not want to see this paid parking they were trying to introduce. We do not want to charge people to enter the Botanic Gardens.

Of course, another really important point is that we do not make legislation in this place on the basis of what current boards tell us their current intentions are. What we do is we look at the words of the act—the words of the bill before this house. Make no mistake: if we do not amend this bill the words of this act would introduce new paid parking on Sundays and public holidays, it would

allow the Botanic Gardens to charge entry fees at our gardens and it would place a new and very unfair burden on South Australian families during the midst of a cost-of-living crisis.

The South Australian Liberals will not let that happen. We will support amendments to this bill that will scrap Labor's new car parking fees at the Botanic Gardens that they have tried to introduce by stealth, and we will support amendments to this bill that will ensure the Botanic Gardens cannot charge a general entry fee to enter the Botanic Gardens. We will stop Labor's picnic tax.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:48): I would like to issue a warning to anyone in my community or the community of Waite that if they see a gentleman in chinos and a check shirt holding a clipboard and after your personal data, you better be very careful about handing it over, because the claims they will use to try to harvest your personal information will more than likely be misleading and wrong. We have seen that in this case and we have seen it when they have stood out the front of the Aquatic Centre. They will go to no end to harvest people's personal information based on misleading claims.

The Adelaide Botanic Garden is a beloved institution in my community. Like other icons along North Terrace—the Art Gallery, and the Museum—it offers a free escape from the hustle and bustle of our capital city. I know that, as a country kid coming up to Adelaide when a family member of mine was at the old Royal Adelaide Hospital, it provided an important escape for my family while our beloved family member was seeking treatment in hospital.

Like many in my community, I am passionate about accessible open green space, and the Botanic Gardens form part of this. It is an ever-growing institution and it needs increased flexibility for it to thrive. That is why we introduced this bill to parliament with proposed amendments to allow the Botanic Gardens board to explore commercial opportunities, such as co-branded food and drinks to help supplement its income. This is in line with other institutions such as the Art Gallery and the Museum. An example of this might be a Botanic Gardens gin, which sounds rather refreshing. We might all need one today after this debate.

However, instead of supporting this amendment bill the Liberal opposition chose to play politics. They sent out a misleading email to our communities, they stood out the front of the Adelaide Botanic Garden with incorrect claims that we would be charging entry fees for the Adelaide Botanic Garden, calling their claims a picnic tax. This was blatantly wrong and what is even worse, they knew it was wrong.

What is really disappointing is that the Liberal opposition were even briefed by the Botanic Gardens board on the amendments to the act, and they were specifically advised that general entry fees would never be charged by the Adelaide Botanic Gardens, and yet they pressed on with their misleading claims. This makes the fake news spread by the Liberals even more deplorable, as it demonstrates that they are deliberately willing to mislead our community for their own political gain and dine out on people's personal information at all costs.

The Botanic Gardens board was so concerned by these claims that they chose to write to the Liberal opposition leader, David Speirs, calling for him to correct his claims. This is humiliating. They wrote originally in November last year when the misinformation first emerged, with the Presiding Member of the Botanic Gardens board, Judy Potter, writing:

On behalf of the Board, I ask you to correct the record on the suggestion that general entry charges are being introduced, or even contemplated, by the Board.

What is even more humiliating is that again, to reiterate the board's frustration—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HOOD: —that the retractions and corrections of the claims had not been made, in the most recent letter Judy Potter wrote, and I quote:

The Board is particularly concerned by the continuation of this campaign of misinformation, after I have both briefed your office on the actual intents of the Board, have written to you to formally correct the record, and have flagged the negative effect this is having on our community, visitors and staff.

It is absolutely deplorable that because of these misleading claims the staff of the Adelaide Botanic Garden were having to bear the brunt—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms HOOD: —of your misinformation—

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

Ms HOOD: —campaign. It is deplorable. It is disgraceful that you were willing to allow staff of the Botanic Gardens to bear the brunt of your lies. Like many in my community I am deeply disappointed that the Liberals would try to tarnish the reputation of our beloved Adelaide Botanic Gardens to score some cheap political points. This bill does not seek to charge general entry fees to the Botanic Gardens. It always has been and always will remain free to enter.

A government amendment will ensure that general admission to the Botanic Gardens will continue to be permanently free of charge, and it has always been the case that the gardens could charge entry fees for admission to parts of its site, such as the Bicentennial Conservatory, to exhibitions, programs, special events and special after-hours activities, and this provision will continue.

A government amendment has also been lodged to enforce that no charge will be made to the board's current capacity to manage car parking. This means that the status quo remains and no charge will occur to Sunday car parking for general parking or special events.

I want to end on a positive note, as we probably all need a little bit of positivity at this point in the debate. I would like to just flag that in a really exciting coup for the Adelaide Botanic Garden we are going to have the world's most celebrated contemporary glass artist, Seattle-based Dale Chihuly, come to Adelaide. He has chosen our Adelaide Botanic Garden for the first major exhibition of his work in Australia. It is coming from September this year to April next year. I hope all our community can come on down and support this incredible exhibition that is coming to Adelaide and, more importantly, support our beloved Adelaide Botanic Garden. With that, I commend the amendment bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (11:53): I, too, rise to speak to the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2023. We are so lucky to live in a city that has many beautiful green spaces, and some of those are our Botanic Gardens, where many South Australians have enjoyed picnics and weddings, the mix of historic and modern fountains, the range of native and exotic plants, flowers and trees, and the lakes and wetlands.

Unfortunately, these beautiful places have been under attack lately and you would think that the Deputy Premier is heading down there with a padlock and a ticket booth and the adjacent Botanic Park would never see another half-eaten sandwich for the wildlife to feast upon. The allegation being made by those opposite that this bill will lead to entrance fees being introduced is total rubbish—just another scare campaign. A government amendment will ensure that general admission to the Botanic Gardens will continue to be permanently free of charge.

The Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium Act 1978 currently provides limited capacity for the Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium to pursue commercial opportunities which could support its ability to secure additional sources of funding. This bill will enable the board to raise money needed to update and maintain the gardens and their assets, to fund new projects, events and services. South Australians expect that the gardens will remain accessible, contemporary and offer new projects, events and services.

I note the gardens have recently updated their toilet facilities, and works are underway to revitalise other parts of the gardens, but this has to take place over a period of time due to availability of funds. The ability to raise additional funds to allow the gardens to be enriched through new projects and assets will further enhance the visitor experience.

As you can imagine, maintaining these beautiful gardens and delivering new services is a challenge, which is why, like all cultural and collecting institutions, the gardens need to raise additional funds in order to deliver a dynamic and changing array of services for the community and to carry out their extensive range of research and conservation projects.

The changes in this bill will assist the board to find diverse ways to raise money to support the work of the organisation so they never need to charge the public. These amendments bring the act more in line with both the SA Museum Act and the Art Gallery Act and other acts of other jurisdictions establishing comparable bodies. It is about updating the act, not living in the past like those opposite who probably believe these institutions should not be accessible to the masses.

The previous version of the act listed a specific set of functions and activities whereby the board and management could pursue commercial revenue. This bill replaces the prescriptive list with a general function, enabling the board to seek revenue to support the work of the gardens.

The Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium could consider a range of activities such as licensing imagery from their extensive collections, developing new products for sale, either directly or through partnerships or joint ventures with the business sector, or establishing new access programs and services.

South Australians will not be charged to picnic in the Botanic Gardens or to visit the zoo or Botanic Gardens on a Sunday. This was just another scandalous suggestion made by those opposite, which is simply untrue. Fearmongering in a cost-of-living crisis—disgraceful.

The amendment enables the board and management of the gardens to manage car parking demand and ensure equitable access by being able to arrange and enforce parking time limitations that will ensure the gardens' car parking is not used as a free all-day parking option to access other areas of the city.

This is a bill that will allow our beautiful Botanic Gardens to enhance their offerings to visitors and should be supported by all members. There will be no charge to enter the gardens, unless an event is occurring, and parking will remain free on Sundays. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:58): I take the opportunity to speak on this bill and of course raise my concern about another attempt by this government to impose a new tax on South Australians. We know how tricky Labor can be when they are in government about how they sell broken election promises. We even saw an article last week about no new taxes by the Treasurer of South Australia, but of course if you call it a charge or if you increase taxes and revenue dramatically that does not fit in that category.

One thing is for certain: if there is no ability for car park charges and entry fees to be charged and event charging for the Botanic Gardens, then these amendments that are going to be introduced by the minister during the committee process would not be necessary. They are only there because of the campaign that was run by the Liberal Party, making the public aware of the government's intent, after more than a century of free access to the park and free parking on weekends, to change all that overnight for, I suppose, 30 pieces of silver. It is a very small amount of money, but we know how Labor operates: a small amount of money here, a small amount of money there.

We saw the doubling of the emergency services levy when the member for West Torrens was a new Treasurer. Nothing was mentioned, of course, in the lead-up to that election, but there was a doubling, and of course we were very quick to make the public aware of the impact that would have. That was a very early election promise for the 2018 election, which we announced back in 2014 because we knew it was so unfair.

We also know there was an inquiry that was conducted under the previous Marshall government that found Labor cooked the books when it came to the figures that they presented to ESCOSA justifying rises in water rates. They artificially inflated the value of their assets. I think there is someone else who is facing criminal charges about artificially inflating assets—a US presidential candidate, Donald Trump. Maybe he learnt that from the South Australian Labor Party. You can actually pretend that something is worth more for financial gain, just as Donald Trump did and just as the previous Labor government did when it came to water rates in South Australia.

People do not believe the members opposite when they claim that it was a lie or a scare campaign run by the Liberal Party, because today in this chamber they are actually seeing amendments brought to this place by the government, the government that drafted this legislation and brought this legislation for a new tax in South Australia, to amend the very issue that was raised by the Liberal Party, the additional costs that were imposed on park users by the Labor government.

We would not be seeing amendments from this government today if the opposition had stood back and just waved this through. We did our job. We exposed it, and it was not fake news, it was not a lie, it was not alternative facts, because we are seeing amendments to correct it today.

If you want to talk about despicable campaigns, let's go back to the 'You can't trust Habib' campaign. Let's talk about that with the Labor Party. We saw somebody with a Lebanese name singled out, her name written against a bullet-ridden wall in an election campaign asking if people could trust Carolyn Habib. That is a dishonest campaign, not a campaign advising people of changes to the use of the Botanic Gardens in South Australia, something that people value and they want to use. They expect the government to make that available to them for their use.

That is one of the things that general taxes pay for. We do not have a user charge for most of the services that government provides in Australia. We have a tax system, and it is managing the revenue from that tax system that will enable things like the Botanic Gardens to continue to be an asset available free of charge for South Australians to use.

While I am on my feet talking about the Botanic Gardens, I would like to raise how active and how concerned a number of my constituents have been, living so close to the Botanic Gardens, about the Queensland bats. We have learnt so much about the disease that bats carry. It is claimed that these bats are native bats. They are not native to South Australia; they have come down from Queensland.

On any warm night in the suburbs of Unley you are almost covered by a dark cloud at dusk as the bats fly through the suburbs dropping God knows what as they excrete their day's feeding over the suburbs of my electorate in Unley. I think it is time that a solution came up to deal with those bats to get rid of them. I know that there are people who have contacted me who say they will not go to the Parklands because they do not want to be bitten by a bat. You can understand that, because we know that bats carry diseases that are not common, diseases and viruses that can be very damaging if that virus is injected through a bite or some other means.

So I call on the minister to investigate what opportunities are available to deal with those bats. I know it is a sensitive issue because they are native to Australia, but they are not native to South Australia and they are not native to Adelaide. I think this is the confusing issue that we see from time to time, when people defend something that is not working when someone has just decided that we should be using native trees or we should be protecting native animals when they are not in fact native.

A classic example is in the streets of Unley: box trees from Queensland which replaced plane trees and jacarandas many years ago. We see time and time again people tripping and falling on the debris these trees produce, with bark being stripped or leaving the tree almost every day of the year. The difference between those trees and deciduous trees of course is that deciduous trees have a season where they drop leaves and the council is very active in removing those leaves from the streets and keeping the gutters clear so we do not get flooding. With the box trees, it is continuous. Although they planted the damn things in the first place, local government do not have the resources to keep the gutters as clean as they should be.

With climate change we are seeing—particularly in the summertime—heavier, shorter downpours and the consequences of minor flooding off the streets in the inner suburbs. As we are seeing more infill coming through over the years and more hard surface, we are seeing fewer gardens. Where there was one property there might be three properties on the same block of land. Trees have been removed and so we are seeing a lot more water running. The debris from the trees is causing issues with minor flooding. Whether it be on gardens or whether it be even into people's cellars, it is a concern that has been raised with me by constituents.

In conclusion, the bill in its current form introduces a new tax, introduces new charges, and we look forward to supporting the government's own amendments. They have been dragged kicking and screaming back into this place to remove that risk of charges being imposed on South Australian botanical garden users.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate,

Environment and Water (12:08): I am delighted to close the second reading on this and thank all of the people who have contributed. The virtues of this bill have been described by both sides of the house. This was in fact, as has been indicated, a bill whose genesis came under the previous government and was presented to me after considerable work had been undertaken by the board. We have advanced it for all of the good reasons that have been articulated both in my original second reading speech but also by speakers on both sides of the house so I will not repeat those.

There has of course in the interim been quite the dust-up over what the bill intended and did, and also what the government intended to do. To use the word 'misleading' is probably as generous as I can be in some of the statements that were made. Essentially, two allegations were made, and they are two quite separate allegations, even though they have been muddled together in the discussion of them by those opposite.

The first allegation responded to the suggestion in the original bill, which said that we would no longer prohibit the board from considering charging on Sundays. The only place where charging is being debated, of course, is in Adelaide, and the charging on Sundays is prohibited by the current act. The board asked me if we could remove that prohibition because you do not change an act all that often, and they felt that it might at some point be useful, probably just for special occasions, in order to ensure there is a turnover of people using the parking on a Sunday or a public holiday, but that in any case, if they were ever to turn their minds to doing it, having had the prohibition removed they would of course undertake extensive consultation.

I understand that that had in fact been discussed with the previous minister, that he had inquired as to why it was that parking was not able to be charged on Sundays and public holidays. Having agreed that that was a reasonable request, and given the amount of parking charges that exist across Adelaide, the opposition decided to seize on that and say that the potential 80¢ an hour, which is what it is on Saturdays, was a picnic tax. The Leader of the Opposition I understand phoned the chair of the Botanic Gardens Board and said that, out of friendship and respect, he wished to tell her that he would be politicising this bill and seeking to gain political advantage. That is what politicians do, I understand that.

In order to assuage people's concerns we almost immediately—in early October—filed an amendment to make it clear that any such changes could only occur in the event that there was a special event occurring, rather than generally on a Sunday or a public holiday. This was in order to remove the concern that there would generally and always be a charge on Sundays.

A bill that is filed and an amendment that is filed exists in the same universe—you cannot refer to the bill and not refer to the amendment: they have both come from government, they are both our position, and the one succeeding the other subsumes the other. However, that did not dissuade the opposition from continuing to suggest that parking would suddenly be charged at all three Botanic Gardens, and that it would be charged always on every Sunday and every public holiday, even though there was an amendment that clearly meant that that was not the case.

That is one element, and it could be argued that we should never have suggested removing that prohibition at the request of the board, and because of the extent of concern that has been agitated by the opposition we will no longer pursue that and no future board will be able to consider introducing charges on a Sunday at Adelaide Botanic Gardens, regardless of the event that is being managed at the time. We have accepted that the opposition's position has agitated sufficient people that we need to make sure that the reputation of the gardens is preserved.

Unfortunately, the second charge the opposition made, which has absolutely no basis in fact in the bill that had been presented by this government, has been far more harmful to the reputation of the institution. I understand again that we are politicians, that it is something that we engage in: trying to get people to listen to us and want us to be in government and not the other side to be in government—and we need to find angles for that.

We also have an obligation as politicians to be honest with the people of South Australia. From time to time politicians get away with misleading, but usually it catches up with them—look at Scott Morrison. Usually when you serially make up things people start to notice and, unfortunately, on the pathway there you can do terrible damage to institutions in which people have faith. People love the Botanic Gardens: it has enormous visitor reach, and the Leader of the Opposition was

perfectly right when he said that, having kept it open during COVID, it was one of the places people were able to go to feel that they could quite genuinely breathe.

I felt the same about Semaphore Beach, despite some experiences the Leader of the Opposition visited upon my community during that time. I truly understand that for those living near any of the three Botanic Gardens that was a lifesaver, or at least a mental health saver, and an indicator of the extent to which people are attached to the Botanic Gardens.

To suggest that the government has secret plans to introduce a charge on general admission is simply untrue. Nothing in the bill suggests that. There is not one clause in the bill that we presented that facilitates, encourages, hints or implies that that would be the case—nothing. What the opposition has done is take a pre-existing clause—that has been in the bill forever—which gives the board the power to charge but which has never been exercised for general admission, and suggested that somehow, although that existed during the opposition's time in government, suddenly we would use it, with no evidence whatsoever.

That is what has agitated the board, and that is why the board—without my request; at no point did I ask the board to contact the Leader of the Opposition; at no point did I ask the board to engage publicly in this matter—decided that to protect the interests of their institution they had to ask that that misinformation cease. But it didn't, it hasn't. Therefore, we have an amendment to put beyond doubt that the original act—which always had that facility—will no longer have the facility to charge for general admission.

Proof that was never the intention of this government—as it was not of the previous government, for whom that legislation existed in exactly the same form as for this government—is that, having announced the Chihuly exhibition, which will be a magnificent exhibition, the general admission hours will be free, and so they should be. What an extraordinary exhibition to share with the people of South Australia and everyone who is visiting here.

Of course the general admission should be free. It always has been, even though there is a little clause in the act that has existed forever that suggests that the board could choose to charge. In order to try to protect this institution, which has weathered such a storm, we have, of course, also filed an amendment yesterday (I am not sure why the opposition is so puzzled by the existence of these amendments) to remove that.

Members have quoted from the letters from the board, and I would like to read those letters now so that they are on record, because there are many people in South Australia who have heard from the opposition—and who, touchingly, believe that a politician could not possibly completely make something up—who have become concerned they might be charged for general admission to the Adelaide Botanic Garden, to Mount Lofty, and also to Wittunga, about which I wish to say a bit more. I will just read this onto the record. Dated 15 November, it reads:

Dear Mr Speirs—

be reminded that this Mr Speirs, the Leader of the Opposition, was their minister for four years and, I think, showed a lot of interest in the Botanic Gardens, as well as in their undertaking commercial activities—

On behalf of the Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium, I am writing to you to express our disappointment at the 'No Picnic Tax' campaign you are prosecuting in South Australia in response to the proposed changes to the Botanic Gardens and the State Herbarium (BGSH) Act 1978.

A central tenet of this campaign is the incorrect claim that these changes to the Act will result in the introduction of general entry charges to the Adelaide Botanic Garden, the Mount Lofty Botanic Garden and the Wittunga Botanic Garden.

As I carefully explained to Mr Batty, and the staff from your office when we briefed them on the changes of our Act on 28 September at your request, the Board has never had any intention to levy a general entry charge to the Botanic Gardens and has no intention of doing so in the future. Indeed further amendments to the Act, which I am advised were filed in parliament on October 18, enshrine this stipulation into the Act.

No proposed changes to the Act reference general entry charging, with the exception of special sites and projects that have been subject to entry charges for many years, and across multiple governments. Given that we were very clear with your team on this, statements that there is a plan to introduce general entry charges across our sites,

and the stress that this claim is causing our loyal visitors and staff, are particularly disappointing. Your passion for the gardens is well understood to us and we would like to ensure you fully understand the Board's position and intentions.

Free daytime general entry to the BGS sites is a fundamental part of our ongoing success in serving the community of South Australia. Thanks to the hard work, innovation and creativity of the Gardens' staff in building on our core offer with special events and programs aimed at growing and diversifying our audience, we have seen significant growth in visitation over recent years, leading to a 6 year high of 1.3M visits to the Adelaide Botanic Garden in 2022/23.

Under your letter of direction as our Minister (17th September 2021), the Board was asked to pursue commercial opportunities to supplement our State Appropriation within the extent of our powers. We have found that the 1978 Act is limiting in what we can pursue and needs to be updated to be fit-for-purpose in 2023 and beyond. The fundamental objective of these changes is to give the Board the flexibility to pursue commercial opportunities consistent with our mission and purpose, and it is the responsibility of the Board and the Minister of the day to ensure these activities are in line with that purpose and with community standards.

Parking fees at our sites have long been part of our operation, and funds raised from these go directly to support the important horticultural, conservation and public engagement of the work at the BGS. The modification of the 1978 Act's blanket ban on parking charges on Sunday were proposed to better enable the Board to manage parking demand at a time when parking charges apply across the City on Sundays. Again, I was clear with your office that there is no immediate plan to implement this, rather it was to give the Board the flexibility to respond to parking demand over the future life of the Act.

Mr Speirs, the Board takes its responsibilities to ensure that the BGS serves its community very seriously. The Board and I would strenuously oppose any proposals to introduce general entry charging to the sites we manage and the suggestion that we are seeking to do so is a misrepresentation of the Board's position, and of the changes that have been proposed to the Act. On behalf of the Board, I ask you to correct the record on the suggestion that general entry charges are being introduced, or even being contemplated, by the Board.

Noting we have not discussed this with you in person as you were not able to attend the briefing, I would welcome the opportunity to discuss this matter with you at your convenience.

Yours sincerely,

Judy Potter

Presiding Member

Board of the Botanic Gardens

A very polite and restrained letter. On 2 February, Judy Potter was again moved to write a letter:

Dear Mr Speirs,

I refer to the Board's letter to you on 15th November 2023 regarding your campaign around entry and parking charges at the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium sites. It has come to our attention that, in spite of the Board clearly setting out the fact that this campaign is promulgating misinformation, there are still leaflets being handed out containing such misinformation and suggesting that general entry and parking charges are being planned for the Wittunga Botanic Garden. To be absolutely clear, there is no plan from either the Board or Government to introduce any such charges at this garden. Any such suggestion to the contrary is false.

I can also state that suggestions that we have seen in the media that either the Premier or the Deputy Premier have sought to have general entry charges introduced to any of our sites are also incorrect.

The Board is particularly concerned by the continuation of this campaign of misinformation, after I have both briefed your office on the actual intents of the Board, have written to you to formally correct the record, and have flagged the negative effect this is having on our community, visitors and staff.

I note that we have not received a response from you to our earlier letter. I remain available to meet with you to brief you directly in case you remain unclear on any aspect of the amendments to the BGS Act.

Yours sincerely,

Judy Potter

Presiding Member

Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium

I place those on record, and I think they speak for themselves. Any suggestion made in this house earlier today that somehow there is a unity ticket between the opposition and the Botanic Gardens board and the Botanic Gardens staff is laughable and will be treated so by the staff and by the board, who know exactly—exactly—what you have been up to.

I conclude by talking very briefly about the Wittunga garden because, having had the history recited by the Leader of the Opposition, I was reminded that, yes, indeed, it opened in 1975. I was at primary school next door. I was already there waiting for Wittunga to arrive. I recall the excitement at the time that there was this neighbour being developed and being presented to our community.

I grew up in Coromandel Valley. I went to Blackwood Junior Primary School, Blackwood Primary School and Blackwood High School. I am of that community, although I have been living in my own community for about 20 years now, and of course my children were born while we were living, and are living, in Semaphore. But I did grow up in that community and I understand how much people love Wittunga. From time to time, there has been anxiety about the future of Wittunga which has always been able to be reassured.

The opposition will know that well, too. They have chosen to make a community alarmed about something that is not real. They may well have success in garnering information and data. They may well have success in portraying changes to the act as some sort of victory of theirs. But politics is a long game, and in politics people learn who you are and what you stand for. For someone who is early in their career, they might want to think about how they want to present themselves to the community in the long term, because this will be remembered and it will come back. It will come back next time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: One-term wonder I think is probably an exaggeration. Having been around this game for a very long time, it is so easy to go for the cheap shot and it is almost never worth it in the long run.

I commend this bill to the chamber. I look forward to passing the amendments that have been tabled for a long time and that have been available to the opposition for a long time. Let's get this done so that we can reassure the public of South Australia about one of their most dearly loved institutions.

The house divided on the second reading:

Ayes25
Noes.....13
Majority12

AYES

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

NOES

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

PAIRS

Boyer, B.I.	Pederick, A.S.
-------------	----------------

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr BATTY: With whom did the minister consult with respect to this bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that the board determined the nature of the bill through its own internal processes.

Mr BATTY: In the minister's second reading speech, you mentioned that these changes are in line with community expectations. Given your previous answer that seemingly you have not consulted with the community on this bill, what was the basis for that statement?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: If we regard the majority of the bill in one sense and then the parking question separately, the majority of the bill is bringing the Botanic Gardens into line with the other cultural institutions in South Australia, so we regard that as having set the community expectations for how cultural institutions are managed. Parking would never have happened without a consultation process prior to any changes, so while it removed an inhibition it was not a decision to charge for parking, which was always going to be—if it ever occurred—a subject of community consultation. There have, of course, been two sets of amendments filed since then: first to limit that only to special events and then to accept that there will be no changes to parking.

Mr BATTY: It is that parking question that we have taken a lot of issue with, obviously. Just to confirm: there was no community consultation at all on the removal of prohibition on paid parking on Sundays and public holidays at the Botanic Gardens and, to the extent there was any, I assume there was no support for that proposal?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The Botanic Gardens board took the view, as I expressed in my close of the second reading speech, that given that acts are updated only rarely it was an opportunity to remove a prohibition that exists for the Botanic Gardens but does not exist for most of the parking in the city—which reflects a community standard itself—but that, as has been clearly articulated, any actual change to the parking would have been subject to community consultation.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr BATTY: What fees and charges are currently being collected by the board of the Botanic Gardens?

The CHAIR: I am not sure how that relates to the clause. There has to be some relationship to the clause, even a tenuous one.

Mr BATTY: What fees and charges are currently being collected by the board of the Botanic Gardens, and how will this change on the commencement of this act?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: In essence, there will be no change to fees being charged. There have been longstanding charges, while both sides of politics have been in government, for special events. That will not change, and there will be no addition.

Mr BATTY: We see currently charges for special events already. I mentioned some of them in my second reading contribution. I am trying to understand the mechanism under the current act for currently charging. I note section 27(2)(c), which deals with the power to set fees by regulation, and I query whether that is how we are currently charging for *Light Cycles* or the wildlife photography display. Is there an intentional decision to move that power to collect fees and charges away from the regulation space and into just the domain of the board in this bill?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The bill makes no changes relating to that matter. When we deal with removing the capacity to charge for general entry, for reasons explained at length, that then creates some changes, but we are not discussing that amendment at the moment.

Mr BATTY: On commencement, this bill will introduce several new powers in the new section 13(2), and I will look at some of those in turn. One of them is section 13(2)(hg). This is a section that will give the board the power to collect advertising and sponsorship revenue. My question is whether the board already has that power and, if not, how are we seeing the Santos advertising currently at the gardens? Secondly, how do you envisage that commercial opportunity being realised over time? Are we going to see more sponsorship in our Botanic Gardens?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It might be worth asking more specific questions in the clause that actually makes the change that is being referred to, which is coming up, section 13(2)(h), where we delete the general powers and substitute the specifics. It might be that if you have specific questions about how that will work that we go through them when we get to that clause.

The CHAIR: I will give you a chance if you want to rephrase that question more narrowly to something that relates to this clause, or we will move onto the next clause.

Mr BATTY: I do want to go through some of the specifics in the following clause, but I am trying to allocate my questions across. My question on clause 2 is: on commencement, what changes to sponsorship and advertising will we see? We already see sponsorship and advertising at the Botanic Gardens. How is that occurring at the moment in the absence of this bill, and are we going to see much more advertising and other sponsorship at the Botanic Gardens?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We would not expect to see any more sponsorship under the new legislation than we have previously, but the sponsorship will continue to be part of the way in which the gardens advertise what is occurring.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr BATTY: This is the crux of the bill that inserts a whole lot of new powers for the Board of the Botanic Gardens. One of those new powers is section 13(2)(hf) which will give the board the ability to charge and collect fees and charges for admission to exhibits, events or on special occasions or for special purposes. My question is: what do you envisage as being some of those special occasions or special purposes where we will see the ticket booths going up at the Botanic Gardens, and who determines whether Tuesday is a special occasion?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Just to be clear, the reason for this clause is because we are deleting the general provisions we need to then replace that with specifics and it is articulating what has been occurring for some time but has to articulate it specifically because of the removal of the general provision.

The understanding of general admission is essentially: during the daylight hours when there is no event that requires extra resourcing to put it on. For example, Fringe events have long occurred in the Botanic Gardens and a Fringe event, as a special event that people can choose to go to, will be charged for. The *Fire Gardens*, which was done under the previous government, the *Illuminate Light Cycles*, and, currently, the wildlife photography which is in the Conservatory, are examples of events that have had additional expenditure associated with them, additional cost and are discretely used.

As we have made clear and are introducing with the amendment, charging for general admission, the access to the gardens as they are during daylight hours, will be removed from the current act.

Mr BATTY: I am not sure that the specific provisions are in here because of the removal of the general provision because that is, of course, not coming until we amend the bill, once again, following advocacy from the opposition. But I guess what I am trying to understand is if there are any activities currently taking place in the Botanic Gardens that are currently free that, due to the provisions of this bill, the board could decide, as soon as this bill is passed, to start charging for.

I know a particular popular activity is the corpse flower, where you see queues around the street. Is this something we are expecting, for example, to see ticketed in future? Again, I am less interested in what the current director might tell you now and more interested in what this bill, and the words of this bill, might allow for down the track.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Just to be clear, the current act allows the board to set unregulated charges. So, right now, without this bill going through, the board could charge. This bill, particularly with the amendment that we are introducing, will restrict that, so this is a step forward, not a step backwards, in terms of access. I appreciate that we are talking about legislation and therefore the views of a particular board or even a particular government do not stand; the legislation stands. Nonetheless, in answer to the question of "Will things that are free now suddenly be charged for?", they will not be.

Mr BATTY: I think some of that goes back to my previous questioning, though, of how the board is currently charging now. My guess, which it would be good to have you respond to, is that it is taking place through the process in section 27(2)(c), which does not allow the board to charge, on a whim, for the corpse flower. It allows fees and charges to be set by regulation. My question is: in the future, if this bill is passed, could the board of the day decide to charge for the corpse flower because it is now a special event or a special occasion?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think, to put all things beyond doubt, there is absolutely no intention of charging for anything that is currently free, using any provisions of either the current or the future act to charge for them. The current act does facilitate that occurring, and we are restricting that so we can make sure that we preserve general entry. That is absolutely crucial. It is interesting to note that with the corpse flower the approach that the Botanic Gardens board took was to simply ask for donations. People were very generous, which just shows how much they care about the gardens. I move:

Amendment No 1 [ClimateEnvWater-2]—

Page 3, after line 40 [clause 3(5), after inserted subsection (4)]—Insert:

- (5) To avoid doubt, the Board may not charge or collect fees or charges for admission to the gardens or other land vested in, or under the control of, the Board, or any part of those gardens or that land (except as permitted under subsection (2)(hf)).

This makes sure that we cannot charge or collect fees for admission to the gardens or other land vested in, or under control of the board, or any part of the gardens, except as identified in subsection (2).

Mr BATTY: This is an amendment to the minister's own bill, and it is inserting a prohibition on charging or collecting fees for admission to the gardens. If this amendment is not passed now, could general entry fees be charged to enter the Botanic Gardens?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is exactly what the current act has always said. It has always been the case, including when the Leader of the Opposition was the environment minister. This now restricts that.

Mr BATTY: How did this amendment come about and when did it come about and is there a reason why it was not included in the initial bill as drafted?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The fact of the capacity to charge general entry fees was not drawn to my attention. I did not realise because no-one has ever done it. I did not realise there was a capacity to do that. The campaign waged by the opposition claiming that we had some secret plans to do so with absolutely no evidence we could have done exactly the same while in opposition suggesting that the previous minister was planning to do it as he had exactly the same powers before him, and he did not and nor have we. In order to calm people's concerns about the Botanic Gardens, we introduced this amendment, and it is also once I realised that the existing act contains such a provision, which was not previously drawn to my attention.

Mr BATTY: Was any consultation taken on this clause and did the board of the Botanic Gardens request this amendment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The board indicated that it was in line with its intention to never charge in any case.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 2 [ClimateEnvWater-2]—

Page 4, before line 2—Insert:

- (1) Section 27(2)(c)—delete 'gardens or other land vested in, or under the control of, the Board, or any part of those gardens or that land' and substitute:

Bicentennial Conservatory situated within Adelaide Botanic Garden

Amendment No. 2 continues to allow a fee that has never been charged and is waived for the Bicentennial Conservatory, given that it is an expensive asset and may at some point require some funding. Amendment No. 3, as described at length, no longer persists in the view that we might at some stage want to manage parking on Sundays and public holidays.

Amendment carried.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 3 [ClimateEnvWater-2]—

Page 4, line 2—Delete all of the words in this line

Mr BATTY: This is the paid parking on Sundays backflip. If we do not pass this amendment today, would the bill that you initially introduced allow for the introduction of paid parking on Sundays and public holidays?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The bill and the amendments both have equal weight; they are both from government and one subsumes the other. The government will pass an amendment to no longer pursue that position.

Mr BATTY: What you initially introduced would have allowed for paid parking on Sundays and public holidays, so it would not be wrong to suggest that that is exactly what it did.

The CHAIR: From previous discussions, you would just need to explain how the existing law stood. What you are inferring is that the existing law did not stand and that is incorrect.

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

The CHAIR: The member for Morialta shouldn't be interjecting, but you are also not in your chair.

Mr BATTY: I have a question about this amendment that I would like the minister to answer. If this amendment does not pass today, would the bill that the minister introduced allow for paid parking on Sundays and public holidays? The minister and those opposite have been running around saying—sorry, we might have to continue.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00

ADVANCE CARE DIRECTIVES (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PUBLIC HOLIDAYS BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PUBLIC SECTOR (MINISTERIAL TRAVEL REPORTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

RESIDENTIAL TENANCIES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BUDGET MEASURES) BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (INDUSTRIAL MANSLAUGHTER) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

VETERINARY SERVICES BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***REGIONAL HEALTHCARE**

Mr ELLIS (Narungga): Presented a petition signed by 99 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take steps to ensure the equitable distribution of health expenditure, material and staffing resources to ensure appropriate access to quality health care for regional and rural South Australians; and, to reclassify Port Pirie and Wallaroo hospitals to improve resource allocations within the electorate of Narungga.

*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 Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Report 1 of 2024—Regional bus service contracts—Phase 1

Report 2 of 2024—ICT asset management

[Ordered to be published]

Report published and distributed pursuant to the order of the House of

30 November 2023—Parliament of South Australia—Equal Opportunity

Commission—Third Progress Report—

Review of Harassment in the South Australian

Parliament Workplace

Reports published and distributed pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991—

Public Works Committee—

58th Report—Tonsley Technical College59th Report—Port Augusta Technical College60th Report—The Heights Technical College61st Report—Modbury Hospital Health Precinct62nd Report—New Women's and Children's Hospital Early Works Package

Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation And Compensation—

1st Report—Referral of The Work Health And Safety (Crystalline Silica Dust) Amendment Bill

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

Capital City Committee—Annual Report 2022-23

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination No. 8 of 2023—Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia

Report No. 8 of 2023—Common Allowance for Members of the Parliament of South Australia, 2023 Review of

Determination No. 9 of 2023—Accommodation Expense Reimbursement and Allowances for Country Members of Parliament

Report No. 9 of 2023—Accommodation Expense Reimbursement and Allowances for Country Members of Parliament, 2023 Review of

Determination No. 10 of 2023—Members of the Judiciary, Presidential Members of the SAET, Presidential Members of the SACAT, the State Coroner, and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court

Report No. 10 of 2023—Members of the Judiciary, Presidential Members of the SAET, Presidential Members of the SACAT, the State Coroner, and Commissioners of the Environment, Resources and Development Court, 2023 Review of

Report No. 11 of 2023—Salary Sacrifice Arrangements for Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers, 2023 Review of

Determination No. 12 of 2023—Berri Country Magistrate Housing Allowance

Report No. 12 of 2023—Berri Country Magistrate Housing Allowance, 2023 Review of

Determination No. 13 of 2023—Accommodation and Meal Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers

Report No. 13 of 2023—Accommodation and Meal Allowances—Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers, 2023 Review of

Determination No. 14 of 2023—Conveyance Allowances—Judges, Court Officer and Statutory Officers

Report No. 14 of 2023—Conveyance Allowances—Judges, Court Officer and Statutory Officers, 2023 Review of

Determination No. 17 of 2023—Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner and Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner

Report No. 17 of 2023—Auditor-General, Electoral Commissioner and Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner, 2023 Review of

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

Professional Standards Councils—Annual Report 2022-23—Corrigendum

Return to Work Corporation of South Australia—Annual Report 2022-23

Rules made under the following Acts—

Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Environment, Resources and Development Court Act 1993, Youth Court Act 1993, Magistrates Court—Joint Criminal—No. 3

Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Youth Court Act 1993, Magistrates Court—

Uniform Civil—No. 10

Uniform Special Statutory—No. 2

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

Green Adelaide Board—Annual Report 2022-23

Landscape Board Annual Reports 2022-23—

Alinytjara Wilurara

Eyre Peninsula

Hills and Fleurieu
Kangaroo Island
Limestone Coast
Murraylands and Riverland
Northern and Yorke
South Australian Arid Lands

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—Road Rules
Passenger Transport—Vehicle Age Limit
Road Traffic—
Miscellaneous—
Prescribed Breath Analysing Instrument
Road Rules and Other Matters
Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—Road Rules
Rules made under the following Acts—
Road Traffic—Australian Road Rules—Miscellaneous

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

Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator—Annual Report 2022-23
Distribution Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2022-23
Essential Services Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2022-23
Generation Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2022-23
Government Financing Authority, South Australian—Annual Report 2022-23
Industry Fund Annual Reports 2022-23—
Adelaide Hills Wine
Apiary
Barossa Wine
Cattle
Citrus Growers
Clare Valley Wine
Grain
Grain Industry Research and Development
Langhorne Creek Wine
McLaren Vale Wine
Pig
Riverland Wine
SA Grape Growers
Sheep
Lifetime Support Authority of South Australia—Annual Report 2022-23
Motor Accident Commission—Annual Report 2022-23
State Owned Generators Leasing Co Pty Ltd (SOGLC)—Annual Report 2022-23
Superannuation Board, South Australian—Annual Report 2022-23
Transmission Lessor Corporation—Annual Report 2022-23
Treasury and Finance, Department of—Annual Report 2022-23
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Aquaculture—Miscellaneous

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

Wellbeing SA—South Australian Suicide Prevention Plan 2023-26 and Suicide Prevention
Action Plans Annual Report 2022-23
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Advanced Care Directives—Miscellaneous
Controlled Substances—Poisons—Exemptions

Safe Drinking Water—Fees Notice
Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products—Regulations—Smoking Bans

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Child Safety (Prohibited Persons)—Prohibited Persons—Exemption

By the Minister for Education, Training and Skills (Hon. B.I. Boyer)—

Child Development Council—South Australia's Outcomes Framework for Children and
Young People Report 2023

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

Local Government Grants Commission—Annual Report 2022-23
Local Council By-Laws—
District Council of Yankalilla—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Local Government Land
No. 3—Roads
No. 4—Moveable Signs
No. 6—Foreshore

By the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs (Hon. A. Michaels)—

Notice made under the following Acts—
Liquor Licensing—Late Night Trading Code of Practice

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

Official Visitor—Gaybrielle Cotton Annual Report 2022-23

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. N.D. Champion)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—General—Certificates of Occupancy—
No.2

Ministerial Statement

O'DONOGHUE, DR LOWITJA

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:06): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: It is with deep sadness that I rise to speak today on the passing of Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue AC, CBE, DSG, who died peacefully with her family by her side on 4 February.

Determined, strong, thoughtful and deeply compassionate, Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue dedicated her life to the service of others and leaves her proud legacy of improving the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people throughout the nation. On behalf of all South Australians, I extend my deepest sympathies to Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue's family and her friends.

I can advise the house that following discussions with the family of Dr O'Donoghue they have accepted the state government's offer of a state funeral that will honour her extraordinary life. Further details regarding the funeral will be released in the near future. In lieu of flowers, the family has asked for donations to the Lowitja O'Donoghue Foundation in memory of Dr O'Donoghue.

The family have also asked to be present when the parliament moves a formal condolence motion, which will occur in the coming sitting weeks, providing all members the opportunity to talk about this truly remarkable woman.

Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue's life story is an extraordinary one. Born in 1932 at De Rose Hill in the remote north-west corner of South Australia, she was removed from her mother at the age of two, along with two of her older sisters. Dr O'Donoghue and her sisters were the survivors of a harrowing time in Australia's history when Aboriginal children were being removed from their families. She did not see her mother again for more than 30 years.

Employed as a domestic servant at the age of 16 years old, Dr O'Donoghue was encouraged to work as a nursing aide at the Victor Harbor Hospital. When she applied to complete her nursing training at the Royal Adelaide Hospital she was refused the opportunity because of her Aboriginal heritage.

In the stoic fashion for which she would come to be known, Dr O'Donoghue fought that decision, which included personally seeking support from the then South Australian Premier of the day, Sir Thomas Playford. The decision was eventually overturned and in 1954 she became the first Aboriginal person to train as a nurse at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

After completing her training, she worked at the Royal Adelaide Hospital, eventually progressing to the position of Charge Sister, despite ongoing experiences of racism, and remained working there for 10 years. During the 1960s, Dr O'Donoghue travelled to India to nurse with the Baptist Overseas Mission, gaining a broader perspective on Indigenous cultures worldwide and cementing her determination to fight for the rights of Indigenous people.

Dr O'Donoghue's leadership, tenacity and integrity were her strengths during decades of significant change in Indigenous affairs. She articulated the yes case for the 1967 referendum. She drove the negotiations for native title legislation that followed the Mabo High Court ruling and she was the inaugural chairperson of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Commission. In 1992, Dr O'Donoghue was the first Aboriginal person to address the United Nations General Assembly during the launch of the United Nations International Year of Indigenous Peoples.

She was awarded numerous honours in recognition of her contribution to promoting Aboriginal rights, including the membership of the Order of Australia in 1977 (the first Aboriginal woman to become so), Australian of the Year in 1984, Australian National Living Treasure in 1998, a papal honour from Pope John Paul II and investiture as a Dame of the Order of Saint Gregory the Great in 2006, and the NAIDOC Lifetime Achievement Award in 2009.

She was also invested as a Commander of the Order of the British Empire in 1983, a Companion of the Order of Australia in 1999 and has received an extraordinary list of honorary doctorates from universities around Australia, the most recent received from the University of Adelaide in 2021.

Taking pride of place amongst the honours is the honorary fellowship awarded to Dr O'Donoghue by the Royal College of Nursing in 1995 and the honorary fellowship from the Royal Australasian College of Physicians in 1998.

We mourn the loss of Dr O'Donoghue. History will regard Dr O'Donoghue as a pre-eminent and persistent force in improving the lives of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. She helped deliver significant outcomes in health, education, political representation, land rights and reconciliation. She was a formidable leader who was never afraid to listen, speak and act.

It was her wish that future generations would learn and prosper from the pathways that she had created. It is now our duty and of all the people we represent to ensure that Lowitja O'Donoghue's name is long remembered as we work to build on her legacy for the health and wellbeing of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people. Vale, Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue.

The SPEAKER: The leader, on indulgence.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): On indulgence and on behalf of the opposition, I would like to make the briefest of remarks following the sad passing but at a great age of Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue, who was well known by many Australians as being not only

a great Australian and a pioneer for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander people but particularly a pioneer for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander women and a very significant matriarch in her family and a friend to many across racial divides.

The opposition expresses our deepest condolences to the family and friends of Dr O'Donoghue. There will be a much more fulsome opportunity when we have the parliament's condolence motion to make more detailed comments from both sides of the house and the crossbench in front of her family and friends.

Today, I simply want to recognise Dr O'Donoghue's leadership from the humblest of beginnings, her tenacity to pick herself up as a member of the stolen generation, to advocate for other members of the stolen generation, to fight for her own career opportunities and then blaze a path for hundreds, if not thousands, of other Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islanders across our nation. In fact, it could be said that she blazed a path for many Indigenous peoples across the world and being the first person of Aboriginal descent to address the United Nations General Assembly certainly demonstrates the significant international legacy that Dr O'Donoghue had that extends beyond our shores.

Dr O'Donoghue was someone who had career achievements and also led her people in the most admirable and, in many ways, humble fashion. Those I have spoken to who knew her speak of her character as being tenacious but humble, wanting to bring people together rather than divide them but, equally, not afraid to be direct and blunt in her delivery of home truths.

There will be significant opportunity over the coming days and weeks for South Australians and Australians to provide their comments and their reflections on Dr O'Donoghue's life, her legacy, her achievements, her love for her family and her love for her friends. I am delighted that her family have accepted the state government's offer of a state funeral. For now, I want to finally reflect on Dr O'Donoghue's contribution as a formidable leader, a devoted family member and a beloved matriarch, and I look forward to this house sharing more of her stories and her achievements when the condolence motion is presented in the coming weeks. Vale, Dr Lowitja O'Donoghue.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:20): I bring up the 63rd report, entitled Kapunda High School Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 64th report, entitled Marion Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive Intersection Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 65th report, entitled South Australia Police Barracks Relocation Project Road Safety Centre.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 66th report, entitled Southern Fleurieu Health Service Victor Harbor Emergency Department Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 67th report, entitled Gawler and District Netball Association Court Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***AMBULANCE RAMPING**

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier still claim he will fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In recent months, we have seen the release of some of the worst ramping results in South Australia's history—4,285 hours lost on the ramp in one month—more than 1,400 hours worse than the worst month during the term of the Liberal government.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:23): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because it is an important subject which the government is dedicating an extraordinary amount of policy effort towards, including an unprecedented level of resources. The Leader of the Opposition not unreasonably points out—

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

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The Leader of the Opposition quite reasonably, in my view, points out the December data, which was an exceptionally disappointing month when it comes to ramping—November and then December. As the opposition will be aware, the government has seen throughout the course of calendar year 2023 some evidence that TOC hours or ramping hours were declining in some months, only to see an explosion in the numbers towards the end of last year. To speak plainly, that is exceptionally disappointing and somewhat frustrating, particularly where there had been a degree of positive momentum on one level.

The government sees those hours as an opportunity not to relent but, rather, to only recommit ourselves to doing everything we possibly can to address the challenge. There is a very substantial rollout of additional resources that continue to be delivered, particularly throughout the course of this calendar year—namely probably the most important element, and that is more beds. We have had the view that the system needs more capacity, particularly given an ageing population and a growing population. In the second half of this year, we will see over 150 beds of brand-new capacity come online and then 130 extra beds next year.

We don't suggest for a moment that that alone solves the problem; you need, clearly, the staff to service those beds. To that end, we have already put on hundreds of extra clinicians—doctors and nurses, along with other ancillary staff. We are literally doing everything we can. There is not a proposition or a proposal that gets elevated to the executive arm of government that doesn't get thoroughly scrutinised, and if we are satisfied it will make a positive difference, we do it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: There is very much an attitude within the government that there is little we are not willing to do if the evidence underpins that the policy will make a positive difference. We are absolutely satisfied and unmoved around the fact that additional resources are required in the system, which is why so much of the government's recurrent expenditure and capital investment in terms of new dollars has been allocated to this system—in excess of \$4 billion all up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The opposition—I think, legitimately—asked a question around TOC hours. That is an appropriate focus of the opposition, as much as it is of the government, and it is our government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What I would say is that the TOC hours are not the exclusive or only focus of the government but they are a part of a range of measures that we monitor very, very carefully. I will also say this: as we look to the second half of the year when those new beds come online, along with other investments that the government is making, it is our hope that delivers substantial improvement that we saw evidence of last year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and we expect to see throughout parts of this year as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the Premier concluded his answer? The Leader.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier apologise to South Australians for the worst ramping levels in history? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Labor has delivered more ramping in two years than the former Liberal government saw in its entire four-year term, all despite promising to fix ramping at the election.

The SPEAKER: That element of purported fact of course is going to be subject to debate, which is the first telltale sign that it may not be an accepted fact. Nevertheless, I am going to turn to the Premier.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:27): If the opposition is determined to have an analysis of statistics, they are welcome to do so. What that will demonstrate is that we have had a trajectory of growth in ramping hours that has been sustained from the former Labor government to the former Liberal government and, of course, what we have seen more recently. The challenge—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Colton! The member for Morialta! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The challenge before us—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is to turn that around, which is what this government is determined to do. For people in the system who are working day in, day out to address this challenge, from frontline nurses and doctors right up to the CEO of Health, what gives them hope is that we are actually delivering on a plan to make a difference. That actually matters, because—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What we know is that it actually matters. This is a problem that people reasonably care about. We can talk about why they care about it in just a moment. It is a wicked problem that we see around the country—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: This is where there is a degree of contrast, which I am resisting elevating, but this is where there is a degree of contrast because, on this side of the house, what we have isn't just a political point; rather, what we have is a comprehensive policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We actually have a program and a policy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Frome! The member for Morialta is on two warnings.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —a program and a policy to employ—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —hundreds more doctors, hundreds more nurses and hundreds more ambulance officers and to actually implement a hundred more beds.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The point of contrast not just between the behaviour of the two sides of the chamber but between a policy and a plan—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and a complete absence of a policy and plan is startling.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert! Premier, please be seated. The member for Morialta is on a final warning.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The contrast between the existence of a policy, a plan and a program and the absence of it is startling and one that the electorate is conscious of. What I would seek to remind—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Adelaide, member for Elder, member for Frome! Member for Hartley, you are now on a final warning. There is some fresh vigour and enthusiasm; it is a new parliamentary year. It will not surprise you to know that the standing orders still apply.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: In the short time remaining, one of the reasons that South Australians care about ramping is that when ramping gets exceptionally bad they worry about whether or not the ambulance is going to roll up when they call 000, and not just roll up but roll up on time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What we know is that ambulance response times today—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —are exceptionally better than what they were when we came to office, and we continue to dedicate ourselves to that effort because that is what makes a difference to people being able to rely on a service when they are in their desperate time of need.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett is warned.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is again to the Premier. What does the Premier say to the family of 54-year-old Eddie from Hectorville?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:32): A number of things. The first thing is that the government's expectation and commitment is to dramatically improve the situation that Eddie had to confront late last year, when his carer tragically had to call 000 on behalf of Eddie and get access to an ambulance service. Eddie's case is of course being thoroughly reviewed by SAAS, as is appropriate, and we await the outcome of that exercise. What we saw there was 000 being called. Eddie's case was triaged as a low-priority case.

Subsequently, Eddie went into the queue waiting for an ambulance, not being of an acute high order. Time elapsed beyond what would be reasonably expected for even a low-acuity case for the ambulance to roll up. When it was elevated to a priority 1 in the early hours of the following morning, of course the ambulance did come within four minutes, but in this particular case, it was too late for Eddie. There are legitimate questions around what led to that occurring, including why the late elevation to a high-acuity case.

For Eddie and his family, what matters is that when they call 000, they can rely on the ambulance rolling up at a clinically appropriate time. This is the point: the ambulance response times issue isn't a political point. It is actually manifestly important to people who rely on these services. What I would say to anybody who is concerned with that metric is that, absolutely, we need to improve on the situation that we have today, but the situation we have today is a lot, lot, lot better than what was the case two years ago.

In fact, just to be clear about this, we know that ambulance response times in the month that we have just had, corresponding to two years ago, ambulance response times were 36—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Well, we can pick any month you like. In December 2021, P2 on-time performance was 51 per cent. In January 2022, the corresponding month we have just had, it was 36 per cent. It has now gone from 36 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to 65 per cent. Now, any family who is concerned about ambulance response times would take comfort knowing that the likelihood of the ambulance rolling up on time is twice as high today as what was the case two years ago.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Almost twice: 36 per cent to 65 per cent. The number of ambulances rolling up late as a percentage was twice as high than what is the case. That, of course, doesn't change the circumstances that tragically applied in Eddie's circumstance, which is heartbreaking, but it is improving and it has improved a lot.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: An interjection referring to COVID reasonably points out COVID, and of course what we saw with COVID was a dramatic reduction in a whole lot of activity that was occurring in our hospitals because COVID didn't come into South Australia until the early months of 2022. So, in late 2021, COVID was of a very low order presence in our society, and even then ambulance response times weren't collapsing. We know that there is work to be done—that remains ongoing—but the state is in a far better position today than what was the case two years ago.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the status of the review being undertaken by the South Australian Ambulance Service into the death of Eddie, including when it will be completed and whether or not those findings will be made public?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:36): I can update the house in relation to this matter. After the tragic death of Eddie, both the Premier and I spoke with SA Ambulance Service and asked that this matter be investigated thoroughly. That has obviously been underway for a number of weeks now and is involving both the acting executive director of clinical services but also the chief medical adviser for South Australian Ambulance Service. I also asked that the Chief Medical Officer of South Australia, Dr Mike Cusack, be involved as part of that review.

They have been undertaking work over the previous few weeks in terms of looking at the case, looking at obviously what happened in terms of that day and that night, but also they have been speaking to Eddie's mother as is appropriate as part of that review as well. We don't have that review—that hasn't been received by government yet—but I think that the government has been clear of our intention to release the findings and recommendations of that review after we receive them.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): A supplementary to the minister: will Eddie's family be made aware of the findings of that review and talked through those findings prior to its being made public?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): Thanks to the Leader of the Opposition. Yes, Eddie's mother as the next of kin has been met with by the reviewers, and I understand that they have committed to meeting with Eddie's mother and talking them through and showing them the review before that is released.

STATE ECONOMY

Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the South Australian economy?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:38): I want to thank the member for King for her question. I was with the member for King just last week in her electorate, as we occasionally get the chance to do, and I was somewhat buoyed by some of the conversations we were having with members of her constituency who were talking about the challenge of finding people to employ. It feels like an entirely different conversation to the one that the state was having this time 15 years ago.

Demand for labour in South Australia has never been higher; it's having a profound impact. It brings with it challenges but it is very much a demonstration of the fact that notwithstanding the challenges that exist within the economy, particularly when it comes to cost of living, our state is flying. This isn't a set of stats that has been cherrypicked, or whatever the allegation might be; these are actually numbers that are being frequently produced by independent agencies.

Last week, for the first time in the history of the Commonwealth Bank producing the State of the States report, we came number one in the nation—number one in the nation. It is extraordinary. It comes on the back of the ANZ's Stateometer which had us in a similar position. The ABS seems to release data on a highly frequent basis that almost perpetually has South Australia leading the nation. Just yesterday, when it comes to export growth—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —what we saw was South Australia with over 8 per cent growth. I think the next best state was Western Australia, with somewhere over 1 per cent, and then everybody else was negative. We are not just outperforming the rest of the country by a little bit, we

are doing it by a very, very long way. The CommSec State of the States report pointed to a number of areas of economic activity that actually really matter to people's wellbeing, the most compelling of which is the fact that we lead the nation in new dwelling starts in South Australia. We know new dwelling starts matter because—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —we've got a housing crisis around the country—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —so, if you want to get into a new home, your best chance of doing that is in South Australia. The question is: is this an accident or is it because the government is actually intervening in the market and doing something about it? Well, I can assure you it is the latter. We abolished a whole tax for eligible new homebuyers when it comes to new builds, which has been welcomed by industry; we have done the biggest land release in the history—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —of the state; we are moving—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! The member for Colton is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —at warp speed when it comes to trying to make a positive difference to the housing market. What do we get from the opposition when it comes to housing policy? A vacuum, a period of four years of indifference as acknowledged by the Leader of the Opposition himself—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on a final warning.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and here we are: we've got Renewal with a full book, massive land release, tax reductions and in turn the highest number of new dwelling starts in the country—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —construction activity—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —employment growth, export growth—number one in the country. That is something that is worthy of celebration. We don't suggest for a moment that this government exclusively deserves the credit—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —we also pay homage to small and medium businesses in particular in our state who work so hard to realise every opportunity they've got before them. We are their partner and we look forward to partnering for many years to come.

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned.

GENERAL PRACTITIONER INCENTIVES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:42): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the government offer financial incentives to attract and retain GPs in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: In a nationally competitive environment, and with significant pressures on our emergency departments, the Victorian Labor government is offering GPs in training a \$40,000 incentive.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:43): The good news is that we have increased a range of different incentives that we are doing through SA Health, firstly in terms of offering assistance for people up to \$15,000 in terms of relocating to South Australia or, in fact, if people are taking up a job in regional South Australia to provide them with that assistance to move to a regional area in South Australia.

In addition, we have recently brokered a new deal between the South Australian government and also between the AMA and the Rural Doctors Association covering the arrangements between doctors who work for our public hospitals right across regional South Australia. As part of that new arrangement, we now have additional incentives in place for doctors to sign up and be part of those arrangements working in regional areas, working with SA Health, providing those services in public hospitals. I believe there are over 30 additional areas that are now receiving payments of up to \$10,000, and then in remote areas they will be able to receive up to \$50,000 if they sign up to be part of those programs to work in our public hospitals, as well as providing GP services.

The other key area of work that we are doing is in relation to what is called the single employer model. This is addressing the issue that we face in terms of helping to attract people into working as GPs, particularly in regional areas, and also as rural practitioners who have a general scope of services covering emergency departments, obstetrics, anaesthetics, etc., in regional areas.

There has been great success over the past couple of years working in the Riverland on this project. I particularly want to thank Professor Paul Worley, who is leading the work up there, along with Wayne Champion and the team in the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network. We are seeing doctors wanting to sign up and be part of that program, become GPs, and then, ultimately, buying houses in the area and becoming part of the local community in the Riverland.

We are now working with the commonwealth government to see if we can get the exemptions to the Medicare rules that have enabled that program—as a trial to start—to now be expanded to other areas in regional South Australia. This is something that I know the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners have been particularly interested in, as well as the other college in this area, ACRRM, as a great opportunity in terms of the potential to get more people to become a GP, particularly in terms of regional areas. I think that there is scope down the track to look at whether that could even be extended to outer metropolitan areas as well, but our focus at the moment particularly is on those regional areas.

We have a good relationship with the Royal Australian College of General Practice. We meet with the chair of the South Australian board on a frequent basis, and are always keen to discuss any other opportunities that we may have to work together, of course bearing in mind as well that primary care primarily under our federation arrangements is a federal responsibility. Obviously, we need to continue as a state government to make sure that there is pressure on the federal government to address the issues that we have seen in terms of Medicare, bulk billing and GPs over the past decade.

You can see in the Report on Government Services that was released just last week how over the past 10 years the number of people waiting for a GP has gone up and up for people waiting for urgent care from a GP over 24 hours. I absolutely can tell the house that I believe the new health minister, Mark Butler, is very committed to addressing this issue, but it is really turning apart the past 10 years, where we saw cuts and underinvestment in terms of Medicare, to address that issue.

GENERAL PRACTITIONER INCENTIVES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:47): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the minister agree with comments made by Dr Rebecca Loveridge, who is the Chair of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners GPs in Training? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: In *The Advertiser* yesterday, on 5 February, Dr Loveridge reflected on the Victorian government's GP incentive scheme. She observed that many young doctors are now opting to stay in the hospital system because they face a \$30,000 drop in pay and loss of benefits, including parental leave, if they leave to commence GP training. She then went on to say 'GPs in training should have the same pay and leave entitlements as their hospital-based equivalents'.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:47): That is exactly the point that I was raising in terms of what we are undertaking in terms of the single employer model, and perhaps I didn't explain that well enough.

What this enables somebody coming out of medical school to do is to sign up for an arrangement—in the Riverland at the moment it is a five-year contract for their training—and then they work for SA Health under an arrangement where they are paid the same as somebody who would be undertaking that training in a metropolitan hospital. They will be working in a regional area, and then they will be able to access leave arrangements, access maternity leave arrangements, access long service leave arrangements, and undertake work not only in our public hospitals and regional areas but also in primary care as well, and a pathway to having those qualifications in general practice.

This is why when both the shadow minister and I had a big meeting recently with general practitioners from across the state looking at general practice issues, this was one of the things that was listed as a key priority by those general practitioners that we met with. It is rolling out this program, which we can already see is delivering results. We are very happy to examine any other programs around the country to see if there are results stemming from those, but we can see already that there are results stemming from this work that is undertaken here in South Australia. We want to maximise that and make sure that we get the full benefit of that for this state.

GENERAL PRACTITIONER INCENTIVES

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the minister have any plans to address the concerns raised by Dr Loveridge? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: In *The Advertiser* again on 5 February Dr Loveridge was quoted in the story about workforce incentives in Victoria saying, and I quote, 'South Australia is absolutely at risk of a brain drain across the border' if we don't apply these types of incentives.

The SPEAKER: Tremendous newspaper, *The Advertiser*.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:49): Thank you. Quoted three times in three questions.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: We read it often.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's right: we read it on this side of the house. It's good to know the shadow minister reads it. Not everybody on that side does read it. I reiterate the comments that we want to invest in terms of evidence-based programs that can make sure that we can address the issues that we face. Obviously, our primary area of responsibility is as per every state in relation to public hospitals and ambulance services, the federal government have a primary responsibility in terms of general practice and also in terms of aged care, and we are working collaboratively with the federal government in terms of their investments in Medicare.

We are also working collaboratively with the federal government in terms of addressing the barriers in terms of recruitment of staff into Australia. This is a big issue that we face right across the country, where we are in a globally competitive environment and where we are competing, particularly at the moment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —for people from the UK. You can see that those doctors do want to come here but they face extended waits in terms of the processes involved in immigration, the processes involved in the medical board, and the processes involved in the colleges compared with countries like Canada and New Zealand that have taken action in recent years to streamline those processes to make it a lot quicker for people particularly from low-risk countries to gain their accreditation immigration status to be able to work here.

A recent example of that is that we have been successful in attracting a GP to Wudinna recently, which obviously is in one of the more tricky areas, and I am sure the local member is very appreciative that that has occurred. The doctor who came to Australia from the UK faced a year's wait in terms of being able to do that. That doctor, in fact, mentioned how he had seen campaigns being undertaken in the UK at the time, but the steps involved through all those processes were very lengthy compared with other countries. Thank you to him for persevering through that process.

The good news is that we have undertaken a lot of work with all the other states and the federal government. There has been a review by the former New South Wales health secretary Robyn Kruk into all the processes from end to end in terms of recruitment of overseas health practitioners, particularly doctors and particularly from lower-risk countries like the UK. At the recent national cabinet meeting that the Premier attended, there was an agreement in terms of the implementation of this to make sure that we can get those processes fixed to make sure that we can recruit as fast as we possibly can.

The other end of the coin as well though is in relation to how we can get more Australian doctors through medical school. A lot of people don't know that the number of doctors who go through medical school is capped by the federal government. While we are seeing increasing numbers of doctors needed in our public hospitals, and we are certainly hiring more doctors, and every other state is hiring more doctors to work in our public hospitals, we need the number of doctors coming through medical school to increase to make sure that we can meet that demand and also to make sure that we can address the fact that many doctors now are wanting to work part time compared with the doctors of previous years. So for the same number of headcount we are getting less FTE.

That's why another thing South Australia has been advocating to the federal government is increasing those medical places so we can increase the supply of South Australian and Australian students.

VISITOR ECONOMY

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Tourism. Can the minister provide an update to the house on South Australia's visitor economy?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:54): Today was one of those massive milestone days for South Australia, with Emirates committing to coming back with daily flights from 28 October. When we came to government, we were very committed to building back our tourism economy and that meant reinstating those airlines that ceased during COVID. Our expectation is of a \$160 million impact to our economy through tourism and, of course, through freight. Each flight will take 14 tonnes of freight to and from Adelaide to Dubai and beyond.

Of course, Emirates has 140 connections throughout the world, so with one stop we are connecting to the globe. It is a fantastic day. This builds on our fantastic announcement that we made of hitting a \$10.2 billion dollar visitor economy. Our expectation was to build back to where we were before COVID, but what we have actually done is gone beyond that already and this is a fantastic opportunity. We have already reached \$1.22 billion in international spend beyond and above our

COVID figures. Emirates' announcement today will only build and build that opportunity that we have, supported of course by interstate visitation at \$3.6 billion and intrastate at 3.2.

We do know that the CBD of Adelaide was particularly impacted during COVID, particularly when those convention, conference and business delegates were not coming. I am so pleased to see that the visitor spend in the CBD is back to \$5.6 billion. This is a record-breaking amount and it goes also to the hard work we focused on with major events.

We know people are talking about South Australia more now than they have for a decade and what a great start to the year we have had. In 2024, we started with the Adelaide International live at the drive—fantastic tennis—and then, of course, we had the Santos Tour Down Under. It was a fantastic competition we had this year and, of course, next year is our 25th anniversary. We are expecting great things and I look forward to announcing those.

There is the Laser Men's World Championship. I don't know that much about sailing, but, I tell you what, 45,000 hotel nights turns my head. We have had three lots of championships, just wrapping up now out there in the western suburbs, impacting our economy.

Of course, it is our favourite time of the year with the Fringe, Festival and WOMAD coming back. The Fringe sold a million tickets last year. That was a great announcement and a great achievement. Of course, that leads us in to Gather Round and LIV Golf. These are two events people talk to me about when I am interstate and about how excited they are. We know that people have been buying their tickets as quickly as possible. The LIV Golf hospitality tickets are sold out already.

In May, we are leading onto Tasting Australia. What I love about Tasting Australia is the impact on regional areas. Of course, 47 per cent of every dollar is spent in the regions. The regions are a key player. It is such an important part of what people want to connect to in South Australia.

In July, we are onto Illuminate. Everyone puts on their beanie and their coat and comes to those events, both free and ticketed. What I am most excited about is an international event that will be here for the first time. Dale Chihuly's *Garden Cycle* will be in the Botanic Garden for seven months from September through to April 2025. This will be the first time in the southern hemisphere. It is absolutely stunning. Once again, there will be free entry for South Australians for what is a beautiful exhibition.

HUNTER CLASS FRIGATE PROGRAM

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:58): In the spirit of bipartisanship, I am delighted to hear Emirates is returning. It will save me about four hours going into Glasgow instead of Edinburgh when I return to Scotland, so it is excellent news. I am not returning permanently. My question is to the Premier—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Onto more serious matters: is the government fighting to maintain the program of nine Hunter class frigates being built in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 5 February 2024, a number of news reports claimed that the Premier was 'relaxed' if the Commonwealth government delivered six frigates. It has also been reported that Australian Industry and Defence Network chief, Brent Clark, has said that, given the government was prioritising speed to capability, defence would have no choice but to procure from overseas to the detriment of local companies.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:59): I thank the leader for the opportunity and for his question because it's extremely important on a range of different levels. In respect of the last part of the Leader of the Opposition's question, if the federal government went down the path of seeking to procure frigates or any major surface ships from overseas, that would have a deleterious impact on local industry and, in our view, the long-term security and sovereignty

of the country, and we would actively campaign against it. We have made that view clear: formally, informally, private, publicly, at every possible level.

Yesterday I had the opportunity—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I'll come to the number. Yesterday I was in Canberra to advocate the state government's position specifically in regard to the Hunter class program. What we know is this: the commonwealth, under the former government, identified the building of the Hunter class in Adelaide. They announced the policy of building nine of the ships in Adelaide, but in terms of the funding profile, there were zero ships—zero ships—and that's part of the challenge.

The federal government now has to make sure that if we are to build the Hunter class in South Australia, we don't just announce a number, we actually announce the extraordinary volume of dollars that is required to actually build them. That's where the rubber hits the road. Not too dissimilar to health policy, you have actually got to put the money in. With the federal government, they have to deliver upon that.

In terms of what matters to our state and to the industry more than anything, it is the continuous shipbuilding program. The South Australian government is entitled to have a view around what ships, but largely we want the federal government making decisions around what ships are built that best meet the Navy's needs, particularly in the current strategic environment. What matters from our perspective is that we are actually building the ships here in South Australia, which is central to the sovereign capability of the nation.

To that end, we do not believe that the federal government can honour its commitment to continuous shipbuilding in South Australia without it being Hunter, because if they don't deliver Hunter, then there is no continuous shipbuilding. Hunter has started. It needs to continue. For it to continue, they have got to allocate the resources to build Hunter. It is our view that a commitment of just three would mean it would be almost impossible for them to honour that pledge. Six ships takes us into the late 2030s and that would provide time for the commonwealth to assess Hunter, amend the Hunter program, redesign Hunter and come up with a new version to replace Hunter, so that continuous shipbuilding can continue beyond the late 2030s.

What matters is that we get Hunter and we get it now, and that we have a plan to work out whatever replaces Hunter, because the absence of that gives us the valley of death that we have seen across governments at a federal level. What we are campaigning and advocating for is a release of the surface ship review and for the federal government to honour its commitment to continuous shipbuilding here in South Australia, and that we get on with the task of actually allocating the funds and building them.

We acknowledge the federal government's position that there are no dollars allocated to nine frigates; there never was, it was just a media release. What we need now is to allocate the funds to actually start building these ships in South Australia and creating all the jobs and economic opportunity that comes with it.

REGIONAL ROADS

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Regional Roads. Can the minister explain how the iPAVe system may assist in road maintenance? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: MacKillop has a backlog of road maintenance that needs urgent attention. I am aware the Intelligent Pavement Assessment Vehicle is due to investigate roads in the local areas.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (15:04): I thank the member for the question. I am sure, as a fellow regional MP, he is very concerned about his regional roads out there. I know the member deeply cares about all the roads across not only his electorate, but the surrounding electorates.

On 3 May last year, I announced in this place that I would undertake an analysis of the roads across all of regional South Australia. Recently, I enjoyed a demonstration of the world-first technology that is being used to assess the condition of all roads in regional Australia. This is the iPAVe truck. It was deployed in South Australia for the first time and has already covered nearly 400 roads across all of regional South Australia, providing rapid data collection without the need of traffic control. The iPAVe 3 is the only comprehensive pavement measurement vehicle that can provide structure and service condition data in that way.

I had the opportunity to look at it in the depot here through the department of transport. I also had the opportunity as the local member to have the mayors of the surrounding councils, including Copper Coast, to come up and have a look at that opportunity so councils can also utilise this facility.

The Intelligent Pavement Assessment Vehicle is a prime mover and a trailer equipped with the heavy weight over a single rear axle. A series of lasers mounted in the trailer measures the performance of the pavement in the wheel path as the truck travels down the road. It can get up to 80 km/h. Several cameras are also mounted on the iPAVe to collect asset and pavements imagery, and the ground penetrating radar is also included in the sensor suite in combination. This can go down to one metre under the road to actually get the opportunity to see how good it really is. This information is used to assess the bearing capacity of the pavement itself.

I am advised that the iPAVe 3 has covered 6½ thousand kilometres of the 18,000 kilometres of the state's sealed road network. More than a third of the survey has already been completed. This new vehicle has already covered the rural outskirts of Adelaide up to the Northern Territory. It has also gone to the Far North of our state as well as parts of Yorke Peninsula and also Eyre Peninsula. The member for Flinders should be very aware of that himself.

As the local member for MacKillop suggests, the iPAVe 3 is due to cover the South-East region later this month, including roads in and around his electorate. I would encourage him to also include and communicate with his councils there. The data gathered will be used to help determine future road maintenance and prioritise repairs and upgrades in MacKillop and across all of South Australia.

Once the condition of the south-east road network has been assessed, the iPAVe3 is set to travel next to Kangaroo Island to assess the roads on the island itself. The iPAVe 3 analysis of South Australia's roads is due to be completed by the middle of the year. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport will then analyse the results and submit a final report to my office in the ensuing months.

Unfortunately, after four years of the previous government and rivers of COVID stimulus cash flowing into the state for road maintenance over that period, this government inherited a backlog of \$2.1 billion. How is it possible that in just four years under the care and control of the previous government that the road maintenance backlog more than doubled?

It demonstrates a total lack of concern for regional communities by the inner city elite of the Liberal Party. People in communities across all regional South Australia, like MacKillop, know that their roads got worse over the last four years. However, we will analyse the roads, we will get the true indication—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —and prioritise it on a needs basis.

The SPEAKER: Order! There were a number of interjections from either side and so I permitted the minister to speak.

HUNTER CLASS FRIGATE PROGRAM

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. What actions is the Minister for Defence and Space Industries taking to ensure the full complement of nine Hunter class frigates will be built here in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: On 5 February, the Premier travelled to Canberra to advocate to the federal Minister for Defence to continue the Hunter class frigate shipbuilding program in South Australia. The minister did not participate in this delegation.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:08): It was a really insightful observation from the shadow minister that the Premier was in Canberra yesterday. Well observed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier, please be seated. The member for Morphett will leave under 137A for the remainder of question time. We are not going to have that type of behaviour.

The honourable member for Morphett having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What the shadow minister was referring to was the fact that yesterday we made an important trip to Canberra to advocate on behalf of the state's position. I have to say that I am very, very grateful for the fact that as Premier I have the ability, not having any portfolios exclusively allocated to me, to travel to Canberra and advocate on whatever the most important issue of the day is in the full knowledge that I have a suite of ministers who are utterly dedicated and thoroughly committed to their respective portfolio areas. That is not more true in any portfolio than in the Deputy Premier's responsibilities.

We are working collectively to make sure we advocate this case. The Deputy Premier's work, particularly in the defence industry, does not exclusively pertain to the work of Defence SA; it actually goes more broadly than that to the single biggest challenge that all of these programs have, and that is workforce. We know that the development of the workforce that is required to build the frigates, let alone the submarines, is a real challenge.

The work that has been undertaken in the Department for Industry, Innovation and Science from the minister is extensive. I would like to acknowledge the work of not just the Deputy Premier but Adam Reid and their team, who have done a lot of work getting down to the nitty-gritty of the profile of the workforce and the skills that we need to be actually able to build the equipment. I have to say: it is going to take a whole-of-state effort, which is why I think it is appropriate that those responsibilities sit at the highest levels of government, and particularly with the Deputy Premier.

We have already announced a whole range of different policy measures that we have initiated to tackle that challenge, but this would be an opportune time to highlight probably one of the most tangible ones that is most readily understood by the electorate, because it is now physically able to be seen, and that is the development of the technical colleges. This is a policy that the Deputy Premier was able to institute while we were in opposition and the now Minister for Education has the responsibility of delivering.

We can see firsthand that in the space of less than two years now down at Findon High School is a brand-new technical college full of students doing their work, including a suite of young men and women who are now getting the technical skills at Findon High, starting in year 10, to be able to complete their SACE certificate, walk out of Findon Technical College and walk straight into a job at BAE, one to one. That is because BAE have been central to the development of the course that is being delivered—not just the course but also the infrastructure of the course being delivered at Findon Technical College.

It is a policy effort that had its genesis going right back to the Deputy Premier's stewardship in opposition in crafting that effort. It is making a real difference on the ground now, which isn't just appreciated by BAE, it isn't just appreciated by the commonwealth; it's appreciated by the young people who are excited about taking up that challenge and setting themselves up for a long-term and prosperous future.

APPRENTICESHIPS

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister explain why

apprenticeships in shipbuilding-related pathways have dropped since Labor came to government? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: NCVET data shows that since Labor came to government there has been a 69 per cent drop in commencements for engineering apprenticeships and a 47 per cent drop in commencements for 15 to 19 year olds. These results are in stark contrast to the significant year-on-year growth in the previous years. Labor's commitment to the engineering pathway at Findon will see 20—just 20—students going into those jobs at BAE around the end of 2025 or early 2026.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:14): I thank the member for Morialta for his question. I think if I could cut to the chase around the reason for why there has been any drop in apprenticeship numbers, we saw during COVID a large amount of stimulus money put in by the former federal government—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Worst in Australia. The worst drop in Australia.

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Unley!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: This was your big opportunity this week, but you're still here. You're still here, like the Ghost of Christmas Past, lurking around. A great deal of money was given—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: A large deal of apprenticeship wage subsidy was given by the former Liberal federal government, and that can play a role in increasing apprenticeship numbers, but of course you have to ask the question around whether that is sustainable or not. What we are seeing now, post that stimulus ending, is more organic growth through all the things that we are doing in South Australia but also the things that the federal Albanese Labor government is doing as well to actually grow those numbers outside of offering those subsidies for apprentices. The technical college is certainly an important part of that. I would remind both the member for Morialta and this place, though, that the Findon Technical College is just one of five that we are building. It is the first.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey, member for Newland!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I would also point out that what we are building here with these five technical colleges—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is on a final warning.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I might politely remind the member for Morialta—and we are normally pretty good at being bipartisan on issues around education—that these are also five brand new public schools that we are building.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: They're not new schools: they're new buildings.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I think they are new schools. They are five new public schools.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: We are splitting hairs now. The point I am seeking to make is that when those—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta, your exchange with the member for West Torrens must cease. I am going to grant the minister an additional 15 seconds if required.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The point I was trying respectfully to make was that when those opposite finished some of those new public school buildings that were announced by the Deputy Premier, we gave plaudits to those opposite. We gave plaudits for building—

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

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Which you claim is yours but is clearly not. We are building here five new public schools. If you do indeed seek to be bipartisan in how you approach issues around education and public education—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe, member for Schubert!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —here is a fantastic opportunity for you to get behind not just Findon technical school but the other four that will be open by 2026 as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Unley is warned for a final time.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: If I could circle back perhaps to the member for Morialta's question, indeed there was a laser-like focus from those opposite when they were in government around commencements—very important. The member for Unley only spoke about commencements, though. He very rarely liked to talk about completions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: It might come as a surprise to those in this place that if we look nationally at the training system in Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is on a final warning.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —it is about one in two who make it through from commencement to completion. It is an exceptionally inefficient system, and we are focused here on not just trying to increase the number of young South Australian people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —and mature South Australian people who are in training but making sure they get all the way through from starting that training or apprenticeship to actually finishing, which is not something that those opposite were very focused on in the four years that they had on this side of the chamber.

TRADE AND INVESTMENT STRATEGY

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister update the house on the state's trade and investment strategy?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (15:18): I thank the member for Adelaide for her question and her interest in the state's trade and investment strategy. It's all good news. Our state's export and investment figures absolutely demonstrate the confidence that we have in the state economy. Yesterday's publication of the ABS stats on international trade in goods reported for the 14th time during this government's tenure that South Australia produced record merchandise exports valued at \$17.93 billion for the year ending December 2023.

We are one of only two states that recorded an increase, with every other state having falls. As the Premier told the house, Western Australia, off the back of its incredible mineral wealth, saw an increase of just 1.1 per cent and we are up 8.5 per cent, the fifth consecutive month that South Australia has led the nation for export growth. So that's good news. It's good news for jobs, good news for higher earnings, good news for higher investment, good news for higher profits, and it's a testament to the government's strategy, I think, in these things.

We have re-established Invest SA, which was scrapped by the former government. That has already funnelled a billion dollars of investment into this state. We have the government's hydrogen plan, which paves the way for the decarbonisation of our economy—something that they oppose. We have the Northern Water Supply project, unlocking mining exports; the AUKUS defence pact, and all of the pipeline of the frigates, as the Premier said, cementing our status as the defence state.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Listen to them opposing all the good news. They hate good news, hate it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Nothing gets them going—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders, order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —like good news. We are targeting the emerging markets in the region. We are opening new markets that are coming to us as a result of—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: South Sudan, for instance, which has opened up for wheat farmers in your electorate, mate, so you should pay attention. You should pay attention.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: You should actually pay attention. One of the other things we have seen is that since—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —we have a grown up federal government, which has a grown up relationship between Beijing and Canberra, that has facilitated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —the Premier leading a trade mission to China, which was very well timed for our rural exports in particular and our winemaking regions in particular. So what we have is actually a coherent strategy, not some sort of wish list. What we are doing—we have even had bipartisan missions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We have even had bipartisanship in this area. We are focusing on China, the United States, on India, on expanding their great demand for our commodities and our exports—copper, iron ore, wheat, barley, lentils. All of those things we are focusing on. I know the member for Chaffey had a really good meeting about lentils in India, and I am glad he did that. It's a

very important part of our export strategy to be bipartisan and to have stability and predictability in government policy.

But we have also made important investments via the budget and we now have the largest international footprint in the state's history—new offices in Washington, in Frankfurt, in India—and we have appointed Mr Martin Haese as a special envoy to Singapore and South-East Asia. Why is that important? Because we have a 30 per cent increase in export growth to South-East Asia—a 30 per cent increase in that area. We have Thailand up almost 70 per cent, Indonesia at 42 per cent, Vietnam up at 26 per cent. So these are huge markets for the state, huge opportunities for the state's exports, and we would have thought that the opposition would support this.

Ministerial Statement

O'DONOGHUE, DR LOWITJA

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:23): I table a ministerial statement made by the Hon. Kyam Maher, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, in the other place.

Grievance Debate

MARSHALL, THE HON. STEVEN

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:23): I take the opportunity today to pay tribute and use this speech to give thanks to the Hon. Steven Marshall, the 46th Premier of the state of South Australia and the 42nd Leader of the Opposition.

I think when anyone serves in a leadership position and role like Steven Marshall has for an extended period of time it is appropriate that the parliament takes the opportunity to pay tribute to his achievements, to the sacrifices that he made to do that role, particularly in relation to time spent with his family and friends, and obviously to also highlight the legacy that Steven Marshall contributed to his local community, both as a local member of parliament and more broadly across the state as Premier and minister for four years between 2018 and 2022. Steven has a significant legacy and I have said multiple times that I believe that history will be kind to the government of Steven Marshall and, in particular, the leadership provided to this state by Steven Marshall.

Steven is a personal friend and he is a mentor. He has consistently supported me from the time I was a candidate to when I was a backbench MP, to when he put faith in me and promoted me to be a shadow minister. He then consistently gave me support during my time as a minister. I think I speak on behalf of all my colleagues on this side of the house, and in the other place as well, when I say wholeheartedly that Steven provided us all with a level of support, encouragement and mentorship to help us gain confidence in our portfolios and to help us connect with and reach into the communities that we represent. There was not an occasion when he was not there for me, and I am sure for many of my colleagues, to support us and to help us do our jobs well.

I remember when I was the shadow environment minister I was laid up for a couple of months with glandular fever. I missed several weeks of parliament; I could not attend key events. Steven said that he would cover them. He would go to the many waste management breakfasts, he would attend the various meetings with stakeholders and he did that as Leader of the Opposition. He said, 'Don't worry about it, David, you get better. I will do it.' I thought as leader of the party that was a pretty significant sacrifice to make. It could have been passed on to another shadow minister, but he said that he would do it.

Steven's legacy, in terms of his contribution to our state, will rightly in some ways be seen through the lens of national and international leadership success around the COVID-19 pandemic. But it must be much greater than that. It must be about repositioning our state's economic foundations, honing in on embryonic industries associated with and supporting the existing defence industries, particularly around space—the achievements around bringing a range of space startups to our state.

Of course, the National Space Agency being located in Adelaide must be attributed to Steven Marshall. His focus—his obsession—sometimes irritating, was on cybersecurity. He went on and on

about the need for us to be obsessed about cyber, and he was right. That is an area that we need resilience in and the opportunity for this state is immense in this area of cybersecurity. The jobs that will create, the IP and intelligence that will create in our state will be transformative. Steven's legacy sits a few hundred metres from here in Lot Fourteen, the former Royal Adelaide Hospital site, which could have been apartments but with Steven's relentless focus has become a place of startups, a place of entrepreneurialism, a place of intellectual property to take our state forward.

When a former leader of our state departs the parliament, it ought to be recognised. His contribution and his support for so many people across this state ought to be kindly reflected upon. His relationships across the country and across the world that were used to build up this state ought to be celebrated, and so today I want to put on the record my thanks and, on behalf of the Liberal Party of South Australia and many South Australians, our thanks to Steven Marshall for the leadership that he brought to South Australia.

STATE ECONOMY

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:28): I rise further to the Premier's earlier comments to share some further detail about the extraordinary achievement that South Australia has recorded over the last two weeks, now being found as the number one performing state economy in the nation. This is an extraordinary achievement for all South Australians. This is not an achievement necessarily for this government; this is an achievement for all participants in our economy. This has been an extraordinary effort over the last couple of years in particular as the state has gone from strength to strength.

In the last two weeks we have been found to be the number one economy in the nation, leading the nation on four of the eight key economic indicators that the CommSec report looks at. If you cast your mind back to two years before, and you look at the CommSec State of the States report that covered the performance of all states and territories for the first quarter of 2022, the state was ranked equal fifth in the nation, and this shows the remarkable progress which we have made as a state in only the last two years or so.

Those four areas that the CommSec State of the States report finds indicates just how important this achievement has been for our state's economy and where we can expect to see the growth going forward. Pleasingly, in the first full financial year of the Malinauskas Labor government, South Australia had the fastest economic growth rate amongst all states. What a remarkable achievement—3.8 per cent—significantly higher than the national growth rate of 3.1 per cent.

The most recent survey from the ABS has our unemployment rate once again below 4 per cent, not quite at the record low that has been recorded in the last six or so months of 3.6 per cent, but to be at 3.9 per cent, a full percentage point lower than what it was at the time of the last election, shows just how strong jobs growth has been; tens of thousands more South Australians employed over the last two years and, pleasingly, a significant reduction of the number of unemployed in South Australia.

We lead the nation on construction work. A record \$8 billion in engineering construction work was done in the year to the September quarter and, as the Premier said, we lead the nation on dwelling starts, which could not be more important as the nation confronts a housing crisis and, in particular, a housing affordability crisis.

I spend quite a bit of time, as pretty much everyone does on this side of the chamber, thinking about what our role and responsibility is to try to provide an environment in which economic growth can flourish. Of course, it is not all up to the state government. We are only one significant economic participant, but we are by no means the largest participant in the economy. We represent less than a fifth of economic activity, so this is really an achievement of the majority of South Australians, but it is our role to provide some certainty and some confidence to back up the public investments that we commit to.

I cast my mind back to roughly the same point in time of the last electoral cycle, and think about the two different approaches from this government compared to the previous government. Now you might remember at about this same time of the previous economic cycle under the previous Liberal government we had had six months of the most contentious, debilitating public debate about

land tax reform that the state could remember, and we had a Business SA survey released with its latest confidence statistics showing that business confidence cratered at the end of 2019 after this debilitating debate over land tax.

There had been a drop-off in the intentions for private sector investment. There had been a drop-off in housing finance commitments because uncertainty had been introduced into the South Australian economy by that. Contrast that to the approach of this government. We have committed to no new taxes and no tax increases, and not only have we done that but we have cut taxes, particularly for first-home buyers in the middle of a housing affordability crisis. This is a great achievement by the whole state, and one which the government looks forward to continue fostering into the future.

MARSHALL, THE HON. STEVEN

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:34): I met Steven Marshall in 2006. In 2008 we became colleagues as candidates for Dunstan and Morialta—Norwood and Morialta as it was then. He and I have become friends over those years and he has worked his guts out for South Australia.

Today, he has tendered his resignation to you, Mr Speaker. He is no longer the member for Dunstan. The Hon. Steven Marshall is a former Premier, a distinguished citizen and will continue to be a massive contributor to our state. His legacy alone will continue to contribute to our state. I will say much more about him and his legacy in the future.

Today, I want to give voice to some of the people outside this parliament who have had particularly important things to say. I think the editorial in *The Advertiser* a week or so ago had it very right in that it said he always put our state before his political interests. Indeed, the only criticism that could really be levelled at him is that politics was not his first passion.

I reflect on the comments of some of our AM broadcasters of distinction made this morning on morning radio, with news of his imminent resignation from the parliament. David Penberthy said:

One of the things that defined your premiership was how much work you put into trying to reverse the brain drain from South Australia.

Will Goodings said:

In terms of the things that the normal public cared about, he was a victim of the worst case of bad timing you could possibly imagine in politics.

On the ABC, Sonya Feldhoff said:

When you took over from Isobel Redmond, you were that unifying factor. You were leading and bringing people together.

Across social media there are many great South Australians who have reflected on Steven Marshall's outstanding legacy and I pick some of them to give voice to their words. Derrick McManus, a South Australian hero said:

Thank you for your service The Hon. Steven Marshall. Have a very happy and successful future.

Viv Padman OAM, the Executive Director at Premier Health Care, said:

Formidable record of turning the State around during a very difficult period.

Helen Edwards AM, the Director of the National Wine Centre of Australia, described it thus:

Integrity, inspiration and innovation despite drought, bushfires and a pandemic. Thank you as Premier for making tourism's economic recovery a priority. The results particularly in our regions defied the odds. All the best.

Tina Ferguson said:

Congratulations on a job well done Steven. Thank you for your support in some of the programs I was involved driving opportunities for women in STEM. You truly care and stand by your words, you'll always have my vote. Look forward to seeing where you pop up next.

A leader in the arts industry, not just in South Australia but around Australia and internationally, Rachel Healy said:

The Hon. Steven Marshall your personal commitment to the arts and extraordinary leadership and support for philanthropic giving was nothing short of remarkable. You will be hugely missed.

In a similar tone, Yarmila Alfonzetti, formerly of State Opera South Australia, said:

I remind state and federal politicians on a regular basis about the example you set by being authentically invested in, passionate about and committed to the performing arts industry...many of them could take a leaf out of your book...

Then on another topic that was important to Steven Marshall and his legacy in space, Jason Held, CEO Saber Astronautics, said:

Thanks for all of your hard work and for being a true friend to Australia's space industry.

Similarly, Adam Gilmour, CEO of Gilmour Space Technologies, said:

Hope they clap you out. Super well done. So much energy and enthusiasm for your state and [your] nation. Good luck in the future—Hero.

Pallave Dasari said:

Thank you for your service to our state. In particular for your leadership through the COVID pandemic and establishing Lot 14.

Kelly-Anne Saffin, the Chief Executive Officer at Regional Development Australia, said:

Thank you—it was a pleasure to work with you—and particularly to drive tourism during Covid when so much was unknown. It's an outstanding legacy and good luck with your next chapter.

Tiffany Sharp said:

You also supported the domestic violence and military veteran sector and were at many a candlelight vigil, standing shoulder to shoulder, you did so without fanfare, as a speaker or using it as a platform for party promotion, it was noted by many. Thank you.

Denis Yengi, Head of the African Communities Council, said:

Thank you...Steven Marshall...for your contribution to our state and betterment of Multicultural communities in SA.

Simon Brewer, former Campbelltown mayor, said:

Congratulations Steven. I think your willingness to listen to and work with local government was also great and your passion for Aboriginal reconciliation was very tangible. Thank you and good luck for the future.

David Basheer from Basheer Hotels said:

Congratulations Steven and thanks for all you did during a most difficult time.

Tim Stollznow in *The Advertiser* today succeeding mightily in America said:

Great job Steven. Sad for SA that it was for only 1 term!

There were many more, including I would say Port legend Alipate Carlile, who said:

Congratulations on an amazing career leading South Australia. Your leadership throughout has been outstanding and I look forward to following your next steps.

One comment that I must highlight because it will not come true from Matthew Gerard, founder of Grand Cru, calling on Steven, saying:

Come over to Melbourne Steven we need you.

Sorry Matthew, but that will never happen. Steven Marshall is committed to South Australia and has demonstrated that throughout his career, particularly as Premier, as member for Norwood, and as member for Dunstan, and I thank Steven for his service.

MOUNT GAMBIER BUS SERVICE

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:39): I rise today to talk about the Mount Gambier bus service, and it is quite timely that today the report of the Auditor-General was tabled in parliament on regional bus service contracts phase 1. I will certainly be looking at that closely because the Mount Gambier city bus service is totally inadequate. The procurement process that was undertaken does not service our needs. It is pretty much a complete duplication of what we had before and

reports that I have had are that the tenderers were not able to put in variations to an existing route or financial arrangements that would have better served the people of Mount Gambier.

In 2021, as the existing contract approached, the Mount Gambier city council conducted a thorough evaluation of the Mount Gambier public bus service. The purpose was to communicate to the state government the shortcomings in the current service. The report highlighted the vital need for effective public transport within the city and its surroundings, urging substantial changes to the government-funded service. At the time, the routes had remained unchanged for well over 30 years.

The review also revealed such issues as the inadequate servicing of crucial facilities, such as the Mount Gambier hospital and Foodbank, and restricted service hours hindering access to employment and education, as well as prolonged wait times at stops and a lack of service to our growing residential areas.

After lengthy delays, the new eight-year contract was announced in August last year and, believe it or not, remains identical to the one that was in place for the previous 30 years. A majority of the housing developments that have been established in the last 30 to 40 years are not taken into consideration. Well over 2,000 homes and 5,000 residents are located in the north-east corner of Mount Gambier and there is not one bus service that services this area.

The new \$63 million Wulanda recreation centre is a fantastic new addition to our city for both locals and visitors. Again, there is not one bus service to this area. Foodbank is a vital service for many of our most vulnerable residents in and around Mount Gambier. The closest bus stop requires a 1.5-kilometre round trip walk. Residents from our two largest retirement communities must endure a lengthy walk to reach the closest bus stop, which is impractical for many of them.

We have seen the state government invest \$55 million into building a new technical college and upgrading our local TAFE facilities. Unfortunately, with the first bus of the day not leaving until 9am, we may see many students running late to class.

Simply put, our current service has not been fit for purpose for many years, let alone for the next eight years that this contract is expected to see out. In 2022, Bus SA released a report titled 'An investigation of regional public transport spend in Australia'. It exposed a stark contrast in public transport spend between metropolitan and regional residents in South Australia, as \$221 is spent per head for metropolitan residents, compared to just \$40 for those living in our regions.

If our regions are to grow and grow at a more rapid pace, we need further investment to ensure all residents have everyday access to essential services, as well as employment, entertainment and social activities, something that our current Monday to Friday, 9 to 5 service in Mount Gambier does not provide.

In contrast to other states and territories, South Australia lacks a standard service commitment for regional centres. I draw comparison to the Victorian town of Stawell with a population of just 8,500 people. Their bus runs six days a week, with a weekday start time of 7am and the last run finishing at 6.15pm. The new like-for-like contract for Mount Gambier is yet another example of government not listening to regional communities. We need to find a solution that fits our less densely populated areas.

WESTERN HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:45): I rise today to talk about a very important issue for my local area, the Western Hospital. I think it has become abundantly clear over the last week or so that from the local community's perspective the hospital needs to continue, not just because of its immense connection to the local community but also because of what it would mean for the broader South Australian public health system, should the hospital close. In the context of having ramping now two or three times what it was when Labor took office, the importance of this hospital has only become increasingly more over the last number of years.

We are talking about a facility that has been on this site since 1974 but in the community for much longer, when it was previously located on Seaview Road. Somewhere in the order of 350 to 400 patients go through the GP clinic every day. There are 50 or so inpatient beds, and also day oncology and other services are provided at the hospital precinct. As media commentators have said

to this point, this hospital is way too big to fail for the immense role that it plays in ensuring that there is significant pressure taken off the public system. Its contribution is huge.

At this point in time, I think we have to take the Treasurer's word in terms of his assessment and Treasury's assessment of where the books are, with the hospital having gone into voluntary administration just a week ago. In terms of what we can do moving forward, I and certainly others in the community think that there is still a greater role that can be undertaken by the government in ensuring that the future of the Western Hospital is preserved.

I think there is a place for the government to provide absolute certainty, as best as possible, in terms of an assurance of the level of public day surgery or elective surgery work that can be conducted at the Western Hospital to make this as appealing an asset for purchase as possible. I also think it would be incredibly helpful to have the government come out and provide an absolute assurance that the land on which the hospital sits will not be rezoned into the future, and will be kept as land that is only for the use of private healthcare facilities or public healthcare facilities, so that we can have assurance over that into the future and whoever owns the land or the buildings—noting that is not the hospital at the moment—understands that our community's view and the state government's view is that there should be no change in use for that land moving forward.

My office has been inundated with people contacting me in terms of understanding what this looks like moving forward. There is obviously a level of uncertainty that surrounds the current situation. To that effort, and to call on the government to undertake what I have just mentioned, we have launched a petition that we think will help send a message to the government, to the voluntary administrators and also to any potential buyers showing just how much this community hospital means to us and how much the community supports this hospital.

Everybody wants to see this hospital continue so that we can see it continue to provide those important services into the future. In less than a week, we have already had well over a thousand people sign the petition. I encourage you to come into the office or to contact me via the office number on (08) 8353 1111. It has been amazing to see the number of people who have come in and picked up copies of the petition to take out to local community groups. Colleen Billows, a local community legend whose late husband, Gordon, was the inaugural chairman of the hospital and is buried at the hospital, has been stellar in getting out and continuing that effort around the community. Angelo, the chair of the Friends of Western Hospital, has likewise been incredibly helpful in providing assistance. It is genuine community grassroots people who understand that we need this hospital to continue.

While I am on my feet, I would just also like to mention that the countdown is well and truly on for the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club Pink and Blue Swim, Walk and Run this year on Saturday 10 February. We have well and truly diversified from just the swim to the walk and now to the run, so everybody can come down and participate. The event raises significant funds for both breast cancer research and prostate cancer research in South Australia, having raised more than \$500,000 already over the years that it has been going.

The community have loved being involved. I have loved being involved since well before my time as the local member. To Paul Rafanelli and his team that organised the event down at the surf club, thank you for what you do. If you want to jump on and get involved, simply visit the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club website at westbeachslsc.com.au. Register and come down. We would love to see you in the water this weekend.

ENVIRONMENTAL WARRIOR AWARD

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:50): I would like to take a minute to talk about the wonderful graduates who finished some of their educational journey last year in my community. For our year 12s, who are now planning their next steps, whether it is to enter the workforce or off to university or TAFE or even having a gap year, I know they all worked incredibly hard last year and they deserve the break. For our year 6s, who are now a week and a bit into the next chapter of their education, meeting new friends and teachers, experiencing exciting opportunities and a new style of learning, I would like to take this opportunity to wish them all an incredibly safe and happy year and hope that they do the best that they can.

Specifically, I would like to talk about some of the winners of the Environmental Warrior Award, which is my year 6 award for all the primary schools in my community. It is an award that is designed to acknowledge a graduating year 6 student who displays outstanding care for the environment and passion for climate change and does all they can to raise awareness within their cohort at school.

The winner from Belair Primary was Micaiah. She was a committed leader of the eco club every Friday lunchtime, demonstrating skills, helping clean up rookwood scrub, checking the bird boxes and doing lots of odd jobs that help the environment. Scarlett from Bellevue Heights looked after the chickens, repurposing old clothing to make library bags, voluntarily cleaning up rubbish from the schoolyard during playtime and embarking on several projects in teams to make a positive change for the environment.

Tim from Blackwood Primary, who was a prominent part of the Blackwood's Green Team, was involved in planting vegetables and harvesting them, watering the garden areas and ensuring that the plants and seedlings were taken care of. Lilly from Clapham showed strong passion for taking care of the earth and animals. She showed leadership skills in the Stephanie Alexander kitchen garden ambassador program that I am very fortunate to be able to volunteer in.

Zali from Concordia is a member of the sustainability group that meets each week. Involved in a variety of environmental initiatives, Zali was part of the tree planting initiative, maintaining the school vegetable garden and looking after the school chickens.

Zara from Coromandel Valley Primary School is an environmental science communicator, visiting the kindy and teaching others about caring for the environment. She spoke at the Nature by Night Festival with Green Adelaide, and she was also an environmental ambassador for Coromandel Valley through being a leader of the Tirkanthi action group.

Stefanos from Eden Hills Primary initiated composting in the upper primary because food scraps were just getting thrown in the bin. They built a compost tumbler and put together the school worm farm. Ale from Hawthorndene, who I have got to know quite well, has a daily routine on arrival to class that includes checking the conditions of various plants in a number of classrooms as well as caring for the numerous pot plants that he brought to school himself.

Jacob from Scotch College vocally and actively campaigned for the environment, in particular championing for reducing waste through the Golden Lunchbox Award, which is an award given to classes to bring nude food to school. Owen from Upper Sturt Primary consciously picked up rubbish and tidied spaces to ensure the area where he is is tidy and respected. He does not want animals to suffer from human impacts and takes steps to ensure their safety and survival.

They were all environmental warriors, and I was very proud to present them with their award. This year the award was made from completely recycled products that had been saved from landfill. An old decking post was turned into the discs. The plastic on top of them, which was made from recycled milk bottle lids and soft drink lids, was made by Daniel Mee, who owns Recycled Plastic Panels. Also, Julian James, using a CDC machine, was responsible for the engraving. Our Mitcham Young Citizen of the Year hand-sewed all of the lanyards that went with the award. It was truly a beautiful thing to be able to provide to the students. My hope is that the winner is inspired by the medallion and sees how so many pieces of recycled material and people had come together to create it, acting as a reminder that we can all work together to create a more sustainable future.

At Blackwood High School my senior school award is the Community Volunteer Award. It was awarded to Steven Raymond, who has been in the CFS since he was 11 years old as a cadet, following in the footsteps of his dad and his grandfather. At St John's, Chelsea Adams was the winner. I have been fortunate to spend quite a bit of time with Chelsea, as she is also a member of my Waite Youth Advisory Council. Both of these students work hard outside of school, volunteering and helping the community.

Last year, right at the end of the year, both of those students joined me to celebrate their win by taking a rooftop walk on Adelaide Oval as we scaled new heights, hopefully reminding them that the sky is the limit. Both of these students and all of my year 6s were incredible community advocates and I look forward to seeing what they can bring to the future of our community.

*Private Members' Statements***PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:55): I take this opportunity to reflect on a local issue relating to code amendments. I have been engaging with a lot of locals from my community in the Clare Valley for over 12 months now in relation to their experience with the Stanley Flat code amendment. Our valley has an exciting opportunity to expand its population, increase supply of housing and, of course, pump prime the local economy, notwithstanding the imperfections of the planning process that they have experienced during their submissions.

In 2022 it was recommended by both the local Clare and Gilbert Valleys Council and the State Planning Commission that the minimum block size of this particular proposal should be two acres or 8,000 square metres, which would be in sympathy with existing blocks along White Hut Road. While the community nervously awaits the minister's determination, there are some well-founded concerns held by locals that the minimum block size will shrink to as small as 1,200 to 3,000 square metres, against all advice and common sense.

While the minister in good faith has communicated with neighbouring stakeholders, he currently reserves his right to explore opportunities that he says will be 'to create additional residential land supply', with 'the preference to using the land efficiently'. It is making locals nervous.

I would argue that while there are housing pressures of accessibility and affordability that we are feeling statewide, there remains a great social challenge for my electorate—but local opinion should still count in this matter.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:57): Today I would like to talk about a woman who has actually passed away. The reason I want to speak about her is that quite often as an MP you get to meet a lot of wonderful people in your community, and while time does not permit you to talk about all of them in this place, there are some who make an enormous contribution to the community without any fanfare. One such person is Winsome (Win) Nicolai.

Sadly, Win passed away on 17 December last year. She was the sort of person who dedicated her whole life to community involvement in addition to raising her own family. She was involved in a number of community activities. She first became involved in Girl Guides as a young person herself, then came back to the Girl Guides when her own daughter became interested. Through the Girl Guides she became a district leader and a regional leader, which covered the Mid North down to Gawler, including the Barossa Valley. She did quite a bit of work through the Girl Guides.

She was also involved in the Gawler Amateur Swimming Club and the Evanston Gardens Progress Association. She was secretary of the Gawler Amateur Swimming Club and was a volunteer with the International Women's Day Committee, the Royal Flying Doctors, etc. People like Win make our community better and I would just like to acknowledge her passing.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:58): I rise to request that I receive a response from the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport to my letter dated 9 November. In my letter I asked the minister to consider a number of suggestions for improved driver awareness at pedestrian crossings adjacent to schools on Unley and Goodwood roads.

The key suggestions included:

- a declaration of designated school zones adjacent to the schools on Goodwood and Unley roads;
- the introduction of prominent road-based alerts, physical road-based and also in-car audio alerts;
- the reduction of speed limits, particularly at and before school transit times; and
- a speed and red-light camera installed on the Walford site crossing on Unley Road.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel) (15:59): My community is growing rapidly, and Mount Barker will soon be the largest city in the state after Adelaide. Indeed, the whole of the Hills is

growing. It is unacceptable that there is only one transport link to Adelaide from Mount Barker, the South Eastern Freeway. Passenger rail services need to be restored to the Hills to provide a second vital transport corridor. The previous government refused to permit any trial by Talgo to test its trains in South Australia. The then opposition, the new government, indicated they would permit Talgo to run a trial if there was no cost to the taxpayer.

This is a question of money and political will. Let's be brutally frank: if the government issued a tender for rail services to the Hills tomorrow, it is likely many companies would be interested and Talgo may well be amongst them. Of course, the cost and engineering challenges are real. I ask the minister not to confuse high-speed rail with the viability of conventional rail, which operated in the Hills for many years. Talgo manufactures high-speed and conventional railcars. They are not the only provider. To avoid this issue altogether simply by pointing to fast rail as unachievable misses overall, in my view, the point.

Bills

BOTANIC GARDENS AND STATE HERBARIUM (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 4.

Mr BATTY: We are in the dying stages of this committee. I am sorry we could not finish it before lunch, but I thank the minister and Mr Harvey for returning because it is an important point that I just want to clarify. We are at clause 4 and amendment No. 3, which is the paid parking on Sundays backflip. Clause 4, as we have covered previously, in the minister's original bill that was introduced would have allowed paid parking to be introduced on Sundays and public holidays. This amendment removes that ability. My question to the minister before the lunch break was for her to please tell me whether the original bill that she introduced would have allowed paid public parking on Sundays and on public holidays at the Botanic Gardens. When I asked you that before the break—

The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:

Mr BATTY: I did not get an answer from you before the break; you sort of shrugged your shoulders. I ask because, in contributions made by others in the course of this debate, I have been called a liar, effectively, for suggesting that paid parking might be introduced by the board, and that is what is allowed under this bill. My question is: but for this amendment passing now, would paid parking be introduced on Sundays and public holidays by the board under the bill you originally introduced?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The bill I originally introduced would not have meant that paid parking would have been introduced. It removed a prohibition. It was swiftly followed by an amendment, that was ignored in the public commentary by the opposition, that restricted that only to special occasions. Now, in order to preserve the reputation of the gardens, we have resumed the original position, which is that Sundays and public holidays are protected.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (16:05): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I would like to add a point of clarification because I suspect that this bill may yet have some misinformation or debate surrounding it. The allegations that Wittunga was going to be subject to paid parking were made by the opposition and were objected to by the member for Waite. There is

nothing in the bill that facilitated, encouraged or indicated that there would be paid parking for Wittunga.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (16:05): Deputy Speaker, can you indicate at what point would be appropriate for me to make a contribution on the third reading?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Right now, while you are on your feet.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Excellent. Well, it is not something that I have done very often, Deputy Speaker, but I am very keen to do so on this occasion because I played a pretty straight bat when I made my contribution to the second reading but then came the contribution from the member for Waite and I thought, 'Well, that is not going to go without a response,' so that is what I am going to do for the next period of time.

The behaviour of the member for Waite drew to the house's attention—or she sought to malign my colleagues as liars for attempting to hold the government to account for creating a piece of legislation that removed a prohibition on a range of things and created the opportunity for the board of the Botanic Gardens of South Australia to do things that we felt uncomfortable with.

We felt that giving a future board, because of course it was ruled out by the current board, the opportunity to create paid parking on Sundays and public holidays would put a barrier to access to the gardens at Adelaide, Mount Lofty and Wittunga. It would create a barrier to people accessing those iconic state sites, those places that people go to and enjoy. It would create a barrier based on potential socio-economic challenges that people from particular parts of this state endure more than others. It would create a level of elitism around our gardens and we sought to push back against that.

As any good opposition should, we sought to oppose these provisions, or lack of provisions at the time, and we sought to create a situation where these gardens are as accessible as possible for people from across South Australia. That is the job of the opposition: to stand up for people when they are being excluded from things. Through this legislation, we were creating a situation that was potentially exclusionary.

The board—and we have to take them at their word. They are mostly made up of good people; not all, I might say, because this gives me an opportunity to put something else on the record, which would not have entered the record had it not been for the member for Waite. So the director and the minister and the chair of the board can hear this bit of information. Members of my team were harassed by board members over the Christmas period about our campaign against paid parking. Those directors ought to really reflect on it. I hope the chair contacts the directors today and asks about their conduct over the Christmas period. These board directors felt that they needed to harass members of my team and staff members as well. That is inappropriate conduct by board directors and they should be counselled accordingly.

The board has also put into the public domain—and this was mentioned by the member for Waite—that I initiated all this; this was all my plan. I certainly asked the board of the botanic gardens to explore ways to free up commercial opportunities for those gardens. We had had many successful activities/events around Illuminate. I remember the Fire Gardens project just before COVID as part of the Fringe in 2020. These are really successful projects and programs that could be undertaken within the botanic gardens' estate or using products from the botanic gardens. The member for Waite mentioned gin as being one of them. We have no problem if juniper berries are collected from plants within the botanic gardens and used in a process to create botanic gardens-branded gin. We have no problem with that whatsoever.

What we did not want to see as an opposition were gate fees on our botanic gardens: that when people rocked up to Wittunga Botanic Garden to visit the nature playground that had been built there when I was the minister they might be charged for the privilege to do so; that when they went into the Adelaide Botanic Garden to visit one of the many iconic sites there, such as the beautiful Moreton Bay fig tree avenue, they might be charged for the privilege to do so; or, that when they went up to Mount Lofty Botanic Garden and visited the rhododendron garden they might be charged for the privilege to enter that garden.

All we sought to do was to draw to the public's attention that a piece of legislation that was before the people's parliament was seeking to create a situation where prohibitions on certain

activities, as the minister confirmed, would be removed and a future board—not this board, because this board is mostly made up of good people, though not all—could exploit the looseness of the legislation.

I remember when I studied statutory interpretation in law school, one of the things that we were told was that good statutes are precise and create certainty, so this legislation was not good. It got through the minister's office, it got through the board and it got through the Labor Party caucus. Do you know who should have picked up on it in the Labor Party caucus? The member for Waite. I suspect, though, she did not mind excluding people from Wittunga Botanic Garden. The member for Waite wanted to create this little elite enclave for her own residents and did not want people from other communities, perhaps my community, coming in. When she said that I was the 'Minister for Glenthorne', was she sneering at me and saying, 'Your residents can stick to Glenthorne and I will have my residents enclaved up there at Wittunga Botanic Garden?'

Well, when I was minister I sought to create opportunities to enliven Wittunga Botanic Garden, welcome people into Wittunga Botanic Garden and create features and destinations within that garden so that people would know that that garden existed and that it was not just a place for the people of Blackwood to enjoy. I hope the people of Blackwood do enjoy that garden, and they can do so now knowing that no future board will put a padlock on the gate and charge people to get in or surround it by paid parking. But I want our botanic gardens—great iconic assets of our state—to be enjoyed by people from all walks of life, from every corner of this state and further afield.

The opposition supports the board of the botanic gardens in their quest to expand commercial opportunities where sensitive and where appropriate to do so, but we do not support exclusionary activities which would lock the botanic gardens away from a significant number of South Australians who financially might not be able to get there and, as a consequence, because of their socio-economic status, have relied on free access for parking on Sundays and public holidays—the day that they could be assured that they could take their family there, get into nature, get into green space and enjoy those beautiful gardens without a cost impost being placed upon them.

I am proud of our public campaign to draw to the attention of South Australians what the government sought to do, what the board appeared to have endorsed in some form or another, or creating a pathway for a future board to undertake things. This board, this government, this Labor Party caucus, this member for Waite made a range of mistakes here. It did not need to be like this. We did not need to be here wasting parliament's time today moving amendments, but we are because poor legislation was placed in front of the parliament, imprecise legislation which led to uncertainty. The board can write to me time and time again trying to correct me, but I stand by every single piece of material that has been placed in the public domain.

What the government sought to do here was create what could be characterised as a picnic tax, an exclusionary activity raising the barrier for access to our Botanic Gardens—publicly owned state assets. It is about time the government took a good look at themselves. Perhaps the board should do that as well as they go forward. I am more than happy to stand by this campaign, and I will tell people well into the future what they tried to do, and I will tell lots of people later today that the government has capitulated and accepted our campaign to create opportunities for access to our precious Botanic Gardens.

With those remarks, I will conclude my speech, and I will celebrate with my colleagues, and particularly the member for Bragg, our campaign to successfully abolish or block the Malinauskas Labor government's picnic tax.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:17): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the introduction of a bill without notice forthwith.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is not an absolute majority. Ring the bells, please.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (INDUSTRIAL RELATIONS PORTFOLIO) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:19): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Fair Work Act 1994, the Public Holidays Act 2023, and the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. Read a first time.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:19): I move:

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is not an absolute majority. Ring the bells, please.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (16:20): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

As members will be aware, portfolio bills provide the opportunity to make amendments that are minor or technical in nature across a number of acts in one bill. This portfolio bill makes a small number of technical amendments in relation to naming conventions in several pieces of industrial relations legislation.

Part 2 of the bill amends the Fair Work Act 1994 to update references from Fair Work Australia to the Fair Work Commission. Part 3 of the bill amends the Public Holidays Act 2023 to insert names for each public holiday next to their date or in the case of public holidays over Easter the description of the date on which they fall. These amendments will dispel the baseless fear and misinformation the Liberal Party has spread throughout our community about the effect of the amendments passed in the Public Holidays Act last year.

The position of the Liberal Party on this issue has been fundamentally dishonest. The truth is that far from removing public holidays the Public Holidays Act enshrined those holidays in law. It guaranteed 25 April as a public holiday. It guaranteed Easter Sunday as a public holiday. It guaranteed Christmas Day as a public holiday. Under the Public Holidays Act not only would ANZAC Day be locked in as a public holiday on 25 April, but South Australia has specific legislation in the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act to confirm this.

Of course, those facts did not get in the way of the Liberal Party going out into the community and spreading misinformation and fear amongst our veteran communities about the status of ANZAC Day. This was a fear campaign run by the Liberal Party to cover for their own brazen attempt to amend the act to scrap the Easter Saturday public holiday after over 110 years of being celebrated in this state—an attempt that went down in flames before this parliament.

What we heard from veterans is that this was fearmongering from the Liberal Party, not the Public Holidays Act, which was causing consternation and concern. In December last year, we heard the President of the RSL in South Australia, Dave Petersen, on radio decrying that this had become a politicised issue and sharing his frustration that veterans were calling him late into the night thinking

that ANZAC Day had been cancelled. What we heard him say when speaking to FIVEaa on 1 December was, and I quote:

I'm not offended by this piece of legislation but what I am offended by is the misreporting of what is happening here, the outrage that some veterans are feeling thinking that their date has been cancelled but it has not.

Unlike the Liberal Party, we will not treat our veteran community as a political football by spreading fear and misinformation. The last thing we want is veterans believing that the sanctity of ANZAC Day has been eroded. The effect of these amendments will be to make clear to the South Australian community what was always the case: that ANZAC Day and other significant public holidays, like Christmas Day, are and will remain public holidays under the laws of this state.

Finally, part 4 of the bill amends the Work Health and Safety Act 2012 to update references to the executive director to the regulator consistent with the rest of the act. I commend the bill to members of the house and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Fair Work Act 1994*

3—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act to replace the definition of Fair Work Australia with a definition of Fair Work Commission. This change reflects the name of the relevant body in the *Fair Work Act 2009* of the Commonwealth.

4—Amendment of section 92—Retrospectivity

5—Amendment of section 100—Adoption of principles affecting determination of remuneration and working conditions

These clauses replace references to Fair Work Australia with references to the Fair Work Commission.

Part 3—Amendment of *Public Holidays Act 2023*

6—Amendment of section 3—Days fixed as public holidays

This clause amends section 3 of the principal Act to:

- insert names of public holidays to correspond with the dates or days on which they fall; and
- insert an explanation of which days Good Friday, Easter Saturday, Easter Sunday and Easter Monday fall on in a year, to correspond with the names of the public holidays; and
- replace references to the dates of public holidays with references to the names of the public holidays in the provisions about additional and substitute public holidays.

7—Amendment of section 4—Part-day public holidays

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act to insert the names of part-day public holidays to correspond with the dates on which they fall.

Part 4—Amendment of *Work Health and Safety Act 2012*

8—Amendment of section 117—Entry to inquire into suspected contraventions

9—Amendment of section 277—Reviews

These clauses replace references to Executive Director with references to regulator. The principal Act provides (in section 4) that regulator means the Executive Director so the changes are simply providing consistency in language within the principal Act.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (16:28): If there is one date we will know it is 6 February, which will probably be known from here on in as the day of backflips. We have had the backflip on the member for Waite's sneaky picnic tax and now we have the backflip

on our public holidays. These backflips are good backflips. They are celebrated by the opposition, of course, but the government has been repeatedly dragged kicking and screaming to the table on these reforms or fix ups to their initial legislation.

We saw the backflip on the picnic tax and now we have got legislation which has been repaired in order to fix the picnic tax, to block the picnic tax, making sure that people no longer will be threatened with gate fees or paid parking on Sundays and public holidays in our precious Botanic Gardens. That one was not noticed in caucus, it was not noticed by the board of the Botanic Gardens and it was not noticed by the minister.

Now we have got the amendment for the names of public holidays before us. This is unnecessary. This did not need to happen. We do not need to be here wasting parliament's time with this legislation, if only the government had not sought to cancel the names of our public holidays in an act of grotesque political correctness, in an act of huge overreach, in an act of elitist wokery. The attempt to cancel the names of our public holidays—public holidays that mean so much to South Australians, that mean so much to our veterans community in the case of ANZAC Day, that mean so much to faith communities in terms of Christmas Day and Easter, and that mean so much to many other Australians in terms of Australia Day.

Why did political correctness have to go mad, in terms of this government's approach to our public holidays? Why do our public holidays need to be reduced to mere dates on a calendar? Why can meaning not be placed alongside those dates? Because that is what this government decided to do, despite attempts in the upper house—standalone attempts by the Hon. Heidi Girolamo—and in this chamber as well. I want to particularly hone in on what happened to Heidi Girolamo when she moved the amendments in the other place. She was harangued, she was bullied, she was harassed and she was name-called by members of the Labor Party who said what she was doing was unnecessary and was, in a way, trying to create outrage over nothing.

That was not the case, because that outrage was immediately and significantly felt right across South Australia and, in fact, right across our nation. When it became apparent to people in the general public, the ordinary people—not the cloistered elites who inform and advise the Labor Party, not those people—when people in the outer suburbs and people in the regions started to understand what this government was trying to do by cancelling the names of our public holidays, the government started to get feedback, and they realised that their haranguing and bullying and name-calling of Heidi Girolamo was actually completely misplaced because Ms Girolamo had highlighted and sought to fix something that the majority, the vast majority of South Australians, wanted fixed as well.

South Australians do not want their political class to try to cancel the names of public holidays. South Australians want 25 December to be called Christmas Day. South Australians want 26 January to remain Australia Day, by name. ANZAC Day is, I think, probably the most important of all. They are all important in their own individual way, but when it comes to ANZAC Day, we do not want that to be reduced to a mere date. We want ANZAC Day to be called ANZAC Day because it is a sacred day remembering those who have sacrificed everything for this state and this nation.

Why should ANZAC Day be reduced to a mere date in legislation? Why should it not be proudly referred to as ANZAC Day? Why should the public holiday not be given the meaning, rather than reduced to a mere sterile date—as if waiting for some point in the future for that meaning to drift away in the minds of Australians and be replaced just by a day off, a day to go to the beach, a day to hang out with your family. These days have significant meaning sitting behind them.

This government has been caught out. They try to say, 'Oh, no, it's not about that. It was about trying to create another public holiday.' This was entirely separate from that. This government has been caught out, and they can have all the spin they like. This government sought to cancel days that mean a huge amount to tens of thousands, if not hundreds of thousands, of South Australians.

The attempt to remove the name ANZAC Day from our public holiday legislation and translate it into a mere date is sacrilege in my view, and that is a view shared by thousands of South Australians. It is shared by the veterans' community. It is shared by hundreds of members of the Returned and Services League of South Australia—that fear, that sadness, that grief that a government that sought to represent them would strip away the word ANZAC from that public holiday.

It makes no sense to me. It makes no sense to South Australians. I do not even think it made much sense to the right of the Labor Party. The Premier stepped in and said that this legislation must be moved. He was forced to do that by the opposition, by the mood and the feeling and the anger of South Australians. I am glad he has done it, the same as I am extremely glad that the member for Waite's picnic tax has been done away with as well.

Today is the day of backflips, and I am grateful that this government has come to the party, listened to the opposition—more importantly, though, listened to the anger and the sentiment of South Australians—and we have put an end to this politically correct nonsense. Our public holidays' names and heritage will not be cancelled from legislation, and that ought to be commended to this house.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:36): I rise today to make a contribution on this bill before the house, entitled the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024, but we know it is not quite that. This bill represents the Labor Party, the Malinauskas government, walking into this chamber today, not wanting to and still maintaining the spin right to the very end. There has still been no admission almost that they have actually got this wrong. This is the day of cleaning up the house.

If we go back to where we are, it is the first day of sitting for the parliamentary year. Instead of looking forward, instead of dealing with some of the key issues that are facing South Australians today, instead of dealing with the housing crisis, instead of dealing with issues around cost of living, instead of dealing with those issues that are front and centre to South Australians—let us not even broach the subject of ramping or the South Australian health system that has only become worse under this government—we are here today using taxpayers' money to make changes to bills that this government has already had opportunities to do so.

The arrogance that has beset this government already did not allow that to happen until it became blatantly clear and obvious that they were on the wrong side of this, that the South Australian public clearly valued the names of their public holidays having the meaning that is attached to those names of their public holidays in this state's legislation. Only then, when it was beyond all doubt that they were on the wrong side of this, was there a conversation had.

Let's walk through how we got to this point, because I think it is important. There have been what I would describe as mistruths that have been perpetuated throughout the Labor Party's significant spin machine to try to get this back in the can, to try to take a bit of the heat out of what would be one of the silliest missteps in terms of the life of this government to this point for something that was, as *The Advertiser* described, completely inevitable criticism.

Let's walk back: we had the Holidays Act, the version that had been in place up until it was repealed by the government's bill dealing with these naming conventions. This version that I am looking at was current between 2012 and 2023. If we go back over some of the arguments that were put forward by those opposite, we can tell that there was just a scant bit of truth in some of them.

Regularly we heard government ministers saying, for starters, that the names were unnecessary—they did not mean anything to anybody and we did not need to have them in the legislation. It then moved to, 'They haven't been in the act previously, so, my goodness, why would we?' But there is only one problem: you see, if we turn to the Holidays Act 1910, the one that I said was in force between 2012 and 2023, let's turn perhaps to section 3A—oh my goodness, it talks about ANZAC Day and uses the words 'ANZAC Day'. If you just shift to the next section of the act, section 3B: Christmas Eve. Goodness me! If you turn the page, we even have Good Friday. Over the page again, Christmas Day is mentioned in the previous act.

But no, we had government ministers out there perpetuating: 'No, no, we're not doing anything new there. These names didn't exist previously. It was all a figment of our imagination. God forbid that these names actually be mentioned.' It was preposterous from start to finish in terms of the complete naivety about the names of these public holidays and how they resonate with the South Australian public.

One of the other arguments that has been put—the minister in fact rolled it in again this morning—was, 'It was all the Liberals, the nasty, naughty Liberals out there spreading misinformation about the fact that we were getting rid of ANZAC Day altogether.' If you go back to the speeches that

were provided in this place and the public comments that have been provided on the radio, you will see that it has been made clear that the only thing the Liberal Party were alleging was that this government was looking to strike out the names of those public holidays from legislation.

One would have to think, one would have to assume, that the only reason you would start to reach for these excuses in the bottom of the barrel, the back of the cabinet, is because you know you have been caught out. But instead of coming in here with a degree of humility, with a degree of repentance about what has occurred to this point, we cannot even come into the house today to have another public holidays bill 2024, amending names of public holidays or including names of public holidays. No, the government has to come in here and dress this up as the Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill 2024. They could not even bring themselves to walk in here and be truthful about what they were trying to do in the title of the very bill that they introduced. What does that say? One can only imagine.

We know the Premier was on his leave—and rightfully so—at the point in time when this was hitting the parliament, but I find it rather difficult to believe that he was not involved in some way in the decision-making to reach the Labor caucus' position on this issue. I think the Premier is rightfully involved in all of the decisions, one would think to an extent, of the Labor caucus, but particularly one that had a level of such public importance.

The question then has to be asked: what was this all about? Why did it take so long? Was this some internal issue between the left and right factions? 'No, we want to get rid of the names. It has to happen. We will keep pushing, pushing, pushing, pushing until it becomes so unpalatable that we have to come in here and do this all again.' Was it the internal friction that was the issue? Was it just a complete lack of political judgement? Was it a complete lack of understanding of the sentiment, of the thoughts, of the South Australian public? Those of us on this side will probably never know, but those opposite surely understand what took place to get us to this point.

The broader question, the one that struck me on the night that we were having this very debate—at this point, I am referring back to the set of amendments that I moved in this place when that discussion took place. They look eerily similar to the bulk of the bill that is before us today. When I look back at that debate, it was almost like there was an air of flippancy to the discussion around adding back the names of the public holidays into the legislation. The Deputy Premier simply, almost dismissively in my view anyway, said that the amendments that were before the house at that point in time were just about giving the colloquial names for each of those public holidays:

Somehow, South Australia has survived for 110 years with the Holidays Act without including these names. Somehow we have managed to work out that we have those holidays on those days.

That was the statement that she gave to the house on that day. Funnily enough, I have just referenced the original Holidays Act and, goodness me, the names of the holidays are actually in that act. So not only was it flippant, not only was it dismissive, but it was also inaccurate.

The Labor Party, the Malinauskas government, has had two opportunities to fix this. We had debate in the upper house, where the bill was introduced. Again, one would have to ask the question why the Attorney-General is not introducing this bill in his house for an act that he has carriage of, as I understand. Why is the Attorney-General not introducing this bill? Why is it up to the member for Cheltenham to come and take the sandwich for his—

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs: 'Minister'.

Mr COWDREY: 'The member for Cheltenham', too. Why is it the member for Cheltenham has to come in here today to take the sandwich for his colleague from the other place? Why was that the case? Is it embarrassment?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order, minister and the member for Heysen!

Mr COWDREY: In the other place, we had members there. The other place traditionally has been known for the way and manner in which members interact with each other being of a standard that is slightly improved on this house, the house of the commoner. While we hold ourselves to a level of decorum that is what most would believe to be sensible—most of the public probably do not

agree with that from time to time—the other place has been known to be reasonably sensible in the manner in which it has its significant discussions.

But on that night, there was behaviour well and truly unbecoming of that house in the manner in which my colleague Heidi Girolamo was treated, and all she was seeking to do was what the government is seeking to do now, what the Liberal Party had been seeking to do on multiple occasions since this bill was first introduced. I can go through a time line of the fact that we had the bill, we had the discussion and the public discourse had begun in late November. We turn to 1 December, as I think the government was just starting to understand what they had taken out of the can, just how tinny they were in terms of the South Australian public's view on this issue.

But again, we had the Attorney-General on FIVEaa with Matthew Pantelis on 1 December defending the decision that they had made, describing the Liberal Party pointing out what had occurred in this place, what had occurred in the other place, what the government had done in removing names of public holidays from the legislation—simply that. I quote:

It's scaremongering. The Public Holiday Act has been around since 1910 and generally what it does—'generally' I think was probably the operative word that the Attorney was relying on in this instance— is refers to dates that are the same each year, like 25 April, but then when a date moves around like Easter it can be on different days and refers to the name of them.

I can hold up the holidays act of 1910 again and point out the fact that ANZAC Day is clearly referenced in that act. But it was this continuation that there was nothing to see here, and why? I go back to the core question, the one that I referenced but did not quite point out, the one that has stuck with me right from the very beginning when we were undertaking this discussion, this debate in the house: what was the harm in keeping the names in the legislation? What was the harm?

That is the question that those who sit opposite need to think long and hard about. Was it the internal factional issues of somebody perhaps pushing for something more, somebody not willing to give something up? Was it simply that they did not want to agree with amendments that had been put forward by the opposition? Because, by golly, they seem reasonably sensible and straightforward to me. Or was it more sinister? Was there a greater idea? Was there a bigger plan in terms of what was trying to be achieved here?

As the leader quite rightly said, we welcome the government coming to the house today with this bill; that goes without saying. The RSL welcomes the government coming to the house today introducing the bill. We should at every point in time find any way we possibly can to acknowledge, to reference, to credit those veterans who have given their lives for our country and our state.

When we come into this place there is a line that is often thrown around by members here that language matters. We need to be so precise with our language because it matters. Well, it matters in this case as well. It mattered to veterans around South Australia that 25 April is referred to as ANZAC Day. It matters to people of faith, no matter where you sit on the spectrum of faith, that 25 December is referred to as Christmas Day. It has just been a complete nonsense, and to walk in here today to see the debacle that was simply the introduction of this bill, the suspension of standing orders just to get here. This has been a debacle from go to whoa and it is one of this government's own making.

The minister again has tried to make representations that the people of South Australia believed we were eliminating ANZAC Day, that it was never going to be there forever more, when simply we were saying the name of ANZAC Day had been referred from the legislation. Such was the cut through—and I am not one to visit hotels on too many occasions with two young kids, two and four—that I am reliably told that on a quiz night at the Prince Albert Hotel about a fortnight ago one of the questions that was asked was: which state removed the reference to Australia Day from its public holiday legislation?

That says more than anything that the topical cut-through of this issue—the fact that this resonates with everyday Australians—is there and it is well and truly real. *The Advertiser* quite rightly pointed out that this was inevitable criticism, that this decision left the government open to be criticised and, my goodness, it was 100 per cent accurate. All these things could have been avoided.

We are here today using taxpayers' money to have this house sit because of the arrogance of this government, because of the arrogance of members opposite, because of the arrogance of the Malinauskas Labor government. This could have been dealt with three months ago. This could have been dealt with when it was tabled back then—not one opportunity but two opportunities, both in the other place and in this very chamber just a couple of months ago.

Make no mistake that today the Liberal Party has been legislating from opposition, and this really highlights more than anything the lack of genuine legislative agenda and the popular streak that governs the decision-making of this government. On these occasions, with the picnic tax and with this mop-up today, their rudder was well and truly off course and long may that continue.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:56): I rise to contribute to the debate, moved as I am by the contribution of the Minister for Police introducing this bill because the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow treasurer have said it all: it is so true that we are here on backflip day, on mop-up day, on a day on the return of the parliament in 2024 when the government comes into this place with its tail between its legs and moves to suspend standing orders so it can mop up what was an egregious error at the end of last year.

I come into this place, as I do on every occasion, as a proud Australian, as a proud South Australian and as a proud representative of those electors of mine within the district of Heysen in the Adelaide Hills because this is a place that is not ultimately driven by technicalities or procedures, it is not a place that is cut and dried and divorced from people and communities. Far from it. This is a place that is about heart, it is about humanity. In the work that we do as legislators, we are reflecting the heart and soul of our community: of those who send us here, of those who send us to legislate, to characterise the nature of this fine state that we live in. It is about heart and it is about humanity.

Well it is that we suspend standing orders to get this done, but this is important work and these changes that we make that articulate the names of these days in this legislation are matters of substance. So it should be noted that when this legislation is introduced, it is introduced undercover of a description that puts it in terms of a portfolio and of statutes amendment, and the minister introducing it describes it as suitable for changes of a minor nature or a technical nature. They are the ones that are suitable for inclusion in a bill that is described as a portfolio bill.

We see undercover of this portfolio bill the real work that needs to be done urgently in the political interests of the government now at this late stage in part 3 of the bill to reintroduce the important names of those holidays that we have long celebrated in this state and will continue to do, I hope, for many decades and centuries ahead: days such as Australia Day of course; days such as Christmas Day of course. My goodness, whoever thought of anything so outrageous as to start to tell your children, 'Well, happy 25th of December, children.' How outrageous.

But certainly no more important day ought to be recognised in this statute, and spelt out in bold text, as 25 April, ANZAC Day. It has been so recognised in this country since 1916. It recognises perhaps the most significant day in the then short history of this federated nation, when on that morning at dawn in 1915, so many brave Australian soldiers made their way ashore. It was, as we know, to become among the most famous of military engagements, and it has come in the more than a century since to define those characteristics that we are so proud of in the character of Australians.

So, far from taking some opportunity on the reform of legislation to do away with these names, far from taking that kind of action, this ought to have been the very occasion on which the name was writ large, the name was spelt out, and the name was cemented in that occasion to update the legislation. We have heard from the shadow treasurer that the names have long been spelled out.

So I say that, far from this being some occasion to make amendments that you might find in a portfolio bill that might be described as minor or technical, far from that, the government ought to have come in here with the name of a bill that reflected the importance of applying the name, of reminding ourselves why we apply the name, of reminding ourselves why we commemorate on these important days, and not first to diminish their identification and importance on the introduction of the legislation last year, and then to continue to do so by the means by which this is brought back to this chamber on this occasion.

I have paused to focus on the importance of ANZAC Day, because ANZAC Day, of course, is a date that is a national day of commemoration. It is a state day of commemoration, and as we all know, each and every one of us, it is a day of local commemoration. It has become as important, even more important over the more than a century since, to those very local small communities that sent what were in some cases the large bulk of a small town's young men, and so well it is that we name that day in the legislation.

The important role of the Hon. Heidi Girolamo MLC in the other place in calling this out and, of course, the debate in the other place has been recognised. I recognise that contribution in particular, and I also take this opportunity to recognise and thank those committed members of RSL sub-brigades across the state throughout South Australia who shared with the opposition a view about the importance in particular of ANZAC Day, which is so important to our veterans.

We have heard this kind of excuse of technicality that has come from the government about this. We have heard this sort of excuse that it is about process and that is at the core of what we do and we know better and it is a technical change. I just say to members in this place that this is a place about heart and humanity. In order to achieve a greater level of coherence, if it is necessary in order to build the fabric of community that we hold so dear in this state, let's legislate with some heart and humanity and let's remember to keep that at the core of our consideration whenever we have an opportunity to legislate to reform, to review, legislation.

Let's remember that the very origin of the word 'holiday', an old English word, derived from 'holy day'. These days, when first described, were holy days. They were so special as to be designated in that way. Now of course they have come into modern usage as a day of rest, as a day of celebration and a day of commemoration and we identify public holidays through the year for that whole variety of purposes. Let's remember that derivation counts because it identifies and highlights the importance that was ascribed to that description from the beginning.

While we have holidays for a whole range of purposes these days and they are legislated, it is well that we name them because if we name them we remind ourselves why they are important to us nationally, at a state level and locally. We do not all have the same public holidays state to state. There are some days that are celebrated in some states and not others because they are of that particular greater significance to that state.

Let's name those days, let's identify them for the important days they are to all South Australians, let's ensure that the legislation is informative and let's do all we can to galvanise our respect with particular reference to ANZAC Day, which has been such an important feature of the urgency of this debate. With particular reference to the importance of ANZAC Day, let's get on with the passage of this important legislation that could not be further from the simply minor or technical. I commend those aspects in particular of the bill and I look for their speedy passage.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:08): It is like the former minister, who acted in the role of the Attorney-General, did not know what statutes we had on the books here. I remind the member opposite that the ANZAC Day Commemoration Act 2005 was introduced by a former Labor government to make sure that ANZAC Day was enshrined in law.

Given he is so fond of Australia Day, how could he have sat there for four years in government while the act only said '26 January' and did not mention the words 'Australia Day'? Why did they sit silent? Why did they all sit silent?

I will not be lectured about Christian holidays. I will not take a lecture about Christian values from any of the members opposite, especially the former Attorney-General. I will not take any values from him or members opposite. How dare he insinuate that members of this house and this government do not believe that Christmas Day should be celebrated as a public holiday. How dare they. Who do they think they are?

Think of the arrogance to tell practising Christians that we do not believe in Christmas Day. Think of the arrogance to know that there is another piece of legislation that enshrines in law ANZAC Day commemoration and then to go out and tell the returned services league community—to tell our

veterans—that we have somehow abolished ANZAC Day, even though we have an act in parliament that we introduced when I was in parliament. It is here to make sure it would be enshrined forever.

But, of course, what they do not mention is that Good Friday remained mentioned. They did not mention that. When you saw Senator Antic on his Instagram post talking about how we tried to wipe out Christianity and tried to erase our Christian values from modern society, it did not mention that we left Easter and Good Friday in the legislation. Why is that? It is because it was just pure political pointscoreing. That is all it was. It was not about what they really cared about. It was not about Christian values. It was not about public holidays. It was cheap political pointscoreing. That is all it was. I will not take a lecture from anyone on that side of the parliament about Christian values, given what they did in the last four years they were in office. How dare they. It is just appalling.

The idea that the Premier of all people is some sort of woke warrior who wants to remove references to these types of days is just simply a fantasy. It is just not true and members opposite know it and that is why they hate him so much. They dislike the type of premier he is, so they try to invent these fake culture wars because that is the only thing they have. They have no policies on health. They have no policies on ramping. They have no policies on education, health, transport or infrastructure. They have zero policies. All they have is Alex Antic pretending we are trying to get rid of ANZAC Day and pretending that we do not support Christmas Day and rubbish speeches by a man who wants to be the attorney-general saying that we are running around telling everyone to say happy 25th of December.

How appalling to attack another member of parliament's Christian values. I have never once said to any member opposite who espoused Christian values that they are not a real Christian because they are members of the Liberal Party. Why would I? Why would you do that? But what are you implying when you say that members on this side are trying to erase Christmas? What the Attorney-General did was simply say that for dates that are fixed the dates are fixed and for dates that are moved the occasion is named.

The Liberal Party opposite have done a very good job trying to smear up the culture wars. That is all they have. They are trying to be the big warriors, the sky after dark type. They want to go out there and talk about how we are trying to abolish Christian values and so we are getting rid of Christmas when they know it is rubbish. They know it is rubbish. They know it is not true. When we come here to fix this, rather than celebrate it and say, 'Okay, good, well done to the government', they attack us for suspending standing orders and they attack us for moving the bill and then they say, 'We commend the bill to the house'. It is not about the actual naming in the bill, it is about the issue that they wanted.

I got fired up over this over Christmas. A number of my friends said to me, 'I have seen Senator Antic say that you are abolishing Christmas.' What could be further from the truth. There is this idea that one political party thinks they have ownership of Christian values and Christian holidays over another. If you want to play this game, mate, I am ready to go. If you want to match my voting record against a majority of your voting records on Christian values, let's go. I am up for it. Line me up against every single Liberal that you want to about Christian values. I am your huckleberry. I will do it, no problem at all. Do not come here and lecture us that we somehow do not support Christian holidays, or that we are trying to get rid of ANZAC Day, when we have a special piece of legislation to make sure no-one could ever do it and it is here in law.

I get fired up about this because returned servicemen believed what they were hearing that we were somehow trying to denigrate ANZAC Day. Why would we? Why? I make every single service I can for ANZAC Day and Remembrance Day. I try to support our RSLs. The idea that somehow we do not support our RSLs is offensive. Of course, it is. Labor members and Liberal members of this house went off and fought together. Of course we support our returned servicemen. They go off in our name. Of course we support them. That is why we introduced a piece of legislation in 2005 to make sure that ANZAC Day is commemorated ongoing. It is law, l-a-w, law. It is in the books.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: So are the tax cuts.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is true. They were. He has got me on that one because I am responsible for the stage 3 tax cuts! My point here is if this was such an important issue to members opposite, for four years Australia Day remained unmentioned in legislation. Why did they

not put it in? There is no answer, and do you know why there is no answer? It never occurred to them. It never occurred to them, not once. They were happy, for the entire time they had a majority in the parliament, to leave the legislation that we are amending today with 26 January as a public holiday without it referencing Australia Day.

I think there is a Greek word that comes to mind, and that word is hypocrisy. It is hypocrisy, pure hypocrisy, to try to politicise something like this. What they are really attacking is the parliamentary counsel. What we are really saying here is because the government wanted to formalise public holidays and we brought in a piece of legislation that had the fixed dates with the date, and the dates that moved with the name, I thought—

Mr Cowdrey: It did not happen.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It did not happen.

Mr Cowdrey: There were no names in there.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There were no names.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: No.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No. Good Friday is in there.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Yes, because you couldn't work out the maths to put the maths in, that's why. You didn't put the mathematical sum in. That's why that was in there.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My goodness! This is a great case study in incompetence from members opposite. There was no deliberate plan at all to try to remove names from the statutes to try to bring in some sort of woke agenda at all. It was very simply the days that are fixed have the date, and the dates that are moveable are given a name. It is very simple. Members opposite, who are so opposed to this, made no changes while they were in office and left Australia Day unnamed. There is no answer to that.

Mr Cowdrey: There is nobody in the room here who can answer that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Alright, but it only said 26 January, so to take the words of the opposition, what do we say on 26 January? 'Happy 26 January day'? Why not put 'Australia Day' in there? Why did the Marshall government not put Australia Day in there? Why did the member for Colton not move a private member's bill when he was a backbencher in the Marshall government to introduce Australia Day into the statute? Why didn't he? Did he not care about Australia Day? See where the argument can go here? See how offensive it is almost immediately? See how you recoiled when I said that? Because it is offensive. It is silly. It is the type of politics people hate.

Mr Cowdrey: Not much you say can offend me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Really? Yet here you are listening. No, it is not your bill: it is our bill, and we are the ones who are removing the culture wars from this statute. We are the ones who are focused on policy, not culture wars and mudslinging and accusing some members of being unpatriotic and not loving their country or other members of not being Christian enough. We do not do that.

If members opposite want to start that type of politics, I say bring it on. If that is what you want, we will retaliate. But that is not the type of politics the people of South Australia want. What they want is a policy focus. They want us to focus on their cares and concerns, not trying to frighten them that someone is trying to abolish Christmas Day—which would never happen in a country like Australia. It is not going to happen. If you want to repeal ANZAC Day, this is the legislation you amend. Why would you? You would never, we would never do that. Of course ANZAC Day is important to us.

When I heard the shadow Attorney-General talk about the importance of ANZAC Day, the implication in his remarks were that we did not understand the significance of ANZAC Day—that some of us on this side of the house think that ANZAC Day is just another day. Of course it is not. It is a solemn day. It is a very, very solemn day when we remember people who went and gave their lives for our country in the first, most defining battle of a new, young country.

What members on the opposite benches are attempting to say is that the Labor Party is unpatriotic, does not care about our returned soldiers, does not care about Australia Day and does not care about ANZAC Day. Then, also, in sort of hidden messages, it is that we are also not Christian, because we do not like Christmas Day. That is the part that I found offensive, very offensive.

I am happy to have this debate with members opposite. If they want to run a 'Who's more Christian than the next person?' campaign, let's do it. No problem. I go to church every week. If we want to have this debate, let's go ahead. What is the next test? These types of debates do not add to the discourse of South Australia or the political discourse of this state.

What it does is that it shows that an opposition is desperate, and they are frightening people to try to get votes. They are scaring people, and they are playing on prejudice. I think it is appalling, absolutely appalling. It is one of the lowest points for members opposite I have ever seen, because when you take the accusations to their final conclusion what they are trying to say is that if you are in the Labor Party you do not love your country, and if you are in the Labor Party you do not respect Christmas. That is what they are trying to say, and that is appalling, because it is not true. It is a lie. It is an out and out lie.

The idea that we would somehow abolish Christmas Day or that this was some sort of move by left progressives to try to bring in some sort of new reset to try to undermine traditional Christmas values I think was just an appalling debate. I think this amendment puts that to rest.

I leave the house with a final question. If this was so important to members all they had to have done for the four years they were in office was introduce an amendment to insert the words 'Australia Day' into the act that governs public holidays, and they never did it, but you will not hear me saying that members opposite do not support Australia Day, because I know it is not true. I know it is not true. Of course they do. They celebrate our national holiday. They take the public holiday. They go to the citizenship ceremonies. I have seen them. I have sat next to them. It would be a lie to say that of members opposite, so why is it okay for members opposite to say that about us when they know it is not true?

I commend the bill to the house, and I hope this finally puts an end to these stupid culture wars that members opposite are trying to cling to. How about they come up with a policy pretty please?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (17:22): I think that at next year's Academy Awards I am going to send that clip in, because I have never seen such insincerity in my life. As I recall the 'Don't trust Habib' campaign of the Labor Party, that was the most disgusting thing that has happened in politics in recent times: having people in the seat of Elder wrongly believe—and whether they wrongly or rightly believed it does not matter, but they wrongly believed—that that woman was a Muslim and she should not be voted for. That is what that was all about. The member for West Torrens was going on about Christian values. I can tell you what: there is nothing Christian in that. We all know the story of the good Samaritan.

It is just extraordinary that the minister would try to defend what is the biggest balls-up that I have experienced by government in my 18 years in this place and try to cover it up with attacking members for speaking about a bill that replicates the amendments that the government rejected—an amendment bill that reflects the amendments the opposition presented when the bill went through in, I think it was, November last year.

We need to remember that *Hansard* is a permanent record of what happens in this place. It is something I often share with school students when they come through the chamber. I particularly refer to a *Hansard* from the Legislative Council from 1912. I stumbled upon this simply because I pulled it out one day and it was the smallest and lightest *Hansard* with only a couple of hundred pages, not hundreds and hundreds of pages in it. I came across a debate by Mr Cowan MLC in 1912 about daylight saving. In that debate, he tells the house that every state has agreed that daylight saving will be a good thing. Then I explain to the kids that this was 1912. When was daylight saving introduced? Except for the emergency process that went through during the Second World War, it was 1971. They find that extraordinary, but they have learnt that from the *Hansard*.

Imagine if this government did not realise what a major mistake it had made in removing the reasons for these holidays. The reason a particular date is there for a holiday that is an obvious reason, without actually knowing what the holiday is called, is New Year's Day, because we all know that 1 January is the first day of the new year. Any person with a reasonable standard of education or world experience would know that 1 January is New Year's Day. Of course, the date of 26 January was to commemorate a particular event of the first settlement coming to Australia, and so that is why it is called Australia Day.

I found the report from the member for Colton interesting about the quiz night at the Prince Albert Hotel. I am reliably advised that the lefties in the room cheered when they heard that South Australia had removed the name Australia Day from the holiday list and was the only place in Australia to do so. I wonder how they would have felt if the question was: which is the only state that does not celebrate Labour Day as Labour Day? I wonder if there would have been cheers or screams at that time.

That is the whole point about this legislation. The reason, the emotion and the connection with all of these days have been completely removed and replaced with numbers and months. It is an extraordinary oversight. I really do think this was a major tin-ear omission from the government and whoever was responsible for this bill.

Where does it end? If we were not attending to this today, if the Liberal Party did not run the campaign we ran in the media, out in the public, telling South Australians what this government had done to describe the reasons for holidays, would we have lost Remembrance Day as being the day that we call the 11th of the 11th? It is not a public holiday, but it is Remembrance Day. I do not say that I am not available at 11 o'clock on 11 November. I say I am not available on Remembrance Day because I will be at the commemoration, if somebody wants an appointment or some other invitation lobs on my desk. It is Remembrance Day. We are not going to commemorate the 11th of the 11th at 11 o'clock. It is Remembrance Day, and it is well known because it is called Remembrance Day and we are reminded about why it is called Remembrance Day on every 11 November.

There is no doubt that even the government's attempt to fix the mess that they created by just instantly dismissing the concerns raised by the Liberal Party, both in the Legislative Council and in this chamber, about adding amendments to put those names back in. But even the name, Statutes Amendment (Industrial Relations Portfolio) Bill—getting back to *Hansard*; why would anyone know what that was about? I think it should have been called, 'How the hell did that happen?' amendment bill. That is what I think it should be called because there are people listening to this debate, and I can tell you now that social media and the emails that have gone to my electoral office about people—if you want to talk about emotive issues, this is how social engineering starts.

Yes, sure, have the holiday but we are not going to talk about. We are not going to talk about what the holiday was about. We don't want to have a debate or a discussion about the history of Australia or the history of this particular day or why people lost their lives, or why Australia is the nation that it is because of that first settlement on 26 January 1788. I think that the whole purpose—can you imagine a proud country like the United States not having or renaming Martin Luther King Day after the date? It just would not happen. There would be riots in the streets, I am sure, by those who are true believers in America's freedoms and celebrations of their way of life.

Today, this is a backflip by the government. I am pleased that they have had the courage to come in and do this. I find it bizarre that we needed to suspend standing orders. I guess they did not want it on the *Notice Paper* for very long. Both the minister as the mover, and the member for Cheltenham, and then the Minister for Transport were simply attacking the very people who are supporting this bill today and would have preferred if the government had supported the amendments during the committee process when they were staged. But now we have it on permanent record in *Hansard*, in the statute books for that short time, the fact that we do not recognise the history behind these days.

Do you know who else did not like history and removed it all? Pol Pot. Remember, Pol Pot started from the year zero when he came to office. There was no history before him. It is extraordinary that nobody picked it up. The member for King did not pick this up and was happy for her constituents

to celebrate dates rather than days; the member for Newland did not pick it up; the member for Waite, the member for Davenport. No-one picked it up. Why did they not pick it up?

Of course, the minister said—and this is a line that is growing from the government—'Why didn't you do in four years what we didn't do in 16 before you?' It seems extraordinary. Everything that is not done—'Why didn't you do it in four years?' We didn't do it in 16, but you didn't do it in four.' It reminds me of a scene from *Seinfeld* when George Costanza was trying to impress. He was posing as an American tourist from Kentucky, I think it was, because he was trying to date the attractive New York guide. Jerry said, 'Well, what did you tell her?' George said, 'If I condense everything I have done over the last 30 years into one day it is pretty impressive,' and that is what we are seeing with the 16 years of Labor government. They compress everything. They compare 16 years of their government with the four years of ours, where for two years we were managing an international health crisis, a pandemic that saw thousands of lives lost around the world where it was not managed as well as it was managed in South Australia.

It is not over. We know that there are more deaths in nursing homes from COVID now than there were a few months ago. It is not over. This government thinks it is over. It is not over; there are still things that need to be done. Where are the vaccination advertisements reminding people that there is a new variant and there is a new vaccine to deal with that new variant? How do people know that? But I guess they are hoping to be here for another 14 years so they can do what we did in four years over their 16 years.

We need to understand that the only reason we are here using the valuable time of the parliament to rename public holidays—or dates in the calendar, I should say, that were public holidays with the reasons why they were public holidays—is to remind people, whether it is a day of commemoration, whether it is a day of celebration, whether it is a day for a race in the history about the Adelaide Cup and the contribution that that industry has made to our culture and to our establishment as a colony, and later as a state in that instance.

In regard to Labour Day, I wonder if SA Unions were consulted about removing the name Labour Day from the October public holiday. I wonder if they agreed. Was it their idea to remove Labour Day? Perhaps the conversation went like this: a group of people said, 'We really want to stop using Australia Day' and then members of the government thought, 'We can't really just remove Australia Day and not the others, so are you prepared to give up Labour Day? If you're prepared to give up Labour Day we'll have a go, we'll see if we can get away with it.' That is what I think happened; that is how they got this through the party room.

It was a deal with the left and the right—either that or the right were asleep. I know the Premier was on leave. Maybe the member for West Torrens was preoccupied with something else. Others did not really care or did not quite understand the cultural significance of such a significant change. Maybe that is how it happened. They are the party of deals and we know that there is always a compromise when it comes to what they really believe in.

On those points, I support these amendments but I am very disappointed that we have to go through this again. I remind the house that we had the opportunity to leave these where they are when legislation was going through to deal with the public holiday on Christmas Day.

Another very interesting question here, of course, is: how many of the bodies that have an interest in these days were consulted? Were the Australia Day Council consulted about replacing Australia Day in South Australia being known as 26 January, or the racing industry about the Adelaide Cup day being replaced with, I think, the first day of March in the legislation? Was the RSL consulted about ANZAC Day?

Was there a protocol? Is there a protocol that is supposed to be followed if you are removing a birthday that was put in place to celebrate the sovereign or the monarch's birthday? Is there a protocol? Do you need to contact the Palace? Do you need to, at the very least, have a conversation with the representative of the sovereign here in Australia or in South Australia? Did that happen? Was that a requirement?

Was Unions SA consulted? What did they say? I put a theory out there that I think probably would be the only reason, I would imagine, that Unions SA would agree not to celebrate a day called

Labour Day. You can imagine how revved up people would be when someone said, 'Let's go out and celebrate the first Monday of October.' There's not much to get enthusiastic about, is there? 'Let's go out and celebrate Labour Day! Yes!' You can hear them all shouting when you use that language, but the first day of October: 'What was that about?'

You can imagine those kids who did not have the opportunity, those schoolkids in 50 years' time who didn't have the opportunity to have a member of parliament that read old *Hansard* to them so they would understand that it used to be called Labour Day. 'Is that why we have that holiday?' And Proclamation Day: was the History Trust consulted? I am interested to know what their views are.

There is no doubt about the fact that we have only had a lead speaker from the government and then we have had an attack from the Leader of Government Business. Congratulations to him; he is very good at it, but he did not actually argue anything, other than he wanted to have a debate about who is more Christian than somebody else. I would argue that you do not need to be Christian to hold Christian values. Our whole society is built on Christian values. I know there would be many people in this house who would not call themselves Christians but would argue that they live Christian values.

What about those with different religious beliefs? Many of those live Christian values as well, because they are human values. It is why we are different to animals. I support these amendments and scratch my head as to why those public holiday names were removed from the bill in the first place.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

CHILD SEX OFFENDERS REGISTRATION (CHILD-RELATED WORK) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:43 the house adjourned until Wednesday 7 February 2024 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***ENTREPRENEURIAL SPECIALIST SCHOOLS**

14 The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (7 February 2023). With regard to entrepreneurial education programs:

(a) Will the government continue to support the Department for Education's entrepreneurial education program in Seaton, Heathfield, Banksia Park, Murray Bridge and Mount Gambier?

(b) What extra funding is provided to the five entrepreneurial specialist schools on an annual basis in 2022 and 2023, to enable them to deliver their extra programs, and will that full amount continue to be provided to those schools in 2024 and beyond?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

Please refer to Legislative Council question on notice 205, answered on 31 January 2023.

CFS CADET PROGRAM

104 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 36—What has prompted the need for a review and modernisation of the CFS cadet program?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The South Australian Country Fire Service (CFS) has been running successful cadet programs for many years, which provides the opportunity for young people between the age of 11–18 years to learn new skills and gain experience within a community-based volunteering organisation.

The CFS Cadet Program was last redeveloped in 2010 and resulted in a suite of resources including policies, guides and forms being implemented within the organisation. The CFS Cadet Program resource and administrative framework review ensures the program remains contemporary.

CFS VOLUNTEER LEADERSHIP PROGRAM

105 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 38—Given that the pilot of the volunteer leadership program was a highlight of 2022-23, will this program be run again in the future?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The CFS is exploring options to further deliver this program.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

106 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 51—What is the reason for the discrepancy between the \$158 million that was budgeted for the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service in 2022-23 and the \$172 million estimated result for the year?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The increase in expenses in the 2022-23 estimated result compared to the 2022-23 budget is predominately due to the outcomes of the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service Enterprise Agreement 2022.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

107 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 54—Why was the number of building development proposals conducted in the 2022-23 financial year more than triple the long term average of roughly 200 per year?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

Recent changes to the National Construction Code now require fire engineering briefs and reports be provided for every building referral submitted to the South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service (MFS), where previously only approximately 10 per cent of proposals would require these. This has, over the last three years of adoption, incrementally increased the number of reports submitted through to the MFS for review.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

108 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 57—What was the outcome of the review of the staff development framework and did it find that MFS competency-based assessments are consistent with the new Public Safety Training Package?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The Staff Development Framework review identified the need to transition the MFS competency-based assessments to align with the new Public Safety Training Package.

The MFS competency-based assessments are currently consistent with the new Public Safety Training Package and the Staff Development Framework better reflects the role of the firefighter.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

109 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 57—Was the average age of the firefighting fleet reduced during 2022-23 and if so, by how much?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

During 2022-23, the average age of the MFS general pumper firefighting fleet was reduced from 16 to 15.2 years. This figure does not include three new vehicles that have recently been delivered but are yet to be fully commissioned and commence as operational appliances.

To ensure the MFS is equipped to greatly reduce risk posed to South Australians, the government is honouring its election commitment through the allocation of \$14.1 million over four years to provide 12 new trucks, and a greater maintenance capability.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

110 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 60—Dot point three under targets for 2023-24 states that a review will be undertaken of policies and procedures to facilitate the recruitment and retention of a more diverse workforce. Does the MFS have a staff retention issue and if so, have reasons been identified for this?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The MFS does not have a 'staff retention issue'.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

111 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 62—Where did the \$1 million in 'other income' come from given it wasn't budgeted for the 2022-23 financial year and isn't budgeted for the current financial year?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

This comprises of:

- A once-off Australian Road Rescue Organisation (ARRO) hosting revenue of \$190,000 which was used to offset ARRO expenses.
- A once-off FBT refund from years 2018, 2019 and 2020 of \$380,000.
- Salary recoveries of \$500,000.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE AERIAL FLEET

112 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 1, page 33—When will the additional nine aircraft be operational?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

Aerial fleet came online from the commencement of the fire danger season.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

113 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 93—How many staff and volunteers were deployed to support emergency flood operations in New South Wales in 2022-23?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The South Australian State Emergency Service (SES) deployed a total of 58 personnel in support to New South Wales over the July to October period in 2022. This included 44 volunteers and 14 staff.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

114 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 93—What units will receive the four replacement trucks?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

The four SES Units identified to receive this year's trucks will be Port Broughton, Prospect, Streaky Bay and Tumby Bay units.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

115 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 4, Volume 2, page 93—What units will receive the three quick response vehicles?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

As per the SES light fleet operating model, the three quick response vehicles (QRV) will initially be received by regional staff as part of the QRV rollout program where at 60,000km they are forwarded onto an SES unit.

The regional staff to receive these QRVs are the South Region Commander, Southern Adelaide District Officer and Northern Adelaide District Officer. Their current vehicles will then be received by units within the north region, that are yet to be confirmed.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE FLEET RENEWAL

116 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 3, page 112—What vehicles make up the high and bulk capacity, mid capacity and small capacity fleet renewal for 2023-24?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

Fleet renewal planned for 2023-24.

High and bulk capacity:

- 2 x 24 rescue tankers with self-contained breathing apparatus (SCBA),
- 3 x 34 rescue tankers,
- 3 x 34 urban tankers (2 x SCBA),
- 3 x 34 urban offensive, and
- 2 x BW12 rural support.

Mid capacity:

- 4 x 24P rescue urban offensive,
- 1 x urban pumper/offensive technical,
- 1 x quick response vehicle (QRV) rural support,
- 1 x state hazmat logistics,
- 1 x specialist rescue vehicle,
- 9 x QRVs, and
- 8 x 24P rescue tankers (4 x SCBA).

Small capacity:

- 4 x 14 rural offensive,
- 1 x urban pumper general – urban technical,
- 6 x road crash rescue,

- 6 x urban rural pumpers, and
- 12 x 34 urban tankers (2 x SCBA).

GAWLER STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE

117 Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12 September 2023). In reference to Budget Paper 3, page 112— Why has the estimated total cost of the Gawler SES unit project increased by almost \$700,000 compared to the previous budget and why has the completion date has been delayed by a year?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

Design finalising and planning approvals are being undertaken by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport on behalf of the SES. The SES has allocated funding from internal budgets to address the rising costs of construction projects.

HAHNDORF BYPASS

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (26 September 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): The Department for Infrastructure and Transport advises maintenance works on River Road commenced on 14 September 2023, and include vegetation management, shoulder sealing and fixing of localised pavement failures. The department has advised that the majority of these works, which will improve line of sight and shoulder width, are expected to be completed prior to the Hahndorf truck diversion coming into effect from 30 October 2023.

The anticipated cost of the maintenance works on River Road is estimated at \$3 million, noting final costs may be subject to change, depending on site constraints and latent conditions.

Other works, include improvements at the junctions of Strathalbyn Road/River Road and Mount Barker Road/River Road, and minor improvements at the intersections of River Road with Kangaroo Reef Road, Sawmill Gully Road and Fairview Road, are expected to commence in 2024. This time frame will be subject to community consultation, design development and necessary approvals.

TAFE SA

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 September 2023).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

Unlike some other jurisdictions, the South Australian Government delivered 2,000 fee-free TAFE and VET places in the first tranche to non-government providers.

1,500 fee free places in tranche 2 of the initiative will be quarantined for delivery by non-government providers.

NATIONAL SKILLS AGREEMENT

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (17 October 2023).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

Training delivered by TAFE SA will continue to be funded at an appropriate level to deliver on the government's expectations and priorities for the public provider.

This differential has long existed, including under the funding arrangements of the former government, and stems from the role the public provider has in delivering training in regional and remote locations, offering a broad range of courses to deliver on labour market and local needs, providing support services to students, operating campuses with large infrastructure and capital requirements and to deliver on the industrial arrangements to support the workforce.

The role of the public provider is supported by non-government providers and the government continues to provide subsidy levels that are aligned with economic need and quality training.

As the member will also be aware, the 2023-24 SA budget included a \$28 million targeted subsidy increase for not-for-profit and industry providers to recognise their critical role in the training system. This is an initiative ITPA has advocated for over many years, and it is the Malinauskas Labor government who has delivered it.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition)** (31 October 2023).

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier): I have been advised:

The annual report containing the audited full financial years' data is published on the department's website each year, including all contractors over \$10,000 and the nature of work undertaken.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition)** (31 October 2023).

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier): I have been advised:

The department was provided with specific funding in the 2021-22 state budget to enhance cybersecurity and digital government systems over a three-year period from 2020-21 to 2022-23. Most of this funding and the corresponding expenses were allocated in 2021-22, resulting in a reduction in spending in 2022-23.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr COWDREY (Colton)** (31 October 2023).

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer): I thank the Member for Colton for his questions.

1. Has the personal data been removed from the dark web and, if so, when was it removed?

The data appeared on the dark web in early September for a period that was so brief that it was unable to be accessed and has not reappeared since.

2. Has the South Australian government, or a third party, paid a ransom or engaged in any transactions associated with the removal of Super SA members' data from the dark web?

No, the South Australian government has not. I have no oversight of the actions of a non-government entity.

HAHNDORF BYPASS

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (31 October 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): The Department for Infrastructure and Transport advises vegetation management works along River Road commenced on 14 September 2023, with the majority of these works completed by the end of October 2023. Some remaining vegetation works on River Road were completed 20 November 2023.

On 22 September 2023, shoulder sealing works on River Road commenced with the majority completed by 30 October 2023 (around 95 per cent). Remaining finishing works are expected to be completed in January 2024, weather permitting.

When planning the timing of road works, a number of factors are taken into consideration to minimise the impact to road users, surrounding residents, and to enable the works to be undertaken safely and efficiently.

Asphalt works on projects, particularly at junctions and intersections, are generally undertaken at night, including line marking.

The majority of the works on River Road were undertaken as day works, with night works undertaken on three occasions, to date (as at early December 2023).

On Sunday, 22 October, and Monday, 23 October 2023, asphalt works were undertaken at night at the junction of River Road and Mount Barker Road. On Sunday, 29 October 2023, night works were also undertaken to apply line marking to River Road.

HAHNDORF BYPASS

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (31 October 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): The Department for Infrastructure and Transport advises in order to improve safety on River Road, a first coat of line marking was applied to the edge lines, once the shoulder sealing was completed. A final coat of line marking was completed in December 2023.

Line marking was also applied to refresh the existing centre lines on River Road.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE STAFF

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (1 November 2023).

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services): I have been advised:

As of 9 November 2023, 17 CFS volunteer members, and zero staff, were suspended.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley)** (2 November 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

The \$35 million forms part of the broader \$155 million South Australian Rural Roads Safety Package, jointly funded by the Australian and South Australian governments (80:20) with works being delivered between 2019 to 2025.

The South Australian Rural Roads Safety Package focuses on road safety improvements on the South Australian regional road network.

These works aim to improve road safety and travel times for all road users, improve route reliability, efficiency and freight productivity and support economic growth for regional communities.

The \$35 million spent in the 2022-2023 financial year as part of the South Australian Rural Roads Safety Package was for the following projects:

- Long Valley Road – a southbound overtaking lane between the railway line to Gemmell Road and included the upgrade of the junctions at Stirling Hill Road and Gemmell Road.
- Riddoch Highway – a northbound overtaking lane north of Wrattenbully Road, Joanna, and a southbound overtaking lane south of Edenhope Road, Coonawarra.
- Augusta Highway – a southbound overtaking lane constructed between Lake View Road and Damascus Road, south of Redhill, and a southbound overtaking lane constructed between Maro Creek Lane and Diagonal Road, north of Lochiel.
- Finishing works on two new overtaking lanes on the Lincoln Highway, north of Whyalla.
- Planning and design for new overtaking lanes on Victor Harbor Road and the Riddoch Highway.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley)** (2 November 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

At page 274 there is no reference to a cost to purchase additional land for the north-south corridor.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr PATTERSON (Morphett)** (2 November 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised:

The Office of Hydrogen Power SA engaged the following providers for legal services:

Supplier
Ashurst Australia
Crown Solicitors Office
Piper Alderman Solicitors
Gray Andreotti Advisory
Lena Grant Lawyer

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs): I have been advised:

In late 2022-23, the state government allocated an additional appropriation of \$740,000 to the Outback Communities Authority (OCA) to recognise that the OCA had not been able to apply an asset sustainability levy, as had been included in its revenue for 2022-23.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs): I have been advised:

The \$1.25 million increase in grants and subsidies in 2022-2023 relates to the Australian government's Local Roads and Community Infrastructure grant program.

The Local Roads and Community Infrastructure grant program supports councils to deliver priority local road and community infrastructure projects across Australia. In the unincorporated areas of South Australia, funding has been provided to complete projects to enhance local community facilities.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs): I have been advised:

The Outback Communities Authority's Financial Report for the year ending 30 June 2023, page 13, reports one employee in the \$320,001 to \$340,000 band in 2022-23.

The increase is due to the separation of the former Director of the Outback Communities Authority on 31 January 2023. As a result, payout of leave entitlements moved them into the higher remuneration band.

The position of Director, Outback Communities Authority is remunerated at SAES 1 level.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TELFER (Flinders)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs): I have been advised:

The Local Roads Community Infrastructure grant funding for the Outback Communities Authority in 2022-23 was expended on the projects shown in the table below.

Project
Andamooka public toilets
Iron Knob public toilets
Community pump tracks
Aussie Travel Code
Blinman caravan & camper services area
Innamincka sporting club upgrade
Innamincka sporting club – additional funding
William Creek RFDS clinic
Port Le Hunte shark net
Andamooka rec centre enhancement
Fowlers Bay playground upgrade
Blinman Hall aircon
Pimba campground upgrade
Penong rest area
Beltana Hall upgrade
Copley Hall upgrades
Fowlers Bay Hall upgrades
Penong oval water harvest
Yunta swimming pool upgrade
Leigh Creek pump track shade
Penong pump track shade
Andamooka pump track shade
Andamooka caravan and campground upgrade
Blinman mine water storage

Project
Marree pump track shade
Western United Tigers kitchen aircon
William Creek Gymkhana arena upgrade
Marree Hall aircon
Copley tourist bay upgrade
Marla community BBQ
Copley half-court
Copley half-court additional funding
Marree Hall upgrades

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that a number of social media posts were 'boosted', that is paid to increase their coverage to South Australians, in the 2022-23 financial year for a total cost of \$571.76.

This cost relates to three posts that were posted on 23 March, 5 April and 14 April 2023.

A further round of boosted posts, incorporating video information for consumers, is currently underway for the 2023-24 financial year.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that total project expenditure for OneCBS to 30 June 2023 was \$2,545,142. CBS has completed the planning, procurement, discovery and design phases of the project. Following the discovery phase, CBS received fixed price quotes and revised scheduling from the systems integration partner, providing confidence that the project is on track to deliver by 30 June 2024 within budget.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): As noted in the Auditor-General's Annual Report for the 2022-23 financial year, licensees are prohibited from operating any gaming machine that was installed prior to 31 May 2001 and returns winnings to players of less than 85 per cent, or 87.5 per cent in the case of any gaming machine installed after that date. The Member for Heysen refers to 2021 but I believe he was referring to this 2001 change.

I am advised that there are no machines currently operating that have the pre-2001 return to player of minimum of 85 per cent. All current machines operate with a return to player of not less than 87.5 per cent.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (14 November 2023).

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning): I have been advised:

As of 31 October 2023, 826 system enhancements have been delivered over the last three years.

These system enhancements include user experience and regulatory compliance related system changes along with system updates to ensure ongoing stability and cybersecurity protection of the e-Planning system.

As the system consists of several different technologies the patching schedule varies depending on the recommendation from the system vendors.

ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (16 November 2023).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

It can be confirmed that the SACE Board have had no reports of the use of AI during the 2023 exam period.

TAFE SA

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (16 November 2023).

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

As per the requirements set out in the TAFE SA Act 2012 section 7, part (4):

the Board's membership must include persons who together have, in the Governor's opinion, the expertise, abilities and experience required for the effective performance of TAFE SA's functions and the proper discharge of its business and management obligations (including in the areas of education and training, business, industry and community affairs and strategic planning).

Ms Broadfoot and Ms Marrone meet the required skill sets for appointment to the TAFE SA Board.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

In reply to **Mr COWDREY (Colton)** (28 November 2023).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining): I am advised that under the Infrastructure SA Act 2018 Infrastructure SA has the function to review and evaluate proposals for major infrastructure by public sector agencies. It is not the responsibility of Infrastructure SA to undertake a separate benefit-cost assessment.