

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 8 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

DUNSTAN BY-ELECTION

The SPEAKER (11:01): Before I call the Clerk, in view of certain legislation before the parliament, I inform the house that writs for a by-election in the electoral district of Dunstan will be issued on Friday 16 February 2024 in place of Thursday 8 February 2024. I will publish the date for the by-election in the electoral district of Dunstan today at 4pm, as earlier advised. That date is unaffected by the changes in the date for the issue of the writ.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: THEBARTON AQUATIC CENTRE REFURBISHMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:02): I move:

That the 42nd report of the committee, entitled Thebarton Aquatic Centre Refurbishment, be noted.

The Department for Education proposes to refurbish facilities at the Thebarton Aquatic Centre to create a modern recreational and sporting facility for the community. Located on Meyer Street in Torrensville, the aquatic centre is within the City of West Torrens and is a very well-used public asset.

The centre caters for approximately 1,500 users per week and is utilised by a range of community groups. It is also a critical facility in the delivery of the Department for Education's water safety program. The refurbishment will create a more accessible and safer facility for the community, with key aims of the redevelopment to focus on the refurbishment of spaces around the existing pools to provide better amenities to pool users. Key aims of the project include:

- refurbishing existing spaces to provide contemporary and efficient facilities supporting social and community outcomes;
- improving the centre's ability to provide quality aquatic services, including educational services to South Australians, and delivering South Australian government commitments;
- providing a compliant community facility;
- improving access to the facility for people with disabilities;
- increasing water safety for the children of South Australia; and
- reducing the risk exposure associated with aged infrastructure.

The capital cost is \$8.7 million, and construction has commenced, with practical completion anticipated for June this year. The aquatic centre is closed during the construction period, and the department was actively involved in relocating the users to nearby swimming centres during this time. Project construction will follow two key stages, with stage 1 comprising demolition works to existing amenities, an external structure, ancillary spaces and the pool plant enclosure.

Stage 2 will follow with construction and refurbishment of:

- a new pool plant area, allowing for plant and equipment to be positioned in a compliant manner;
- a new pool store, directly opening onto the pool concourse;
- new complaint amenities with showers and water closets located in two separate change rooms;
- an accessible shower/water closet to include a change table and provision for patrons with disabilities;
- two general learning areas, one with a kitchenette to allow for basic catering facilities for events; and
- an open area at the south end of the pool hall.

The project scope also includes refurbishment work to the main 25-metre pool, the learn-to-swim pool and the steel structure of the pool hall. The pool concourse will be reconstructed to ensure proper drainage, and slip-resistant tiles will be installed. The department states that the refurbishment has been designed to be adaptable to accommodate future pool works, if required.

Thebarton Aquatic Centre specifically caters to the needs of disability community groups and services. Therefore, requirements of the Disability Discrimination Act have been considered to make provisions for persons with disabilities. These include the installation of a disability access ramp to the main pool to provide equitable access along with additional amenities access. Three options were considered in the development of the project, which included: option 1, do nothing; option 2, build a completely new facility; and option 3, refurbish and construct the new facilities on the Thebarton Aquatic Centre site. Option 3 was determined as the most appropriate and cost-effective solution that addressed the key objectives for the project.

Sustainable development principles and environmental objectives were incorporated into the project design and policies. These principles aim to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions over the duration of the project. The project will utilise a holistic life-cycle approach to planning, design, costing, construction, maintenance and building management. Design of the aquatic centre will demonstrate best practice design measures, to reduce energy input and maximise use of natural light and ventilation. Additionally, the design is future adaptable and will utilise existing renewable, recyclable and locally sourced resources with an emphasis on minimising waste to landfill.

Risk assessments have been undertaken and determined there is a medium range of risk relating to construction program and project cost. To address these risks, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport is providing risk-management services from the early design stages, and throughout construction. After consultation with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's section of Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, the department confirms there are no native title implications over the site area. The Department for Environment and Water confirms there are no local heritage places on the site. The Department for Education assures that engagement and consultation has occurred with all relevant and appropriate stakeholders. Care has been taken to consult and ensure all the needs of stakeholders have been considered during the refurbishment process.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Thebarton Aquatic Centre refurbishment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Helen Doyle, Acting Executive Director, Infrastructure, Department for Education; John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and David McLeod, Senior Associate, Grieve Gillet Architects.

I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for West Torrens for the written statement supporting this project in his electorate. Based upon the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NAILSWORTH PRIMARY SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:08): I move:

That the 43rd report of the committee, entitled Nailsworth Primary School Redevelopment, be noted.

Mr BROWN: Located on Balfour Street, Nailsworth, the Department for Education proposes to redevelop the aged and heritage-listed infrastructure at Nailsworth Primary School to provide new flexible and contemporary learning areas. The project will provide modern education accommodation, comply with legislative requirements and deliver on the department's benchmark accommodation for students in a primary school. Additionally, the redevelopment will provide learning areas to develop creativity and enhance student engagement.

The project will allow for collaborative teaching practices and will increase the total school enrolment capacity from 588 to 756 places, alleviating enrolment pressure the school has been facing over recent years. The capital cost is \$5 million and it will be funded through the department's existing resources. Construction is expected to commence in March this year, with practical completion in March 2025. Key aims of the redevelopment include:

- to refurbish existing infrastructure to provide additional flexible learning areas, supporting contemporary teaching and enhancing student engagement;
- to improve street presence (particularly off Balfour Street) by creating a focal entrance, increasing the school's connectivity to the community; and
- to demolish aged infrastructure.

The refurbishment of existing infrastructure includes work to two buildings, one of which is listed as a local heritage building. This heritage building was previously used as the Prospect Community Library and reinstated to the school in 2019, with the main objective of the project to improve the functionality of this building for school use.

Works on this building will ensure the existing heritage is retained and preserved, with remedial works being consistent with existing materials and form, and will be in line with local heritage guidelines. Internal spaces will be updated to maximise the opportunity for available space, whilst the existing elements of the building are retained. The interior refurbishment of the non-heritage building will incorporate new teaching walls, glazed partitions and contemporary finishes to suit the new functions of the building.

Project work revolves around reinvigorating, reimagining and repurposing the existing facilities on site to create more equitable learning environments across the school. The landscaping work will draw upon the unique heritage character by reinterpreting heritage materials and using local sandstone, bluestone and red bricks.

Project construction will follow four key stages, and staff and students will continue to occupy the site with the school remaining operational for the duration of the various staged works. All potential interruptions to school operations will be kept to a minimum, and further mitigated by programming these works during school holidays as well as out of hours and during weekend periods.

Three options were considered for the development of the project. They were: option 1, a 'do nothing' approach; option 2, build a completely new school; and option 3, redevelop and construct the new facilities on the Nailsworth Primary School site. Option 3 was determined as the most appropriate solution as it allowed for the redevelopment and construction of new and existing learning and educational facilities in line with the school's needs and contemporary requirements.

Sustainable development principles and environmental objectives were incorporated into the design and policies for this project. These include energy, water, materials, and waste initiatives to promote cost saving methods and minimise waste to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions over the life cycle of the project.

Risk assessment has been undertaken, which determined there is a medium range of risk relating to construction, design and project cost. To address these risks, the proposed project team

is experienced in the delivery of educational projects, and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport is providing risk management services from early project design through to construction.

The Department for Education is mindful of risks associated with the project, including refurbishment works being undertaken whilst staff and students are present, and maintaining access to classrooms. The department will ensure there will be a dedicated school access to the first floor classrooms in the location where refurbishment is occurring, with a separate access for contractors. Additionally, to ensure safety of staff and students, the demolition and removal of any asbestos-clad infrastructure will be undertaken on weekends or out of school hours.

After consultation with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Unit, the Department for Education confirms that there are no native title implications over the site area. The Department for Environment and Water has confirmed there are two buildings listed as local heritage places on the site with one directly affected by these works, and which will require major refurbishment to maintain and preserve its heritage form. There are no state heritage places or contributory heritage items on this site.

The department assures the committee that engagement and consultation has occurred with the school principal, the governing council, school staff and the education director, who all endorse the project. This has occurred at each stage to ensure there has been direct representation on project development.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Nailsworth Primary School redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Helen Doyle, Acting Executive Director, Infrastructure, Department for Education; John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Peter Ahladas, Associate, JPE Design Studio. I thank the witnesses for their time before the committee.

Based upon the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I recognise the presence in the gallery today of Ms Rachelle Barlow from Business Mount Barker and also Stroud Homes, a guest of the Minister for Small and Family Business. You are most welcome in parliament today.

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: NDIS INQUIRY

Adjourned debate on motion of Ms Wortley:

That the 46th report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into the impact of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) on South Australians living with disability who have complex needs and are, or are at risk of, residing for long periods in inappropriate accommodation', be noted.

(Continued from 30 November 2023.)

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:15): I thank members opposite for creating this vacancy of time so that the opposition may address what has been a significant report in front of the Social Development Committee for the better part of 12 months. As the lead and only speaker, I seek the house's indulgence to work through what has been a significant report.

The 46th report of the Social Development Committee was an inquiry into the impact of the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) on South Australians living with disability who have complex needs and are, or are at risk of, residing for long periods in inappropriate accommodation.

At the outset, I would like to sincerely thank the work of the secretary to our committee, Robyn Schutte, and our research officer, Mary-Ann Bloomfield, who provided such thorough

administrative support to the committee members. I also take this opportunity to thank my committee members.

This report resulted in a 230-page document with 38 written submissions, 22 oral submissions and, of significance, 53 recommendations. It was referred to the Social Development Committee on 17 May 2022 and has, in fact, taken well over 12 months for the committee to deliberate, confer, approve, table and now note this report. It is of some minor note that I record my disappointment that it has taken yet another five months since the tabling for the opposition to respond—but here we are.

The terms of reference paid special attention to the significant issue that is inappropriate accommodation for those living with a disability. The submissions that we received certainly spoke to the impact that has on the hospital system, as well as residential aged care, for those who present to hospital with complex needs and the medical practitioners find that they cannot then be discharged back to that accommodation because it is inappropriate in its provision for that individual.

As a committee, we spent a lot of time reflecting on the impact on the hospital system, on the health system and discussing hospital avoidance programs. Since five months have passed and this report does exist, I am going to refer literally to a lot of the content that is in the report.

I note that our report found that many South Australians who visited the emergency department of a hospital because of a lack of anywhere else to turn, and have non-medical hospital admissions, resulted in long stays and sadly a decline in participants' health, wellbeing and opportunities.

Of significance, the committee learnt through those submissions that the longest delayed discharge time for an NDIS patient in South Australia waiting for appropriate accommodation supports as of March 2023 was 1,184 days in hospital.

We were presented with the reality of the challenges in the health system when it comes to a flow problem: presentations through emergency or by referral, bed stays and then the discharge process. What seemed to be reported at the time was that if you were an elderly person aged 65 years and over, your average stay was very much reduced because the aged-care sector was in a position to support that discharge. For someone on an NDIS package, their length of stay is much longer, as we know; the average was about 125 days. So there is certainly a long way to go.

We spent a lot of time reflecting on inappropriate housing, including recognising that it is quite a thin market. There has been high demand and no supply for some time and, in fact, recommendation 26 speaks to that. I will come back to the recommendation shortly, but of course workforce shortages in this space, high demand and no supply in the housing sector, as I said, and impacts to the hospital discharge process have added to those lengthy hospital stays. The effect of COVID on the housing market certainly pushed prices up and the stock dried up. We saw that affordable housing had reduced, which meant that people were, sadly, languishing in hospital. We know the impact that this continues to have on our health system.

On a positive note, the committee really did embrace the people who presented a submission in person, and we heard from and visited one extraordinary individual, Allan Hunter, who had designed and built his own modified home which was compliant with the specialist disability accommodation standard. I do not have the time to sing the praises of Allan but he is an extraordinary individual. Allan has lived for 20 years as a quadriplegic and he deserves special mention, given the intelligence and sophistication that he brought to designing his own home. While designing and paying for that home himself, Allan used the Livable Housing Australia platinum standard as a construction guide for anyone living in a wheelchair. Along the way, he completed a Master's thesis in complying with the Livable Housing Design Guidelines, and is certainly a model example of what the system could be studying and identifying for people's needs down the track.

In the 12 months from the year 2022-23, the committee found that the NDIS had provided funded supports to a total of 600,000 people to the tune of \$34 billion. The committee, as we reflect on our recommendations, had to look at the national cost and, as the federal minister has also done in his review, sought opportunities for reform. While we were focused on people who are living with a disability and their housing opportunities, these statistics rang through. There were 31,000 people

with an allocation or access to supported independent living (SIL) options, at a total cost of \$11 billion. By contrast, there are 23,000 people who are living with an allocation for specialist disability accommodation (SDA), at a cost of \$230 million. So there is a difference there: \$230 million compared with \$11 billion.

The committee's takeaway was that the NDIS participants with SIL living packages only make up 5 per cent of the total number in the NDI Scheme, and the total cost of the SIL service makes up 33 per cent of that total NDIS funding. So there is a lot of opportunity for the federal government now to turn its mind to value for money and to look much more closely at funding specialist disability accommodation.

The committee, with its 53 recommendations, noted that seven of them required the state government's urgent attention. I note that from the time we tabled this report, the Minister for Human Services has been very forthcoming in reviewing our recommendations and writing back to the committee with her feedback. From the minister's own letter to the committee, the minister confirms that 33 of those recommendations are supported by the South Australian government, 17 are supported in principle and three are listed for further consideration.

I take this opportunity to reflect on the links that are being made or the similarities of the references across a number of reports—our committee report, the state government's response to them and federal Minister Shorten's most recent NDIS review—where there is a national commitment from the federal minister that all state governments, all national cabinet, should agree to jointly invest in psychosocial supports outside the NDIS to assist people with severe and persistent mental health conditions who are currently unable to access support.

I put the challenge back to the state government and the health minister that investment in psychosocial supports is being recognised by the federal government. In the Mid-Year Budget Review it seems that only \$500,000 has been allocated for the rest of this financial year, and I am calling on the state government to make sure that investment in psychosocial services outside of the NDIS is a priority going forward.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MARGARET TOBIN CENTRE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:26): I move:

That the 44th report of the committee, entitled 'Margaret Tobin Centre—psychiatric intensive care unit expansion', be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing, or SA Health, proposes to deliver a new 12-bed psychiatric intensive care unit through a major extension of the Margaret Tobin Centre within the Flinders Medical Centre. The project forms part of the broader state and commonwealth governments' \$400 million election commitment to upgrade and expand the Flinders Medical Centre and has a capital cost of \$30 million. Early works commenced in January this year, with the main works anticipated to commence in May. Practical completion is expected in mid-2025.

Flinders Medical Centre forms part of the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and is the largest hospital providing services to the southern metropolitan area. The extensive range of health services provided at Flinders Medical Centre encompasses mental health and psychiatric intensive care. The Margaret Tobin Centre is the principal acute mental health service in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and was constructed in 2005.

The service currently has a 38-bed mental health inpatient facility, consisting of an eight-bed psychiatric intensive care unit and two acute care units that can admit a total of 30 mental health consumers. Admission to the facility can be facilitated in a planned manner by Community Mental Health Services, through an emergency department or via general medical pathways.

The project will increase the number of bays in the psychiatric intensive care unit from eight to 12, which will reduce pressure on service delivery, improve admitted mental health consumer outcomes and assist with patient flows from the emergency department. The addition of specialist acute mental health beds in southern Adelaide will provide improved access and deliver a new psychiatric intensive care unit aligned to contemporary mental health facility design principles.

The project will provide enhanced consumer care outcomes through the delivery of a modern, homelike environment which is non-institutional for individuals presenting with acute mental health conditions and will enable the relocation of the unit's existing functions.

The extension of the psychiatric intensive care unit will be positioned across a suspended floor on the same level as the adjacent Margaret Tobin Centre bed stock. Construction will also incorporate a secured lower-level area for staff and mental health consumers. It was recommended to build the new ward positioned on one floor to promote greater operational efficiency with the existing Margaret Tobin Centre and simplify staff movements during night shifts. The 12-bed ward will consist of the following support areas:

- three private family interview or meeting rooms, one sized larger to accommodate for extended family groups, reflective of a culturally inclusive environment for visiting families;
- a purpose-assigned sensory room, providing a dedicated location for diversion therapies;
- a de-escalation room and courtyard with adjoining ensuite for consumers experiencing severe acute mental health episodes;
- a consumer dining room; and
- an on-ward staffroom and office, store and utility area.

The secured lower level will provide support functions and will include a consumer interview room for consultation with consumers brought by vehicle prior to admission to the psychiatric intensive care unit; a consumer property hold for storage of a consumer's personal effects; and an open plan office for multidisciplinary clinical teams, an enclosed office and a staff area.

Sustainable development principles and environmental objectives were incorporated into the design and policies for this expansion. Importantly, a design work group has been tasked with ensuring these considerations are fully integrated, with an independent consultant appointed to support the sustainable aspirations of the project.

These sustainable principles are expected to provide a health facility with good environmental qualities, achieve a value for money solution and assist in improving user comfort and wellbeing whilst managing behaviours. The new facility will provide a positive workplace, reduce energy and water consumption, reduce the consumption of renewable and non-renewable energy resources and minimise recurring costs associated with maintaining the facility.

Risk assessments have identified potential risks related to the location, budget and the project program and time line. To mitigate these risks, a project control group has been established, comprising members of SA Health, the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. The committee will be responsible for providing day-to-day project management, reporting and controls functions.

After consultation with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Unit, SA Health confirms there are no native title implications over the site area and the Department for Environment and Water has confirmed there are no local heritage places on site.

SA Health assures the committee that engagement and consultation has occurred with various units and agencies within SA Health and the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network. This has included undertaking specialised subject matter reviews, focusing on specific requirements of each unit and facility. Reviews and consultation will continue throughout the life cycle of the project with key stakeholders.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Margaret Tobin Centre psychiatric intensive care unit expansion. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Tim Packer, the Executive Director Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; John Harrison, Director Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; Michael Hegarty, Chief Executive and Principal Architect, Design Worldwide Partnership; and Dr Michael Nance, Clinical Director Mental Health Services, Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

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

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE AQUATIC CENTRE DEVELOPMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:32): I move:

That the 45th report of the committee, entitled Adelaide Aquatic Centre Development, be noted.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) proposes to demolish and rebuild a new Adelaide Aquatic Centre. Located in the City of Adelaide's North Parklands, the Adelaide Aquatic Centre was built in 1969 and has now reached the end of its useful life. The project forms part of a 2022 state government election commitment to build a new Adelaide Aquatic Centre and will provide a regional-level aquatic and wellbeing centre that incorporates a wide range of aquatic and allied health functions.

The development is a key government social infrastructure project aiming to deliver world-class facilities and offer sporting groups, local residents and the broader community fit-for-purpose modern services and amenities. The scope will include the demolition of the existing centre and construction of the new facility on an adjoining site referred to as Park 2 of the City of Adelaide North Parklands. The existing centre's footprint will be returned to parklands for recreational and public uses and will result in no net loss of parklands, with the department noting that 1,000 square metres of parklands will be returned.

The new Adelaide Aquatic Centre will be a multistorey building and will provide indoor and outdoor swimming pools; an outdoor aquatic and landscape zone; allied health and fitness facilities and amenities; and improved connectivity, including additional car parking and improved pedestrian and cycling pathways.

The new development will provide more offerings for the community, including a 10-lane 50-metre indoor pool suitable for regional-level swimming carnivals, water sports and recreational use; a dedicated indoor learn-to-swim pool, which will increase the number of learn to swim places from 1,200 to 3,000; a warm water pool for rehabilitation programs; an outdoor 8-lane 25-metre pool with a separate lagoon edge for swimming, water polo and recreational use; outdoor aquatic splash play spaces with shade structures and outdoor areas; and water slides to also be installed as part of the project scope.

Pedestrian and cycle pathways to enable connection of the Parklands trails with the centre and extensive landscaping and native plantings will complete the outdoor aquatic and landscape zone. The development will also provide an increase in car park spaces to accommodate for the projected increase in users. The capital cost of the development is \$135 million and construction is anticipated to commence in April of this year, with practical completion in summer 2025-26.

The Adelaide Aquatic Centre falls within the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout, which is a commonwealth heritage-listed place protected by the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act. It has been determined that the project is consistent with the heritage values of the Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout.

DIT is working with the City of Adelaide on a native tree replacement strategy to improve the mature tree canopy and the return to Parklands zone. The returned space will also incorporate sporting fields, landscaping and the continuation of existing pedestrian, cycle and access pathways.

The project will deliver a Green Star Building, through integrating the natural environment and committing to sustainable building design and construction. Sustainable development principles have been adopted and will incorporate sustainable technology as part of the project. DIT has encompassed these principles through active design strategies designed to minimise greenhouse gas emissions and resources over the life cycle of the project, ensuring that climate change risks, such as increased temperatures and rainfall patterns, have been considered. These strategies will incorporate building a fully electric facility capable of carbon-neutral operation; having energy efficient lighting, heating and cooling; incorporating double glazing and promoting natural ventilation.

Delivery of the project will require contractors to work under the environmental heritage and sustainability requirements of the department. An environmental management plan addressing key environmental and heritage components and compliance with relevant legislation will be developed to ensure that the environmental risks associated with the project are appropriately managed.

DIT is aware of associated risks and will ensure correct project management strategies are in place to identify, assess and mitigate risks, with an active risk register to be developed and implemented throughout the project.

Extensive consultation advising on the location, building design and types of included facilities has been undertaken with community groups and relevant stakeholders. A community reference group, representing a range of key community interests, including local residents, businesses, the Adelaide Park Lands Association and entities affiliated with the existing Adelaide Aquatic Centre, was established to provide in-depth analysis and consultation on the proposed project. Late last year, 1,200 people, inclusive of over 60 user groups, provided valuable input in relation to the functionality for the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre. Consultation with the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing; the City of Adelaide; the City of Prospect; and the City of West Torrens has also occurred.

Preparation of a community and stakeholder management plan has been prepared to provide an overview of these communication activities during the construction phase to provide relevant stakeholders, local residents, property owners and businesses with continual updates and engagement on the project.

After consultation with the Attorney-General's Department's Aboriginal affairs unit, it was determined that there are no registered or reported Aboriginal sites, objects or ancestral remains within the project area. An assessment of the risk of encountering previously unknown and unrecorded Aboriginal heritage sites has been undertaken and has established that there is a low risk. DIT has stated that it will utilise discovery protocols should an inadvertent discovery be made during construction. There are no state, local or contributory non-Aboriginal heritage-listed places expected to be directly impacted by the project.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Adelaide Aquatic Centre development. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Simon Morony, Executive Director, Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; Kylie Taylor, Chief Executive, Office of Recreation, Sport and Racing; and Josephine Evans, Director of JPE Design Studio. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (11:39): Obviously, on this side of the chamber, we support the building of the Adelaide Aquatic Centre. As has been pointed out by the member, this was a facility that was built in 1969 and it has come to the end of its life and needs to be replaced, but we still have a number of questions when it comes to this particular facility. A number of questions were asked in the committee, but in my humble opinion there are still some that remain unanswered, and we will be keeping a close eye on things in that regard.

Going in to the election many out there thought that this was going to be a redevelopment, something in the order of \$80 million. Now we see that it has increased—blown out, you might even say—to a cost out to \$135 million and who knows what we will actually end up with once this is finalised. Some are saying that is a lot of extra money for just a waterslide—a very expensive waterslide indeed.

Those opposite have said in the past that the existing centre would stay open while the replacement facility is built. You do not just have to take my word for it, that is what residents of the City of Adelaide have told me. That was their understanding, that is what they were told, and they still remain out there very, very disappointed.

What this government has failed to do is to take into consideration the human aspect of relocating a number of these families. There are kids at the moment who have Learn to Swim

programs, whether it is during the school holidays or whether it is during the regular season, and you cannot just relocate all these families to facilities that are in the vicinity of the location. Some of them are now inconvenienced, very much so, and are having to travel far greater distances. On top of that, you also have a very vulnerable cohort, sometimes elderly residents, who do rehabilitation in some of these facilities. Many of them do not drive, they rely on public transport. They are now having to go to other parts of the city for similar treatment.

So this is a backflip by this government, one minute saying that the existing aquatics centre would stay open and the next minute saying it will be closing around August. That is a clear broken promise and we are calling them out for it. Not only has the project taken longer, not only is it costing more than expected but the promise of having the centre open has been backflipped on and that is leading to other additional incurred expenses through this promise of somewhat alternative accommodation.

When I listen to some of the evidence, I think some of those relocation plans have not really been thought out, especially since some of these people in the middle of winter are being asked to go to pools that just do not have the appropriate level of facilities. We know that there are a number of schools that use the facilities for recreation and they will have to relocate. Time will tell how that goes and whether that relocation actually exists. As you know, sir, I am a young father myself and I have the great fortune of watching my little one go to swimming lessons, and let me tell you every time I go there it is absolutely packed because there is such demand for what is a crucial skill for young people to develop.

The other thing to raise here is about the economic credentials of this government when it comes to their investments around these sorts of things. Under the former Liberal government we planned, if elected, to invest \$25 million towards a new aquatics centre, but we also wanted to make sure that other bodies had skin in the game as well because it would be responsible to do so. If you look at The ARC facility in my electorate, I think it is the best facility of its kind in the world, in fact. That was a great collaboration between state government, federal government, local government and private organisations coming together for what is an outstanding facility. But, alas, not here. We see the government basically writing a cheque for the entire project, although I understand that the council is contributing some early works.

At the end of the day, that is what socialism is, is it not? You just keep going until you run out of other people's money—what can I say? Is it financially prudent to not have a contribution from other relevant stakeholders for this kind of facility? The other question I ask is: if it is okay for this facility, what about every other facility? Is this a new precedent by this Labor government, that they will just take the bill—they will just pick up the bill, they will pick up the tab, for any infrastructure project like this? The cynic out there might say that they will only do it where they think that it is of merit from a political point of view. How about that? Would that not just be outrageous? Time will tell whether that is money well spent.

I have to say, I am looking forward to seeing how this goes. I think there would have been a more prudent option, and that is to allow funding channels to be enabled by bodies like the council, and the federal government as well, because we all know that when we pull together, pool our resources together, then we will be able to achieve better value for taxpayer dollars. At the end of the day, there are needs and there are wants, and there is a finite level of resources out there. This is economics 101, which this government does not seem to understand. I think they could have got a better deal when it comes to producing the funding for this model.

The opportunity cost now means that we are going to be missing out on other facilities across the state where there need to be those upgrades. That is not going to occur now because the government has seen fit to bankroll the whole thing. I look around and I see there are many electorates that I know would benefit from increased funding and resources in their recreational facilities. My fear is now that that will not occur because of what the government has done here. I think that they could have maximised taxpayer value for money a bit better.

In saying that, we will wait to see how the project goes. We will continue to monitor the time lines and the costings. As I said, we do accept that the Adelaide Aquatic Centre needed to be

redeveloped. It is just about the journey of how we got here. We would have liked to see that being a bit different.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (11:47): I thank the Public Works Committee for their report on the Adelaide Aquatic Centre redevelopment. I want to make a brief contribution to highlight three promises from those opposite that have evaporated in respect to the Adelaide Aquatic Centre.

The first of those is with respect to costs before the election. We see an \$80 million commitment to the new Adelaide Aquatic Centre. Fast forward a couple of years to where we are at, and that price tag has already, before we have even commenced construction, blown out to \$135 million—a \$135 million water slide. This is a huge cost blowout by this Labor government during a cost-of-living crisis. That is the first promise that has evaporated, with respect to the Adelaide Aquatic Centre.

The second was a very clear and explicit promise from those opposite that the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, the current facility, would remain open while the new centre is being built. Allow me to quote the member for Adelaide, from before the election. She said, and I quote:

...the current facility will continue to operate while we build the new centre—meaning the hundreds of thousands of visitors, locals and families who rely on this service each year won't miss out during the upgrade.

Well, that promise has been broken, just like the first promise, and those hundreds of thousands of people that the member for Adelaide was so concerned about before the election have been left high and dry now for a year or two or more while the new facility is being built. It is a great shame that that promise has simply evaporated.

The third and final promise that has evaporated with this new Adelaide Aquatic Centre is with respect to the Adelaide Parklands. They promised us, before the last election, that they would protect Adelaide's unique Parklands. They have broken that promise with alarming speed and alarming severity at every single opportunity, whether it be at the Thebarton barracks and the absolute debacle in trying to move some horses; whether it be not supporting legislation in this place to heritage-list the Adelaide Parklands; or whether it be now, in this case, paying total disregard to the preservation of the Parklands in this new Adelaide Aquatic Centre redevelopment.

I hear from those opposite that this is going to expand the footprint of the Parklands. Well, forgive me for simply not believing those opposite when it comes to making promises with respect to the Parklands. They have shown their true colours over the past couple of years, and they are doing it again here with the Adelaide Aquatic Centre, and it is very disappointing. We will continue to watch this development. In the meantime, we utterly condemn three broken promises on cost, on keeping the centre open and on protecting our Parklands with respect to the Adelaide Aquatic Centre.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:50): I would like to thank those who have made contributions. I would like to thank the member for Bragg for his consistency on this particular project. The hostility that we get from him about the Adelaide Aquatic Centre redevelopment continues, and I can certainly admire his consistency on the issue.

As for the member for Hartley, I must say I did enjoy listening to him wax lyrical about economics and government finance in general. After that contribution, it is no wonder some people say he is completely wasted where he is in the Liberal Party and he really should be elevated. I would also like to put his mind and potentially, even possibly, the member for Bragg's mind at ease. The issue of relocation of facilities during construction was canvassed quite considerably at the committee meeting at which the member for Hartley was present. A number of questions were asked, and I feel the department's responses were quite good, fulsome, and went a long way towards assuaging people's concerns about the issue.

I think this is a great project. I think it will be not only fantastic for the people of Adelaide but great for everyone across the city of Adelaide, and also the state as a whole, and I look forward to it being built.

Motion carried.

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ROMA MITCHELL SECONDARY COLLEGE
REDEVELOPMENT**

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:51): I move:

That the 46th report of the committee, entitled Roma Mitchell Secondary College Redevelopment, be noted.

Mr BROWN: The Department for Education proposes to construct new facilities to accommodate additional student enrolments on the Roma Mitchell Secondary College site. Located on Briens Road, Gepps Cross, within the City of Port Adelaide Enfield, the secondary college encompasses a girls' education campus, a separate co-education campus and a special education campus on the one site. The college offers the International Baccalaureate, with a middle years program provided for students in years 8 to 10, and a diploma program for years 11 and 12.

The project aims to provide modern educational accommodation, meet legislative compliance requirements and deliver the department's benchmark accommodation for students in a secondary school with the following key aims:

- providing additional accommodation, including specialist spaces, to provide future enrolment growth in the Adelaide inner-northern areas;
- providing modern, supportive learning areas; and
- delivering a connected, multidisciplinary learning environment that engages learners.

The new works of the Roma Mitchell Secondary College include:

- a purpose-built facility with a multifunctional gymnasium that meets international competition standards with change rooms and amenities. The sports courts will be sized for basketball, netball and futsal and will also be used for sports academy programs between the school and the Home of Football, which is located directly north of the site;
- six new integrated general learning areas, a teachers' preparation area, an office and meeting room, along with dedicated weights and fitness rooms specifically for the students' sports programs; and
- a cafeteria to service the gymnasium and the girls' campus that will be serviceable for weekend activities.

The project scope requires landscaping and site works with construction and landscaping occurring concurrently. The architectural form and materials used for the construction of the new works will be suitable for a school environment, durable and complement existing buildings on site.

Three options were considered for the project: firstly, to do nothing; secondly, to build a completely new school; or thirdly, to redevelop and build the new facilities on the Roma Mitchell Secondary College site. Option 3 was the preferred option, as it aligns with the key aims of the project and provides for the construction of suitable and compliant learning and educational facilities.

The capital cost is \$20.9 million, and construction has commenced with practical completion expected in December this year. The department states that sustainable development strategies have been incorporated into the project design and delivery, to ensure that energy consumption and greenhouse gas emissions are reduced over the lifespan of the project. This includes integrated water, material, waste and physical environment initiatives to ensure that ecologically sustainable considerations are adhered to. To integrate these initiatives, a passive design has been developed to incorporate natural light to learning spaces as well as shading to windows, and the project design has utilised vegetation to create cool air and the optimisation of orientation to increase natural breezes.

Delivery of the project will require contractors to work under the environmental heritage and sustainability requirements of the department. An environmental management plan addressing key environmental and heritage components will be developed to ensure that any environmental risks associated with the project are managed correctly and are in compliance with current legislation.

The department confirms that risk assessments have been undertaken, which determined that there is a medium range of risk. To mitigate these risks, the project team has demonstrated

experience in the delivery of education projects, including the previous Roma Mitchell College redevelopment of the senior campus and girls' campus, and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport is providing full project risk management services in the project management, design, cost, procurement and construction stages.

The Department for Environment and Water has confirmed there are no local heritage places or items on the site. After consultation with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation Unit, the department confirms there are no native title implications over the site area.

Consultation and engagement have ensued, and have been endorsed by the principal, governing council, school staff and the education director of the secondary school. There has been close involvement and direct representation with the governing council and school staff during each stage of the project, and great care has been taken at the concept planning stage to consult and ensure that the needs and requirements of all stakeholders were taken into consideration.

The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Roma Mitchell Secondary College redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects and Technical Services, Department for Education; James Macdonald, Manager, Project Management, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Nicole Dent, Associate Director, Grieve Gillett Andersen. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work. I must also say that I had the honour of attending at the site with the minister and a few of my colleagues the other week, and I can say that not only is the school leadership very excited about this project but also the students themselves are very excited to get the new facilities.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL MENTAL HEALTH REHABILITATION UNIT AND INPATIENT UNIT EXPANSION

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:57): I move:

That the 47th report of the committee, entitled 'Noarlunga Hospital mental health rehabilitation unit and inpatient unit expansion', be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing, or SA Health, proposes to develop a new mental health rehabilitation unit and inpatient unit at the Noarlunga Hospital through a comprehensive expansion of the existing facilities.

Delivering an additional 48 beds, the expansion forms the key component of the state government's election commitment to increase the number of mental health rehabilitation beds, as well as the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network's infrastructure master plan to construct additional inpatient capacity at Noarlunga Hospital. The total investing budget is \$74 million, with construction works anticipated to commence in March this year and practical completion to be in October 2025.

Noarlunga Hospital was built in the mid-1980s, and is operated by the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network. The hospital is co-located with a range of primary health care and mental health services, including geriatric evaluation and management care, surgical services, a renal dialysis service, outpatient, and emergency department services. The hospital currently operates an overnight bed base of approximately 89 beds and approximately 41 same-day equivalent points of care, inclusive of renal dialysis, medical infusion and emergency department bays.

There has been an identified demand for clinical services in southern Adelaide due to an ageing population, resulting in a greater reliance on the public health system. The Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and SA Health have developed the southern redevelopment in response to this rising demand for health care within South Australia.

The project will support the enhancement of clinical service capabilities and bed bases at Noarlunga Hospital which, in turn, will minimise transfers to heavily utilised hospitals such as Flinders

Medical Centre, and ensure delivery of care closer to home. The expansion will support the closing of the service gap for consumers requiring access to acute mental health rehabilitation services through providing temporary facilities. It will also improve the hospital's broader asset condition to support the future development facilities and infrastructure in line with broader infrastructure planning being progressed by SA Health.

The hospital expansion will deliver:

- a new 24-bed mental health rehabilitation unit to enable the delivery of non-acute, rehabilitation-focused adult mental health services for the community of southern Adelaide. The configuration of the unit will provide discrete and dignified access via a controlled secure access foyer and reception zone;
- a new 24-bed inpatient unit to provide overnight acute medical care, configured to enable effective circulation and promote effective line of sight from central clinical support service spaces; and
- targeted site engineering services upgrades to support the expansion, including fire services, hydraulic and electrical upgrades.

Upon completion, there will be increased accessibility to inpatient mental health services for the communities of southern Adelaide, as well as the accommodation of acute medical functions at Noarlunga Hospital.

The project will provide a contemporary, deinstitutionalised, homelike environment for consumers requiring access to mental health services with a longer length of stay that reduces reliance on the use of finite points of care in higher-acuity mental health services. After taking written and oral evidence, the Public Works Committee recommends approval of this public work.

Motion carried.

Bills

PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (USE OF PASTORAL LAND) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 7 February 2024.)

Clause 7.

Mr WHETSTONE: With the establishment of the Pastoral Board, there are a number of questions with the make-up. Will the Pastoral Board be equipped or formally trained to now provide oversight of pastoral leases that are used for conservation purposes?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I thank the member for his question. I am advised that with the various members bringing their own skill sets and in addition to the expertise and experience of the Pastoral Unit, that experience and ongoing work is sufficiently done inhouse.

Mr WHETSTONE: Just on that, obviously there will be a change of land use, ongoing skills within the board. I look at the criteria. The question is: does the current composition of the board provide appropriate representation for pastoralists, given that 90 per cent of the leases in South Australia are used for pastoral purposes?

For the establishment of the board, there are six criteria there for the make-up of the board. I am looking at (a) down to (f). Really, it could be that the minister will use her discretion by putting in departmental people or public servants. They could be overwhelmingly represented in the six-member appointment. Looking at the first four members, they could be appointed by the minister being public servants, not pastoralists. Is there a better understanding of just how the establishment of the board will be considered?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that there are already provisions in the pastoral act, section 12 specifically, for five of the six positions on the board to be for people with experience

in managing pastoral leases, including three of the members being nominated by the Minister for Primary Industries, Livestock SA and Primary Producers SA. As the member would note from the amending bill, in response to part of his question, the minister responsible is charged with selecting from a list of three persons, those three persons having been submitted by the various organisations contained within section 12.

Mr WHETSTONE: I understand that. I guess if I lay it out a little more clearly, the composition of the board is:

- (a) one, being a person who has, in the opinion of the Minister, wide experience in administration of pastoral leases; and
- (b) one, being a person who has, in the opinion of the Minister for Environment and Heritage, a wide knowledge of the ecology...
- (c) one, being a person who, in the opinion of the Minister for Primary Industries, Natural Resources and Regional Development, has had wide experience in...soil conservation...
- (d) one will be selected by the Minister from a list of 3 persons...submitted by Livestock SA...

and that would sit as a pastoralist—

- (e) one will be selected by the Minister from a list of 3 persons...submitted by the South Australian Farmers Federation...

and that would, ideally, be a pastoralist. When we get down to:

- (f) one will be selected by the Minister from a list of 3 persons submitted by the Conservation Council—

where is the expertise by the Conservation Council on pastoral lands? The question should be: why is it submitted by the Conservation Council? There are a number of representative organisations, one being the Nature Foundation. Are they going to be considered as one of those three people submitted for selection as a board member?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Further to the member's question, I am advised that in addition to the prescriptions contained within the bill and the current act regarding the nominating organisations—particularly those organisations which the member has listed and the skill sets or expertise contained therein—on balance, the government's consideration that the Conservation Council now be required to nominate a person who has experience in conservation of the rangelands environment is an appropriate mix, considering the other skills and other expertise brought to the board.

Mr WHETSTONE: On that point, the reason I am looking for clarification is that the minister funds the Conservation Council as a lobby group. That is my concern. Will there be anyone else, other than from the Conservation Council, from a lobby group that could be appointed to the Pastoral Board?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: That would be subject to the nominations provided to the minister, as contained within both the act and the amending bill. The premise of the member's question regarding defining any organisation as a lobby group I think is a matter of interpretation, conjecture and relativity, considering that the organisations that are nominating to the board, including those that the member has listed—and the very good work they do—also undertake considerable lobbying on behalf of their members.

Mr WHETSTONE: I have a final question. Will any of the appointed board members have a level of expertise in pastoralism, or will they be specifically appointed having a direct skill base in conservation more so than pastoralism? Will there be a skill base directly in conservation, or will there be a broad skill base for pastoralism and for conservation?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am not sure I can distil it down into an easy answer to the member's question, other than my previous answer regarding broad-based skills and expertise brought to the board. But, absolutely, in the portion of the member's question regarding whether there will be members with experience in pastoralism on the board, the answer is yes.

Mr WHETSTONE: And a final question again, Chair.

The CHAIR: This is the final final?

Mr WHETSTONE: Of course. In the establishment of the board it states that at least one member must be a woman, and one must be a man. Will a deputy have to be a man if the member is a woman? As a deputy, will there be a man and a woman in combination, or will there be a woman-woman combination? What is the make-up of a pastoral board member and a deputy? How is that made up? How is that relevant?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: The act does not provide any specificity in respect of the appointments of the deputies and substantive members. The one male and one female is in respect of the substantive six members.

Mr TEAGUE: Just to provide those who are following more closely the make-up of the Pastoral Board as it will be constituted post-implementation of these changes, is there not an overarching sense that there is some housekeeping in relation to subclause (1) regarding section 12(2)(b) relevantly referring to the minister responsible for the Native Vegetation Act, as opposed to the minister for environment and heritage? It retains various references to the minister—the minister responsible under the act generally—and we see changes such as that in subclause (3), changing, for example, the relevant stakeholder, in that case from the SA Farmers Federation to PPSA.

That might lead to two questions wrapped up in one. The first is: is the minister able to explain to the committee the overarching purpose here in terms of the identification of relevant ministers. It is possible, for example, that it might end up, under certain administrations, that that minister happens to be one and the same for all purposes. Is there any particular advice about where that sits presently and the reason for making those particular changes, so that we might have two or three or one, as I read it?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I thank the member for his double-barrelled question. I am advised that the current act is drafted in such a way that it obviously defines the minister or the portfolio, subject to the advice having been received by parliamentary counsel in a modern form of drafting that it is now more prudent to purport to list the act which a minister is administering, as opposed to the minister who is in that portfolio. That is effectively futureproofing, subject to the machinations of government, portfolio responsibility, etc., across the future.

Mr TEAGUE: And so, for explanation, the Minister for Primary Industries being the minister for the purpose of the act, unless otherwise described, means that the Minister for Primary Industries might, under certain circumstances, be the minister who is responsible for the native veg act, but it might be the Minister for Environment, for example, so you have flexibility. As I understand it, that is what that provides for.

The second of the—as the minister describes it—double-barrelled question was going to the substitution of relevant stakeholders to be consulted. To take the first of those examples, in subclause (3) we are substituting out the SA Farmers' Federation in favour of PPSA. Is there—and it goes to the concern raised by the member for Chaffey—consistency in relation to the status of those stakeholder bodies that are to be consulted?

Given that this has shown that it might desirably, for good reasons, change over time, is there a mechanism for review in relation to the relevant body to be consulted? I think the member for Chaffey has given the example relevantly that on the conservation side there are all kinds of bodies that have credible contributions to be made on behalf of their relevant stakeholders.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that obviously as far as the parliament can, and we can as government, we can draft a futureproof machinations of government. There is only a certain extent that we can do that for civil society. To answer part of the question, should there be the dissolving of an organisation without a successor, then it may be a matter the parliament needs to contemplate, but I can point to the example here that the successor organisation to SAFA being Primary Producers SA that is precisely what the act has done.

I do not like to give this example, because I have no reason to suggest that it will be, but should Primary Producers SA dissolve and there be a successor organisation then the act would administratively contemplate that in an easy way. But it may be the case, under the same circumstances, that the government of the day may need to return to parliament should there be a revolutionary change to the organisation itself or the successor organisation.

The CHAIR: You have one more question.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, well, I was hoping I might have a more fulsome answer to question 2, but here we are, we will absorb it into question 3. The other substantive part of that question was about commonality of status of the stakeholder bodies. Is there a commonality of status of those bodies to be consulted and, if not, is there any light that the minister can shed on the means by which those bodies have been determined? I think the minister said a bit about PPSA's status. There might be something more to say about the Conservation Council. I note that the Conservation Council is in the present act.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: With respect to the member's question on commonality, if I can try to deduce what he is seeking on that one, all the organisations contained within the act and the amending bill have a commonality across purpose, across recognition in legislation or otherwise and, of course, within the forward-looking bill, should it pass the parliament. But in respect to the second part, which is the consultation, I think the way ministers will consult is well established, particularly on appointments, with organisations contained within an act by way of written correspondence seeking nominations or otherwise.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 8 provides an opportunity, perhaps, to reflect also on the change of words at clause 5, which is a simple change from the singular to the plural. Clause 8 relevantly changes 'pastoral purposes' to purposes 'under this Act'. My curiosity, given that we are now introducing an extended range of permitted activities that are consistent with a pastoral lease, is really what the need is to introduce the plural at clause 5 and, in the same way, what the need is to describe the activities as being activities under the act where the object of the bill and the defined uses that are now set out to be subject to clause 3 are broadening those permitted uses. Is there a relevant distinction now between pastoral uses on the one hand and those other uses that are permitted in accord with a pastoral lease?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: In respect to the why, I am advised that it was on balance, and it was a preference within the drafting to prefer that use of language, particularly with the substantive bill, that will extend from just pastoral leases to consider conservation purposes. The drafting contained within the bill was the preference that was arrived at.

Mr TEAGUE: I thank the minister for that answer. I suppose what we are left with, therefore, is a contemplation of multiple enterprises, and we have seen that already in clause 5. Clause 8 then really makes it clear about carbon farming and conservation purposes and I think we had this debate with the minister yesterday.

I put it in terms to the minister yesterday that carbon farming might be seen as more connected directly with the pastoral purposes in that it is an adjustment to the use of the land that would otherwise be wholly for the running of stock in order to have some component of carbon farming as an adjustment to that use, whereas conservation purposes are entirely separated.

We are now going to contemplate, therefore, distinctly multiple enterprises on pastoral country that are to be consistent with a pastoral lease. Can the minister perhaps therefore make clear that it is to be contemplated—in terms of the use of the language that is used at clause 5, spoken to at clause 8—that carbon farming might be regarded as one enterprise, pastoral use might be regarded as another enterprise and conservation purposes might be regarded as another enterprise, all of those enterprises then being contemplated as expressly permitted under the bill?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: In respect of those questions regarding clause 5 and any interpretation of those questions asked of the Deputy Premier, I would refer to her answers in respect of the member's questions regarding clause 5 and the way that they would apply.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

Mr WHETSTONE: As to clause 9—Assessment of land prior to grant of lease, minister, will the government expect lessees who use the land for conservation purposes to meet a different standard than lessees who are currently using the land for pastoral purposes?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that for lessees the current conditions will continue unless otherwise approved or amended by the board.

Mr WHETSTONE: I understand, but obviously we will see a conversion from pastoral purposes to conservation purposes. Will there be a change in standard? Obviously the land will be used differently for different purposes. Will there be different criteria on assessment? Will there be different criteria on the condition where sometimes conservation purposes mean locking the gate? Sometimes they do not, but if they do there will have to be a consideration for the different outcomes on those lands. We know that pastoralism has been around for many, many decades but converting what was a pastoral piece of land to a conservation purpose now will have different impacts on that landscape.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that the board will continue to have the ability to assess and apply conditions. I am also advised that, subject to the parliament's passing of this bill, or otherwise, that the board has committed to reviewing the application and decision-making around conditions for the new categories. I am advised that that work will be undertaken upon the passing of this bill, or otherwise.

Mr WHETSTONE: Will the government continue to prioritise equally those lands that are used for conservation purposes with those lands that are used for pastoral purposes? Will there be an equal assessment of pastoralism—I will not say versus conservation, but obviously there will be different outcomes with a property that is there for conservation purposes as opposed to a property that is there for pastoralism. Will the government continue to equally prioritise the different land uses?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that ultimately that is a matter for the board. They will continue to assess, based upon the principles and the obligations under the act and with that window of every 14 years.

Mr TEAGUE: Just to take up where the member for Chaffey left off, this is really a very important piece in the bill. It is potentially quite a fundamental change, and there will be plenty of those interested in the bill looking closely at the minister's answers to the member for Chaffey just now. I hope that this is an opportunity for making particularly clear what is to happen now under section 20 of the act. I will just indicate to the committee that, at present, the minister cannot go ahead and grant a pastoral lease over Crown land:

(a) if the Governor has determined that the land should be set aside or used for some other more appropriate purpose; or—

and here is where we see the amendment in the bill:

(b) unless—

- (i) the Board is satisfied that the land is suitable for pastoral purposes; and
- (ii) an assessment has been made of the condition of the land.

Then we see the proviso in subsection (2) that the minister can go ahead if there has been such an assessment within the last 14 years.

So the amendment would, on its face, now provide that the minister cannot go ahead and grant a pastoral lease over Crown land unless the board is satisfied that the land is suitable for—no longer pastoral purposes but now the purposes for which the pastoral lease would be granted. So on its face, now, it is a kind of elliptical reference to purposes that must be purposes consistent with the pastoral act incorporating these new permitted uses. But, as the member for Chaffey has identified, and as I would ask, are we now going to see the granting of a pastoral lease that is wholly and solely granted for purposes that meet the new defined permitted purposes? That is what would seem to be on the face of this.

Therefore, the minister cannot go ahead and grant a pastoral lease until the minister is satisfied that it is suitable for carbon farming or that it is suitable for conservation purposes, and may grant the pastoral lease for those purposes exclusively so that it is a pastoral lease really in name

only, and we are now talking about really a conservation purposes lease or a carbon farming lease. That would appear to be the case on the face of it.

There might be an alternative, more benign set of circumstances that might include bodies such as Nature Foundation that have acquired a pastoral lease with the objective of conducting that range of purposes, primarily conservation purposes, and they are then granted a new lease when the time comes up, but that is not always going to be the case. So the concern is: is there to be any proactive granting of leases that are constraining the use to the new broadened criteria of permitted use?

Until now, we have been talking about expanding permitted use on pastoral land. Here we are talking about now a minister being satisfied that the land is suitable for any of those permitted uses, and on its face would appear to permit the granting of a pastoral lease that excludes pastoral uses.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Within the many hypotheticals the member was rightfully musing over, I am advised that none of those contemplations are being considered, but I am advised that the primary hierarchy will be conservation purposes and pastoral purposes, and then following that, a number of other uses could be applied in addition to that, but the two primary being conservation and pastoral.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, have there been any pastoral leases not had their leases renewed or any conservation leases that have not had their leases renewed?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: Perhaps for the purposes of me seeking information for the member, does he have a period of which he would seek that information? It may not be surprising that I do not have that to hand with my adviser's 30 years of history.

Mr WHETSTONE: I do not want a historical document of many decades, but just to have an understanding of over the last decade. Have there been pastoral leases that have not been renewed? Obviously, there is I think a 42-year lease tenure. Have pastoralists or pastoral lands for conservation reasons not had their leases renewed or had their leases terminated, and understanding why?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I thank the member for his clarification on that. I am advised there is a small number of circumstances where, upon review, the board has made a decision to offer an extension with conditions, or with a change of conditions. There is a small proportion of those where a pastoralist has declined those conditions, and therefore the extension has not proceeded. I am not advised there have been circumstances where there have been cancellations.

Mr WHETSTONE: Through a pastoral or conservation lease period, can a lessee sublease that pastoral or conservation lease? Can they sublease it for other purposes? If a pastoral lease has been granted and there is then an application made to convert that pastoral lease, or part of that pastoral lease, for a conservation purpose or, vice versa, a conservation lease where an application has been made to sublease it for pastoral purposes, is there that flexibility? Is there an opportunity for lessees to change the purpose of the lease agreement?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: The short answer is yes; there are no restrictions on subleasing. If there is a subleasing that is consistent with the substantive approval, then that could be made directly to the minister, and the minister, subject to the act, can make that approval. If the sublease intends to change the use, that is a matter that is then considered by the board through the usual processes under the act. But the substantive answer is that yes, subleasing does and can occur.

Mr WHETSTONE: With the determination of that, is the determination made by the board or is it a recommendation made to the minister?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that if there is no change of use then it is simply a matter for the lessee and the minister.

Mr BASHAM: My question is in relation to the change in management that is likely to occur with carbon farming, in particular, and what that will do to the operation going forward. My

understanding of carbon farming in pastoral country is that it would require maybe some destocking for periods of time to allow the carbon bank to build up to be able to claim those credits over a period of time, and 25 years is the length of these agreements that pastoralists can enter into.

If the pastoralist chooses to exclude stock from a particular area of his pastoral lease for a period of time and that period of time is greater than 20 years—when, under the Native Vegetation Act, it reverts back to native vegetation—in this regard is grazing or not grazing considered a proactive human intervention, therefore stopping the Native Vegetation Act coming into play and causing that land to no longer be allowed to be grazed going forward?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I think the member is probably underplaying his understanding of carbon farming. It is certainly just a tad more than mine at this stage. I am advised that returning land use from other purposes to pastoralism may require the lessee to obtain approval from the Pastoral Board and potentially other approvals.

An example of this occurs where stock have been excluded from pastoral land for a period of greater than 10 years. The reintroduction of stock would require the approval of the Native Vegetation Council under the Native Vegetation Act 1991. I am further advised that this is an existing requirement that is unaffected by this current bill.

Mr BASHAM: So it is unaffected. So that is still required but, if they enter an agreement, can they get it prior to the 10 years lapsing or do they actually have to have it so that on the last day of the nine years, the 364th day, they have put the stock in so they do not have to trigger it? Or can it be prearranged so that they can actually get the ability to do the 25 years and know that they can come back in when circumstances allow the regrazing of that area because the bank has been built up to where it needs to be?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I thank the member for the question. I will take that on notice and get some detail for you between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12.

Mr WHETSTONE: Just for clarification—and I hope it does not seem a silly question—I would like you to give me a clear understanding of the following. Obviously, a pastoral lease can be grazed, it can be used for carbon farming, and it can be used for tourism. Can a conservation lease also be used for grazing, can it be used for carbon farming and can it be used for tourism?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that yes, the board can do that. Upon application, the board can approve that.

Mr WHETSTONE: For clarification, what is the criteria for a pastoral lease—I do not like saying 'versus'—versus a conservation lease? What are the characteristics that cannot be undertaken from one lease agreement to the other? Pastoralism versus conservation?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that a pastoral lease for approved pastoral purposes must exclude a majority of use for conservation purposes and, vice versa, a lease that is approved for conservation purposes would exclude use for a majority of pastoral purposes.

Mr WHETSTONE: I am trying to get some clarification. Does that come down to a stock assessment for pastoralism versus use for conservation purposes? I am still trying to understand what the stocking ratios are from a pastoral lease to a conservation lease. Could you give me a clearer understanding of what the difference will be, or will it be a determination made by the board?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: It would be a determination made by the board.

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

Mr WHETSTONE: For some clarification on the stock assessment or the stock levels, is there a different verification or stock assessment ratio? First of all, how often is that stock assessment

undertaken? Obviously, we have varying seasons, so we have variable feed rates. Is there a different assessment done on a conservation lease as opposed to a pastoral lease?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that clause 13 may answer the member's question. This is a clause which is about the reporting of the lessee to the board; it is not around a different process.

Clause passed.

Schedule.

Mr WHETSTONE: I have some questions on the transitional provisions. If a pastoral lease has a grace period, I need to understand what that period of time is. If there is a pastoral lease given for a certain period of time, and if it is a full term, can the pastoral lease be converted to conservation if it is not used for pastoral purposes? What is the time period? Vice versa, can a conservation lease be converted back to a pastoral lease?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that the transitional provisions only provide for existing approvals or approvals that have already been made by the board. That is the cohort to which the transitional provisions apply.

Mr WHETSTONE: I have a question on abandonment of pastoral lands. If the land is subject to a pastoral lease and it has been abandoned, the board may cancel that lease. Does that also apply to leases for conservation purposes? If it is a conservation lease and it has been abandoned, can the board cancel the conservation lease and, in turn, allow it to be converted back to a pastoral lease through abandonment?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised that the same provisions apply to all pastoral leases under the act.

Mr WHETSTONE: If there is abandonment of a conservation lease—I guess a blunt way of putting that is the gate has been locked or it has been abandoned—can that be converted back to a pastoral lease?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I am advised yes.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (12:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

AYERS HOUSE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 29 November 2023.)

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (12:56): I rise today in support of the Ayers House Bill 2023 to reverse the previous state Liberal government's decision to remove the National Trust of South Australia from Ayers House and fulfil our promise to grant ongoing rights in relation to Ayers House to the National Trust of South Australia, including its use for commercial operations to generate revenue for the National Trust.

The National Trust of South Australia was established as an independent community advocate for the protection and preservation of our built, natural and cultural heritage. The trust works to educate the public on the value of conserving our heritage buildings, the benefits of conservation

and restoration works and how this preservation can have environmental and economic benefits to the state as a whole.

In keeping with these values, the National Trust of SA campaigned successfully to prevent the demolition of Ayers House in the 1960s, restored the house in the 1970s at the behest of then Premier Don Dunstan and has maintained, cared for and kept it open to the public ever since, all with very little government support.

Over its 50 years of its stewardship of Ayers House, the trust has worked to deliver engaging experiences, events, tours and performances for people of all ages, even the occasional excellent wedding. At the opening of Ayers House in 1973, then Premier Dunstan said:

A civilised community is one which values both the achievements of the past and of the present...the work of the National Trust...has over the past decade or so educated, in a real sense, both the public, and its governments, in a proper respect for architectural standards and achievement...I am also pleased to say that in...Ayers House, we have achieved an ideal balance between restoration and function...the house will have a life of its own.

A private chamber music concert will be held in the ball room tomorrow night. I expect the Festival of Arts Writers' Week will have its headquarters at Ayers House. The government intends to entertain here. In all these things, and in others, we will have in Ayers House a state reception centre of distinction and high value, but one to which the public will have continuing access.

That was Don Dunstan. When then minister responsible for heritage, now SA Liberal leader, the member for Black announced the eviction of South Australia's National Trust from Ayers House on North Terrace, he signalled to those of us who are passionate about heritage and the preservation of our state's built form that the Liberal Party is not interested in maintaining our state's cultural history, nor in continuing decades-long public access to Ayers House. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. A. Koutsantonis) on behalf of the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon. S.E. Close)—

River Murray in South Australia, Commissioner for—Mr Richard Beasley SC—
Annual Report 2022-23

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of a delegation of Lithuanian parliamentarians led by His Excellency Darius Degutis. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

TRURO FREIGHT ROUTE PROJECT

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01): My question is to the Premier. Is the government taking any action to deliver the Truro freight route and get trucks off Portrush Road? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 16 November 2023, the federal government cut \$400 million of funding to five key projects in South Australia, including \$161.6 million for the Truro freight route.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:01): Yes, I was very disappointed when the commonwealth government made that cut. I remember having this debate on ABC radio, when the Liberal Party spokesperson on this matter, Mr Tony Pasin, was on. I said to him that the 80:20 funding

model was in place by the previous Morrison government and honoured by the Malinauskas government. I called on him to reinstate that 80 per cent funding if they were elected and he refused—he refused. I see members opposite are now asking that we make it 50:50. It was an 80:20 funding split—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —an 80:20 funding split. The question here is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley! Member for Flinders! The minister has the call. Minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Don't get dragged again—don't get dragged again. I made it very clear to Mr Pasin that he could make a commitment here and now that a—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: What about your commitments and your Labor friends?

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He could make a commitment here and now to fund the Truro bypass—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and they refused.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Liberal Party refused to back this project.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I said—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: As I said, we continue to do the work and advocate for this important project. It is an important project. It should be done. Unlike members opposite, I am not advocating that we pay for all of it—or are they? Okay, right, here we go. Quiet.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Silence—silence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Other than interjections, silence.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta is warned. The member for Schubert is warned. The member for Hartley is warned, and I see the member for Heysen interjecting. Minister.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on three warnings. One anticipates he would wish to engage with the standing orders.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They seem very excited, sir. I am very keen for the Truro bypass to proceed. It's a good project and it is a very important project. I do note that there have been alternative plans about freight diversions talked about previously. There was one called GlobeLink.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Too soon?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! Minister, be seated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey! Member for Chaffey! Order! The member for Morialta on a point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: goes to debate. The minister was asked about Truro, Portrush Road and his federal Labor mates' withdrawal of funding for this important project.

The SPEAKER: That may be. It is possible for the minister to compare and contrast, including in relation to other projects. I will listen carefully.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are two points I want to make. The first is that, when the Truro bypass was cancelled by the commonwealth, we asked the current federal opposition to reinstate that funding. They said no.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta! Minister, please be seated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Elder! Member for Morialta, it is so early in the proceedings today, but you are on three warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the people who live along Portrush Road have seen these promises from members opposite before with GlobeLink. Remember that they were going to move an entire freight line around the back of the hills. They were going to build a 24-hour airport at Murray Bridge.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Remember those promises? What were they? Nothing but hot air.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, your colleague the member for Morialta is seeking to raise a point of order with me.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: compare and contrast is one thing, but the minister's rhetorical flourishes are the very definition of debate, which is against standing orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is some merit in the matters that the member for Morialta seeks to raise with me. I will listen carefully. I will bring the minister to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We continue to do the work on Truro because we think it is an important project. We want Canberra to reinvest in Truro. We have called on them to do this. We want them. As I said publicly, I love all my children equally and Truro is one of those children that I believe deserves to prosper and grow. It is an important project for South Australia. It is an important project and it should be funded and of course I am in negotiations with Catherine King—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —but I note the Coalition opposition have already ruled it out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left and right! GlobeLink was one of my favourite children.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Has the South Australian government incurred costs prior to the recent federal government decisions regarding transport projects and, if so, how much? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Late last year, the federal infrastructure minister announced that the commonwealth would remove funding for the Hahndorf township improvements, Main South Road productivity package, Old Belair Road upgrade, Onkaparinga Valley Road-Tiers Road-Nairne Road intersection upgrade and the Truro freight route. The minister told this place on 16 November:

We will be expecting reimbursement, of course, on money that we have expended on these projects...

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:07): We have incurred expenses because we did the detailed planning for this project and the commonwealth government have agreed to make sure that the South Australian government has that money reimbursed. We are working through that now with the commonwealth government and, of course, it is very important that we do that. The Truro bypass is an important project and we want to make sure that that work is (1) not lost because it is important that we proceed it—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: How much? Have you sent them a bill yet?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can you just let me finish. I know you are a young man in a hurry.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Trust me, patience.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Newland! Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am surprised there is not a drone in here taking photographs of him as he is asking questions.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is important that that important planning work continue. The discussions I have had with Catherine King about the federal review, apart from obviously displaying our disappointment at what she had done, is that the important work of planning continues. We have done a lot of work with the Truro freight bypass because it is an important project to divert a lot of that heavy freight around Truro. More importantly, what the Truro bypass really does is allow us to have much longer trucks, which means less freight across Adelaide altogether, not just for Portrush Road but throughout Adelaide, so it's a very, very important project.

What Catherine King has said to me is, that planning work that we have done the South Australian government will be paid for that, and of course that is very, very encouraging. I have to say that my concerns about these projects that the commonwealth government has decided not to fund are that we want Canberra engaged in these projects, so I have made it very clear to Catherine King that we want them engaged in these, and I try to make the same argument and case to Tony Pasin, the local South Australian federal member of parliament. So I am advocating to both of these people, who is also the alternative commonwealth government, the opposition, that it is important that both political parties know the importance of the Truro bypass.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What concerns me is that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Flinders!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have an open mind from Catherine King who says she will consider funding the Truro bypass, and Tony Pasin—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta's enthusiasm has overtaken him—137A for the remainder of question time. Minister, you have the call.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —who has ruled it out. He refuses. If it's a misrepresentation, Mr Pasin can correct the record, or then I will. If that's incorrect, I look forward to Mr Pasin putting out a statement today saying he will fund the Truro bypass if they are elected.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I look forward to them doing that.

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

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Standing order 98: the question was very specific about whether costs have been incurred and the minister is deviating from the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Very well. There is some merit in the matters raised with me. Minister, there are about 40 seconds remaining, I bring you back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir. Costs have been incurred and we are being reimbursed.

TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:11): My question again is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on whether the government plans to reallocate that funding that had been previously assigned by the state to those transport projects and, if so, how? With the leave of yourself, sir, and the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The federal infrastructure minister had recently announced that the commonwealth would not fund those five separate infrastructure projects in South Australia which had been allocated tens of millions of dollars of South Australian taxpayers' money.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:12): I think what my young friend is asking us to do is to keep money for presentational purposes in the budget, waiting for the commonwealth government to put that money in place. But that's not how budgets work. So I think my young friend needs to do the 101 tutorial on how this will work, so I think it is a pretty strange question—and quite frankly it doesn't help the campaign, Vincent. But I think what we need to do is—what my young friend is asking me is, the commonwealth government has withdrawn the 80 per cent funding, we are arguing for its reinstatement and rather than just having a go at us, because we didn't withdraw the funding, we haven't withdrawn our funding for these projects, the commonwealth government did—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What I would suggest is members opposite work on their colleagues and we work on our colleagues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Florey is warned.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: How's that? You work on Tony Pasin and I will work on Catherine King.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Waite, I acknowledge the presence in the gallery today of students from Glenunga International High School, guests of the member for Bragg. Welcome.

Question Time

SKILLS TRAINING

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. How is the Malinauskas government developing skills training for South Australians?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13): I do want to thank the member for Waite for her question. I know that skills and skills policy is something she genuinely cares about. Her young lad, Finn, of course is a recent recipient of services from TAFE, a chippie, working very hard, no doubt, in the ever growing housing and construction sector in South Australia. He is in housing, I understand, more than civil work and thoroughly enjoying it. The member for Waite herself, if my memory serves me correctly, has also been a beneficiary of the extraordinary work that TAFE undertakes.

We are at full employment in South Australia, largely. It's a magnificent position to be in. It represents the fact that young South Australians, when they complete their schooling, will have the opportunity to be able to get a job in a more easy way than pretty much at any other time in living memory. But that doesn't diminish the challenge before government to make sure that we see people's standard of living improving, not just by having a job but by making sure that they've got a high-quality job that is secure and is able to enjoy growing wages. That can't just be at the expense of businesses themselves; it has to be on the back of growing productivity.

The way we grow our nation's productivity, the way we ensure that South Australia's standard of living improves into the future, is to invest in our most precious resource of them all, and that is our people, particularly our young people. That is the sustainable way to grow our economy. This is why we, as a government, have been so determined to not just invest but also innovate when it comes to skills policy in this state.

We start, of course, with TAFE. We know that TAFE has been underdone in South Australia for too long, which is why, under the member for Wright, the Minister for Education, we have seen a revitalisation of TAFE, a reinvestment in TAFE and an appreciation that TAFE matters as a public sector education provider and has its own role to play that can work in concert with the private sector but is nonetheless essentially public.

Simultaneously, we have also wanted to innovate in our schools. We have a massive challenge on our hands. We know that the pipeline of demand for skilled labour in South Australia is only going to escalate across the course of this decade; it is not going away. Whether it be in the naval shipbuilding program, whether it be in the opportunities around renewables and the decarbonisation of industry more broadly, we need more young people doing STEM and also acquiring the skills that are required tomorrow.

This is why, as a state government, we have chosen to invest in building brand-new technical colleges here in South Australia. That doesn't just represent an innovation in South Australia but in many ways represents an innovation nationally. Last week, as I referred to yesterday, we opened the first of those five technical colleges—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —the first of five technical colleges in South Australia, down at Findon. The first of five, built on time, on budget—and it's full. Students who are studying at Findon Technical College today, enrolled in year 10, are going to walk out of high school in three years' time knowing they have their SACE certificate in one pocket and a trade certificate in another, and walk straight into a job at a company like BAE Systems, or an education service provider in childhood preschool, or in helping in aged care—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —straight out of school, with a qualification and a SACE certificate, into a secure long-term job of the future, aiding the development of our economy. We are investing in skills and we are investing in education because that is the way you grow people's standard of living and grow the productivity of our economy.

REGIONAL JETTIES

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the government take over the financial responsibility for the maintenance and repair of regional jetties? Mr Speaker, with your leave and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: The government is investing \$20 million in jetty funding across the state, and councils are expected to co-contribute to funding. I understand upgrades and repairs to the Kingston jetty have been estimated at around \$20 million; however, the Kingston council's revenue for 2023-24 is approximately \$5.2 million.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:18): That is an excellent question, and I thank the member for his question because—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is offensive to another member, sir.

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To accuse me of writing the member for MacKillop's question is offensive.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It's probably another reason why the crossbench is growing and the party room is shrinking. It's another great tactic by the Liberal Party: attack the crossbench as much as you possibly can. It's great tactics from the shadow treasurer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They do it well: Brown, Olsen, Speirs—good tactics. The Kingston jetty—and I want to focus on this as an interesting case, because there has been a lot of talk about this jetty. The council say that a refurbishment and rebuild would cost \$20 million. Of course, the pilot program that members opposite initiated showed that to reopen the jetty and make it usable for that local community is \$5.6 million.

Under the program established by the Treasury, in coordination with Infrastructure and Transport, we have a \$20 million fund available for co-funding. That would mean the council would need about \$2.83 million to have that jetty reopened for its local community, which is well within its resource. Of course, if the council wants a brand-new jetty or something larger, a larger scope than they currently have like Tumby Bay are asking for now, that becomes a different question altogether.

Remember, when it comes to the outsourcing or the contracting of these jetties to councils over a long period of time, one of the requirements that those councils took up when they took it was regular maintenance. There is a clause in the contract—and I make this very clear to all our regional councils in South Australia—and that clause requires that those jetties be returned to the state government in a fit and proper manner; that is, that they are fit for purpose. If they are not, it is the responsibility of the council.

We understand why Yorke Peninsula Council has nine jetties that need upgrades: special cases. Tumby Bay, for example, is another jetty. They are asking for a \$20 million upgrade for a brand-new jetty, but we understand that the jetty could be reopened to the public with a lot less. The question that we have to contemplate is there are so many jetties across regional South Australia that, if we just accepted the ask of every council for a brand-new jetty, we would be talking about hundreds of millions of dollars into infrastructure. The question is: with scarce resources, how do we get the best outcome for taxpayers?

What we have done in the most recent budget is put up \$20 million which should leverage \$40 million worth of investment in regional jetties. Before we came to office, do you know how much was available for regional jetties? Zero. There was no co-contribution scheme, there was no funding plan, there was nothing—nothing in place.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Regions matter, apparently.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, hashtags don't count for funding but apparently hashtags are the only thing. What I want to say is that I am prepared to work with the Kingston council about the Kingston jetty and look at whether or not we contribute out of this fund half the money required for upgrades and reopening, and making the jetty safe for purpose. But the idea of building a brand-new jetty for each and every single small community that wants one—no doubt they have great arguments for it—the truth is that with scarce dollars we have to be very wise about how we spend this money, and I think the public would expect that from us.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE CRISIS ACCOMMODATION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence. Is the government committed to delivering additional domestic and

family violence crisis accommodation beds across South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: On 6 March 2022, the previous government announced that \$4 million had been allocated towards tripling the number of available crisis beds and tracking domestic violence offenders. It is unclear whether any of these funded beds have been delivered by the new government.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:23): I thank the member for his question. I think we traversed this topic quite extensively during the estimates process, and I am certainly happy to do that again because crisis accommodation is a really important measure in our ongoing quest to prevent and help eradicate domestic family and sexual violence.

What I would first say in situating that question around crisis accommodation is that every effort in that shared quest to prevent and eradicate domestic violence is incredibly important across the four domains that are set out in the national plan, and that are also set out throughout the various initiatives, policy commitments and legislative program that we have as a government. Those four domains, of course, relate to prevention, intervention, response, recovery and healing. Crisis accommodation is a really important part of the response domain in terms of how we make sure that women who are not safe and who need to find security in accommodation are supported.

From memory, I think I took the member through all this data during estimates—but I will certainly do so again—because he asked a very similar question at that time. What I can say is that, first of all, our government took to the election a policy of making sure that we ring-fenced a proportion of public housing for women escaping family, domestic or sexual violence, and that policy is certainly progressing. We have already allocated a number of properties in relation to that particular part of our crisis accommodation and secure housing for women in the extensive policy we have.

I can also tell the member that on 6 September last year, together with the YWCA and the Minister for Human Services, we were there when they launched, or turned the sod, on their project to construct 24 long-term rental units in Hutt Street for women and children affected by domestic, family and sexual violence. We understand those will be completed in 2025.

We continue to provide funding. We have committed almost \$7 million to extend the domestic and family violence crisis accommodation program, so that is certainly rolling out. We have crisis accommodation properties right across the state. We have a cluster in the northern metropolitan area, in the southern metropolitan area, and in regional areas: the Murray, the Hills, the Limestone Coast, Whyalla, Ceduna and Port Lincoln. Right across the state we are making sure we are providing crisis accommodation. As I said, we are also creating additional capacity for crisis accommodation through ring-fencing that proportion of public housing.

What I can say in answer to the member's question is that I think we have far exceeded those commitments we made at the time of the election.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE CRISIS ACCOMMODATION

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:27): A supplementary question for the Minister for Human Services: how many public housing properties have been ring-fenced for women escaping domestic violence since March 2022?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:27): I am very happy to quickly respond. That election commitment is underway, but what is more important is that there are actually hundreds and hundreds of women who have experienced awful domestic violence and terrible situations who are living in public housing and community housing, being supported by both our department and non-government organisations to feel safe and stay safe.

We undertake a range of modifications that assist people with public housing and community housing to remain there in a way they are more comfortable, but we also stand ready to respond should we need to activate an alternate response quickly.

I will refrain from talking about how other members in other places might want to publicly stand in front of domestic violence properties, or indeed how people in this place might think that undertaking a media call in front of a house that is tenanted by someone currently experiencing domestic violence who is seeking support and assistance from many good people, that standing on their front porch might be an appropriate way to highlight an issue. Well, it is not. It is dangerous. It is upsetting. It is distressing, and not just for the woman but also for children, in particular, who are involved who might see their belongings on the television.

CARER RESPITE SUPPORT

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:29): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister provide an update on respite support for carers?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:29): First of all, I thank the member for her question and for her fierce advocacy for foster and kinship carers. I am deeply committed to doing all that I can. Our government is deeply committed to doing all that we possibly can to help improve the lives of children, young people and their families, including foster and kinship carer families.

Carers, of course, play an absolutely critical role in supporting, caring for and nurturing children and young people. They provide love, support and a really strong foundation that helps give children and young people the best possible ability to grow, to thrive, to succeed and to live happy, fulfilling lives. Our government is committed to doing more to help recognise foster and kinship carers' vital roles and their remarkable commitment. They are integral to the child protection and family support system.

What they do is deeply rewarding. It also can come with enormous, sometimes heartbreaking, challenges. They need support and sometimes they need a break. Getting that break can be hard. Following an extensive consultation, where more than 400 people had their say, we have made significant changes to the respite model to ensure that respite is more flexible and easily accessible for carers. We want to help ensure that South Australia's kinship and foster carers can have relief and support in the way that works for them.

The new flexible respite support payment of \$800 a year will help eligible carers pay for respite-like support chosen by them. This can mean hiring a cleaner, a gardener or even simply taking time out to go to the cinema or elsewhere. This move expands the opportunities for South Australian carers to access respite-like help and ensure that they are well supported in the critical role that they play caring for children and young people. Carers will be able to direct the payment towards services that help meet their individual needs, with the first quarterly payment of \$200, on top of existing respite payments already provided to carers.

The new flexible respite arrangements follow other recent initiatives to improve supports for carers, such as the Carer Council, established to amplify their voices and provide valuable feedback on their experiences. The additional payment is also on top of the 4.8 per cent increase we made in the 2023-24 budget that went to every carer, as well as an additional \$50 payment to those who have children and young people under the age of 16.

I am continuously inspired by the tenacity, resilience and commitment that carers show in their efforts to strengthen children's lives and keep them safe and supported to reach their goals. During January, I took the opportunity, as I frequently do, to meet with carers, including in Whyalla, Port Augusta, Port Pirie, the Barossa and Ceduna to hear about what matters to them. This change to the respite model was really well received and it is demonstrative of our government's commitment to listen to carers and to support and empower them to keep undertaking the vital role they do. I thank carers and I thank the peak body, Connecting Foster and Kinship Carers SA, for their enduring advocacy on behalf of carers and the vital role that they play in facilitating the Carer Council.

MOUNT GAMBIER BUS SERVICE

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Will the minister conduct a review of the bus contract that has just been awarded for eight years to the City of Mount Gambier? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: In a grievance on Tuesday, I highlighted that this contract is not fit for purpose. The route has not changed in over 30 years and the department did not address any of the issues highlighted by the City of Mount Gambier's council and their feedback from residents.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:34): I am very concerned about the local member's feedback on this procurement, so I will be asking the department to have a look at it. Whenever you go out to market for new services, to replace a service or to continue a service, there are often opportunities for improvements. It is very difficult in regional communities for us to always get that right.

It's fair to say that we have gone out for a competitive tender and we have done that in two phases. The department released phase 1 contracts open to the market in June of last year, they were completed on 25 August last year and they commenced on 1 October for a term of eight years. But I hear what the member is saying. I know that he is in touch with his local community and I know that I get very accurate feedback from him on these matters, so it does concern me. It does concern me a lot that there may be a contract in place which is not actually serving the needs of the local community.

There are things that we can do without having to change the contract. We can look at the service delivery method and model, whether or not we can do alternatives to that, but what that will mean within an existing package is a reprioritisation. I am open for that discussion with the local council and the member. It is fair to say that the member is held in high regard by the government and he knows his local community exceptionally well—as do, I would say, all the crossbench. So I would be very keen to get a better understanding of exactly what the deficiencies are.

I will be entirely frank: there may be things we can't fix. It's very hard to promise, in some regional communities, the level of service that they demand and want, as things modernise. But I also accept that we can do improvements, and if we can do them within a package and a framework, we will. What I do undertake to the house is to go away and meet with the member and talk to the local council about this and what we can do to improve it. I am more than happy to liaise with him personally, so rather than him dealing with the agency, he will be dealing directly with my office. I will be personally involved in that. That's the very least we can do for the people of Mount Gambier.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Police. Has the Premier's Taskforce into policing completed its review and, if so, when will their findings and recommendations be made public? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: It has now been more than 18 months since that taskforce was established.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:37): I thank the member for his question. The taskforce has been a matter that we have delivered proudly as an election commitment made by the Premier, hence the title of the Premier's Taskforce. Off the top of my head, I can't give a date on that matter for the member's benefit. That is still obviously a matter that will be subject to cabinet considerations.

What I can inform the member of—and I know that he is more than aware of some of the work we have been doing in this space—is that we have been taking some action on matters that have been raised throughout our short time in government. It was very clear on coming to government just how useful and able we could be as a government to free up some of the more historic roles undertaken by police: things like conveying remandees, cell guards and hospital guards. Almost immediately, in our second budget, we employed 189 new sworn police security officers. Those sworn police security officers were really strategically utilised across some of the COVID years and, of course, for those of us who have been in this place for some time, we know the excellent work that our PSOs do in this building alone.

What we have seen already as we have been accelerating employment of those sworn PSOs is the freeing up of police resourcing. Rather than being tied in really important work in cells or rather than being at bedsides, we have been able to get them moving. They are matters that were raised on coming to government and well ventilated in the broad-based work that we have been undertaking as part of this taskforce. What we haven't done is wait for cabinet consideration of the work that is ongoing for the next 10 to 15 years but act now, and that is exactly what we have been doing.

We have also been very proud—I think I have discussed this a little yesterday or the day before, subject to some of the members' questions—of our efforts as a government to invest in doubling the recruiting of police. Now is a great time to be a police officer. We recognise, unfortunately, during COVID there was a significant dip in the number of people who were applying to be police. What that meant was that, upon coming to government, we had a deficit of police, as we did in many other aspects of our workforce.

What we have been doing and what we have done is two things. First of all, we have actually said that we will put some money into this. Rather than asking our police to do more with less, we have actually invested heavily—a \$94 million package in total—to get more police on our frontline to support the frontline and to support those additional 189 police and security officers. There will be 900 police through the Police Academy in the next three years. As I have already spoken about both publicly and in this place, we are actively recruiting in other jurisdictions—the UK, Ireland and New Zealand. The success so far, having only had our migration agreement approved by the federal government in mid-December, has been excellent. They are some of the matters that have been ventilated in the taskforce. We act now and, of course, with a very firm eye on the 10 to 15 years of which the taskforce's work was focused on.

ARDROSSAN COMMUNITY HOSPITAL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:41): I have a question for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister provide an update to my community as to the future of the Ardrossan hospital? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will offer a little explanation.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: At the end of last year, the board of the Ardrossan Community Hospital resolved to close the accident and emergency service because of the difficulties running it. Since then, a number of options have been presented to government about the future of health care in Ardrossan.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:42): I thank the member for Narungga for this good question and for his interest and passion about healthcare services on Yorke Peninsula and in his electorate more broadly. In relation to the Ardrossan Community Hospital, as members may know, this is a small hospital which is a private community hospital. It is one of those which stayed outside of SA Health when a number of those private community hospitals came into the South Australian Health Commission many decades ago.

As the member has outlined, it has been under financial pressure for the past few years. The government has continued to provide funding to the Ardrossan Community Hospital of, I believe, \$180,000 per year to help operations at that hospital. However, it has been under financial pressure and a range of other staffing pressures.

Since our last discussion in the house and last update on this matter, there has been some positive interim news in that the commonwealth government, which is obviously the predominant body in charge of aged care in this country, has provided assistance in relation to surge staffing for the Ardrossan Community Hospital. That has really been able to stabilise their staffing and their operations for the majority of what they do, which is providing aged-care services for their community.

I dare say that perhaps some of the best views of aged care anywhere in the state are available from the Ardrossan Community Hospital. Perhaps equal, I think the Taillem Bend hospital has some very good views as well. The residents who receive those services are obviously very appreciative of them, and we obviously want to make sure that they are maintained. We appreciate that support that has been provided from the commonwealth government.

In addition to that, the commonwealth government has also supported the Ardrossan Community Hospital with undertaking a further review, which I understand has been done by Deloitte at the moment, looking at options for the future of the hospital. That has been provided to the board or is set to be provided to the board, and the board will consider its options.

From a state government perspective, we have been in discussions with them, predominantly through the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network and its board, about the future of those services and the potential for what options there could be, whether it continues operations under its current structure, whether there could be another provider who could provide those services or whether there is some future in terms of working more closely with SA Health. We are continuing those discussions. We will obviously continue them in the context of that report that is set to be received by the board from Deloitte through the federal government and the further options that will be considered.

We also have a hospital 15 minutes up the road at Maitland, which provides services across the central Yorke Peninsula region as well, but obviously for people living in Ardrossan the hospital and the aged-care facility are very important. We will continue to work with them, and I suspect over the course of coming months, as that report is received and considered by the board, there will be further discussions with the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network and the government more broadly on future options for the hospital.

CUMMINS POLICE OFFICE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Police. What action is the minister taking to assist the community in Cummins in my electorate to identify a suitable location to be used as a police office? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: For a number of months, the police officer in Cummins has been without an office facility because the building has been condemned, and community members have had to instead use various public spaces to do routine police business.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:46): I thank the member for his question, but also his genuine advocacy on this matter. It is a matter that he has raised with me and we have spoken about at some length, so I will give him credit for the advocacy that he is undertaking on behalf of his community.

By way of background, the facility being utilised by South Australia Police in Cummins is no longer fit for purpose. It has been condemned. I think it is mould issues, broadly. That is a Department for Infrastructure and Transport property. Of course, for safety reasons that location can no longer be utilised.

The availability, as the member would well and truly know, in Cummins, or for that matter more broadly across the EP, of commercial spaces in smaller regional communities is at a premium, I would say, to say the least. Notwithstanding that, I acknowledge this and I think my strong view is that the quicker we can have more permanent facilities available, not only for SAPOL but also for the member's community in Cummins, the better. It has been far from ideal.

I will recognise and also thank the local police officer, SAPOL more broadly and the local council, who have been working closely and collaboratively to do the best in the set of circumstances—which is not of their own making—that they have found themselves in.

I was advised very recently that a formal lease was entered into between SAPOL and council for some semi-permanent or medium-term to temporary accommodation that will facilitate the occupation of SAPOL in there. Of course, during this time SAPOL presence in the town and across the EP more broadly has been unchanged. Currently speaking, the security upgrades are about two to three weeks away from being completed, as I understand it.

I can assure the member that the planning by SAPOL has been running in parallel to that for the securing of ongoing and permanent accommodation. I can give the member some comfort that SAPOL will have a long presence, not only on the EP but in Cummins.

SHOPPING CENTRE PARKING

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister update the house on any impacts of the Private Parking Areas (Shopping Centre Parking Areas) Act since the legislation came into effect a year ago today?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (14:49): I would like to thank the member for Newland for her question. What a great fighter for the north-east she is. Today marks the one-year anniversary of the Malinauskas Labor government honouring its commitment to ban paid parking at retail shopping centres. In July 2022, I introduced the Private Parking Areas (Shopping Centre Parking Areas) Amendment Bill into the parliament. The bill was assented to on 10 November 2022 and came into operation on 8 February 2023. Of course, this provided time for car park owners and shopping centre owners to lodge an application to seek approval for paid parking, as well as enough time for such applications to be assessed before any prohibition came into effect.

That act now prohibits owners of regulated shopping centres from charging a fee for parking at major retail shopping centres without approval and that includes any retail shopping centre with a total lettable area of 34,000 square metres or more but of course excludes the Adelaide central business district. It impacts centres like Westfield Tea Tree Plaza and Westfield West Lakes. It is important that I update the house to say that no applications for paid parking under the act have been received by the Department for Trade and Investment over the last year.

This legislation came into force after Tea Tree Plaza's management announced its plans to install boom gates and start charging for car parking, akin to the regime that existed for a very long time at West Lakes. Those plans bit the dust. Significantly, the legislation means that parking at West Lakes Shopping Centre is free for the first time since 2013 and that of course provides much needed relief for South Australians and removes the need for staff to park offsite or to pay for parking.

Most importantly, if you go down to West Lakes today, there are no boom gates. Those boom gates have been removed and of course that is a relief to the people who were impacted: shoppers, local businesses, workers, retailers and their employees. All those people had been impacted from 2013 until this act was introduced. It impacted anyone who was working shifts in the early morning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It impacted all those people who were expected to walk across dimly-lit—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —areas and workers vulnerable early in the morning and late at night to antisocial behaviour, injury, theft and the like. Removing paid parking allowed those people to park onsite. It removed the \$35 fee per day that many of those workers were paying and that is \$175 a week or \$9,000 a year. Bear in mind, retail workers get approximately \$48,000 a year, so that is a huge amount of money for those workers. We note that so many of them are relieved, along with the local community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: You can hear those opposite and our young friend, who likes to strike the blue steel pose. I think Matt Abraham referred to it as blue steel, a leadership campaign on Instagram. But we know the Liberal Party opposed this legislation. We know they hate it. We know their current leader said that it seems very popular on the face of it, but can it actually be delivered. That is what he said at the time. Well, here is some news: it can be delivered and it has been delivered.

Time expired.

TASTE THE LIMESTONE COAST FESTIVAL

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:53): My question is to the tourism minister. Could the tourism minister please inform the house how the state government has supported the Naracoorte food festival? With your leave and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: I was approached by one of my constituents, who is a prominent constituent. Rob Hanson came to me six months ago and said the Naracoorte food festival was at risk of not recovering from the COVID days. I have been a strong advocate for this Naracoorte festival. It is on this weekend on Saturday, backed up by the Naracoorte race cup and I know that they are very proud that they are still running the Taste Festival.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:54): I thank the member for the question. The Taste Festival in Naracoorte is back after a three-year hiatus and the tourism commission was very pleased to contribute \$20,000 for this to make sure it could happen, particularly focused around security.

Now, this is a festival that is run by volunteers and I understand the Lions Club of Naracoorte has been a key contributor to this. It has been hard for those festivals that were suspended during COVID to keep that momentum and come back. As I understand, there will be 25 different producers, and performers, producing the best food, the best music and of course the best wine.

The Limestone Coast has been a really interesting region. We saw South Australians really discover their own backyard during COVID and the Limestone Coast has exceeded the 2025 target by achieving nearly \$560 million year on year spend. I am so pleased to have people go back. I know people were also impacted in your region with the tariffs from China around lobsters and crayfish, but to remind ourselves of the fantastic authentic food and seafood.

Let's not forget about Naracoorte and its diverse multicultural population. For those of you who have been down there, welcomed particularly by your Afghan community, many have been there for several decades for now and are quite well established. But I met people from Vanuatu last time I was down there as well and from other Pacific islands who are often at the abattoirs.

What I really like about these festivals is the use of local talent and the music that will be there like Shaun Brown, Unruly Mob, Stringybach Music, and of course you can buy tickets for this event. What is it about events that are so important? Particularly as someone who grew up in a country town, it's an opportunity for you to come together to collaborate and connect but more importantly to bring interstate visitors. Of course, your near border to Victoria means you do have those interstate visitors coming. The wine region is world renowned, and of course it's going to be a great day.

Can I say to your community that I was really pleased to be able to help make this happen and, to come back after that break, they should be celebrated and recognised.

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:56): My question is to the Treasurer. When will dangerous flammable cladding be removed from the Air Apartments? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BATTY: On 27 November 2023 I wrote to the Treasurer requesting that he expedite payments under the ACP cladding limited loan scheme to enable work to remove dangerous flammable cladding to begin. I have not received a response and no payment under the scheme has been made. On the weekend a large fire broke out inside the high-rise building in my electorate.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:57): I am happy to respond on this issue because the issue of combustible cladding has been a concern, particularly for apartment buildings—not exclusively apartment buildings, but particularly apartment buildings—for a number of years. Those concerns have grown because the responsibility of council to enforce the requirement that combustible cladding be removed and replaced was coming to a head, particularly during the course

of 2020 and 2021. When we came to government, we took a different view from the previous Liberal government that we would make a loan scheme available for the residential properties that had not yet dealt with their properties.

Probably for good reason, perhaps to manage a potential perception that there may be some sort of conflict, I have not taken a leading role in managing the implementation of the scheme, albeit the South Australian Financing Authority is responsible for the scheme, and that is principally because I was in receipt of repeated—and I say this in the nicest way possible—frequent and voluminous representations from the presiding officer of the strata group of an apartment block in my electorate, who would be well known to many people in this chamber.

I didn't want there to be a perception that because I was now Treasurer and I have affected apartment buildings in my electorate suddenly we were proceeding with this, so it has remained the purview of the Minister for Planning. I am happy to try to find out why those payments have been delayed. I had heard, not by virtue of your correspondence but elsewhere, that works had already commenced, I think, on the Air Apartments but they have not yet been completed, which is I guess some decent news. But the fact that a fire breaks out in a building which may not have been fully remediated yet is of concern and I will take up the legitimate query of the member and find out where it's up to.

ALUMINIUM COMPOSITE CLADDING

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:59): Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: On a supplementary. Member for Bragg.

Mr BATTY: Supplementary to the Minister for Planning: when would the scheme pay out?

The SPEAKER: That seems to be new content to me, member for Bragg.

Mr BATTY: Well, can I ask a new question, sir?

The SPEAKER: I am going to turn to the member for Elder.

TORRENS TO DARLINGTON PROJECT

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please inform the house on the progress of the Torrens to Darlington project?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:00): Thank you very much. Just to explain to my young friend, you have a procurement before you sign a contract.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: That is right.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. The member for Elder and the member for Badcoe are tireless advocates in their local community, and I appreciate their keen interest in this. The member for Elder is always, always asking about this project and advocating for her local community. In the last state budget, our government committed a record \$21 billion in investment in infrastructure that will create jobs, support our economy and improve the lives of South Australians.

At the centre of this record investment is the Torrens to Darlington project, the largest infrastructure initiative in South Australian history. While it is being undertaken, it will be the largest infrastructure program in the country, right here in South Australia: \$850 million of the total budget is essential network upgrades that are required for the motorway and the wider road network to properly function during and after construction of the project. These are for greater and wider corridor benefits.

The first project to be completed amongst that, along the north-south corridor, is the Selgar Avenue link road—the first beginning. It will always be the first part of T2D that was completed. The member for Elder was there at the beginning, and she was there to make sure it was opened. It was delivered by a local civil engineering company, Bardavcol, and it is complete; it is finished. Connecting motorists to the Tonsley Innovation District and the southbound lanes of South Road,

the new link road will improve local area access and connectivity with the motorway in the Clovelly Park area. I thank the member for Elder for her advocacy and all her help.

Other works across the project are progressing well. There is the Tonsley East substation; the Manton Street and Adam Street junction upgrade; and the Grange Road, Holbrooks Road and East Avenue intersection upgrade, removing that dogleg, which is very important. Of course, the resurfacing of South Road is something that should have been done under the last term of the previous government but had not been. It continues apace. Indeed, that was the part of the project that they left out of the entire scope of the project. They were going to leave parts of South Road untouched, without any new pavement. You can ask any resident in that local area what they think about the re-pavement, and you can hear that they love it.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: Why didn't you do it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We did; we finished it. My young friend again: the premature interjection. He is a habitual interjector. Of course, it continues apace. I know that this project is so important to our state's long-term prosperity that it will sustain 5½ thousand jobs per year for each and every year of its construction. It will slash travel times across the 10.5 kilometre section to just nine minutes when complete.

It also provides economic opportunity to local businesses. I am pleased to update the house that almost 300 of the approximately 570 businesses that have registered their interest in working on the Torrens to Darlington project via the ICN are South Australian or have a presence here. Thirty-three of those companies are owned by Indigenous business leaders. That is a great outcome.

If you are a business or a supplier who is interested in working on the largest infrastructure program in the country, it's not too late to register your interest. I encourage you to do so at t2d.icn.org.au. All the details for registering are on ICN Gateway to be provided to the T2D project. This is a great project and, despite the best efforts of the members opposite, it's proceeding.

Grievance Debate

REGIONAL COMMUNITY CRIME LEVELS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:04): Today, I want to speak about the concerns of regional communities, about the ever-increasing crime levels that we are seeing across South Australia. As a passionate regional member of parliament, I regularly speak to individuals, businesses and organisations from across our state and these concerns about increasing crime have been getting louder.

We have heard about the challenges that the police are facing in this state, with the shortage of around 200 officers down from where they need to be for our policing model; a need for recruiting more officers to fill the many vacancies; and an attrition rate that is the highest it has been in many years at well over 5 per cent. That is, well over 5 per cent of officers are leaving the police force every single year. More police are leaving the force than this government is recruiting. This is incredibly concerning for the people of South Australia as a whole, but especially in regional South Australia where it is already a great enough challenge to get enough officers to fill the positions in some of our further-flung areas, such as in my electorate.

I want to highlight the concerns of the communities in my electorate about increasing crime and community safety concerns, and I want to speak especially about the situation being faced in Ceduna at the moment. Every week I get numerous phone calls, messages, emails and stories from individuals and businesses in Ceduna about their concerns of what they see as a lack of awareness of the crime problem and violent and antisocial behaviour which they are facing. These include concerns from:

- businesses who have daily thefts from their shops;
- individuals who are living in fear of their homes being broken into; people who have told me about their houses being targeted multiple times by thieves breaking in even when they are home;

- businesses who are experiencing levels of constant vandalism, which is unacceptable: the number of broken windows keeps rising; and
- people who are witnessing violence, public drunkenness and experiencing personal threats.

I want to share directly some words from letters from people in Ceduna. The first states:

I don't think that I can continue to come to work every day and be exposed to the constant disrespect and inconsiderate behaviour that is starting to impact myself and staff's mental health.

Another states:

To sum up honestly, if Ceduna keeps declining, I will be forced to close my business.

Another states:

I moved to Ceduna 38 years ago and absolutely love the lifestyle, but am heartbroken to see the path this town is going down.

And another states:

My husband has to sleep at the shop to ensure that we don't get broken into.

Every week I get more and more of these types of stories. The community of Ceduna feels like it has been severely let down, especially by the federal Labor government's decision to remove the Cashless Debit Card from their community. The town feels betrayed and forgotten, and they can't take it anymore. You can see from those desperate words.

I am imploring the Premier, the Minister for Police, the Attorney-General, and the Minister for Human Services: please hear the voices of the community of Ceduna, listen to the business owners, listen to the Indigenous leaders, listen to the community leaders. They are at their wits' end. Visit the community, unannounced, to fully understand and experience what the people of Ceduna are having to put up with every single day and night.

In this place again, I want to reiterate my call for the state government to investigate funding to ensure the long-term future of the Tumby Bay jetty. The jetty at Tumby Bay is unfortunately closed at the moment due to degradation of the over-a-century-old structure, leading to what has been assessed as being unsafe for the community. It is a terrible outcome for both locals and visitors alike, and this is why both myself and the community are galvanised together to plead for action.

Over the weekend, we saw something extraordinary in Tumby Bay. It was an impromptu call from the grassroots level for people to gather at the jetty, and it saw what can only be described as one of the largest displays of civil disobedience that regional South Australia has seen for a long time. They pushed past the fences, the barricades, the SafeWork notices, to walk up and jump off their jetty. There were hundreds of people risking fines or legal charges to very publicly send a message to decision-makers at all levels: 'We need our jetty'.

Tumby Bay needs to have their jetty appropriately funded for the long-term sustainability of their community for future generations. I would not encourage disobeying the law and the risks around that, but this is the desperate position that the community of Tumby Bay are in. I am calling to the government to please listen and find an achievable solution. We cannot afford to lose such iconic pieces of our coastal communities.

DAVENPORT ELECTORATE COUNCIL ELECTIONS

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (15:09): With a council by-election currently underway in the City of Onkaparinga, Pimpala Ward, in my electorate of Davenport, there is plenty of conversation in the community about council elections and how they are run. People care about local issues. They care about their local sports clubs, they care about their local parks and reserves, about beautification in their neighbourhood, about roads and trees and the footpath out the front of their house. However, what people do not seem to care about are local council elections.

In South Australia, at the last local government election in 2022 less than one-third of council ratepayers voted. This means that some local council members and mayors are elected on a very small handful of votes, with some being elected completely uncontested. This raises concerns about

the legitimacy of council elections and whether or not candidates elected can adequately represent their community. I am very pleased that Minister Geoff Brock is undertaking a review into local government participation and elections, and I encourage all members to both consider providing their own feedback and also encourage their councils to do so, if they have not already.

An opportunity that the minister's review seeks feedback on, and a topic that the Local Government Association of SA considers to be the biggest opportunity for local government in the next five years, is compulsory voting. Last year I was fortunate to have University of Adelaide student Isabelle Tindle prepare a report for me that investigated whether or not South Australia should introduce compulsory voting in local council elections.

Issy completed her report as part of her internship, and she did an incredible job. She is a high achiever, and received outstanding marks for her work on this topic. What I learned from Issy's report is that all other states that have implemented compulsory voting here in Australia (that being every single one of them except Western Australia and South Australia) have seen a significant increase in voter turnout, with each of the states seeing an 80 per cent to 85 per cent turnout compared to our substantially lower voter turnout of less than 33 per cent.

We know that it is important to increase engagement, and the minister's review is exploring some of the methods that could help us achieve that. In my neck of the woods, the City of Onkaparinga has been actively advocating for local council election reforms for some time. They would particularly like to see an increase in voter participation, as they worry that local council elections and forums are being weaponised by fringe political groups. We saw this playing out at the 2022 council elections in both the northern and southern suburbs.

Even though the extreme views expressed by these groups are minority views, the lack of general voting in council elections allows these groups to dominate local councils, and subsequently push a wide range of sometimes extreme agendas. Increasing voter participation could help to mitigate this concern, while also ensuring representation on local councils through a large range of elected candidates who more adequately represent their communities.

Another option that Issy's report suggests would likely achieve better voter engagement, and one that I know our communities would be excited about, is the introduction of electronic voting. Access to electronic voting would significantly increase accessibility and convenience for voters, allowing them to participate from anywhere with an internet connection. This will especially benefit individuals with disabilities and those living in remote areas.

Unfortunately, we have not yet been in a position to see online voting introduced widely, but with more and more government services like Centrelink and other secure services like banking now available online, I am sure the technology is within reach. Wouldn't local government be the perfect place to trial it?

Issy's report suggests that whilst there would likely be some level of anxiety around security of online voting, it could in fact enhance the security and integrity of elections through advanced encryption and authentication measures, reducing the risk associated with the current form of voting in council elections through a paper ballot.

Mr Brock's review is receiving feedback until the end of March, and I am really looking forward to seeing the outcome.

Parliamentary Procedure

SUPPLEMENTARY QUESTIONS

The SPEAKER (15:13): Before I turn to the member for Heysen, I did not want to unduly delay us in question time earlier by providing a ruling on supplementary questions; however, it may assist. A supplementary question may refer only to the answer out of which it immediately arises, must relate to government responsibility, must not be read or be too long or quote from letters, should contain only one question, must not refer to an earlier answer or be addressed to another minister, and is governed by the general rules of order affecting all questions. That is the persuasive content of Erskine May.

*Grievance Debate***STIRLING HOSPITAL**

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:14): In this first sitting week for 2024, I can report to the house today good news, outstanding news, for my community of Stirling and surrounding areas that at the end of a year of sustained, hard and dedicated community work, the Stirling Hospital is now likely to stay put and stay open in Stirling. It is a tremendous achievement and I pay tribute to all who have been involved and that really means every single one of those community members who stood up to say just how important the Stirling Hospital is to our community.

Those reassuring words came from the board chair and were directed to the president of the Stirling Hospital at the end of last year. I can tell members that that came as significant reassurance at the end of a long year of hard and sustained work.

Members will recall that in April of last year the board advised me and other community stakeholders that it feared a \$50 million capital challenge and it foreshadowed closing the nearly 100-year-old Stirling Hospital doors and moving to rented premises at Mount Barker.

I held two packed community meetings in the RSL hall in May and in June. I can tell you, in terms of powerful advocacy, sometimes just the presence speaks louder than any words could. We saw board members and chairs dating back many decades. I was so proud to be joined by the Leader of the Opposition, by the shadow minister for health and by the shadow minister for regional health in the course of those meetings where the case was taken up to the board: 'We will not stand for this. We will leave no stone unturned. We insist on that and no less than that.'

This result, coming at the end of last year, I am afraid to say, is no thanks to the Malinauskas Labor government. On 31 May, when I asked the Minister for Health in this place for assistance for the Stirling Hospital, for engagement, the minister was immediately and thoroughly content to wash his hands entirely of the whole thing. He indicated to the house that it was nothing to do with the government, nothing to do with him and there would be no more to see here, despite the fact that the minister was perfectly happy to come along and be part of a ribbon-cutting exercise not more than a few months earlier at the hospital when improved facilities were continuing to be opened.

In the middle of last year, an incorporated association, Save Stirling Hospital, was established. I paid tribute to my predecessor, the member for Heysen, Isobel Redmond, in that regard, who led the way towards a vehicle that could provide that concentrated focus on what was necessary to assist the board and to assist the hospital to find a pathway to stay at Stirling.

So many able and relevantly expert people have stepped up. It has been a source of great inspiration. I say, in particular, thanks to Dr Scott Brumby for his dedicated calm and careful work as president of the association. I say, as well, particular thanks to Professor Margaret Way who these days is based at Monash in Melbourne, a national hospital accreditation expert, whose mum still lives just round the corner from the hospital and whose brother lives in the area. Margaret said, 'Yes, I'm there. What do you need?' It was this group of dedicated people who were able to identify important accreditation rules, both state and federal, to identify means by which there was not such a crushing capital requirement and to engage with the board in a careful and thorough way towards achieving the desired outcome: staying open in Stirling.

I have proudly shared that news with my community. It is reassuring news indeed. There is much more work to be done, but at this time, when the Malinauskas Labor government has so badly failed on its promise to fix ramping, and we see overcrowding in all directions, never has there been a more important time to commit to local health services. Long live the Stirling Hospital. Thanks and tributes to all who have been involved in preserving its proud legacy.

BEACH CAMPING

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:19): We have all returned to parliament after the summer break. It signifies a return to work for us; therefore, the rest of the population must well be back at work, too, so I thought I would provide an update to this house about the increasing propensity for visitors to our region to camp on our wonderful beaches.

Locally, I think we all accept COVID to be the starting point for this phenomenon. We have seen a dramatic increase in the number of cars and caravans accessing our wonderful beaches on the Yorke Peninsula and staying over public holidays and long weekends. That increasing propensity was on full display over the Christmas and new year break, when a plane was put into the sky, a video taken and a count done of the number of caravans on Wauraltee Beach alone, and that number amounted to 470. There were 470 cars and caravans on this particular stretch of beach, and that is just to name one stretch of beach—a truly extraordinary quantum of people who have come to our region. For that, we are tremendously grateful. It is wonderful to host people in our part of the world, as we have a great deal to offer, and long may they continue to come and grace us with their tourism presence.

However, there are some inevitable side effects which need to be dealt with from having that many people and that many caravans on our beaches, not least of which is rubbish disposal. There are no bins or waste disposal services provided on beaches, so we put our faith in those people who are visiting to take their rubbish with them. The vast majority do, but unfortunately there is that minority who decide to leave their rubbish on our beaches and cause a mess on the wonderful pristine natural environment. In addition to that, and without getting too deep into it, there is obviously the problem of human waste. There are no facilities provided on those beaches all the way along them, and people who do not have self-sustaining caravans would clearly benefit from the use of those facilities.

In addition to that—and perhaps most importantly—is the damage they can cause, if they are not careful, to the natural environment. We know that there are hooded plovers on Wauraltee Beach. We love the hooded plover, but visitors might not always be aware of where they are nesting and where they are developing.

There are all these unintended consequences from hosting these wonderful tourists in our region, and we need to start to think about how we might mitigate those consequences. I know that the people who own land behind the sand dunes are getting fed up with having so many people out the front, encroaching on their land and leaving rubbish and mess on their land. I know that Robert Patterson, who has been a frequent contributor to our office deliberations, is fed up and has quit the local action groups in frustration at the lack of action and development. He is crying out to ensure that something happens.

I do not want to sound like the fun police and tell people not to come and camp on our beaches, but we need to find some way to mitigate the damage. There is a bit of a hodgepodge of ownership and management of those beaches: some are under the care, control and maintenance of council, others are on unalienated Crown land and others are held by private owners. That makes the management of these beaches all the more difficult. I quote from council minutes an example of why that management might be slightly more difficult:

This particular parcel of land at Cape Elizabeth has had vehicle users entering one of the council land parcels in breach of council's by-law no. 2 of 2020. However, access to that particular parcel is via a track of unalienated Crown land. Therefore, council cannot close this track as it has no authority to do so, and if it did it would be in breach of the Crown law act.

Here we have an example where they would like to be more involved in the management of that particular bit of land, but are prevented from doing so because of the hodgepodge of management schemes.

In my view, we need consistency across beaches, not just in Narungga but across regional South Australia, so that we can impose a consistent and thoughtful process to mitigate some of those unintended consequences. Unfortunately, she is ill today, but I did ask the Minister for Environment late last year whether there was any news about developments that might be upcoming with regard to that. She said that there would be more information sooner rather than later. I look forward to taking up that issue with her before the next sitting week.

The other issue I look forward to taking up with the minister is regarding Cape Elizabeth. I read out that example where council had such a terror of a time trying to manage it that they have resolved at council to apply to the minister to have their care, control and maintenance revoked, and that land returned to unalienated Crown land to try to give it a better chance of being managed responsibly. So I will be interested to hear the government and the minister's thoughts on whether

that proposal will be accepted by the government and, if so, what they plan to do to provide a consistent, thoughtful means of mitigating the damage that has been done by these wonderful tourists visiting our region.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:24): I rise to speak on some disappointing news about the services that will be provided at the Gumeracha District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital in my electorate of Schubert. The Gumeracha Medical Practice as well as the Lobethal Medical Centre in years gone by have been servicing patients up at the Gumeracha hospital for many, many decades. It was with some disappointment that I opened a press release issued by the Gumeracha Medical Practice, where they noted, 'Gum Medical ends century-long service to Gumeracha District Soldiers' Memorial Hospital after failed contract negotiations.'

I am going to quote Dr Chris Withnall, who is the owner of Gumeracha Medical. He said, 'It is with deep regret that our private medical practice cannot continue to look after our local hospital in the face of bureaucratic indifference.' He then went on to say that the level of disregard was proved by the fact that it was not until a day before the contract expired that a meeting was arranged to negotiate. In that meeting the doctors were told that their service was too expensive and an insignificant contribution compared to all of the major projects elsewhere in the network.

I have to say that there is nothing insignificant about the service that the doctors at Gumeracha Medical provide up at the Gumeracha hospital. I frankly believe that the government should have shown a lot more respect to the doctors at Gumeracha Medical by coming to the negotiating table much sooner. The contract that I am of course referring to is how GPs operate with the hospital in Gumeracha, so I think that is particularly disappointing. We know that Gumeracha has had some difficulties over the past few years in relation to their health services at the local level. Obviously, there was the temporary closure of the emergency department initially through COVID-19. That was a huge concern for many locals not just in Gumeracha but more broadly across the Torrens Valley area.

I would urge the government—and the government really has a very big task ahead of itself—to ensure that the LHN actually stumps up and provides those doctors so that there is not yet another freefall, if you like, of services in my local community.

The situation as it stands at the ED in particular is one which still concerns many locals in my community. If you are under the age of 10, you cannot go and get your stitches done up at Gumeracha Medical. There are a whole host of things that you cannot actually get done at the Gumeracha Medical Practice, and I think that is something that is particularly disappointing. Having those health services closer to home in a regional community is so critically important. Now the only option that people have in Gumeracha and beyond in my northern part of the Adelaide Hills is to either head to the Mount Barker hospital or to head down the hill to go to the hospitals down the hill.

I think that is really, really disappointing. It is part of the reason why, as an opposition, we have been pushing for there to be incentives on the table to attract and retain frontline health workers. We know that it is such a difficult time right across the nation, right across the world indeed, to get healthcare workers, but every other state is competitive with incentives on the table except here in South Australia.

I genuinely worry that if we do not come to the party in that regard services in my local community will just continue to diminish, and that is not something that we can afford to occur. I urge the government to really fast-track an action plan so that there can be doctors up at the Gumeracha hospital. It is something that they need, and it is something that they deserve.

One of the other issues that I would like to raise in the short time that I have left is on behalf of locals who are living in Springton, Mount Pleasant and Eden Valley. They came to me towards the end of last year and the start of this year with some pretty significant frustrations about the power outages that they were having. I think that is entirely reasonable. Locals understand, particularly in regional communities, that often there are storms and often there are trees that interrupt power, but to have so many interruptions that are unplanned I think is a great source of frustration. I am pleased that SA Power Networks have now written back to say that more investment will be made to try to

make that power a little bit more reliable, but there is still a long way to go, and I will keep fighting on that front.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:29): I absolutely love public transport, and I also love delivering community wins for locals in my electorate, and so what I love even more is when community wins combine with public transport. I have three of those in my electorate. I will start with community win one, and that is in relation to bus stop K1 on Hutt Street. It is at the corner of Hutt Street and South Terrace.

I was down there late last year talking to locals about my \$3 million investment in Hutt Street to improve the entrance to this beloved main street in my community, and a couple of locals raised the issue of buses idling at the K1 bus stop. The reason that buses do this is to ensure that they are on track with the current schedule. Buses that may be running ahead of time will wait at that particular bus stop and idle there to make sure that the bus is then aligned with the timetable and move on. Unfortunately, some new residents coming into a new apartment building in the area were being impacted by the buses idling at bus stop K1.

It is known as a time point, and so I advocated on behalf of my local community to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport to see if we could move the time point of that particular bus stop to a better location. I was absolutely thrilled to be able to deliver this community win for my local area. We were able to move the time point further south, across South Terrace and down to Hutt Road, away from local residents, to really improve the amenity for local residents in that area. We have 1,000 of these time points across the Adelaide Metro network, and the department is always looking to review them to make sure they are in the best location. I am very pleased to have been able to deliver that outcome for our local community.

Community win two is in relation to bus stop V1, also on Hutt Street, a bit further down. Again, I had been talking to local residents about our free city connector, which is something that I am absolutely a huge supporter of, but they mentioned that there was a large distance between two of the city connector's bus stops along Hutt Street and East Terrace. It was about a 700 to 800-metre distance.

The free city connector is so important for people in our community to be able to get to services and to access their social networks, but in particular to do their grocery shopping. Particularly in instances of extreme heat or wet weather, having to walk those long distances to access the free city connector, particularly if you are carrying groceries home, was something that was raised as a bit of an issue for my local community.

I was very proud to launch a campaign to advocate for an additional bus stop for the free city connector along Hutt Street, and I was thrilled to be able to inform my community just last week that we will undertake a three-month trial of bus stop V1 as a dedicated stop on the free city connector's route. That starts on Monday 12 February, so it is a bit of an early Valentine's Day present for my local community. I am urging them to come on down to support that particular bus stop on the free city connector route. Let's really lock that in as a bus stop for our free city commuters.

Now community win three: 12 months ago, in this very chamber, I was able to invite in a young woman by the name of Cassie Hames. Cassie is legally blind and I invited her into the parliament because I wanted to hear all about an idea that she had to make our public transport system more accessible and inclusive. That idea was called the See Me App. It was really designed for people who had low vision or were vision impaired to give them more confidence to be able to catch public transport.

I was a huge supporter of this idea. I was blown away by its simplicity but also what a huge impact it would have on people catching public transport, so I made sure I advocated to our Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Tom Koutsantonis, to get behind this idea, which his department did. Just last week, we were able to announce that we are undertaking a six-month trial on the free city connector 99A and 99C of Cassie's app.

Basically, it alerts the bus driver that you are waiting at the upcoming bus stop. When you are on the bus, it alerts the driver to when you want to get off. So you have that confidence that the

bus is coming, it is going to stop, you are going to be able to get on it and then, when you are on it, you know you are going to be able to get to your destination and get off safely.

They are three community wins in my electorate that I am just so excited to be able to announce and I thank all the locals who helped me in advocating for them.

Mrs HURN: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

The SPEAKER: My attention has been drawn to the state of the house. A quorum is not present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:37): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 20 February 2024 at 11am.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6pm.

Motion carried.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: I move without notice:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the adjournment of the house to extend beyond 7pm.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required. We will count the house. It is not present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

Bills

AYERS HOUSE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (15:40): Despite Liberal Party promises made prior to the 2018 election to support the National Trust master plan for Ayers House and promises to provide government investment, the member for Black made the decision to evict one of the state's most respected public charities that has faithfully served the community at Ayers House for 50 years.

The National Trust has 6,000 members across 45 local branches and over 1,000 registered volunteers across South Australia who keep its properties maintained and open to the public. These numbers are an indication of how much the South Australian public value the preservation of their heritage. It was no surprise when the eviction was announced to see a broad cross-section of the community rise up in opposition to the member for Black's plan.

Despite Liberal Party claims to the contrary, the plan was not to restore Ayers House to its 'former glory' with a \$6.6 million renovation. Rather, the plan was to transform South Australia's largest and most intact Victorian mansion into a government office building, thereby removing community access and public participation in its maintenance and restoration works. And despite comments made at the time by the former Liberal government, Ayers House did not sit passively on North Terrace—just ask the dance floor when there has been a wedding there that I have attended—in disrepair, awaiting regeneration in the form of increased business usage and bureaucratic work cubicles but provided access to school and community groups each and every week, year after year,

decade after decade, to a public with a strong desire to experience and learn about the heritage of this Victorian gem.

This bill expands upon Don Dunstan's vision by granting Ayers House to the National Trust as a permanent home, ensuring the trust is safe from the reactionary whim of any future minister. An Ayers House act will maintain the minister as the registered owner of Ayers House on the certificate of title; give the National Trust permanent care, control and management of Ayers House; and allow the National Trust to generate income to further support its operations.

A visit to Ayers House is a rite of passage for school students in South Australia, offering hands-on learning activities and the chance to experience a unique historic place unlike any other. I, and the rest of the Malinauskas Labor government, proudly welcome the opportunity to restore the National Trust to Ayers House and ensure it is once again opened for the next generation of South Australian children to visit and for all South Australians to enjoy. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (15:42): I rise to speak on the Ayers House Bill 2023 and indicate that I am the opposition's lead speaker on this bill and that the opposition will be supporting this bill. Ayers House is without a doubt a property of great significance to South Australia. The state heritage listed building and its grounds boast a deep history—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member for Bragg has the call.

Mr BATTY: Thank you, sir. The state heritage listed building on North Terrace and its grounds boast a very deep history amongst past South Australian leaders, and over some of that time the community have been able to experience the grandeur of Ayers House as a museum venue. Its unique setting on North Terrace affords Ayers House significant prominence in the CBD nestled amongst our cultural institutions including the Art Gallery of South Australia, the South Australian Museum and the State Library of South Australia. It is something that should not only be protected, something that should not only be preserved but something that should be celebrated as a cultural icon.

The Liberal Party, the party of heritage, has always supported measures to protect and preserve Ayers House. The reimagining of the city's north-eastern sector, especially as a result of the previous Liberal government's significant investment in Lot Fourteen, presented the previous government with an opportunity to consider how Ayers House could be used into the future and how it can be best celebrated and enjoyed by South Australians into the future.

The previous government actually had a vision. We had a vision to turn Ayers House into one of the city's great cultural institutions, and we put our money where our mouth is. If we go back and have a look at the 2021-22 state budget, the Marshall Liberal government at that time committed \$6.6 million to upgrade, restore and revitalise this wonderful icon.

I look forward to exploring, soon, exactly how that money has been spent over the last couple of years, or perhaps not been spent over the past couple of years, because this funding was one of the most significant investments in a heritage building in the state's history. It was intended to sensitively restore the property to its former glory, removing asbestos, upgrading air conditioning and providing equitable access by providing disability access. The restoration was to follow the principles of the Burra Charter, along with the Ayers House Conservation Management Plan, ensuring the heritage values of Ayers House would not be impacted.

During that previous term of government, the National Trust was a tenant of Ayers House. Although they had a museum operating there and occasionally held events there—including during history week, which is fantastic—the premises were primarily used as office space for the National Trust as well as storage for various collections of the National Trust. The expiry of the National Trust's lease at Ayers House at that time provided the previous government with an opportunity: an opportunity to reimagine the use and vision for Ayers House as the premier destination it should be, located in that ever-growing cultural precinct on North Terrace, adjacent to the new Lot Fourteen development.

It was envisaged that Ayers House could be enlivened for the public and could be used for a variety of events. So, on this side of the house at that time, you saw not only a vision for Ayers House, not only a plan for Ayers House, but the money to realise that plan. This all came to a grinding halt with the election a couple of years ago of the Malinauskas Labor government, who seem to have other plans, which seemingly have included Ayers House to be sat there, languishing for the past two years, before we finally see this bill come before the house today.

This bill will give the National Trust the permanent care, control and management of Ayers House. It will maintain the minister as the registered owner of Ayers House on the certificate of title, and it will allow the National Trust to generate income to support its operation through leases, licences and other activities within Ayers House but also render the National Trust liable for all claims related to Ayers House.

So, after sitting there languishing for the first two years of the Malinauskas Labor government, we see this bill before the house now. What we do not see from the Malinauskas Labor government, though, what we do not see from the minister's second reading speech, for example, and what we have not heard in this place, is what the grand plan is. There is no vision from the Malinauskas Labor government on what Ayers House should be. It is simply handing it over to the National Trust. We do not hear what they are going to be doing to the property; we do not hear from the minister what their vision is.

But I do know. I do know because I have spent the last 18 months engaging with the National Trust. I have met with successive CEOs of the National Trust, including Darren Peacock and Stuart McNabb. I thank both of them for their time over the past 18 months, as well as the President of the National Trust, Paul Leadbeter, whom I have had the privilege of talking to about this bill over the past little while, about what the National Trust's plans are for the property and what their vision is for the property. It is all stuff I would have hoped to have heard from the member for Elder, and perhaps from the minister in the second reading speech. There is no vision from those opposite; there is just no vision.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order! The member for Bragg has the call.

Mr BATTY: I genuinely hope that the National Trust's plans and visions for Ayers House will be realised—I genuinely hope they will. The National Trust are a wonderful institution and they will hopefully do a wonderful job of managing this cultural icon. But I do hope it is not simply an attempt by this minister, by this government, to simply wash their hands of Ayers House, simply passing the buck for the upkeep and the responsibility of Ayers House to the National Trust and also basically ceding any power at all over how Ayers House might be able to be enjoyed by the public.

Other than an obligation to provide public access to Ayers House, which of course is critical and very important, there is no other obligation—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Order, members on my right! The member for Bragg is attempting to give a speech on this bill. Other members have had their opportunity and will have their opportunity to provide their own contributions. I ask that the member for Bragg be heard in silence.

Mr BATTY: I know talking about heritage upsets the Labor Party—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Please don't respond to the interjections.

Mr BATTY: I know it upsets them, because they like to pretend they are the party of heritage. They like to say one thing about heritage before the election and do the complete opposite after. The Liberal Party is the party of heritage here. We had a plan to protect and restore Ayers House to make sure it was celebrated as the cultural icon that it should be. They just sat there doing nothing for the last two years before we see the member for Elder stand up now two years down the track and pretend to care about heritage in this place. So I genuinely hope this is not just another attempt by the Malinauskas government—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): There is a point of order from the member for Elder.

Ms CLANCY: Point of order: section 25. I find that offensive and I would ask the member to please apologise and withdraw.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): I am sorry, what has the member said that is offensive?

Ms CLANCY: He said that I am pretending to care about heritage, and I work incredibly hard in that space in my electorate.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Thank you. I invite the member to withdraw and apologise.

Mr BATTY: I withdraw and apologise, sir.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Thank you. Let's move on.

Mr BATTY: I do understand the sensitivity on that side of the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Let's move on, member for Bragg.

Mr BATTY: We only have to take, for example, the minister for heritage's commitment before the last election that we would not see the demolition of any state heritage listed property in South Australia. She made that comment I think in February, about one month before the last election, and it was very well received probably by the member for Elder who I know deeply cares about heritage. Unfortunately, we fast forward, and not very long—it took her about five minutes since becoming the member for heritage to break that promise and put the bulldozer through the Thebarton Barracks. What is next?

When it comes to the Labor Party and heritage, they like to say one thing about it, but we judge based on actions. The actions of the Malinauskas Labor government when it comes to protecting heritage property is putting the bulldozer through state heritage listed properties. It is fast-tracking legislation in this place to demolish our heritage laws. They have made an absolute mockery of the very system that is meant to protect heritage-listed properties, so I do understand the member for Elder's sensitivity on this. Nevertheless, I do apologise for her and for the actions that we saw from this minister putting the bulldozer through state heritage listed buildings, despite promising not to do so.

I genuinely hope this is not just another attempt to push heritage to one side and pass the buck when it comes to heritage in South Australia and to pass the buck when it comes to caring for Ayers House, because that would be a great shame. Ayers House is something that should not only be protected but be used and celebrated. Unfortunately, I do worry because we do know that the Malinauskas Labor government's attitude to heritage in South Australia is very different. They simply do not care about it. They will say one thing before an election and then they will do something completely different after an election.

It is not just state heritage listed buildings that those opposite seem hellbent on putting the bulldozer through, they show total disrespect for how we protect local heritage as well. We have a Minister for Planning who has been sitting on the Planning System Implementation Review now for coming on a year, I think, that it has been sitting on his desk. I am hoping that that review has very important recommendations in it about how we can better protect local heritage in South Australia, how we can protect heritage homes and character areas and suburbs like Eastwood and Toorak Gardens in my own electorate, and in suburbs like Beulah Park in the electorate of Dunstan, where I was doorknocking on the weekend.

There are beautiful character homes and a genuine concern for protecting heritage homes in that suburb, for preserving the character of those areas, growing a tree canopy. We heard about the need for a strategic approach to protecting heritage in these areas, for a simple process for listing heritage homes, protecting them, perhaps a single heritage minister and a single heritage act, or whether we need to revisit character areas and historical areas to make sure they are capturing everything we need them to do.

Here in the Liberal Party we have a plan to preserve these suburbs like Beulah Park. We want to protect the character of them, their unique history and heritage that I saw on the weekend. However, as long as we have a Minister for Planning who will not release a planning system implementation review, which has been sitting on his desk for a year, all these homes in my electorate, in the electorate of Dunstan, right across Adelaide, remain under threat. So I use this as an opportunity, once again, to call on the Minister for Planning to release the Planning System Implementation Review, the expert report, that we are all eagerly awaiting.

To conclude, I have serious concerns about exactly what the plan is for Ayers House. It is disappointing that instead of coming into this house with a coherent vision of what we want to see the property turn into, it is simply washing our hands of Ayers House, handing it over to the National Trust. The National Trust does have some plans—and I genuinely hope they will be realised—but I do worry, because unfortunately we have a government that does not care about heritage and that might not support the National Trust in their very worthy ambitions for the property.

We do not want to see Ayers House languish any longer, as it has done for the past couple of years. It is an icon in our key cultural precinct and it should be preserved and protected. Most importantly, it should be celebrated and enjoyed by South Australians.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:57): I rise today in support of the Ayers House Bill, and would like to begin with a quote:

Never has any minister shown such disrespect to this predominantly volunteer-operated organisation.

That was a quote from Dr Darren Peacock, Chief Executive of the National Trust South Australia, in relation to the now opposition leader's and Liberal Party's treatment of the National Trust.

This legislation would not actually have even been necessary if it were not for the former Marshall Liberal government seeking to evict the National Trust from Ayers House on a whim in 2021. I, along with my community, could not believe what was happening when we learnt that the member for Black, the then environment minister, David Spiers, issued the National Trust with a 31-day eviction notice. For an iconic institution like the National Trust to be treated with such disrespect is truly egregious.

I actually feel like I am repeating myself, because this is all starting to sound rather familiar. Just yesterday the opposition leader was attacking the Adelaide Botanic Gardens board because they dared question the opposition leader's misleading 'picnic tax' campaign about entry fees at the garden. I am not sure what the Liberal opposition has against these two highly respected institutions, but here we are establishing a bill to prevent the future whims of the Liberal government.

The National Trust should rightly be revered. It has been promoting and protecting our South Australian heritage since 1955. With more than 1,000 registered volunteers and more than 5,000 members, the National Trust is an integral part of the South Australian community. The time and efforts from the National Trust and their volunteers would be the equivalent of millions of dollars of work supporting South Australian heritage.

Often acclaimed as one of the most cost-effective managers of heritage places in Australia, the National Trust remains the obvious choice to continue its lease in Ayers House and yet, the Leader of the Opposition was so keen to dismantle Ayers House from the inside out.

Naturally, the National Trust launched a campaign vehemently opposed to the Marshall Liberal government's broken promises, with a petition calling on them to reverse the eviction notice and allow the trust to stay in the place it has called home for more than 50 years.

I will come back to that quote, because back in 2021 Dr Darren Peacock, the Chief Executive of the National Trust of South Australia, said, and I quote:

Everything we do is for the public benefit. Never has any Minister shown such disrespect to this predominantly volunteer-operated organisation.

Again, a wave of *deja vu* overcomes me. Only yesterday, I was reading quotes from the Presiding Member of the Adelaide Botanic Gardens Board who similarly wrote to the opposition leader asking them to retract claims that they were negatively impacting on the Adelaide Botanic Gardens' supporters and staff. Again, just to show a blatant disrespect.

The Ayers House Museum welcomes hundreds of thousands of local, interstate and international visitors every year, not to turn a profit, but because they care so deeply about SA heritage. But with David Speirs' plans to replace the beloved museum with government offices and extend private catering facilities, the National Trust were shocked by their sudden instruction to vacate from the property.

National Trust SA President, Deborah Morgan, even wrote to the former environment minister at the time and said, and I quote:

We are most disappointed that the Marshall Government has decided to renege on its commitments made to the National Trust prior to the last election in respect of the future of Ayers House.

She also told members, and I quote:

I consider that the Trust now has no option but to view the manner in which our tenancy was terminated as an invitation to battle with Minister Speirs.

The National Trust's campaign was heard loud and clear by the Malinauskas Labor team, and we made a commitment to the community to guarantee the tenure of the National Trust in Ayers House.

Now that we are in government, I am incredibly proud to be fulfilling this commitment. This act will prevent other South Australian ministers from doing what the Marshall Liberal government and David Speirs tried to do.

Further, this act will give the National Trust permanent care, control and management of Ayers House. It will also allow the National Trust, through licences, leases and other activities, to generate an income to support its operations. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Members

DUNSTAN BY-ELECTION

The SPEAKER (16:02): I inform the house that a by-election in the electoral district of Dunstan will be held on Saturday 23 March 2024. Earlier today, in view of legislation presently before the house, I advised that writs would be issued on Friday 16 February 2024 in place of today. I publish an information circular in relation to the by-election.

Bills

AYERS HOUSE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (16:03): This act will legislate and ensure ongoing public access to Ayers House and exempt Ayers House from council rates. The minister will remain as the registered owner of Ayers House on the certificate of title. The National Trust will be liable for all claims related to Ayers House. We are building on Don Dunstan's vision and efforts in the heritage space, and we look forward to Ayers House remaining in the hands of the National Trust for generations to come. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (16:03): Ayers House is one of our state's finest assets. Named after its original owner, Sir Henry Ayers, a distinguished politician, financier and Premier of South Australia, it is a fine example of colonial architecture that has been home to the National Trust since 1972 after the building was transformed from a nurses' quarters into a public museum, restaurant and function centre. Like many in this place, I have attended several weddings at Ayers House and marvelled in its history and well-maintained environment.

The National Trust was established under an act of parliament in South Australia in 1955. It is not a government body and relies on the generosity of memberships, grants and donations. They do an incredible job of managing many heritage buildings and nature reserves, some of which I have in my electorate, such as Gamble Cottage, Watchman House and Watiparinga Reserve. Its core responsibility is the preservation, management, maintenance and promotion of historic sites, natural

reserves, museums, folk history, collections, icons and heritage. They work hard to raise awareness of our history and also to encourage current and future generations to explore their past, enjoy what our state's heritage has to offer and ensure that these incredible places will be there long into the future.

One of our government's election commitments was to introduce legislation to grant the National Trust ongoing rights to Ayers House, including its use for commercial opportunities so that it is able to generate the revenue it needs to carry out all of the work that it does. The National Trust has over a thousand registered volunteers and over 5,000 members. Some of those volunteers live in my community, and the work that they do in maintaining our local heritage and the love that they have for these treasures is outstanding.

In fact, in November last year I was very grateful to be able to reward one of these volunteers with a Premier's volunteer award. That special person was Maxine Conlon. Having devoted more than a decade to volunteering with the Coromandel Valley & Districts Branch National Trust, Maxine is passionate about promoting the history and heritage of the area. The branch's primary objectives relate to the collection, preservation and promotion of local heritage, both as stories and items of significance. Maxine is active in the pursuit of these objectives as a regular organiser of open days and special events at three historic properties managed by the Trust, as a tour guide on bus and walking tours of the district, and through working on documenting, cataloguing and maintaining the branch's archives. She has been a highly effective and respected branch treasurer for 10 years.

Of particular note was Maxine's extensive involvement in coordinating dozens of activities run to celebrate the 175th anniversary in 2012 of the founding of Coromandel Valley. She was immersed in the year and constantly available. It was a lovely morning tea at Watchman House and it was lovely to share the day with all of the volunteers. The Coromandel Valley & Districts Branch National Trust are also responsible for making some of the most delicious marmalade that I have ever shared, and many of my colleagues here have benefited from them. Bev Harper is the head chef with assistance from her very talented kitchen hand, Bruce. So good is the marmalade that last year it took out two very prestigious awards at the Australian Marmalade Championships held in Victoria. Volunteers are the lifeblood of our community and the work that they do throughout is irreplaceable.

The National Trust, as mentioned, has been the caretaker of Ayers House for over 55 years, and this bill will ensure that they continue to be the custodians. The bill is intended to guarantee Ayers House as a permanent site for the National Trust of South Australia and to permit the National Trust to generate revenue. This includes the National Trust accessing income from the associated car park for the purposes of meeting maintenance costs of the property.

Whilst the government will continue to own Ayers House, the National Trust will be responsible for heritage conservation, property maintenance and all associated operating costs of Ayers House. The National Trust will become the lessor in relation to existing leases and will be able to enter into future lease opportunities for Ayers House. The National Trust will not be allowed to sell, mortgage or transfer the Ayers House land or buildings, and public access to Ayers House will be mandated in perpetuity. The objects of the National Trust of South Australia Act 1955 will be updated to reflect the National Trust's permanent role within Ayers House.

The National Trust was first asked to assist in managing Ayers House in 1971. In 1970, the then Premier, Don Dunstan, invited the National Trust to contribute to his plan to restore, furnish and present the house to the public as a museum, restaurant and function centre. This bill expands upon the vision of the former Premier by granting Ayers House to the National Trust as a permanent home.

The Ayers House Act will ensure that this location is safe from a future minister evicting the National Trust on a whim, like the now opposition leader attempted to do in 2021. Prior to the 2018 state election, the Liberal Party promised to provide \$500,000 to the National Trust to develop and implement a master plan for the building, but in 2021 gave them their marching orders in favour of the History Trust and upped the investment to \$6 million. This was an unprecedented and unwarranted attack on the 55-year stewardship of Ayers House by the National Trust—a body which, for 65 years, has nurtured and safeguarded much of South Australia's built and natural heritage.

Thankfully, this bill will now protect the National Trust and their ongoing work at Ayers House. I commend the bill to the house.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:09): I rise to speak on the Ayers House Bill. It is a pleasure to be able to speak on this bill and the importance of protecting heritage in our state and on the delivery of yet another election commitment. Prior to the election, we committed to introduce legislation to grant ongoing rights in relation to Ayers House to the National Trust of South Australia, including its use for commercial operations to generate revenue for the National Trust. This bill delivers on that commitment.

The National Trust as an organisation has been working to protect and promote heritage in South Australia since it was established under an act of parliament in South Australia in 1955. It exists on donations, grants, membership fees, entry fees and sponsorship and is strongly supported by our community. The trust actively conserves, manages and promotes South Australia's Indigenous, natural and built historical heritage and culture and does so as a community-based, not-for-profit non-government organisation.

Like all not-for-profit organisations, it relies on the support of the community, including more than 1,000 registered volunteers and over 5,000 members. Over the years, the National Trust and their volunteers have contributed towards supporting heritage conservation and heritage education. While we may only have built heritage stretching back over 200 years, we have natural and Indigenous heritage that spans close to 100,000 years, and we need to make sure that all of this is protected.

Ayers House is an iconic building along our cultural boulevard, joining our beautiful Museum, Art Gallery, State Library, Bonython Hall and so many others between our historic Adelaide Railway Station and our unique Botanic Gardens. Many South Australians will have visited Ayers House for events, functions, open days or high tea.

The National Trust was first asked to assist in managing Ayers House in 1971. In 1970, our progressive and visionary Premier of the time, Don Dunstan, invited the National Trust to contribute to his plan to restore, furnish and present the house to the public as a museum, restaurant and function centre from its then disposition as nurses' quarters.

The Ayers House Act will ensure that this location is safe from any future minister evicting the National Trust on a whim, particularly our current member for Black when in landlord mode. The act will maintain the minister as the registered owner of Ayers House on the certificate of title, while giving the National Trust permanent care, control and management of Ayers House. Further, it will allow the National Trust to generate income to support its operations through leases, licences and other activities within Ayers House while also ensuring public access.

The National Trust will be liable for all claims related to Ayers House, while the property will be exempt from council rates, and transitional provisions will be put in place. It is important that we protect our heritage and that we support organisations like the National Trust that work for our community. I support this bill and commend it to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:12): I rise to make a very brief contribution to the debate. I understand it is not the desire of the government to take the debate to committee this afternoon, and so there will be an opportunity for the fleshing out of these matters clause by clause in committee and, indeed, eventually in the course of the third reading. It is important that in the course of the second reading debate, the second reading debate does not conclude without an opportunity to correct the record on a range of things that I think have been aired in variously gratuitous ways by members opposite.

I just want to endorse the contribution of the member for Bragg. He has been of tremendous assistance to the Leader of the Opposition over this now sustained period of time. I applaud not only the Leader of the Opposition's time in government with responsibility for these matters but his continued leadership in the portfolio in opposition. It is a sign of not only his deep knowledge but also his dedication to the task.

The member for Bragg has indicated that we will be supporting the bill. I want to ensure that in the course of the debate there is a fulsome opportunity for the correct record to be placed on the

Hansard. I leave my remarks at that for the time being. I look forward to further contributions in the course of the second reading.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (16:15): I am pleased to be able to make a contribution to the Ayers House Bill. I want to particularly thank the member for Bragg, who acts as the shadow assistant minister for environment and heritage, for largely looking after this piece of legislation on behalf of the Liberal Party of South Australia.

I did want to use this opportunity to correct the record, to make very clear and make sure the exact recent history was on the public record with regard to the Ayers House initiative that began under my time as minister for heritage in South Australia between 2018 and 2022. In fact, one of the most significant investments in heritage restoration of any government building in South Australia's history was the Liberal Party's commitment in 2020-21 to the restoration of Ayers House on North Terrace.

It was deemed by myself, but particularly by the former Premier of South Australia, Steven Marshall, that there was an incredible opportunity to restore Ayers House, to lift it from a really rundown building and to restore its heritage, to tell its story, to tell the story of its founders, the people who built the house, to tell the story of Henry Ayers and his significant contribution to this state, to this parliament in fact. There was so much to be able to do in that property.

The property also finds itself in a geographically strategic location. It is right across the road from Lot Fourteen, which of course was a focal point of much investment, and also heritage restoration in itself, with regard to the previous government's focus to turn that into a hub of entrepreneurialism and a place where start-ups could go to get off the ground and really thrive in South Australia.

As part of the Lot Fourteen project, millions have been spent on the restoration, particularly of heritage-listed facades, and so because of the serendipitous location of Ayers House across the road we really did feel that there was an incredible opportunity to invest in the restoration of Ayers House.

A historic level of funding was to be provided by the state government to lift that building up and to do a sympathetic restoration, to look after every aspect of the heritage of the building, to knock off the much more recent—I think 1960s—annexe that was bolted onto the back of the building, to strip out the old bathrooms and kitchens, which were added in, again, in relatively modern times and had no fitting with the building, nor any modern purpose in terms of being bathrooms and kitchens.

This was a building that had become a camel. It was a building that was not fit for purpose. It had a museum in the front of it, and those rooms were looked after to a degree by the National Trust for some 50 years, but not to the extent that I felt was appropriate as the heritage minister. I felt we could partner with a range of heritage organisations, from the National Trust to the History Trust of SA and a range of other interested parties, to invest in that place.

It was a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity to create an incredibly special place that told the story of South Australia's post-European history and to bring that building to a place where it could be accessed by all because, sadly, it is inaccessible by large swathes of the community, huge numbers of people, particularly people with disabilities and older people, so it is exclusionary in its current form.

We wanted to put a lift on at the back where the old annexe was, giving people access to the rooms upstairs, and obviously do a very sensitive heritage restoration in the state rooms. This would then allow the building to be able to be used for a range of state functions, for events around the History Festival, and to be able to partner across the road with Lot Fourteen, with international visitors who might visit that site being able to cross the road and engage with the history of South Australia through being able to immerse themselves in the state room of Ayers House, hear that post-European story and be able to access the building in a way that just was not possible because as the building stands it is highly exclusionary. There are a lot of parts of that building you cannot get into. A lot of it is sealed off.

Because of limited funds, the National Trust of South Australia's footprint in the house had really shrunk to the state rooms. The ability to expand that, to hold exhibitions, lectures, productions

and perhaps screen movies that told history stories—again, an anchor point, for the History Festival—was the vision for Ayers House. That vision was hijacked by the Labor Party, but not initially. I am not even going to blame the Labor Party for this. It was hijacked by Dr Darren Peacock, the former chief executive officer of the National Trust of South Australia, of blessed memory. He has been moved on now, rightly so.

Darren Peacock spread an immense amount of misinformation and innuendo about what the former government and I as minister sought to do. We wanted to partner with the National Trust. We wanted to partner with history SA. We wanted to partner with our history-focused organisations to create a centre of excellence for the telling of the story of South Australia and that is firmly on the public record.

But as part of that, we did feel we had to end the National Trust's lease and provide them with support to move to their North Adelaide building and to move material into storage that they had stored there. They had huge amounts of storage. It was like a bric-a-brac operation, to be quite frank. Huge amounts of material were stored there in various levels of condition and we felt that we needed to support them to carefully move that out, undertake this multimillion dollar restoration and accessibility project, knock off those modern additions to the building and go back to the true Ayers House, a place that could be accessed by all to tell South Australia's story.

Mr Peacock mounted a huge campaign: Save Ayers House. I am not sure what he wanted to save Ayers House from. My view was that Ayers House needed to be saved from him and his grotesque abrogation of leadership over an extended period of time. He bullied and harangued the board. I saw the way he treated the former president Deborah Morgan in meetings. He talked down to her, talked over her and mansplained to her. It was a terrible process and quite unbecoming.

He spread rumours that we were going to create a situation where the History Trust would have their offices in there. It was certainly going to have office accommodation in the upstairs rooms, and he made out that this was a terrible thing to happen, notwithstanding that for many years the National Trust had their offices in those rooms as well, albeit under very poor, inaccessible and inappropriate conditions for staff.

We wanted to restore those rooms sensitively and make sure they were fit for purpose. We are talking about old bedrooms or sections of the building completely inaccessible now. Mr Peacock—Dr Peacock, I should say, as he would want me to use his correct title—said we were going to fill it with IKEA furniture. Nothing could be further from the truth. We were going to create a situation where this building was going to be beautifully restored. It was going to be a centrepiece for the storytelling for multiple history-related organisations now and into the future.

Dr Peacock spread a sewer of lies and misinformation for an extended period of time against myself, against the Liberal Party, and that was locked onto by the Labor Party. Now, that is their political prerogative and they have moved ahead with the Ayers House Bill. It will be interesting in the committee stage to understand whether aspects of that bill are legally sound. I suspect this bill will be challenged in the courts in the coming years and the government will be caught up in all sorts of litigation, because there are aspects around competitive neutrality in this bill which are absolutely not thoroughly tested. I am absolutely not convinced that the competitive neutrality argument around the business that operates on the western side of Ayers House will be protected appropriately with regard to potential commercial ventures held in the building by the National Trust going forward.

It is also true to say that I have some significant concerns about how the National Trust is going to afford to pay for the ongoing upkeep and maintenance of this building going forward. The Department for Environment and Water injects hundreds of thousands of dollars into this building to ensure that it is waterproof, that it remains with a level of integrity in terms of dangers associated with catching fire and basic maintenance that ensures that building is safe for visitors.

So the National Trust and the members of the National Trust need to be aware that this bill will see that organisation liable for tens of thousands of dollars at a minimum, if not hundreds of thousands of dollars, per annum in terms of ongoing maintenance costs that they do not have carriage of at the moment. They have to go into this deal with their eyes wide open. I am happy to see this property pass into the ownership of the National Trust for all intents and purposes as the bill seems to suggest. But the National Trust has to understand that the level of financial burden and

liability that could be shifted to them is going to be substantial and to the detriment of many other buildings in terms of their statewide property holdings.

The spirit of the bill put forward by the government is supported in a general sense but I do hope that the National Trust and its board, and the members of that board, have a really good grasp of what is coming with this bill, because the liability and the financial impost is significant. I hope they have been able to secure an ongoing grant from the Labor government of around \$100,000 to \$200,000 per annum to ensure that they are equipped to look after this property. It is a jewel in the crown of heritage in South Australia, but to remain a jewel in the crown—and it had drifted in recent years—it needs constant investment.

I do worry that this bill and the transfer of all obligations to the National Trust could leave this building, this beautiful building, this critical heritage asset within our state, fundamentally vulnerable to slipping into genteel decline. That is my worry here and I hope the National Trust have dotted their i's and crossed their t's and I hope they are up for the challenge that faces them with regard to the management of this building.

Of course, the passage of time with the change of government has meant that the pause button was hit with the restoration of the building. That means the costs have gone up, so far less in terms of the overall restoration of the building will ever be achieved now. We have a situation now where much less restoration activity can occur, so that is a lesser outcome for telling the story of South Australia, for telling the story of Ayers House and looking after Ayers House into the future.

This is concerning as well. The accessibility side of things: will the lift go in? Will the instruments of accessibility such as ramps and accessible bathrooms, which were planned as part of the restoration of the back of the building and not impacting the heritage values of the building, still go ahead?

I do not know if that is the case. I hope so, but again I hope we are not seeing this building shut off, excluding hundreds if not thousands of potential visitors a year who do not have the physical capacity to enter the building.

Again, I hope the National Trust have been able to negotiate a multimillion dollar upgrade. We know there are several million dollars sitting there to do work there. It was \$7 million, but the value of works planned now sit at around about \$10 million, given the two years that have elapsed since the work was planned and the inflationary environment that we are in now. All these things lead to a diminished outcome for Ayers House and a diminished outcome for the members of the National Trust. Members of the National Trust should be respectfully asking the Board of the National Trust whether they have done their due diligence around this.

It is one thing to 'save' Ayers House and bring it back under the ownership of the National Trust. Again, I do not have a great deal of concern about that, but does it come with an annual maintenance grant of a couple of hundred thousand dollars to look after it, and does it come with an envelope of money, sitting at around about \$10 million, to do those works that the Liberal government were going to do? If it does not come with that annual maintenance grant and if it does not come with an envelope of money worth around about \$10 million, this building will slip into genteel decline, and the National Trust will nurse it as it decays. That is my worry.

The National Trust manage many buildings around the state. They have a significant asset load. They look after such a cross-section of buildings, from lighthouses to environmental reserves—so not just buildings—and to buildings in country towns. They have great holdings in Burra and Port Pirie. In the South-East, in particular, they have buildings scattered around the CBD and further afield. I just hope that they have the capacity, without selling-off buildings, to look after Ayers House.

Again, I emphasise that I support the sentiment and the spirit of the government's bill, but I do have concerns that the National Trust's internal capacity and cash reserves may not be able to manage this project, going forward, without that ongoing financial commitment from the government. Hopefully, we can find out about that financial commitment during the committee stage in the coming weeks and we can dig into how much money is being provided, both in terms of capital grant and then the ongoing maintenance and upkeep grant. Clearly, this speech will put the government on notice, in an appropriate way, that those questions will be asked as part of the committee stage.

I think Ayers House is a magnificent building. It is a building that deserves to be respected; it is a building that deserves to be restored; it is a building filled with stories that ought to be told for generations to come. I hope that, in the desire to get a quick political in here, we are not seeing the abrogation of responsibility around the stewardship of this building. These old buildings need stewardship: they need love, they need TLC. Ayers House will need more and more into the future as it ages, and moving it, for all intents and purposes, as the legislation says, from the government to the National Trust, will see the National Trust having to come up with significant finance, on an ongoing basis, to look after this building.

I wish them all the best with it. I hope the directors of the National Trust have undertaken their duties. I hope they are not being duped by the government; I think they are smarter than that. I wish them all the best, and here is to a bright future for one of South Australia's great buildings.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

ASSISTED REPRODUCTIVE TREATMENT (POSTHUMOUS USE OF MATERIAL AND DONOR CONCEPTION REGISTER) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 August 2023.)

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (16:34): I rise to speak to the Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Posthumous Use of Material and Donor Conception Register) Amendment Bill 2023, and what a pleasure it is to speak on a crucial piece of legislation that holds the power to change lives in profound ways. Imagine for a moment being unable to fully understand your own genetic make-up, to lack crucial information about your biological heritage. This is the reality for countless individuals born through donor conception. Denied access to their donor information, some are left grappling with unanswered questions about their identity, their medical history or their cultural roots.

Granting donor-conceived individuals the right to access their donor information is a matter of fundamental human rights. Every individual has the inherent right to know their origins, to piece together the puzzle of their identity and to have access to vital information that could impact their health and wellbeing should they so choose.

In 2017, Professor Sonia Allan led the state government's review of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act. In this review, Professor Allan included recommendations that South Australia establish a donor conception register and provide for donor-conceived people aged 18 and over the right to access information about their donors. Subsequently, a donor conception register was established in 2021, and I congratulate the Hon. Connie Bonaros from the other place for her excellent work in making that happen.

Today, the register holds information on donors, recipient parents and persons born as a result of donated material. This bill seeks to enhance the operation of that register by allowing donor-conception participants access to certain types of information and overturning the historical preservation of anonymity of donors. Importantly, this bill also seeks to expand the existing legislative scope to allow for the legal posthumous use of ovum or embryo, as is currently permitted with sperm.

Regarding donor conception data, this bill will enable the retrospective function of South Australia's donor conception register and enable safe and supported access to the information it contains. Put simply, these sensible amendments will allow interested donor-conceived people to access information about their donor no matter when they were born. In doing so, South Australia will not only join jurisdictions including Victoria, New South Wales and Western Australia that all have donor conception registers available to donor-conceived people, but South Australia will also follow Victoria in legislating the retrospective disclosure of a donor's identifying information for donors prior to 2004.

The Malinauskas government has given careful consideration to this bill and sought expert advice from stakeholders across the country, some of whom are joining us in the gallery today, including people from the donor conception community. I am grateful to have had the opportunity to speak directly with one of the stakeholders. Damian Adams is in the gallery today and lives in my

neighbourhood. He is a donor-conceived person, a researcher at Flinders, and has also completed a PhD on the welfare outcomes of donor-conceived people, so I could not have asked for a more qualified person to explain to me the real impact of this bill.

For more than 30 years, Damian searched for the identity of his father and was continuously denied that information. It was not until 2019 that Damian found his father using a DNA search. He says learning the identity of his father was a life-changing moment. He has since travelled to Queensland on five separate occasions to visit him and his new extended family.

Damian has been advocating to government on this matter for a long time. In fact, this week I found 2009 *Hansard* records from when the former member for Fisher (now Davenport), the late Bob Such, spoke on an earlier version of the legislation where he, too, shared the story of Damian. I am so pleased that, in the 15 years that have passed since then, Damian has learned the identity of his father and that he is still working with the donor community to make the process easier for others. So thank you to you and the other stakeholders for your involvement in this bill. Every individual has the right to embrace their own story.

Stakeholders and subject experts like Damien supported not just the development of the bill itself but also helped inform the proposed model as well. As a result, we find ourselves presented with workable, ethical and respectful amendments to what is understandably sensitive legislation. The increased availability of direct-to-consumer DNA tests and services like Ancestry have also contributed to donor-conceived people being able to find out the identity of their donor and, conversely, donors also finding their own children. However, this approach does not provide the systems, the support and assurances that would be present under the proposed regulatory systems for South Australia.

With this legislation comes the controlled release of information already circulating in the public domain in a much more sensitive way. In recognising the impacts that may be felt by pre-September 2004 donors, who were once guaranteed lifelong anonymity, the state government will provide counselling and other support services to historic donors who might need it.

While there are inherent sensitivities associated with this change, it is important to note that this amendment is not without precedent, with similar decisions having been taken and enacted in other jurisdictions. I also note there will be no requirement for historical donors to have contact with their donor-conceived offspring.

It is important for people to have access to information about their genetic heritage. It not only plays a significant role in the development of a person's identity and self-esteem but also enables them to access important medical and genetic information for things like family planning.

Turning now to the posthumous use of human reproductive material, currently sperm can be accessed posthumously for reproductive purposes; however, an ovum or embryo is considered off-limits. What is that about? This bill seeks to rectify this, meaning that people whose female partners have sadly passed away will be afforded reproductive opportunities that may once have passed them by. This amendment would bring South Australia in line with Victoria and New South Wales.

As is the case with proposed changes to the donor conception register, full and careful consideration has been given to this amendment. Strict conditions will apply to the posthumous use of human reproductive material, including requirements for the deceased person to provide a consent prior to their passing and that their partner, seeking use of reproductive material, had been living in a genuine domestic relationship with the deceased person before their death.

It is my view that this bill strikes a reasonable balance between the protection of a donor's welfare and a donor-conceived person's access to important genetic and medical information. This is a thorough and reasonable change coming at the right time. I commend this bill to the house.

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (16:42): I rise to speak on the Assisted Reproductive Treatment (Posthumous Use of Material and Donor Conception Register) Amendment Bill 2023. In doing so, I indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition.

Can I say from the outset that the opposition, those on this side of the house, are supportive of the bill—albeit I do flag one amendment that I will outline later on. I also acknowledge Damian

Adams, who is in the gallery today. It was fantastic to have the opportunity to meet with him towards the end of last year and, like the member for Davenport, just hear his journey to finding out the missing piece of his genetic puzzle. It was very touching for everyone who was able to speak with him.

I would like to acknowledge the long legislative journey that the donor conception register, and indeed assisted reproductive treatment and technology more broadly, has been on to really get to the bill that is before us today. There are so many individuals, there are many groups and organisations, even members of the other place, including the Hon. Connie Bonaros, who have worked for such a long period of time for this type of framework and for this bill to come to fruition.

Those people have been on long journeys themselves and, although it may go without saying, for many people this legislation involves deeply personal, complex, expensive and emotional processes. I know the member for Davenport has reflected on this, and in my research I, too, was interested to know that it is estimated one in six couples in Australia experience some measure of infertility. I think all of us in this place know someone who has had those struggles, and it is deeply troubling.

Assisted Reproductive Treatment or ART, as I might refer to it for the purposes of this bill, does have an important role to play in allowing people to grow their families, to build their families and, ultimately, to reduce the heartache that is so often associated with infertility.

Once considered an innovative and cutting-edge treatment, many aspects of ART are now considered as standard medical practice, with one in 20 women who gave birth in Australia in 2020 using some form of ART to do so. The South Australian ART Act has, as its paramount consideration, the rights of any child who may be born as a result of this type of treatment and technology. The paramountcy of the child's welfare is reflected in the guiding principles of the National Health and Medical Research Council's ethical guidelines on the use of reproductive technology in clinical practice and research.

As we discuss the bill before this house in all its different complexities, I would like to reflect on the wellbeing of a child born as a result of ART in its many forms and note that whilst there is a balance to be struck in some elements of the bill, the opposition believes that at all times consideration must be given to the end result, the ultimate aim of this technology, that is, of course, the safety and welfare of the resulting children and the formation of families.

When this bill was first brought to the house last year, I did some research and South Australia, in particular the University of Adelaide, has a very long and proud history of innovation and pioneering research into fertility, conception and reproductive technology. In fact, in 1971, the University of Adelaide developed the first frozen semen bank in Australia and with it the first sperm donor program. In 1985, the University of Adelaide's Obstetrics and Gynaecology department achieved South Australia's first birth from frozen embryo.

Within the next decade, the Obstetrics and Gynaecology department would go on to achieve world-leading medical advancements in reproductive technology, successfully achieving the world's third birth following intracytoplasmic sperm injection, and the fifth in the world to achieve the preimplantation genetic diagnosis in relation to cystic fibrosis.

Much of this world-renowned research was a result of pioneering medical professionals, the likes of Professor Colin Matthews AO, Professor Alastair MacLennan AO and Professor Jeffrey Robinson CBE. Really, those advances in the late 1970s through to the early 2000s made much of the technological advances that we are discussing today possible.

During the work of the University of Adelaide, sperm donors provided their reproductive material for research purposes and many ultimately up until 2004 on the condition of anonymity. In fact, donors had no other option at that stage but to donate on the assumption of anonymity and doing so anonymously.

As we know now, the anonymous donation of gametes, that is both sperm and eggs, is no longer allowed in Australia. While donations are frequently provided on a de-identified basis, all donors are required to make their identity available to children conceived from their donation when the child turns 18 years of age. Of course, there are also instances of known donation, where the

donor has a connection to the recipient and the children born as a result of the donation may be informed at an early age of their genetic heritage.

Now, having reflected on that really important history, I might get to the four main aspects of the bill. Of course, as has been outlined, there are four. First of all, it updates the legislation to bring the use of female gametes or ovum and embryos in line with what is already provided for the posthumous use of sperm and specifies how that can occur.

Secondly, it changes the operation of the donor conception register to allow for the sharing of information about donors in certain circumstances and ensures assisted reproductive technology and treatment clinics maintain suitable records and provide information to the register. Thirdly, it amends the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act to allow for donor information on the birth certificate of donor-conceived children. Fourthly, it removes the historical anonymity of donors who provided human reproductive material prior to 2004.

I will speak firstly to the posthumous use of material. Like the member for Davenport, I was shocked to note that for many years you could use sperm posthumously, but it has not been possible to use eggs after death. This bill seeks to amend the ART Act to bring the use of female gametes and embryos in line with what is currently permitted for the posthumous use of sperm—big tick. I think it is fitting that we seek to make relevant amendments through this process to clarify women's intentions and those of her surviving domestic partner for the use of her genetic material, and that does build on recent-ish legislative changes in relation to surrogacy in South Australia.

It is hoped that assisted reproductive treatment providers will reflect these amendments in their processes, policies and counselling, to make clear to couples and individuals who are undergoing assisted reproductive treatment that they can specify their intentions for the use of their human reproductive material after death. That is something that we will go through in the committee stage, but we would be very interested to note at what point in that process people are given the option of being able to use their ova posthumously.

Secondly, in relation to the operation of the donor conception register, it is our assumption—and we will clarify this, once again, during committee—that a suitable framework to host the register will be in place and there will be tight controls for accessing and, of course, safeguarding the information contained within it, because the register will obviously hold quite a significant amount of confidential and personal information, and securing the register and preventing misuse of that information is obviously critical. During the course of the last few months, there has been an element of concern about the safety and the security of the information on the donor conception register.

In a practical sense, we know that in recent years many donor-conceived people are turning to online genealogy websites such as ancestry.com, taking DNA tests and joining support groups to help find and ultimately connect with their donors and their families. They are essentially connecting the dots, which is something that Dr Adams did so many years ago.

The purpose of the donor conception register is to safely manage the release of donor information to children conceived as a result of their donation. Donor-conceived children will be required to apply to the register for access to identifying and medical information about their donor, and it is only once an application is made that the process of releasing information to the donor child—and only to the donor child—can begin.

The assumption of the donor conception register—and I say 'assumption' because there are a lot of practical details that are yet to be determined through regulation and the like—is that applicants will be provided with counselling and support services prior to receiving information about their donor. Donors will have three months to select their preferred mode of contact, and may even advise that they do not wish to be contacted at all. Regardless of the contact preference set, all information will be released, including the information of donors who donated under the assumption of anonymity pre-2004.

The third point is in relation to birth certificates. Noting a child's donor-conceived status on their birth certificate will go some way towards recognising the critical role that a donor plays in a child's conception, while also allowing situations of known donation to have the donor's detail on a

birth certificate from birth. There have been some discussions around the automatic nature of this notation, which has raised some concerns; nevertheless, we do support that element of the bill.

We understand that close to 80 per cent of donor-conceived children are not aware of their conception status. Of course, to be able to access the donor conception register, children will need to be aware that they are donor-conceived—which we know is not currently happening in the volume that we would hope, nor has it happened historically.

Reflecting the nature of a child's conception—that is, a donor's involvement—on a child's birth certificate from birth will, we believe, go some way towards ensuring that the circumstances surrounding a child's conception are made clear to the child early on in life: again, breaking down some of that stigma and giving them further ownership, if you like, of their identity. We look forward to asking questions during committee on the practical implementation of this change, and how it is anticipated that Births, Deaths and Marriages will interact with individuals and assisted reproductive providers to verify accurate information.

That brings me to the fourth point of the bill, and that is in relation to pre-2004 donors. As I have already flagged, pre-2004, if you were donating your sperm, you did so on the basis of anonymity. On this side of the house, we do have concerns about the release of information of donors who provided their reproductive material prior to 2004 and now, under the bill, will have that anonymity retrospectively lifted—that is, those people who never gave consent for their identifying or medical information to be released because they donated on the condition of anonymity.

This bill proposes to remove that anonymity, and it has raised concerns on this side of the house. As I mentioned earlier, we must strike the right balance between the rights of the child conceived as a result of ART and protecting those donors who will now automatically lose that anonymity.

I would like to make it clear that we have no concerns whatsoever about the release of medical information to donor-conceived children for pre-2004 donors—absolutely none at all. In fact, we do believe that that is the critical element that can impact their lives. It impacts their family planning, the health and wellbeing of donor-conceived children, their subsequent children and so on and so forth. We do believe that withholding that type of information does go fundamentally against the purpose of this bill and this reform.

However, the release of identifying information about a donor who provided human reproductive material at the very earliest almost 20 years ago is concerning in some regard. I therefore indicate that we will be moving an amendment in relation to clause 5 of the bill, and that will reinstate some of the protection of anonymity that would have been historically provided, effectively providing an element of choice. That is, those donors who provided human reproductive material for the purposes of ART on the basis that their identity would not be disclosed without their consent will have a choice to notify the minister in writing that they do not wish for their identifying information to be released.

We do hope that this is not an issue for the vast majority of donors pre-2004, but we believe that this amendment does strike the right balance. It will allow choice. By identifying information, we mean name, date of birth, last known address and any donor code—all items which the Victorian donor conception register has identified as identifying information.

As I have stated, all of the medical information will be provided. That is not something that will become an option for donors pre-2004, but we do believe that this amendment simply ensures the option of choice, and anonymity is maintained. To be clear, this amendment does not relate to any person who donated after 2004, because of course after that point you could not donate on the assumption of anonymity.

Finally, I would like to thank Dr Damian Adams from Donor Conceived Australia. I think he provided a real insight into the struggles that he had, and I think that is largely reflective of the concerns that many people in the donor-conceived community have, because they have this missing piece of their genetic puzzle and ultimately their identity. I hope that, as a result of the passing of this bill, there will be more stories like this, that more people can get that missing piece of their genetic puzzle without such struggle. We just need to get the balance right.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

ELECTORAL (CONTROL OF CORFLUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 2, page 2, after line 12 [clause 2(1), after inserted subsection (2a)]—Insert:

- (2b) Subsection (2a) does not apply to the exhibition of—
- (a) an electoral advertising poster by a person holding the electoral advertising poster (either directly in their hands or by holding an implement or device to which the poster is attached); or
 - (b) an electoral advertising poster that—
 - (i) is not attached to a building, hoarding or other structure or fixture on a public road or road related area; and
 - (ii) is exhibited at, or in the vicinity of, a place at which a designated event or activity is being held; and
 - (iii) is exhibited immediately before, during or immediately after the designated event or activity, provided that the electoral advertising poster is not exhibited at, or in the vicinity of, the place for more than 6 hours; or
 - (c) an electoral advertising poster—
 - (i) of a kind prescribed by regulation; or
 - (ii) in circumstances prescribed by regulation.

No. 2. Clause 2, page 2, after line 16 [clause 2(3), inserted subsection (4), before the definition of *electoral advertising poster*]
—Insert:

designated event or activity means—

- (a) an assembly within the meaning of the *Public Assemblies Act 1972*; or
- (b) an organised gathering, meeting, function or event relating to an election; or
- (c) a person canvassing for votes relating to an election; or
- (d) any other gathering, meeting, function or event, or class of gathering, meeting, function or event, prescribed by the regulations;

No. 3. Clause 2, page 2, lines 17 to 22 [clause 2(3), inserted subsection (4), definition of *electoral advertising poster*]
—Delete the definition of *electoral advertising poster* and substitute:

electoral advertising poster means a poster, notice or sign displaying an electoral advertisement;

No. 4. Clause 3, page 3, line 5 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)]—Delete 'Without limiting subsection (1)(e) but' and substitute:

Notwithstanding any other provision in this Act, but without limiting subsection (1)(e) and

No. 5. Clause 3, page 3, line 13 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(a)(i)]—Delete 'on behalf' and substitute 'with the consent'

No. 6. Clause 3, page 3, line 15 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(a)(ii)]—Delete '6' and substitute '12'

No. 7. Clause 3, page 3, line 16 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(a)(ii)]—Delete 'on behalf' and substitute 'with the consent'

No. 8. Clause 3, page 3, lines 21 to 23 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)(i)]—Delete inserted subparagraph (i) and substitute:

- (i) it is exhibited—
 - (A) in the case of a group of candidates—by a member of the group or with the consent of the member of the group whose name on the ballot paper is at the top of the group; or

(B) in the case of any other candidate—by or with the consent of the candidate; and

No. 9. Clause 3, page 3, line 26 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)(ii)(A)]—Delete '6' and substitute '12'

No. 10. Clause 3, page 3, line 27 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)(ii)(A)]—Delete 'by or on behalf of the group' and substitute:

by a member of the group or with the consent of the member of the group whose name on the ballot paper is at the top of the group

No. 11. Clause 3, page 3, line 31 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)(ii)(B)]—Delete '6' and substitute '12'

No. 12. Clause 3, page 3, line 32 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)(ii)(B)]—Delete 'on behalf' and substitute 'with the consent'

No. 13. Clause 3, page 3, lines 37 and 38 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1c)]—Delete 'is exhibited by or on behalf of a candidate in contravention of' and substitute:

exhibited by or with the consent of a candidate contravenes

No. 14. Clause 3, page 4, lines 1 and 2 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1d)]—Delete 'is exhibited by or on behalf of a group in contravention of subsection (1a) or (1b), the candidate' and substitute:

exhibited by a member of a group or with the consent of the member of the group whose name on the ballot paper is at the top of the group contravenes subsection (1a) or (1b), the member

No. 15. Clause 3, page 4, lines 6 to 10 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1e)]—Delete inserted subsection (1e) and substitute:

(1e) If an electoral advertising poster is exhibited within 50 metres of an entrance to a polling booth open for polling without the consent of a candidate or group required under subsection (1a), the person who authorised the exhibition of the poster is guilty of an offence.

Maximum penalty: \$5,000.

No. 16. Clause 3, page 4, after line 10 [clause 3(1), after inserted subsection (1e)]—Insert:

(1ea) Despite subsections (1c) to (1e), if the Electoral Commissioner is satisfied that a person has contravened subsection (1c), (1d) or (1e), the Electoral Commissioner may give the person a written formal caution against further such contraventions.

(1eb) Subject to subsection (1ec), if the Electoral Commissioner gives a person a written formal caution under subsection (1ea), no further proceedings may be taken against the person for the contravention in relation to which the person was cautioned.

Note—

The presiding officer at a polling booth may (under subsection (1f)) direct or cause the removal of an electoral advertising poster exhibited in contravention of this section (whether a written formal caution is given in relation to the contravention or otherwise).

(1ec) If, in relation to an electoral advertising poster exhibited in contravention of subsection (1c), (1d) or (1e)—

(a) a person given a direction by a presiding officer under subsection (1f) to remove the poster fails to comply with a direction; and

(b) the person is also given a written formal caution under subsection (1ea) in respect of the contravention; and

(c) the failure to comply with the direction continues after the person is given the written formal caution,

nothing prevents criminal or civil proceedings from being taken against the person in relation to the contravention.

No. 17. Clause 3, page 4, line 17 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1f)(b)]—Delete 'on behalf' and substitute 'with the consent'

No. 18. Clause 3, page 4, line 22 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1f)(c)]—Delete 'on behalf' and substitute 'with the consent'

No. 19. Schedule 1, page 5, line 11 [Schedule 1 clause 1(2), inserted paragraph (caa)]—After '(or is a poster' insert 'within the ambit of section 115(2b) of that Act or'

No. 20. Schedule 1, page 5, after line 13 [Schedule 1 clause 1]—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) Section 226(5)—delete 'this section' and substitute:
subsection (2a)

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

It is good to see the Electoral (Control of Corflutes) Amendment Bill 2023 come back to the house. I am happy to make a few comments in regard to the 20 amendments as a whole, having moved that they be accepted by the House of Assembly.

The amendments that have come back are, in my view, acceptable to the overall sentiment or spirit of the legislation that I was aiming to achieve. It will be interesting to see if we get feedback from the Electoral Commissioner in due course as to the workability of some of these. They might increase the threshold a little bit as to the workability or the administration of the act going forward, but it is fair to say that we have achieved a very significant win here today in regard to the banning of corflute posters on public infrastructure in particular across South Australia.

I surveyed my electorate in 2021 in regard to their views on corflute posters and in the last 24 hours I have had the opportunity to dig out that survey. There were several hundred submissions and 86 per cent of those that were returned to my office opposed having corflutes on public infrastructure. They did so for a range of reasons, from visual amenity through to the fact that they were single-use plastic, a waste of resources and energy, and in some cases ended up as pollution, either in landfill or in even less desirable places like our creeks and parks and beaches.

The community has really spoken over an extended period of time. Public polling undertaken by media outlets, as recently as yesterday by *The Advertiser*, showed very clearly that the community was well and truly over these corflute posters. As the member for West Torrens said yesterday, the time has come for this legislation and the time has come to end the use of corflute posters in South Australia on public infrastructure.

As I said yesterday, of course these will continue to be present where people want on private infrastructure and there are amendments that allow them to appear at political events and the like, which gives people, individuals and political parties, the opportunity to express particular views, but again not in a way that would see them plastered on Stobie poles and lampposts and other pieces of public infrastructure up and down streets and highways the length and breadth of the state of South Australia.

Today, I had the opportunity to speak on ABC Sydney to talk about this legislation. It has had some national interest associated with it, even though in most other states the situation in regard to the display of these posters is already significantly restricted. There is clearly, in some jurisdictions, a desire to see what we are doing here and to see if we are going to go a bit further than what they allow there.

It has been a fairly rapid process as far as the final conclusion of this piece of legislation goes, but it is good to see the houses and political parties working together and I look forward to seeing far fewer corflute posters spread around this state in future elections. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There are amendments from the upper house. We concur with the changes made by the Legislative Council. The leader is right: this is a measure whose time has come. I have been fascinated by the outpouring of grief from some on the loss of corflutes. I have to say that my office has been inundated for copies of the fat Kouts corflute that was available from 1997 to 2002 in a limited edition run. I have 500 of them left and I understand that they are now hot property, which I may or may not be selling for a fee.

I do congratulate the Leader of the Opposition. Change comes incrementally in politics. This has been an incremental movement that has been gathering pace. As I said in my remarks in the

house yesterday, I do not believe that there is an ulterior motive here. I just think that people are reaching a point where they think that corflutes do not serve the purpose we think they do.

People are sophisticated. They get their news from a diverse range of methods and platforms and there will be no lack of evidence that there is an election on in Dunstan. There will be no lack of evidence that there is a fixed date in 2026 for an election. These posters have now become visual pollution and there are environmental benefits of reducing the single-use corflute, which is pretty unique to South Australia.

What we do here every election campaign is not replicated around the country. It is not done in Western Australia. It is not really done in Victoria. It is not done in almost any other jurisdiction in the world. People put things on their front lawns, as they do in the United States, or they put things on their front fences. Loyal Liberal members will put some signs on their front fences. Loyal Labor members will put their signs on their front fences. Independents and the like will do theirs. But I think the idea of putting them on Stobie poles has really gone too far.

It is also dangerous. I am surprised that no-one has been killed putting up election signs. We have a lot of young volunteers who are in a rush in the middle of the night at the time the writs are issued to go out and put up signs. They have ladders on the side of the road.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs: It's crazy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is. Of course, they are climbing Stobie poles that are carrying high volts and lots of amps across our city. It is dangerous and we should not allow it, so I think this is a good improvement for the people of South Australia. It will be interesting to see how it works in the seat of Dunstan, but I think the people of Dunstan are sophisticated enough to make up their own minds without needing a piece of plastic to tell them who to vote for. With those few remarks, I commend the amendments to the house. I look forward to the bill's speedy passage.

Motion carried.

SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 November 2023.)

Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:08): Many of us in this chamber would know of someone who has had a car that has caused them headaches. My husband's first car was certainly one of them and it had such a great impact that I am still hearing about it. He saved up all he could for his first car, a lovely red 1976 HJ Holden ute. It was a magnificent car. More importantly, it was also what he needed to be able to get to and from his work. Coming from a country town, we only had one bus route growing up and being a shiftworker meant that it did not always suffice as transportation for work. He needed that car. It absolutely was a necessity.

Unfortunately, it was riddled with issues. The gearbox was shot. I often hear stories about how he would need to crawl under the car to kick it back into place. It would overheat in the summer and at one point the engine mounts broke, leading the engine to drop out of the car while he was at work. By that point he had decided he had to get another car and was fortunate to have enough money to be able to get something a little more trustworthy. He was fortunate that he was able to do that because not everybody can.

After your home, your car can be one of the biggest investments you make, an investment for so many that is a necessity. It certainly was for me. I lived 15 kilometres out of town, I needed my first car to be able to get to and from school, to sporting events and to community commitments. Without it, I would not have been able to contribute fully within my community or access all that was available to me at the time. So to make such a big investment only to find out you have been ripped off through deliberate dodgy acts is unacceptable and for that reason I stand in support of the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2023.

I support the bill because it will help reduce red tape for second-hand dealers, it will help streamline purchases and, most importantly, it will strengthen protections for consumers. We are a

state that likes to drive and there are more than a million licensed drivers across South Australia who will likely purchase a vehicle multiple times throughout the various stages of their life, all the way from their first car to the car that they will purchase upon retirement.

The reality is many consumers would prefer to purchase a second-hand vehicle and that is for a few different reasons. Traditionally, second-hand vehicles save consumers money due to the depreciation of value once it hits the road, albeit we are in an interesting time regarding that, which is pertinent to my second point that the demand for cars has increased in recent years and new manufacturers have not been able to build enough new vehicles to keep up with that demand. That is leading some consumers who would like a new car to pay above the odds, to skip lengthy waitlists by buying a near-new one often with low kilometres, which is why ensuring there is no tampering with odometers is so important. For both of these reasons we are seeing an increase in the amount of second-hand cars purchased and we want to ensure that we have the adequate protections in place.

We know that many consumers prefer to purchase a second-hand vehicle from a licensed dealer rather than through private sale because of the protections that are afforded to them under those circumstances. We have an act to oversee the licensing of motor vehicle dealers to ensure that we have an informed and reputable industry, as well as strong consumer protections. We recognise that despite minor amendments over the years, the act and the Second-hand Vehicle Dealers Regulations have not been comprehensively reviewed since 2009 and a lot has certainly happened in that time period in this area.

Since this time, the Australian Consumer Law has been introduced and there have been changes to technology that have impacted vehicle standards, the way that dealers operate their businesses and the expectations of consumers. As I mentioned earlier, there is a developing trend within the sector. We need to be ensuring that we are keeping up. By improving parts of the act relating to the duty to repair vehicles, cooling-off periods, disclosing disclosure of information about previous vehicle owners, electric and hybrid vehicles, contracts of sale, and penalties for non-compliance by dealers, we are able to modernise the legislation in place to protect consumers.

Firstly, this bill seeks to increase maximum penalties for unlicensed dealing and tampering with vehicle odometers. Recent prosecutions for odometer tampering have resulted in fines far less than the maximum amount and existing fines are often just a small proportion of the profit that is made from tampering with an odometer. It is why we are seeking to increase the fine for odometer tampering from \$10,000 to \$150,000 or imprisonment of two years, making South Australia the jurisdiction with the toughest penalties in Australia for this form of behaviour.

Changes to the act will also allow purchasers to apply to the court for compensation from a private seller where the private seller has been convicted of odometer tampering. Previously, purchasers could only seek compensation from dealers for any disadvantage they had suffered after buying a vehicle with a tampered odometer.

In regard to unlicensed dealing offences, the penalty for a first or second offence will increase from \$100,000 to \$150,000. The penalty for third and subsequent offences will increase from \$100,000 or 12 months' imprisonment to \$250,000 or two years' imprisonment. The maximum penalty for body corporates that engage in unlicensed dealing will also increase from \$250,000 to \$500,000. Increasing these penalties will act as a deterrent for those who seek to profit from unsuspecting purchasers and better protect the community and licensed dealers from the adverse impacts of these activities.

Additionally, a new offence will be created for false and misleading statements in relation to odometers. Furthermore, the Commissioner for Consumer Affairs will be able to direct a person to rectify an odometer that has been altered and stop a person from selling or disposing of a vehicle with a tampered odometer. This will ensure that history does not repeat over the lifetime of the vehicle.

These decisions will be reviewable with the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal, and a failure to comply with a direction will attract a maximum fine of \$20,000. The commissioner will also have the option of paying to rectify an odometer where these costs are not recoverable by other means, such as compensation following a prosecution. We do this because we

believe in doing what we can to support road safety, and we anticipate that these new enforcement powers will help reduce the risk of unsafe vehicles being driven on South Australian roads.

These changes will allow second-hand vehicle dealers to disclose defects that will not be subject to the duty to repair, provided that the vehicle remains roadworthy. Under current provisions in the act, dealers have a duty to repair a defect that arises during or after the sale of the vehicle. There are a number of exemptions to this requirement, including vehicles that are over 15 years old or that have been driven more than 200,000 kilometres before the sale.

We are also providing greater protections to consumers by removing the current provisions that allow someone purchasing a vehicle to waive their general right to have a vehicle repaired by the dealer under the duty to repair obligations. It encourages transparency and assists consumers to make informed decisions upon making purchases, as dealers will be required to provide clear, written notice to the consumer identifying a defect, and the consumer will need to acknowledge the receipt of this information. I understand that this reflects arrangements in the majority of jurisdictions and is consistent with the duty to repair under the Australian Consumer Law.

We also intend to accommodate new vehicle technologies, with the bill expanding the duty to repair to cover the main battery for hybrid and electric vehicles, with a statutory warranty period specified in the act. This change will support continued interest by South Australians in electric and hybrid vehicles, and it will ensure that access to repair rights is consistent for owners of second-hand vehicles. We have also taken steps to ensure there is a transitional provision included in the amendment bill to cover hybrid and electric vehicle batteries in vehicles purchased either prior to or following commencement. This provision will allow electric and hybrid vehicles that are still under the statutory warranty period to receive the new protections that we are proposing.

It is important to note that the legislation we are proposing today has been subject to consultation with key industry groups, including the Motor Trade Association and the Royal Automobile Association of South Australia, and they have provided strong support.

As I mentioned earlier, through this we have been able to make changes that help to reduce red tape and to streamline purchases. To further aid consumers in making informed decisions, this legislation also makes small changes to the Second-hand Vehicles Compensation Fund. Currently, dealers provide financial contributions to this fund, and it is primarily used to compensate consumers where there is no reasonable way of recovering the money they are owed by a dealer. This bill broadens the use of the fund to include programs relating to education, research or reforms that benefit dealers, salespersons or members of the public.

In regard to red tape, we are making changes to the cooling-off period when buying a vehicle. Currently, consumers have two clear business days to consider the purchase of a second-hand vehicle from a dealer. A consumer may cancel the sales contract by written notification before the end of a cooling-off period, unless they have chosen to waive this right. To waive the right to a two-day cooling-off period, a separate form needs to be signed by the purchaser and a person independent of the sale. This requirement does impose an additional burden on consumers to be able to obtain a witness who will sign the form on what could be considered a tight time line, especially when we take into consideration how busy our lives currently are with work, with school, with caring responsibilities, and so on.

Amendments to the act will now specify that a consumer does not require an independent witness to sign the form waiving the cooling-off period. In these circumstances, the cooling-off period will expire when the form is signed by the consumer.

Finally, we are making changes that will support the privacy of the consumers, which both dealers and consumers will benefit from. It is in regard to the disclosure requirements about previous owners of a vehicle. Currently, when a vehicle is being offered for sale, it must include a public notice with the name and address of the last owner. While this requirement does provide some transparency for purchasers, it does raise some privacy and safety concerns for previous owners and imposes an administrative burden on dealers. The bill does seek to remove that requirement to display the name and address of a previous owner on a notice, and it replaces it with a statement that the details of the last owner of the vehicle are available from the dealer on request.

This bill makes similar amendments in regard to the disclosure of where a vehicle has previously been used, such as a taxi or a hire car. Notices must currently display the name and address of the person from whom the vehicle was previously leased. However, this information can often be quite misleading for consumers as dealers may not have received accurate information from previous owners about the history of the vehicle. As such, the bill seeks to remove the requirement to disclose personal details and it replaces it with a statement that these details are available, again on request. Both these changes to disclosure requirements will also apply to vehicles that are sold at auction.

The legislation before us today seeks to improve transparency. It seeks to empower and support consumers to make informed decisions when purchasing a vehicle as we recognise how big an investment this is for so many. Buying a car is a big deal, and buying a lemon can be the difference between getting to work or not, getting to school or not, accessing essential services or not, and for those reasons I commend the bill to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:22): I rise also to indicate my support for this important amendment to the legislation. When rising to support it, I cannot help but reflect upon the electorate that I represent. This is a bit of a state issue in some ways. When you look at the vehicle fleet in South Australia, the mean age is greater than that in some of the other states like New South Wales. I am not sure if these are the latest figures, but the average or the mean age of the vehicle fleet in South Australia is over 11 years, so a lot of people are driving around in cars that are getting on. Clearly, the second-hand car market is a very important market for a lot of people in this state.

Indeed, before coming here, in the whole of my life I have only ever owned one brand new car. The logic of buying a new car and driving it off the block, where it immediately depreciates in value, was never sensible to me. That might be because I have some Scottish blood and a bit of a frugal take on the world, but to buy a vehicle that you are going to drive off the block and it is going to depreciate straight off does not make much financial sense to me.

Having said that, obviously over the recent year or two there are vehicles that you do buy new and they have appreciated in their value because of supply constraint issues around vehicles, all of which are now produced overseas—the availability of chips and a whole range of other factors. You would have bought a Prado a year or two ago and until recently you could potentially get more for that Prado selling it second-hand than you paid for it new. Hopefully, that situation is going to change.

For my electorate and for a lot of regional electorates, the issue is when you look at the socio-economic profile. I do not include all regional areas within this socio-economic profile; clearly, there are some areas and some people who do incredibly well in regional communities. I guess the classic one in my electorate would be Roxby Downs. Sometimes it is ahead of Burnside and sometimes it is behind Burnside when it comes to income levels generated—mind you, they have to work hard for that—and there are a lot of new cars, a lot of big cars, in Roxby Downs because, like a lot of Australians, we have a propensity to buy four-wheel drives. That does make a bit of sense out Roxby way.

However, a lot of people are not in the position to buy a new car. They have to buy a car either from a licensed dealer—and there are some protections there but clearly, as this bill illustrates, we can improve those protections, and it is good there is industry support for that—and then we have a lot of people who do private sales. In many instances, it has not been a great history there when it comes to people being looked after and protected.

For a lot of people, the purchase of a vehicle is one of those big purchases, and when you do not have much in the way of financial resources almost invariably you are going to get a second-hand car. I look at some parts of my electorate, like the APY lands—it is always interesting to go up to the APY lands—where there are a number of vehicles on the side of the roads, some of which have been turned into virtual artworks that have been reproduced in books and presented in a particular way.

However, you just wonder, when it comes to a whole range of those cars that were purchased either from businesses or private operators, how many people have been ripped off. Odometer

readings are one of those classic areas where you can grossly misrepresent what is going on with a vehicle—and it is getting harder and harder.

A lot of those vehicles used to be driven around in those areas, areas with incredibly poor roads, which also impacted on the life of the second-hand vehicle. It has already been adjusted with an odometer reading, and they are already getting an old car, and then that old car is being subjected to roads that at times you need a four-wheel drive to get around on. That has a real impact.

There are a lot of skills in the APY lands and elsewhere, and once upon a time you used to be able to fix up a car quite easily. If you had a bit of mechanical nous, you could get in there and do all sorts of repairs and keep your car running, but the growing sophistication of the car fleet has a range of consequences. It is not as easy—and it is often impossible, unless you have the IT equipment and a degree and all the rest of it—to fix a car.

Admittedly, those cars have all sorts of safety features, but the consequences of that are that it does add to the cost and if you do have a prang it is going to cost you a lot more to fix up the car. If you look at insurance premiums, their increases are partly a reflection of just how sophisticated cars are now. Once upon a time, you could replace a windscreen quite simply, you could replace all sorts of bits, but to do it now is very expensive, given all the locked-in sensors and all the processes that people have to go through. So there are already some real costs imposed on people, and that is getting more onerous—and it will get more onerous—over time. So we can do stuff hopefully to improve the quality of the cars people are getting.

When it comes to adjusting odometer readings, that is something that has happened over the years, I would like to say more with some of the privateers than the businesses, but it has clearly happened across the field. This amendment and the very significant increases in the penalties should be warmly welcomed by all of us. I have not heard the speeches apart from one, and that was very comprehensive so I do not want to repeat it, but I would assume that this bill has strong bipartisan support because we need to go in that direction.

It has clearly been shown that people who do the wrong thing are people who are dodgy, and the fines that have been imposed essentially are a slap on the wrist. You have a far greater chance of making more money through the sale of those cars than the fines you have had to date. It is welcome to see that very significant increase when it comes to fines.

The other element of this is ensuring. It is the same with a lot of legislative approaches: we can amend bills, we can improve them, we can increase penalties, but at the end of the day we also need to ensure that compliance will be there, that there will be sufficient scrutiny. This is an important piece of legislation, and it will over time lead to an improvement. To those of us who are regional members—and we know that probably on a per capita basis there are more second-hand cars in the regions—this will be very welcome. With those few remarks, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (IDENTITY THEFT) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Tuesday 20 February 2024 at 11:00.