

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 2 May 2024

The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) took the chair at 11:01.

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MODBURY HOSPITAL HEALTH PRECINCT

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

That the 61st report of the committee, entitled Modbury Hospital Health Precinct, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) proposes to establish a new health precinct at Modbury Hospital. This project reflects the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network's infrastructure master plan, which intends to construct additional inpatient capacity at Modbury Hospital and aligns with the government's commitment to create additional bed capacity across the public health system.

Modbury Hospital is part of the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network, which is one of the largest health networks in South Australia. It is expected that the number of residents in this catchment will grow by 12 per cent over the next decade, with the most significant growth in the older 70-plus demographic, which has a high reliance on health services. The SA Health Clinical Services Plan predicts that by 2036-37, bed day demand at Modbury Hospital will grow by 66 per cent.

Originally built in 1973, the hospital currently operates an overnight bed base of 206 beds, with an additional 20 same-day beds and 44 emergency treatment spaces. The new Modbury Hospital Health Precinct will consist of a three-level building on the southern portion of the hospital and will deliver 44 additional mental health beds and 12 chemotherapy spaces, resulting in a 21 per cent increase in overnight bed places.

Of these 44 beds, 24 will be part of a new mental health rehabilitation unit to enable the delivery of non-acute, rehabilitation-focused adult mental health services for the community of northern Adelaide. The remaining 20 beds will be part of a new older persons mental health unit that will provide overnight acute medical care and will replace the current older persons mental health unit at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. The 12 chemotherapy spaces will be part of a new cancer centre, with chemotherapy chairs, consult and interview rooms, and a treatment room for minor procedures to enable comprehensive oncology care for northern Adelaide consumers.

A multideck car park will be constructed to accommodate parking requirements for consumers, visitors and staff as well as spatial provision and enabling works for future expansion for a neurobehavioural unit with linkages to the new older persons mental health unit. Ultimately, this initiative supports the progressive increase of the hospital's clinical services capability.

The capital cost of the project is \$117 million. Construction works have commenced with practical completion and operation expected in December 2025. The expected outcomes include:

- the establishment of 44 beds at the Modbury Hospital in contemporary facilities which are reflective of the Australasian Health Facility Guidelines;
- support for closing the existing service gap for consumers requiring access to mental health rehabilitation services by way of the mental health rehabilitation unit being the first services of their kind for South Australia;

- the establishment of a new cancer centre facility to improve accessibility to chemotherapy and other oncology and haematology services for the north-eastern community;
- support for the progressive increase in Modbury Hospital's clinical services capability and self-sufficiency by transferring the 20-bed older persons mental health unit from the Lyell McEwin Hospital to the Modbury Hospital Health Precinct;
- the upgrading and expansion of key site engineering infrastructure to enable the operation of the additional 24-bed mental health rehabilitation unit as well as Modbury Hospital's broader asset condition; and
- the configuration of the new development in a manner which can support future expansion of facilities and infrastructure at Modbury Hospital, consistent with the broader infrastructure master planning being progressed by SA Health.

The new building will be constructed on the southern portion of Modbury Hospital and will provide connectivity to the existing hospital through an enclosed and elevated link way. The precinct will be configured in a stacked manner, with the 24-bed mental health unit on the lower ground floor, the 20-bed older persons mental health unit on the ground floor and the cancer centre on the first floor, alongside an administration support area.

SA Health recognises that provision of a health facility with good environmental qualities is essential to achieving a good value-for-money solution and one that will assist in improving user comfort and wellbeing as well as reducing patient recovery time. To achieve this, SA Health has incorporated ecologically sustainable development principles into the scope of the project, including:

- the incorporation of accessible and flexible spaces to futureproof the building;
- a facade design that encourages a high level of daylight into non-clinical spaces while mitigating solar glare as well as minimising heat gain and loss to facilitate a minimum energy reduction of 10 per cent;
- improved occupant thermal comfort through the use of better air conditioning with an increase in outdoor air provision and separate air handling for wards to minimise the risk of cross-contamination; and
- the use of materials that are durable, require minimal maintenance and repairs and are locally sourced from certified environmentally responsible sources where possible.

Engagement and consultation have been key themes throughout the planning process for the precinct, occurring with clinical and non-clinical staff, consumer reference groups and industrial bodies. The functional design, operation and model of care requirements were informed by clinical reference groups who were consulted throughout the concept planning of the new facilities and infrastructure at Modbury Hospital.

Consultation and engagement will continue throughout the life cycle of the project, and key stakeholders will remain informed of the works as they progress through construction into service readiness. SA Health confirms that consultation with executive stakeholders has occurred in relation to the design of the new facilities, the management of ongoing health service delivery during construction and the long-term operational considerations such as efficiency, clinical effectiveness and safety.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Modbury Hospital Health Precinct project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Melissa Nozza, Director of Capital Projects and Infrastructure, SA Health; John Harrison, Director of Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; Deidre Kinchington, Acting Executive Director, Strategy and Innovation, Northern Adelaide Local Health Network; Catherine Startari, Director, GHD Design; and Jeremy Kelly, Principal, Silver Thomas Hanley. I thank the witnesses for their time.

I would also like to thank the member for Newland for her statement to the committee supporting this project in her electorate. I would also like to put on the record my support for this

project, as I know a number of my constituents in Florey use Modbury Hospital on a regular basis—indeed, I was born at the hospital.

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: NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL EARLY WORKS PACKAGE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:10): I move:

That the 62nd report of the committee, entitled New Women's and Children's Hospital Early Works Package, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) proposes to commence an early works package for the new Women's and Children's Hospital on the Thebarton barracks site, which sits in close proximity to the Royal Adelaide Hospital and Adelaide BioMed City.

In January 2023, the New Women's and Children's Hospital Act was proclaimed, which facilitated the development of the new hospital on the project site. Prior to construction, a range of enabling and supporting works are required, with a number of these works able to commence immediately to help the efficient use of project resources. These early works will maintain progress without materially impacting upon South Australia Police operations during their decommissioning and relocation process. The complete early works package includes:

- relocation of engineering services from Gaol Road, Bonython Park works and temporary services;
- associated works for utility service relocations, including ongoing site investigations to determine existing conditions;
- stormwater outlet works;
- demolition and site clearing;
- construction of the hospital car park; and
- construction of a hospital central energy plant building.

The ultimate aim of the early works package is to ensure that the necessary supporting infrastructure is in place to mitigate against project delays, to maintain the project program and to enable commencement of the main hospital later this year. The works will begin with the relocation of the authority services, delivery of stormwater infrastructure and improving site access along Bonython trail, which will allow for construction of the car park and central energy plant.

SA Health states that, without implementation of this early works package, there is the possibility of cost escalation that is currently forecast at \$10 million per month and prolongation of the entire project. Therefore, it is critical that the progress with these works is maintained to facilitate the main hospital works and to avoid unnecessary budget increases. Construction has commenced, with a major milestone of the works being the completion of the hospital car park, expected in early 2027. The capital cost is \$306 million and forms part of the \$3.2 billion new Women's and Children's Hospital project's approved budget.

Construction of the hospital car park will improve site logistics for construction of the main hospital building by improving amenity and car parking for the trade workforce. The relationship between the car park and the central energy plant has been carefully considered to mitigate impact on the Parklands and Adelaide Gaol. The car park will be relocated closer to Port Road and the emergency department entry, with entry and logistic flows on the Port Road side of the development to ensure vehicles are kept away from the Parklands.

Project management will follow best practice guidelines for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. This

management will continue to incorporate development, consultation, evaluation and review over the lifespan of the project. To mitigate risks, a robust governance structure has been implemented which will be utilised at all stages of the project. This structure will ensure appropriate oversight through a single point of accountability, as well as effective project committees, decision-making activities, the separation of project governance and an organisational control structure.

SA Health has incorporated ecologically sustainable principles into the scope of the works. The department states that facilities with good environmental qualities are essential to achieving a good value-for-money solution and will assist in creating a positive workplace, reducing energy and water consumption, reducing the consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources, and minimising recurrent costs associated with the project.

The project will incorporate key design principles to reduce energy and water use and associated greenhouse gas emissions. This will include installing a solar system on the new car park roof to supplement the hospital's electrical demand, natural ventilation and stormwater treatment to meet Green Star criteria and other legislated requirements.

The Central Archive has identified two Aboriginal cultural sites near the proposed works location. Authorisation has been sought and received from the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, and a cultural heritage management plan will be utilised and negotiated with traditional owners. Due to the location and nature of the site, there is potential for heritage artifacts, works or evidence of past occupation and use of the site being uncovered during ground-disturbing activities. As a result, the project has engaged a qualified archaeologist to provide advice and manage any discoveries made during the construction process. SA Health states that native title has been extinguished over the whole site area.

The department affirms that consultation and engagement with the Women's and Children's Health Network clinicians, staff, consumers and stakeholders have occurred to finalise the new hospital's concept design. Relevant stakeholders and precinct partners have also been extensively consulted throughout the development of the new hospital to ensure that opportunities to open and rejuvenate the surrounding Parklands are incorporated into the project. The project team regularly engages with Kaurna representatives, which will be ongoing to include assisting in the development of the interior narrative of the new hospital's design.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the new Women's and Children's Hospital early works project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were:

- Dr Robyn Lawrence, Chief Executive, Department of Health and Wellbeing;
- Brendan Hewitt, Project Director, New Women's and Children's Hospital Project, Department of Health and Wellbeing;
- Daniel Shaw, Construction Manager, Lendlease Building Contractors; and
- Thomas Masullo, Director, Woods Bagot.

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: KAPUNDA HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:16): I move:

That the 63rd report of the committee, entitled Kapunda High School Redevelopment, be noted.

The Department for Education proposes to redevelop fire-damaged facilities at Kapunda High School, which will involve the complete restoration of an affected state heritage-listed building and replacement of an affected transportable building, including provisions for a staffroom area and staff amenity consolidation.

Kapunda High School is located on West Terrace, Kapunda, within the Light Regional Council area. In March 2022 the high school suffered a major fire, which severely damaged the state heritage building known as Eringa, as well as a timber transportable building that accommodated four learning areas and resulted in the loss of teaching facilities.

Eringa was originally built in 1876 and had been gifted by renowned pastoralist Sir Sidney Kidman in 1921 to the education department for high school purposes. As Eringa is state heritage listed, the restoration will aim to reinstate the building to its original form and be as close as possible to its pre-existing construction and condition, while optimising its long-term functional use as a school administration hub.

Work will be carried out in line with Heritage SA requirements, with interior finishes selected suitable to the federation-style era of the building. The remaining fire-affected building that included four learning spaces will be replaced by the construction of a single-storey facility with an open plan and collaborative layout, in conjunction with access to shared interdisciplinary learning areas. Selected interior finishes have been chosen to promote and elevate the learning environment.

The redevelopment will also see the construction of new staffroom provisions to allow for staff amenity consolidation, as well as the development of outdoor areas with moveable stations to provide flexible student gathering spaces, and the provision of disability access via a new lift and fully accessible amenities. The remaining buildings are in good condition, which allows for the construction of new infrastructure and the redevelopment of existing facilities to reflect contemporary educational requirements.

Once complete, the works will result in the high school catering for a total school enrolment of 700 places. The key aims of the project include to:

- restore a state heritage-listed building to its original structure and condition, providing contemporary administration spaces;
- provide new accommodation to support contemporary teaching and learning pedagogies;
- develop creative, flexible learning spaces to enhance student engagement and allow collaborative teaching practices; and
- make provisions for persons with disabilities in accordance with legislative requirements.

At a capital cost of \$21 million, the project is currently in the tender phase, with estimated practical completion in September 2025. Project construction will follow two stages, with stage 1 comprising demolition and stage 2 comprising construction and restoration works. The school will remain operational for the duration of the works, with staff and students remaining on premises.

Best practice principles for the project procurement and management will be followed as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. Risk assessment has been undertaken and determined the project has a medium range of risk relating to construction program and cost. A further risk identified is with the staff and students remaining on site during construction. This risk will be mitigated through utilising a staged approach to meet the needs of the school without impeding the project, alongside controlling entry and securing the construction site.

To mitigate further risk, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport is providing risk management services through project management, design, cost, procurement and construction and the proposed project team are experienced in delivery of educational projects. The department reports that it has adopted ecologically sustainable strategies in the design and delivery of the project and has incorporated these principles to reduce energy consumption and associated greenhouse gas emissions. The project will use a holistic, life-cycle approach to planning, design, costing, construction, maintenance and building management.

Sustainability principles will be achieved via design measures that allow for natural light to learning spaces, shading of windows, increased access to preferred solar orientation, and natural breezes and the use of vegetation to create cool air. Additionally, design elements for the new building provide for minimal internal structural elements, ensuring future adaptability of the learning spaces within the building envelope.

Consultation and engagement have occurred throughout the project, in particular with the principal, governing council, school staff and the education director, who all endorse the project. At each stage, the governing council and school staff have been closely involved with direct representation on the project development. During the concept planning stage, care has been taken to consult and ensure the needs of all stakeholders were considered.

The Department for Environment and Water confirms there is one state heritage place on the development site directly affected by these works. A check of the Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects determined there is no record of Aboriginal sites within the project area.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Kapunda High School redevelopment project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Helen Doyle, Director, Capital Projects and Technical Services, Department for Education; John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Nicole Dent, Associate Director, Grieve Gillett Architects. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Frome for her statement to the committee in support of the project in her 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 work.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:22): I am very pleased that the Public Works Committee has considered the Kapunda High School project and given it its support. I am grateful, and particularly the member for Frome is grateful, that the education department is doing this tremendously important work.

The Eringa building is more than just a facility in which education is undertaken. It is a part of our state's history. It is a critical part of the cultural history and heritage of the town of Kapunda. There are members of parliament who have undertaken lessons in that building and they understand its value, but it is the people who live in that town and continue to maintain the connection through the high school to that building who are very important.

It was only a few days after the last state election when the news came through that fire had torn through the Eringa building and created such extraordinary devastation to this beautiful heritage asset. When I was the Minister for Education, I had the opportunity on at least two occasions to engage with students and staff there. It is still in functional use, despite its, let's call them, heritage features. It was not built for modern-day education necessarily, but people still valued being able to undertake seminars, do work and have right in the midst of the school this beautiful heritage building.

Given the community's interest and given the generations of students who have maintained a connection through Kapunda High School and the pride felt for that building and its connection to broader South Australian history, it was perhaps unsurprising when not only members of the school community gathered that morning in shock, disbelief and sadness but also members of the broader community who came along.

It was, as I said, shortly after the election. The member for Frome had just been elected. When she was a candidate, she and I would engage with the school community for a period of time, so she was a familiar face to that. She came along. She obviously lived closer than I did, but having recently been the minister, and having had good and strong relationships with many of the staff and even a few of the students at that school, I thought it would be helpful for me to go along as well and show my support. Obviously, the Minister for Education, in what might have been one of his first school visits as the newly sworn-in minister, came along as well.

He addressed staff. It was not long after 9 o'clock—it was early in the morning—and it was excellent that he was able to make himself available at such short notice. One of the key requests that the community had right from the start at that point, and which I, again, credit the Minister for Education for hearing and listening to, was that this building should be sought to be restored, that it not just be replaced with a modern learning space but something that would actually give genuine credit to the heritage and the built form that was so important to the school. We hope that will continue to be the case.

I thank the Minister for Education for engaging with the opposition on a regular basis on this project, and particularly with the member for Frome. The member for Frome has had an extreme level of diligence and a strong level of personal interest in seeing this project fulfilled to its best possible outcome, most importantly for the Kapunda High School and the students and staff who will continue to engage in it but also as a reflection of the heritage issues that are so important in the town of Kapunda and in our state.

I wish the department well in its continued work and indeed those people from the building firms and the trades that are doing this important work. We hope this will be a building that will continue to play an important role in the future of Kapunda High School education and the community of Kapunda for many years to come.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:26): I would just like to take this opportunity to, as always, thank the member for Morialta for his contribution to this debate and I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MARION ROAD AND SIR DONALD BRADMAN DRIVE INTERSECTION UPGRADE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:27): I move:

That the 64th report of the committee, entitled Marion Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive Intersection Upgrade, be noted.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (DIT) proposes to upgrade the intersection of Marion Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive. This intersection is part of the strategic gateway to the Adelaide Airport and is used by nearly 60,000 vehicles per day. It currently operates at capacity during peak periods, with delays for both north-south and east-west traffic.

The project aims to reduce congestion and improve road safety for users, as well as cater for future traffic growth. An Adelaide Airport master plan envisaged a significant growth in passenger and freight movement, with the potential to cause congestion. This project seeks to alleviate this issue and, additionally, will assist in managing the anticipated increased traffic demand during the construction of the north-south corridor River Torrens to Darlington project.

The intersection upgrade is part of a commitment by the department to continually develop and upgrade key arterial roads. As such, this project aims to improve efficiency by reducing delays for commuters on Marion Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive, including the enhancement of public transport reliability.

Additionally, access and reliability for freight and supply chains to Adelaide Airport will be improved and an enhancement of the sense of place will be achieved through stronger integration of pedestrian and cycling movements within the local area. The project will also improve tree canopy as part of the state's urban greening strategy. The intersection upgrade will include:

- an additional right-turn lane on Sir Donald Bradman Drive's western approach to allow two separate right-turn and through lanes respectively;
- an extension of the left-turn lane on Marion Road's southern approach to improve left-turn movement onto Sir Donald Bradman Drive towards the Adelaide Airport;
- an additional through lane on Sir Donald Bradman Drive's eastern approach for westbound traffic, resulting in three through lanes;
- an additional turn lane on Sir Donald Bradman Drive's eastern approach for traffic turning right to head north along Marion Road, resulting in two right-turn lanes;
- installation of a new left-turn lane on Marion Road's northern approach for traffic turning left towards the city;
- replacement of the koala crossing on Marion Road near Jenkins Street with a signalised crossing, which will assist the safe crossing of children attending Cowandilla Primary School;

- upgraded pedestrian crossings, traffic signals and road lighting throughout the intersection to improve visibility and safety;
- installation of bicycle lanes in each direction on Sir Donald Bradman Drive to provide continuous cycling lanes and improved safety through the intersection, as well as green cycle pavement marking through key areas of conflict between cycling lanes and general traffic on all intersection approaches and exits; and
- tree planting and landscaping to maintain the gateway amenity to the CBD.

The capital cost of the project is \$85 million and will be jointly funded by the South Australian and commonwealth governments on a fifty-fifty basis. Planning and preconstruction work is currently being completed, with construction set to commence in the middle of this year. The department states that the project will be open to traffic in early 2026. The upgrade will require the acquisition of a small number of commercial and privately owned properties, with this acquisition process underway.

DIT states that the project will follow its program and project management framework and guidelines in conjunction with contract management procedures. Additional external specialist resources may be employed if necessary. Risk management will form an integral part of the management process to identify and assess risk, ensuring that appropriate management measures are used in the project delivery.

Potential risks have been mitigated through a range of measures, including continued engagement with the community to ease concerns about the upgrade, engagement with affected landowners to secure necessary land through land acquisition; engagement with stakeholders and service authorities to lessen delays with approvals and construction; information provided to affected properties ahead of potential disruptions of power or telecommunication services; and timing of construction to minimise disruption to traffic.

The project's environmental impact will be assessed and managed in line with the department's environment and heritage impact assessment processes and guidelines. An assessment has been conducted covering key environmental and heritage aspects of the projects, including vegetation, fauna, Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal heritage, water quality, noise and vibration, air quality and contamination. Ecologically sustainable development measures are being applied to the project, including optimisation of design to reduce the project's footprint, use of recycled materials where possible to increase sustainability, and an intent to deliver at least 20 per cent canopy coverage to increase green infrastructure.

The project area is within the Kaurna people's native title determination area, and native title is considered to have been extinguished on the land within the project area. A check of the Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects determined that there are no registered or reported Aboriginal sites, objects or ancestral remains on site.

The project will have no direct impact upon commonwealth, state or local heritage-listed places. The Brooklyn Park Boulevard of Honour, which runs along Sir Donald Bradman Drive, has been identified. This consists of trees with memorial plaques for those from the City of West Torrens who enlisted during the Second World War and commemorates 50 years since the end of the war. A number of these trees and plaques will require removal, with relocation being proposed for the plaques and new trees planted.

An extensive stakeholder and community engagement strategy guide has been developed, and the department confirms that extensive consultation and engagement with stakeholders and the wider community has occurred and is ongoing. This includes community consultation, surveys and information sessions, alongside email and letterbox drops to over 870 stakeholders and reaching over 30,000 people via social media.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Marion Road and Sir Donald Bradman Drive intersection upgrade. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Andrew Excell, Executive Director, Transport Strategy and Planning, Department for Infrastructure and Transport, and Neil Welsh, Delivery Manager, Infrastructure Delivery, Department for Infrastructure and Transport. 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: SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE BARRACKS RELOCATION PROJECT—ROAD SAFETY CENTRE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:34): I move:

That the 65th report of the committee, entitled South Australia Police Barracks Relocation Project—Road Safety Centre, be noted.

South Australia Police (SAPOL) are relocating the Road Safety Centre, currently at the Thebarton Police Barracks, to vacant Crown land on Military Road at West Beach. This will enable the construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, announced by the state government in September 2022.

The centre plays an important role in SAPOL's Road Safety Strategy, with police delivering road safety sessions primarily to younger school students. This encompasses an interactive digital experience, theory sessions in a classroom setting and the completion of a supervised, practical component of riding bicycles on the mock roadway. Offsite services are also offered to schools, businesses and other community groups. The centre also offers other road safety-related programs, such as 'Safer journeys together' and 'Obtaining your motorcycle licence' sessions for young drivers and adults, as well as providing school holiday programs and young offender sessions.

Several sites were investigated by SAPOL in partnership with Renewal SA and the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, taking into consideration feasibility, the best equivalent for accommodation requirements and adaptability of layout for operational fit-outs, the quality of infrastructure, and location match. This assessment concluded that the nominated block of land at West Beach was best suited to the needs and requirements to ensure critical operational capability is maintained.

Key criteria for site shortlisting included public transport links for schools, sufficient area for mock roadway facilities and sufficient staff accommodation. The likely completion of works is expected to be in the middle of this year to facilitate the relocation from the Thebarton barracks. The expected outcomes of the project include:

- provision of contemporary accommodation, technology and facilities to support ongoing service to the community;
- creation of modern facilities for the delivery of road safety education to the community to reduce the number of lives lost on South Australian roads;
- support to SAPOL and the government of South Australia's core service obligations to the community in the most efficient and sustainable manner;
- expedited relocation from the police barracks to allow for critical works to proceed on the new Women's and Children's Hospital, in line with government commitments;
- creation of jobs during the construction phase; and
- support for SAPOL's Our Strategy 2030—Safer Communities by ensuring prompt and effective service delivery, maintaining a visible police presence in the community, reassuring the public, and ensuring resources are deployed to emergencies and events when required.

SAPOL states that the project will be managed in line with the Department for Infrastructure and Transport's framework for small construction projects. Further key project management elements include regular design documentation and construction progress reviews, establishment of a cost plan that incorporates management of the project cost, and the development of formal communication channels between end users, stakeholders and SAPOL to ensure that government requirements are understood and achieved.

SAPOL states that failing to achieve successful delivery of the project would present a significant operational risk. A tight project program with a critical delivery date has been determined to allow commissioning and decant prior to the commencement of construction of the new Women's and Children's Hospital, and there would likely be a major impairment of SAPOL's operational capability if the project is not delivered within the expected time frame.

This accelerated delivery carries a risk of incurring cost overruns, and a multiagency governance framework is in place to ensure a value-for-money outcome. Project governance structures have also been established to ensure there is appropriate oversight and risk management during the planning and delivery stages.

SAPOL recognises the importance of ecologically sustainable development principles and reports that it has adopted key environmental objectives and criteria in the design and delivery of the project, with SAPOL committed to providing facilities with good environmental qualities to achieve good value-for-money solutions, providing a positive workplace, reducing energy and water consumption and minimising recurrent costs associated with maintaining and operating the facility.

The Department for Environment and Water has assessed and approved the submission against the Ecologically Sustainable Development Guide Note for Planning, Design and Delivery. Heritage South Australia, within the Department for Environment and Water, has confirmed there are no local heritage places on the site. A check of the Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects determined there is no record of Aboriginal sites at the West Beach location. The SAPOL relocation project team will engage as necessary with Aboriginal groups as part of design progression and will manage Aboriginal heritage in accordance with its standard practices should any discoveries be made.

Consultation and engagement has occurred throughout the feasibility and concept planning works for the SAPOL Police Barracks Relocation Project, and further consultation with various stakeholders will continue throughout the project life cycle. SAPOL will manage the required communications around site planning and logistics to ensure all users receive appropriate information on the project via SAPOL's communications team.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the South Australia Police Barracks Relocation Project—Road Safety Centre. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Noel Bamford, Assistant Commissioner, South Australia Police; Scott Bayliss, Chief Services Officer, Department of Treasury and Finance; and Kate Anderson, Chief Executive Officer, West Beach Parks. 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: SOUTHERN FLEURIEU HEALTH SERVICE (VICTOR HARBOR) EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:40): I move:

That the 66th report of the committee, entitled Southern Fleurieu Health Service (Victor Harbor) Emergency Department Redevelopment, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) proposes to construct a new emergency department for the Southern Fleurieu Health Service at Victor Harbor. This will comprise a new on-grade contemporary and expanded single-level emergency department to address existing capacity challenges and deliver a facility layout that improves workflows, egress and clinician-patient interactions.

The Southern Fleurieu Health Service is operated by the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network and provides a comprehensive range of medical and surgical services to patients across the Fleurieu Peninsula and surrounding communities. As one of the key peri-urban facilities in the state, it plays a critical role within SA Health's regional facilities in treating patients, stabilising those requiring higher acuity care and reducing patient flow to Adelaide's metropolitan area.

This Victor Harbor health service currently comprises a 31-bed facility, including a 24-hour emergency department and acute medical and surgical accommodation as well as obstetric, palliative care, chemotherapy and renal dialysis services. The current emergency department was last developed in 2010 and requires further redevelopment to meet projected activity growth and to address existing problems with layout and functionality.

In 2020, SA Health undertook acute inpatient modelling to project future presentations to this emergency department. Modelling predicted total hospital presentations would significantly increase by 2026-27, with 43 per cent being geriatric presentations, with further increases expected by 2031-32, with 46 per cent being geriatric presentations.

The proposed redevelopment aims to deal with this expected activity growth. It will also address current capacity pressures and will maintain a high-quality and contemporary health service for the growing community in the Southern Fleurieu region. The redevelopment will include:

- 12 patient treatment bays, inclusive of one negative-pressure treatment bay, five enclosed treatment bays to support paediatric patients and six open bays;
- two patient emergency resuscitation bays and three emergency extended care unit short-stay beds;
- patient admission and consulting areas, including a new emergency department entrance, triage area with examination bed, interview room, low stimulus room and two consulting rooms;
- clinical support and utility spaces and new staff facilities;
- an external ambulance canopy and lobby area separate to the main public emergency department access, with enabled ambulance thoroughfare from Bay Road, Victor Harbor;
- construction of an additional car park adjacent to the emergency department entry; and
- construction of new roadways, car parks and landscape works to support the emergency department.

The total investing budget for the project is \$16.8 million, with joint funding from the commonwealth via the Community Health and Hospitals Program initiative and from a state-funded regional Asset Sustainment Program. Site mobilisation activities have commenced, with project completion anticipated in May 2025.

The new emergency department will be located adjacent to the footprint of the current administration building and will see part of this existing administrative building demolished. This will be close to other clinical hospital functions and accessible via a new entry on Bay Road. This was the preferred option as it will minimise disruption to clinical services at the existing emergency department, which can remain operational until the completion of the new facility and transition of services.

Pandemic management has been considered as part of the new facility's design and includes several control measures such as cluster chairs in waiting areas that can enable social distancing, a negative-pressure isolation treatment bay with an independent mechanical ventilation system, a patient bay special room with ensuite bathroom for isolating patients and handwashing basins throughout the facility.

The best practice guidelines for project procurement and management as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities will be followed throughout the project. Part of this process is risk management, and it is integral that risks are identified and assessed, with mitigation measures incorporated where necessary.

Risks identified include construction works being carried out in proximity to an operational clinical environment, which requires clear, ongoing communication with site management and attending patients; the removal of asbestos under controlled removal conditions; and careful management of the project to align with the approved budget. To manage these risks, a two-tier

governance structure has been established, with an executive leadership team responsible for strategic oversight and an integrated management team responsible for overall day-to-day operational management.

SA Health has incorporated ecologically sustainable principles into the scope of the project. The department notes that facilities with good environmental qualities are essential to achieving a good value-for-money solution, which will assist in creating a positive workplace, reducing energy and water consumption, reducing the consumption of renewable and non-renewable resources and minimising recurrent costs associated with the project. These measures include:

- the use of energy-efficient heating and cooling;
- energy-efficient lighting;
- a mechanical system designed to deal with increases in adverse weather conditions;
- an environmental management plan to effectively manage construction waste, air, water and noise pollution;
- the use of water-efficient sanitary and tap-ware fixtures; and
- the collection of rainwater for landscape irrigation.

In addition to those stated, incorporated design measures will increase adaptability and allow changes of use with minimised impact to ensure the building is adaptable and futureproofed.

Engagement and consultation have been key themes throughout the design phase of the new emergency department. Consultation has occurred with clinical and non-clinical staff, specialist agencies, the South Australian Ambulance Service, the Director of Aboriginal Health at the Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network and the Southern Fleurieu Health Advisory Council.

The Register of Aboriginal Sites and Objects determined that there are no registered or reported Aboriginal sites, objects or ancestral remains within the project area. 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 Southern Fleurieu Health Service (Victor Harbor) Emergency Department Redevelopment. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Melissa Nozza, Director, Capital Projects and Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Bronwyn Masters, Interim Chief Executive Officer, Barossa Hills Fleurieu Local Health Network; John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Dennis Tapp, Associate, Wiltshire Swain Architects. 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 SPEAKER: The member for Florey can go and get a drink after almost 45 minutes of nonstop talking because he is about to be provided with some respite in the form of the member for Finniss.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:47): It is a privilege to rise and thank the Public Works Committee for their work in considering such an important project in my community. The Southern Fleurieu Health Service, or the South Coast District Hospital as it is also known, is such an important part of the community structure in Victor Harbor and the surrounding areas. My father was born there, I was born there, two of my three children were born there, my wife was born there; it is certainly a big part of our family, and it even goes back to my great-aunt, Aunty Edith.

In the area where the ED is proposed to be built, or where work has already started, Aunty Edith was a nurse in the hospital in the 1930s, in its first 10 years of operations. Her medical equipment is, or was, on display in the entrance hall to the old entrance of the hospital, which is actually where this new ED is being built. It will be fascinating to see what happens to that historical display. Hopefully it is not lost because it certainly is something that I was very proud of, to be able

to walk in and see Aunty Edith's syringes, etc. The needles were about the size of my little finger. It is quite extraordinary, the advances we have seen in medicine over that time, and I am really pleased that history has been there and hopefully is retained.

Interestingly, at this time of the year, it also reminds me there was an article in the local paper about Aunty Edith, who, after leaving the South Coast District Hospital, went to England. She was in England from 1938 for a few years. The day that the war broke out, on 1 September, she enlisted in the Queen Alexandra nursing service and started serving in England from day one, right through to the end of the war. She was there the whole time, serving in places like France, Malta and the Middle East. It was quite an amazing thing for a lady in her 40s to be serving in a part of the world so foreign.

She then hopped on a plane and flew back to Australia only weeks after the end of the war. It was apparently one of the first times that that had been orchestrated as well. The agent-general at the time was able to get her on a flight because her mother was unwell, and got her back to Australia. That is just a bit of family history tied up with where this ED is going.

Regarding the importance of the ED, personally I have not needed the ED for my health care, but many members of my family have. Unfortunately, both my wife and one of my daughters are anaphylactic to nuts and seafood. Both of them have had different occurrences over time and ended up in the ED, including not long after my daughter turned 18 in January. She must have eaten something that had some nuts in it. She was not aware of what it was and she had an anaphylactic reaction. I cannot fault the staff and the team at the South Coast District Hospital and the way that she was treated in the ED there.

To get in there, she was rushed into the resus room. I was there with her. Evie is actually just starting medicine, so she was quite intrigued at the whole process once she got herself settled down and relaxed and back in control of her immune system, once the adrenaline had been injected. The intriguing thing was that the medical student who tried to put the line in left a puddle about the size of two dinner plates on the bed, not getting the line quite right. It was good to see the team just say calmly, 'Don't worry about that. That's just a little bit of blood. It doesn't matter. Blood makes a big mess.' It was really pleasing.

It certainly highlighted to me the need for the new ED. We were in the resus room. Once Evie was stabilised, we needed to be moved out of the resus room, because it was needed again for another emergency. Sadly, this was very much on view to all of us in there; it is a very tight space. A poor gentleman came in for some standard treatment. He was on holidays. They did some tests and in a very short period of time realised his body was in complete shutdown and gave him hours to live.

Sitting there with your 18 year old, it is quite emotional listening to the family having to ring people and tell them that their loved one only has hours to live. It will be so nice to have a private space in the new ED where people will actually be able to do that without the world listening. I thought that was extremely challenging for my daughter. There was a 10 year old next to us. Likewise, it would have been extremely challenging for that family to have been listening to this going on, but it had to be the way it was because there was no other space available.

I think it is such an important thing to see this ED space certainly increase in size. It is more than doubling, so it is going to be great to have that extra space to be able to make sure that we do not see that crowding. I think it will make a big difference to the community. My only fear is that the local community is growing faster than the numbers that were forecast a few years ago. The number that the community is getting to is actually about the size that it was forecast to get to in about 2035, about 10 years early, so hopefully, this ED will not be at capacity almost the day it opens.

We certainly do need a bit of ability to grow. It is only 10 years or so since the previous ED was opened, so we do need to keep monitoring the growth that we are seeing on the southern Fleurieu and make sure that we keep the medical needs at the right level across that region. It is a particularly strong growing region, and hospital needs are higher in our region, particularly with the demographic. It intrigues me that of the people eligible to vote in my electorate the average age is 66. It is certainly an older community than most in South Australia, let alone Australia, so it is an extra challenging space, and the ED is such an important thing.

I get a close-up view of this space. I see it from my front door. I literally live across the road from the hospital, so I see a lot of what is going on. And certainly, through this build there are going to be some challenges. One of the biggest challenges I see is that the helicopter is not going to be able to land onsite during this time, because they are worried about flying debris from the construction process, which means they have to find another site.

My understanding is they are going to be using one of the town ovals. That is fine most of the time; the only problem is if it happens to be 2 o'clock on a Saturday afternoon when the football is on. That is not going to be so easy for it to be managed to make sure that the helicopter can sit there for three hours. It is not going to be that easy in the middle of a football game having a helicopter land on the oval.

So there are things that will need to be managed through this process. We will wait and see how it all goes, but I certainly am really pleased to see this spend going forward. It goes back to the commitment by Greg Hunt as minister federally, putting money into this during the by-election where Georgina Downer was involved. So it has certainly been a while before we have actually seen action on the ground, but there is certainly action there right now. It is fantastic to see, and hopefully we will see a new ED open soon.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Finniss. Great story about Aunty Edith too. What a great pioneering story and putting herself out there to help others and having a great adventure at the same time.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:56): I would like to take the opportunity to thank the member for Finniss for his contribution to the debate. It is always, I find, pleasing to hear from local members about their particular views on this project. I am sure not only the department but the government as a whole will be grateful to have the support of the member for Finniss for this particular project.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank the members of the Public Works Committee for their diligence in not only this project but other projects we have considered. I think it would be remiss of me not to point out that the member for Schubert, who has resigned from the committee, has done a sterling job in contributing to the committee. I would like to thank her for her contribution. During the relatively brief time that I have worked with her on Public Works I was very impressed by the way in which she diligently did her job but also did so not in an overly partisan way.

I know we are all politicians, and we all have our jobs to do, and I can certainly respect that from everyone who is a member of the Public Works Committee, but I think it is appropriate for me to say that the member for Schubert has certainly done her job as a member of the committee in a way that shows that she is committed to getting good reports through and has not been overly political. So I wanted to take this opportunity to thank her for her service and to put on the record how much I am looking forward to working with the member for Chaffey as a member of the committee.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GAWLER AND DISTRICT NETBALL ASSOCIATION COURT REDEVELOPMENT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:58): I move:

That the 67th report of the committee, entitled Gawler and District Netball Association Court Redevelopment, be noted.

At the 2022 state election the government committed to funding for the Town of Gawler to redevelop the courts and adjoining facilities of the Gawler and District Netball Association. In line with this commitment the Town of Gawler has received a grant of \$4.8 million executed by the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. The Gawler and District Netball Association is located at Hallam Drive, Gawler, and provides netball courts for players from the Barossa, Light and Lower North regions. There are four winter and 20 summer clubs that use the courts and facilities for competitions and club training. The courts are also utilised for courses, school holiday clinics, School Sport SA training and other external use.

There are currently 13 netball courts, but these are noncompliant with Netball Australia National Facilities Policy, and there are some courts which are unusable due to uneven surfaces and drainage issues. Additionally, the car park is used by both netball court users and the nearby Gawler cycleway, with the car parking facilities inadequate for the number of people seeking access. The proposed redevelopment will involve a demolition of the existing 13 courts and construction of 10 new courts in their place. These will be oriented north to south. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2024

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2024.)

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:00): I would like to continue the remarks that I began yesterday on this important bill, the Supply Bill, that provides a level of funding to the government to fill the period before the parliament passes the Appropriation Bill for the coming financial year. I note at this point that, despite the questions raised yesterday in regard to the *Hansard* record around the insertion of the second reading speech and explanation of clauses into *Hansard* and what appears to be a significant difference and issue with the financial year, we have not seen the Treasurer correct the record. Again, I stand here waiting and hoping that that will be done imminently.

In regard to some of the issues that we traversed yesterday, the vast majority of my contribution to this point has surrounded the clear contrast between where the government sees the economy sitting and the language that has come from the government to this point. Again, I paraphrase the Premier telling South Australian households and businesses that they have never had it better and that the economy is flying. The stark reality for households, as we know, is that they are significantly worse off compared to where they were when this government came to power in 2022.

The average South Australian household effectively is more than \$20,000 worse off, with an escalation of costs around mortgages, everyday household items, insurances, electricity costs and effectively everything across the board on the back of what has been a historically high period of inflation not just for the country but specifically in South Australia. I think it is important to point that out, and I will come back to it at a later point, that Adelaide itself has the highest inflation rate of all Australian cities, and it has been the case for at least the last period. There is something that clearly says that South Australians are doing it tougher than most other places. As we discussed yesterday, this comes on top of historic rises in housing costs.

I do not think there is a day that goes by when there is not commentary around how difficult it is for first-home buyers to break into the market. We see in the media yesterday a thought that at some time in the not too distant future property prices in Adelaide could eclipse those over our eastern border in Victoria, in Melbourne specifically. I do not think that is anything that anybody in this place would have thought possible in our lifetime. I know, growing up as I have, we have always looked to the east and thought how lucky we are in South Australia to have property prices that are relatively affordable in comparison.

Even if you look back to the period of time during COVID, so many people moved back from not just interstate, the east coast, west coast, or wherever else they moved back from, but also overseas, and part of the decision-making process was not just the fact that we were in a jurisdiction that handled COVID as well as anywhere in the world. I think it is not a stretch to make that comment; it has been well said, and from many places. But also, because of the relative affordability of the Adelaide housing market at that point in time, people could move from the east coast—from much smaller blocks and sometimes even apartments—back to Adelaide, where we have significantly larger block sizes, and be able to come and raise their children in a place that we all love living in.

That is the reason each and every one of us, the 47 of us in this chamber, choose to stay where we have been born and bred, for many of us, or for those who have come from interstate to

call South Australia home. It has always been one of the major selling points for South Australia, the fact that we have affordable housing stock. To see the headline that, essentially, the expectation from some quarters is that we could be eclipsing Melbourne in the not too distant future is a frightening thing for many.

I also want to begin my remarks today by giving an update. Yesterday I went through a list of companies and businesses—mostly in the hospitality industry—that have, unfortunately, really suffered over this period of time. Again, this is in complete contrast to the constant commentary from the Labor government, and the Premier in particular, that small businesses and households have never had it better.

It was a significant list of businesses that I traversed yesterday. They were not just isolated to metropolitan Adelaide, the CBD or a particular part of suburban Adelaide, but a complete spread, from regional small businesses to the CBD, to areas like my own in Henley and right across the metropolitan area. There are a number of hospitality businesses that just have not been able to make it work in the current economic climate where we have significant cost escalations across just about everything that goes into the cost base of running a small business, whether it be rent, electricity prices or the cost of the products that they use.

In *The Advertiser* this morning, we learned that a cafe sitting adjacent to The Duke of Brunswick Hotel has been the latest casualty in what was described by the journalist as 'the state's hospitality crisis.' I think it is difficult to characterise what is happening around the CBD and our suburbs as anything but that. To this point, have we heard any commentary from the government in terms of what they intend to do, where they intend to step in or what they would like to do to assist in putting downward cost pressure on the environment for small business? There has been virtually nothing.

The cafe that I reference is called The dob. As I said, it is a cafe that sits next to The Duke of Brunswick Hotel on Gilbert Street. They announced just this morning that they will be closing their doors for the final time on Friday at 2pm. The owner of that business is somebody with whom I note the opposition stood side-by-side calling for help.

The question that sits with the government is: where are they now in this business owner's time of need? The reference from that owner essentially outlines that the current economic landscape made it as challenging as it has ever been for smaller businesses to stay open. I quote directly from the article, in which the owner, who also runs a number of hotels in the state—at least two—said that 'increasing costs and additional burdens such as payroll tax made it untenable for us to operate the cafe without compromising the stability' of other operations.

It is obviously a difficult decision for any small business owner to reach the point where they have to close their business, not just in the interests of their own financial situation but often with the interests of their broader family and the other considerations that come into making those decisions. This is someone who employs 60 people in South Australia and that number has diminished off the back of a decision that has had to be made. That is a failure of government policy to have not found a way to step in and assist in what has been an incredibly difficult period of time for this industry and small business in general.

As I touched on yesterday, it is not that this government has not had the capacity. The additional revenues that have come into this government off the back of each and every household and each and every small business that has been doing it tough has been immense, unlike anything that those opposite could have ever pictured. But, again, instead of showing fiscal discipline, instead of showing an ability to provide or to make any real effort to make things that little bit easier for those households and small businesses doing it tough, instead of doing that, it was simply trousered into general revenue to cover the cost blowouts that had occurred over the previous year.

It is little wonder that some of these small business owners are sitting there wondering where to from here and will this government come to help us. Again, it is such a stark contrast to the approach that was taken by the former government where decisions that were made were made in the interest of trying to reduce the cost burden for South Australian small business, whether that was the emergency services levy, whether that was around water bills, whether that was around payroll

tax, or whether that was around electricity prices generally with the interconnector putting downward pressure on those.

But the business referenced in the article this morning was not the only one. Another two have just announced their closure. Japanese restaurant, Kosho, in North Adelaide, and Foam coffee in Rundle Place have both closed after falling into liquidation as well, on top of the long list of businesses that I referenced yesterday. It is very clear that something needs to change. It is very clear that it is very difficult for small business at the moment. There has to be a realisation of that on the government benches and on the Treasury benches, that it is now time to step up and provide a level of support, to provide some downward pressure on the cost environment for small business in South Australia, because if steps are not taken then the list that I went through yesterday and added to this morning will only get longer and longer.

That stands at the feet of a Premier who has described himself as a pro-business Premier. Again, in my view, and in the view of this side of the house, clearly that is another case of this government saying one thing and actually doing something completely different. We need only look at the headline promise from this government and the crab walk that so quickly turned from talking about ramping, about ambulance response times, to talking about anything but the core election commitment that was made to the people of South Australia that sat on virtually every Stobie pole across suburban Adelaide and much more broadly across the state: that this government would fix the ramping crisis.

Instead, where are we more than two years later? Ramping is significantly worse than it was at the time of the election—significantly worse. If decisions cannot be made in the best interests of both the people of South Australia and the South Australian business community on the back of what the Treasurer himself described as windfall levels of GST and what I would happily describe as windfall levels of payroll tax and stamp duties coming into the Treasury coffer, then imagine when times are bad. Imagine if revenue had dropped. It is a frightening prospect.

More broadly, if I turn to some of the other issues that are making things more difficult for South Australian households and families, I think the first one—and I referenced it earlier—is in regard to inflation. We have experienced the highest level of inflation in the nation in Adelaide for a significant period of time now. As I said yesterday we have, for the first time in a 12-month period from March 2023 to March 2024, slipped down to 4.3 per cent but, again, maintaining the highest inflation rate in the nation.

What does that mean in reality? It means that every South Australian family and every South Australian small business is still having to dig that little bit deeper into their pockets just to pay for what they did previously. That is the stark reality of what that statistic means for South Australian families. It is not something that sits well when we think that we have had these issues for such a period of time, and that the inflation rate has done nothing but assist the revenues coming into the state coffers.

The other issue I want to touch on, probably more briefly, is the reality around the unemployment rate. There has certainly been a lot of talk on the other side of the house about where we are as a state in regard to unemployment. Obviously, there are flow-on effects that come from having significant employment and having labour shortages. I do not think there is a week that goes past when I do not talk to a small business or a medium-sized business, for that matter, or even a large business. One of the key things that they talk about is that finding labour has been difficult—although it is clear from the work that the South Australian Business Chamber has done around their survey of business expectations, that this is now not the first or primary concern for South Australian businesses.

The crest is well and truly starting to form, in terms of where these statistics are going. We have heard a lot about record employment numbers, and the record of number of people employed in the state, but there has been a significant change over the past couple of months. We are now a lot further away from that number and when it was achieved than we have ever been. Frighteningly, in the last lot of the ABS data that was released in relation to employment numbers and the unemployment rate just a couple of weeks ago, there was obviously a significant uptick in the unemployment rate in South Australia, upwards of 0.6 per cent, and now sitting at 3.9 per cent which,

again, is historically low but in comparison now, bringing South Australia back towards the bottom end of the table when we look across the border at other jurisdictions.

The frightening part is the fact that 10,000 jobs were lost over that month but, more than that, 11,500 fewer people were in full-time employment. It is not just that jobs were disappearing, as had been the case in the previous month, but that full-time work has taken the biggest hit. Again, what does that mean for the average South Australian family? It means that in a cost-of-living crisis, where families are now more than \$20,000 a year worse off than they were when this government came to power, their ability to cover those costs is getting more and more difficult. The ability to find full-time work has clearly, from the statistics that have been presented by the ABS, become more difficult.

I did start to work through some of the issues yesterday in regard to the South Australian Business Chamber, as they are now known. It is going to take a little bit of time for me to adjust to that; it is somewhat of a back-to-the-future move but something that will take a period of time for all of us who have been around the place for the last few years to get used to. Their Survey of Business Expectations was released for the March quarter just a couple of days ago. We touched on the fact that, of those who responded to the survey, nearly 40 per cent of businesses felt that the state's economy would perform weaker or slightly weaker over the upcoming year.

The two key measures in that survey are business confidence and business conditions, something that is measured not just by Business SA but by NAB and a range of other surveys that are conducted over periods of time. What is clear is that there has been a trend, certainly in this data, where business conditions are progressively getting worse. In fact, they are down four points on the data of the previous quarter but also down to what is now essentially the lowest point since COVID. They are also well below the level that business conditions were at the last election.

Again, what businesses are seeing out there is not just a complete and utter contrast from what the government is saying but a clear indication that there has been difficulty for them across a range of different areas. I will go into more detail in regard to some of the issues that have been pulled out by the Business Chamber. In particular, in regard to business conditions themselves, I think it is important to highlight that essentially this fall has happened over the full part of the last 12 months.

We are now obviously well and truly below the neutral score, which is 100, sitting at 86.7 points, but we have lost 19 points compared with where we were a year ago. So businesses on one hand are being told by this government that they have never had it better, but the reality is that we know business conditions are 20 points worse, basically, than they were this time a year ago. It is just chalk and cheese.

Further from that data, in regard to business conditions, the chamber in their survey drill into the primary issues that are affecting businesses in this state. We have already discussed the issue around costs, which is clear. I do not think you would meet a household or a business that would say that there has been no escalation in costs for them over the last 24 months, because clearly that just has not been the case. You only need to look at macro figures to know that that is well and truly true.

Two of the top four issues are effectively issues that government has either control of or a degree of control of, with the first being input costs. That was the primary issue affecting business, and there was a significant jump in that across the last six months, now sitting at 77 per cent of businesses outlining that that is something that is affecting their business. The second of those two issues is government policy, and I think this is an important one to touch on. I will go into more detail on that. Government policy has increased across the last six months in particular and is increasingly becoming an issue for South Australian businesses.

That is the complete opposite of what governments should be doing. Governments should be here to try to grow jobs, to drive investment, to improve business conditions, but instead we have the businesses of South Australia saying that government policy is making things more difficult for them and has become more of an issue for them, particularly over the last six months. That is not a pro-business government. Businesses are telling us, are responding to this survey and saying that the direction this government has taken and the policies this government is implementing are detrimental to them. That is not me saying that, it is not the opposition saying that: it is South Australian small businesses saying that.

As I touched on yesterday in regard to costs, some ideas have been floated by the South Australian Business Chamber, in particular around electricity rebates—and I will go into that in more detail later in my contribution—but their pre-budget submission, as highlighted both in this document and more broadly publicly as well, has called on the government effectively to double that and to look at payroll tax reform as a matter of absolute urgency. That reflects not just what the SA Business Chamber is saying, that reflects what we are hearing from business both publicly and privately in discussions the opposition has had, too.

Again, these are decisions that should have happened 12 months ago. These are decisions made when a government has additional revenues coming into its budget on the back of small businesses, on the back of households, paying more and more and more. This is a government that has profited from higher costs to households and small businesses and, instead of doing anything to provide relief to make things better—small bits and pieces—it is clear from the numbers that it has pocketed a lot more than it has provided back to anybody.

In regard to the issue that I highlighted around government policy becoming a bigger issue for small business in South Australia, the chamber has pulled out—and I will read the document verbatim so that I do not make a misstep:

Government policies were again a concern featuring in the top five issues—
at number four, I may add—

for [nearly half] of businesses. Many respondents commented that recent industrial relations changes at both state and federal levels have become a major constraint.

We only need to look back at what has happened, both at the federal level and the state level over the last little while, in regard to industrial relations. We know that, clearly, for Labor governments it is a constant tension, a constant tension between both sides of this house—there are slightly different values: the value of job creation, of understanding that business creates jobs as opposed to governments, that the government is there to support, to uplift and to provide opportunity, that we cannot have a state where essentially we do not foster new industries, new businesses and the creation of new jobs.

One of the issues that was very clear was that government policy around industrial relations has put on a handbrake and became a concern for small business in South Australia. We only need to look back again at some of the major changes that have come in. Within the first six months of this government, roughly, the changes to the Return to Work scheme saw the levy paid by South Australian businesses increase. As cited in this document as well, industrial manslaughter provisions have not been well understood by small businesses in South Australia to this point. There are difficulties for businesses understanding what those laws mean for their businesses and the requirements they will now need to meet as a result.

There is also the additional public holiday in particular affecting those hospitality businesses that we have just mentioned, a long and growing list of small businesses now not able to operate based on the existing cost environment. This government rushed a bill through both houses of parliament in quick succession, with no engagement whatsoever with the business community, and funnily enough, what have we got? We have hospitality businesses in South Australia not able to open their doors anymore and hospitality businesses that once employed South Australians no longer doing so.

This is what happens when you do not understand the consequences of decisions that you make. This government had no regard whatsoever for the potential impacts on the business community when making some of these changes, in particular around the public holiday. How do we know that? Because they did not even bother to talk to them, did not even bother to seek their input around what it would mean for hospitality businesses in South Australia who are disproportionately affected by public holidays and who are finding it tougher in South Australia to operate.

At the federal level, one of the key issues for small businesses, in particular, has been the closing loopholes legislation that had been passed through federal parliament. As I said earlier, businesses that responded to this survey highlighted industrial manslaughter and psychosocial

hazards regulations that were brought in under the WHS Act as some of the key drivers for business in terms of these things becoming issues.

One of the telling parts of how this government, and the federal government in particular as well, have gone about their industrial relations reform, and as I mentioned before with little to no consultation in some circumstances with business, is the fact that they have tried to keep these changes, as best they could, under the rug, keep these issues out of the media, keep these issues as low profile as possible, and as has been touched on earlier, despite what the Premier espouses as his pro-business credentials, the reality of what is happening is obviously quite different from that.

The approach that this government has taken does have consequences in reality. If you look at the survey results in regard to broad business awareness of the changes that have been made both by the federal government and this government in regard to the closing loopholes bill, nearly 70 per cent of businesses in South Australia are either not aware that the legislation has come in or do not understand what they need to do to comply with it. That is a problem—that is a significant problem.

When you look at the regulation changes around psychosocial hazards in the workplace that came in under the WHS Act in South Australia, again, just over 70 per cent of businesses have said that they are either not aware of the regulation changes or they do not know how to comply with them. That is a failing of government. That is a clear desire of this government again to pitch itself as a pro-business government, to try to sift through the desires of the unions but not draw it to business attention as best as they possibly can.

But what does that mean? We have a business community in South Australia that is now largely unaware or does not understand how to comply with the legislation that has been brought in. That does not serve anybody's interests. It does not serve the outcomes of what the union is trying to achieve. It does not serve the outcomes of what small businesses in South Australia are trying to achieve.

It is a fundamental failing of government when you have a government that is not even willing to stand by what they are trying to do by actually educating business in South Australia about what they are trying to achieve, but it says everything about this government because it is all smoke and mirrors, it is all say one thing and do another. That will come to light in time, but there is no greater evidence of that fact than the results of this survey.

I think it is also important to read some of the contributions. It is not just a quantitative survey; there is also the ability for those respondents who complete it to provide some commentary. There are a couple here that really stand out to me that I thought were worthwhile to put on the public record. The first being, and I quote:

Payroll Tax on general practitioners will have a big impact on affordable primary health care. Most general practices have a risk of closing.

We will get back to that issue later because it is important and it is one that is clearly going to be something that everybody is looking to in this state budget, given the amnesty that has been provided to this point, if it can be described as an amnesty. I have certainly heard rumblings from some businesses that it has not quite been as advertised, but it is a clear issue. I will come back to that in a second. The second quote states:

Payroll tax is a significant impost on a business of our size. This has been the first FY that we've reached the payroll tax threshold and it has made a tangible difference to our business. Without payroll tax, we would be able to employ an additional 1-2 FTE...

In layman's terms, that business could be employing two more South Australians. The third quote reads:

Payroll tax disproportionately impacts businesses whose wage costs are high relative to gross revenue. It does need to be reformed.

There are those businesses in South Australia finding it more difficult than everybody else at the moment. The hospitality industry is certainly an industry that would well and truly fit the definition provided in that quote. I have already discussed at length the fact that businesses are doing it tough

in terms of costs. That is borne out in the survey as well. The report found, and I quote directly, that '77 per cent of businesses were concerned about the rising cost of wages, energy and rent'.

Finally, I think one of the most insightful and important parts of this survey was the foreword—I guess we cannot really call it a foreword, given it is at the back of the document—from William Buck that conducted the survey on behalf of the SA Business Chamber. They posed the question: why is the nation's best-performing economy dragging behind in business confidence and business conditions? It has explained what has been lost I think on this government for a long period of time because we would not be in this position if it had not been.

While there are positive macro indicators, those indicators that have provided the results, such as those of the CommSec survey, fail to consider the micro issues faced by businesses—costs, profitability and labour availability. When it comes to what this government has done for small business over their time in office to this point, what we can see is an escalation of costs with very little to show in terms of proportionate return of the substantial additional revenues that have come in to government.

We have seen clearly from this survey an increased burden and cost to small business on the back of industrial relations changes, and we have seen an inability for this government to communicate the new requirements and burdens that they wish to put on small business in South Australia. That does not sound like the record of a government that is out there trying to actively assist small business in our state.

The second piece of work that I want to briefly provide a level of commentary on today is in regard to a document that was released publicly earlier this week, conducted by the Committee for Adelaide, which is a new, non-partisan venture that seeks to work for the benefit of broader South Australia to provide thought leadership in regard to how the state can better prosper moving forward. I think it is a noble endeavour that has been well supported by some of the business community, community groups in South Australia and others more broadly—I think some of our educational institutions as well.

The work that was done has culminated in this document, which is titled '5 point plan to boost productivity', one would assume in South Australia and in Adelaide more specifically. Productivity is important. As I touched on yesterday, not only is it the very basis for improving our quality of life and delivering better wages, delivering better outcomes and ensuring that our GDP and GSP growth in the state continues to be driven forward but it positions us for the jobs of the future.

Interestingly, this bit of work highlighted five points, obviously, given the title of the document, to boost productivity. I think it is worthwhile moving these into the public record of this house but also providing a level of commentary around, at the very least, a couple of these points. The five points were:

1. Increase investment in technology, innovation, training and research and development (R&D) across government, academia and industry.
2. Position Adelaide to be a world-leader in digital technologies and artificial intelligence (AI).
3. Ensure South Australia leads the way in gender equity, inclusive workplaces and economic empowerment.
4. Support businesses to access talent, capital, and local supply-chain opportunities.
5. Reduce red-tape, speed up decision-making and modernise workplaces and systems.

In particular, I think the first two points are worthwhile reflecting on. All of them within this document are well and truly worthwhile, but the first two I see as almost the opposite of what has been occurring, as we understand it, and against the policies of this government to this point.

I will look specifically at the first one, 'Increase investment in technology, innovation, training and R&D across government, academia and industry'. If I reflect primarily on how that dot point relates to government, in the first of this government's budgets, where primarily the cost savings across a range of departments were borne out, the Premier I believe at that juncture highlighted the fact that a disproportionate amount of cost saving was going to be undertaken by his agency in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Despite the best efforts of all our shadow ministers during the estimates process that followed this government's first budget, essentially the answers to every question, provided by every minister, when it came to cost savings and efficiencies that had been provided to government departments or agencies, were essentially: 'We haven't identified those savings yet. It's too early for us to have done that. They will be achieved.' Clearly they were not, given the cost blowouts that occurred and were highlighted in their second budget relating to the first financial year.

It begs the question of what has happened within DPC around investment in digital government, around the transition of government services to digital platforms and around investment in cybersecurity. There is a broader question around this government's pathway, policy or agenda around technology, the digital world and government services. I know that in some ways this government has certainly had a view that anything that the former Premier, the former member for Dunstan, was interested in is surely something that they cannot be seen to be attaching themselves to in any way whatsoever, because that would, in some perverse way, prove that perhaps the former Premier was onto a good thing.

Certainly, it is my understanding—and I am happy to receive information from the government to the contrary—that within DPC currently there is not the same level of effort in regard to the work that was there prior to the election. That is the number one point to improving productivity, both across the public sector and the private sector, but primarily when we are talking about everything that we can directly control, which is of course the public sector. It would be helpful to get information at a period of time, considering that, for the second iteration of estimates on the back of the second budget, to this point there still have been no clear answers in terms of where budget cuts were made.

Certainly, when we reflect on the significant cybersecurity attacks that have occurred over the last 12 to 18 months—which were highlighted in this place for a prolonged period of time and were unfortunately kept secret, for lack of a better term, by this government until they were exposed in this very chamber—it has to be asked whether we are doing enough, whether we have maintained our effort and whether the cuts that may or may not have been made within DPC have borne any level of additional risk to the public sector. Secondly, what pathway, what trajectory, have they placed South Australia on when it comes to improving the productivity of the public sector in South Australia?

The second dot point that was pulled out in particular was to position Adelaide to be a world leader in digital technologies and AI. This is one that I think is particularly important for us to reflect on because, again, I do not think that I have heard much in terms of positive commentary from those who are involved in Lot Fourteen or in some of the other institutions further down North Terrace, directly to our east, in regard to the level of importance or investment from this government on that site since the change of government. It has certainly been a question that has been put to me on a number of occasions, whether the Deputy Premier as the responsible minister actually has much of an interest at all in procuring, in providing improvement on that site.

It has often been described to me as something that was entirely positive for the direction of South Australia—that Lot Fourteen was providing a space where we had businesses wanting to come. It was, and hopefully still is, a magnet where we had significant international companies that were moving on the presumption that they would be joining a growing, flourishing environment of R&D focused on new digital technologies and AI and centred, of course, by the Australian Institute of Machine Learning.

We have these thought leaders, the Committee for Adelaide, putting out papers saying that we need to accelerate the creation of a flagship entrepreneurial and innovation centre and hub at Lot Fourteen to continue collaboration and commercialisation of IP across the universities as well as defence, space, cyber and critical technology sectors—all those sectors that were effectively identified by the previous government as being important not just to provide the jobs for the future but also to provide growth industries for the future here in South Australia.

We have that same group calling for the fact that Lot Fourteen needs to position itself as the national leader for AI and digital skills and training, and that we want the best and brightest to be seeking opportunities in South Australia.

The questions that are often put to me are: when was the last time we saw a press conference at Lot Fourteen? When was the last time we saw a positive announcement from this government at Lot Fourteen? Where is the story? Where is the continued journey that Lot Fourteen had been on? Where is the continued attention that should be there? These are the questions that are so frequently put to me and they are ones that I unfortunately find difficult to answer, because from my perspective it has been difficult to see much by way of attention from this government in regard to that sector that we know is going to be critical and we know is going to underpin productivity, GSP growth and new opportunities in this state.

We can go into a further debate about the priorities for this government and the fact that perhaps they are not as interested in supporting some of these sectors, perhaps they are not as interested in supporting some of these small start-up businesses and perhaps they are not as excited about supporting opportunities to really change the face of what South Australia is and stands for.

The disappointing part about that is how well positioned those industries of defence, space, cyber and critical technologies are to the underpinning work and commitments that we have from the federal government that were secured through the former Liberal state and federal governments around the AUKUS agreement where we will see, all going well, nuclear-powered submarines built not more than 15 to 20 kilometres away from here, give or take, down at Osborne.

We know that we are well positioned for some of these sectors, primarily on the basis that we have both the space and the ability. I noticed in the paper earlier this week or last of a recent launch from the South Australian outback. We are well positioned both from a geographic perspective but also from a skills base, and a soft investment that has been made at Lot Fourteen. It is absolutely critical that the momentum that has been gained over the term of the Marshall Liberal government is not lost during the first term, and hopefully only term, of this Labor government because it does not serve South Australia well to have a departure from the approach that has been taken to this point.

We can see it, and the Committee for Adelaide can see it. It is something that very clearly needs to be addressed by this government, and it needs to be clear. Are they committed to Lot Fourteen? Are they committed to these sectors or not? It is as simple as that and, to this point, I am not sure that those answers have been clear, concise or in any way communicated more broadly to South Australia.

In the five minutes or so before we hit lunch, I just thought it important to go back and give a brief history of how we have reached this point with the South Australian state budget. In coming into government, Labor had a significant level of election commitment. Having looked at the books in their first budget, I am sure the question for them would have been, at that point in time, how they were going to deliver those. We know—well, we certainly know on this side of the house anyway—that the answer to that question was simply to push the two biggest infrastructure projects in the state's history into a review, to get them out beyond the forward estimates to then allow them to deliver what they had committed to prior to the election.

There is a broader question in regard to those projects—(a) we know that the productivity benefit that would have been gained from the delivery of those projects earlier is clearly not going to be realised and (b) the significant cost escalation that has come on the back of those reviews. Again, it is hard to determine whether these things are good, bad or otherwise when essentially the cost-benefit ratios and the plans on which these decisions have been made are not released publicly and, more so, have not even been released to the likes of the Auditor-General, as we understand it. He has, to this point, obviously made requests of the government for attachments or cabinet submissions. We will at a future point in time I am sure address this issue again with the newly minted Auditor-General.

But then there is the question around the role of the CFMEU in some of these decisions to delay some of these projects. The union had had little to no involvement—certainly by way of the Victorian branch anyway—in South Australia up until the Premier of South Australia was elected in 2022. We saw pictures of the Premier arm-in-arm with CFMEU members on the night of his election. We saw a donation accepted on behalf of the South Australian Labor Party from the CFMEU, despite the questionable behaviour that had occurred by union leadership prior.

If we want to talk about the impact of industrial relations on small businesses here in South Australia, certainly within the construction sector, there has been no greater impact for them than the Victorian-led John Setka takeover of the South Australian branch of the CFMEU. We have seen small businesses essentially held over to sign union EBs. We have seen picket lines at the front of South Australian small businesses that are just trying to do their jobs, get out there and build infrastructure in South Australia.

The question that still remains on this side of the house in regard to the CFMEU's role, in what will be the two most important infrastructure projects in our state's history to this point, is how much will they benefit? How much will the CFMEU benefit from the new Women's and Children's Hospital project? How much will they benefit from the cost escalation that has come from the review? I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Petitions

WESTERN HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton): Presented a petition signed by 1,941 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to ensure the future of the Western Hospital at Henley Beach and, in particular, ensures that the land on which the hospital sits remains zoned for health care services into the future.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Rules made under the following Acts

Adelaide Park Lands—Park Lands Lease Agreement—(Rymill Park)

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

Blue Crab Fishery, Review of the Management Plan for the—Review

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge that in the gallery today we have year 12 Legal Studies students from Pembroke School, who are guests of the member for Dunstan. Welcome to parliament. I hope you enjoy your time here and go home informed about how democracy works in South Australia.

SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The SPEAKER (14:02): It has been discovered that on Wednesday 10 April 2024 an incorrect second reading explanation was inserted into *Hansard* for the Supply Bill 2024. Inadvertently, the explanation for the Supply Bill 2023 was inserted and printed in the weekly volume of *Hansard* and published online instead of the 2024 Supply Bill explanation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It was on 10 April, before my time. I was nowhere near Aisle 13!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Let's go easy on Hansard. They do a fantastic job. Hansard apologises for this error and has corrected the *Hansard* online record with the insertion of the correct 2024 explanation of the bill. No damage done. Thank you, Hansard.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would also like to welcome the team from Dementia Australia, who are guests of the member for Davenport and the member for Frome. They have been here today talking to members of parliament about their virtual reality experiences of what it is like to live with dementia. I visited my mum on the way in here, and you do great work, thank you.

Question Time

HOUSING SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04): My question is to the Premier. How many homes have been built on land at Hackham, Sellicks Beach, Dry Creek and Concordia since February 2023? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 12 February 2023, the government announced that up to 23,700 new homes would be built on land to be rezoned as residential at Hackham, Sellicks Beach, Dry Creek and Concordia.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:04): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. To answer him, we have embarked on government-led code amendments. We have completed the code amendment for Hackham. They are now—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you just hear me out. We have concluded the code amendment for Hackham, and we have begun government-led code amendments for Concordia and for Sellicks Beach, and we are currently in that process. As members opposite know, because they could have initiated Sellicks Beach at any time when they were in government, and they could have initiated Concordia at any time when they were in government, it is obvious that rezonings take some time, as does the land division process under councils.

No-one has ever been pretending that these houses are going to appear overnight. It is important to have a pipeline of land supply in the system. Those opposite clogged up that pipeline. Those opposite only rezoned 180 hectares of land in the entire time they were in government. They made no provision for regional housing. And those opposite know that because, when you went to a briefing on regional housing, you all sort of sheepishly came up afterwards and told me what good work it was. So let's not pretend that you are proud of your record in government. We all know that you did nothing on land supply. You left all the hard work for this government.

We now have already doubled the amount of land that you rezoned in four years. We have 90 code amendments, with over 4,000 hectares under rezoning initiated and under consideration, a huge pipeline of work, and we are beginning the process of doing all of the civil infrastructure, all of the civil work, getting the industry ready at the same time as we are the number one on HIA's scorecard for residential starts. So let's not pretend that you have anything to be proud of and that we have anything to be ashamed of. We are pushing through a pipeline of housing supply for the market for the future.

HOUSING SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): Supplementary to the minister: when will work commence on construction of homes at the four locations?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:07): Obviously at Hackham or, as it is now known, Onkaparinga Heights. The first stages of civil work will probably begin at the end of this year. With the other code amendments, we have to get through the code amendment process. It's obvious that you have to get through the code amendment process, then you have to go through a land division process with councils. We are going to let that process be undertaken.

Obviously, land supply is not delivered overnight. You have to do the rezoning through the code amendment process, you have to do all the investigations on traffic, you have to engage councils, you have to actually work out where town centres and roads and all the rest of it are going to be, where the schools are going to be. That is an important process. We are going to do the hard work.

This government has led that work through government-led code amendments for both Concordia and Sellicks Beach. We are confident that we are going to add to building supply, the housing supply. As I said before, we've got 90 other code amendments in the system and over 4,000 hectares under consideration for land supply in this state.

HOUSING SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. When will construction of homes commence on the land that was released by the government at Aldinga, Noarlunga Downs and Golden Grove in April 2023? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 30 April 2023, the government announced a project to set aside blocks for 1,900 homes, with work to begin, and I quote, 'next year' with a minimum target of 15 per cent affordable housing.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:09): I do thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question, and I do want to give the Leader of the Opposition credit for his public acknowledgement of the fact that, when it comes to housing supply and land supply, the government of which he was a member didn't do enough to address the issue. I think that candour is appreciated. Allow me to reciprocate that candour with an honest conversation about the timing.

When we release land, it is the first step in a substantial process that ultimately leads to a family getting access to a home. As the minister was articulating in his answer, the government has to release the land, then there's the code amendment, then there's the land division process—which, ideally, happens concurrently with civil works. Civil works in and of itself then draws out its own complications, with the one that is occupying the government's mind and attention most at the moment being civil works associated with water infrastructure.

Each and every one of those elements takes time. Then, of course, we need the land to be sold, a developer to engage a customer, money to be lent, a house to be built and commissioned, then a family moves in. All of that takes time, and some of that time is there for good reason. There are other elements that I would characterise as unnecessary delay.

One of the responsibilities that has been invested in the Minister for Housing and Urban Development is not just to get supply out into the system but also to aggressively pursue opportunities where we can truncate that process, expedite that process. Are there opportunities where the code amendment process can be sped up? Are there opportunities for governments to intervene to accelerate the provision of water infrastructure in advance of housing construction? They are pieces of work that the minister and the new department have been instructed by me as being their singular responsibility.

One of the reasons why as a government we are now, as we speak, forming a brand new Department of Housing and Urban Development is to make sure that we have single points of accountability. I think one of the frustrations that we have identified over the course of the last 18 months, as we have been aggressively trying to increase housing supply, is that there are multiple points of accountability, and often for good reason. But we have formed the view that by putting them in a singular department with a single chief executive and a single minister, we can seek to expedite that effort.

I think, as the minister referred to, the actions that this government has been able to take have reaped some dividends, with the HIA giving us number one in the country, the BCA giving us number one in the country and the Commonwealth Bank's State of the States report ranking us number one in the country when it comes to the elements that they consider in respect of housing

construction starts and the provision of supply. So bodies independent of government—not accustomed to awarding praise, necessarily, to Labor governments—are acknowledging the work that we are doing. They know that we are all-in on this effort. That is something we will continue to do for as long as we have the opportunity, because these aren't just processes and numbers, it's the opportunity to provide families with homes.

HOUSING SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. How many homes have been built on land at Goolwa North and Fisherman Bay since May 2023? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 8 May 2023, the government announced that up to 2,500 new homes had been, and I quote, 'unlocked' after code amendments were initiated by the minister at Goolwa North and Fisherman Bay.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13): The Leader of the Opposition is right; we have unlocked supply. This is a genuine departure of policy since we have been elected. Much of the emphasis of governments prior has been exclusively on infill. I don't share that view, and we made clear our philosophical position as a government on this prior to the election. We believe both infill and urban growth have a role to play. We don't think that urban growth should necessarily be characterised as a dirty word; we believe that urban growth, provided—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It's two words.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Sure. Urban growth is appropriate provided that the necessary work is done around planning of infrastructure, services, open space—what we are doing in the creation of communities, rather than just gutter-to-gutter housing without much reference to consequence after the fact.

We are in favour of urban growth, and let me explain why. Infill unleashed is having consequences on our streets. It is having consequences on our communities because what we are seeing is cars completely congesting parking in streets, we are losing homes that are diminishing the heritage and sense of place in various suburbs around our state, and we think that that should be addressed in a considered way, which is why the government has reforms with respect to heritage.

We are in favour of infill but we are more in favour of strategic infill rather than letting-it-rip infill. Strategic infill is something else that this government is leaning on in a way that hasn't been universally supported by industry: through our acquisition of things like the West End site at Thebarton, what we are seeking to do in the member for Badcoe's electorate at LeCornu, the land swap that we are pursuing at Keswick, just to name a few examples.

But I also believe that, on top of strategic infill, working families should not be deprived of the opportunity to have a job and be able to live in a home with a backyard so that the kids can get out and enjoy playing a bit of backyard cricket or mucking around with soccer or netball, or whatever it might be, in a healthy way, rather than being deprived of that opportunity, which so many other families in the past in South Australia have been able to enjoy.

So we believe in both. We believe that families should be afforded the opportunity to have a choice: a strategic infill location at maybe a more modest expense close to the CBD and transport, or having a house with a yard in it and that the provision of that should be affordable and accessible. That's why, as a government, as soon as we got in, we have been putting the pedal to the metal and accelerating efforts to actually expand urban growth opportunities and actually release land: land that hasn't been released prior, land that when you add it up amounts to the single biggest land release in the history of the state. That's something we are proud of.

Do we want to see homes built on that land as quickly as possible? You better believe it. Do we want to see that happen? Of course, we do, which is exactly why we are doing the work around infrastructure, code amendments, land division, creating departments and actually getting some things moving. It's also why the HIA, the Commonwealth Bank, the BCA are all queuing up to applaud

the work that this government is doing, and we are going to keep doing it until we start seeing that housing supply flow in a way that will benefit countless South Australians.

HOUSING SUPPLY

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Has the minister sought or received advice or modelling from his agency on whether South Australia will meet its housing targets under the National Housing Accord? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: Data released by Master Builders Australia in early April suggests that South Australia will underperform a target to construct 83,000 new homes by 2028-29 in accordance with the National Housing Accord targets by 33 per cent or 27,000 homes.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:18): We are going to do everything we can to expand supply into the market and everything we can to facilitate private industry and public agencies delivering on housing targets, not because it's a target but because we want to, as the Premier says, provide homes to South Australians.

I guess it's important to realise that there is a timeline to these things, that it does take time. Rezoning takes time. Councils take a lot of time with land division. It takes time to do civil works, it takes time to put infrastructure in. Of course, that means the pipeline has to be put in place by each and every government to make sure there is supply into the market. I noticed the Leader of the Opposition on ABC radio said:

I don't think when we were in government we necessarily got the land release side of things right and the availability of land for housing is a big problem around Adelaide and in the regions as well.

What has happened is, after four years of doing next to nothing on housing—next to nothing on housing in the city, next to nothing on housing in the suburbs and next to nothing on housing in the regions—the opposition shows up and says, 'Why can't you just click your fingers and produce houses?' The answer is because you clogged up the pipeline. You clogged up the pipeline on land release and you clogged up the pipeline on infrastructure, and you should own up to it.

What we are doing is putting land supply into the system. As I said before, there are over 90 code amendments with over 4,000 hectares in the system currently being assessed for land release. That is an unrivalled level of activity in our planning system to provide supply into both the public arena and the private arena—important projects like Onkaparinga Heights, Hackham, Concordia, Sellicks Beach, Dry Creek, the former brewery, Prospect Corner, Bowden—

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —let me finish off—all these things are important. I hear the member's intervention; I say there's no time like today to begin, and the difference between us and you is that we have begun.

HOUSING SUPPLY

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:20): Supplementary: how many new homes are expected to be built in 2024-25?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:20): We came off a record high of about 14,000; the industry is anticipating about 10,000 starts. That is just under our normal level of activity which is normally around the 11,000 mark. I will take the question on notice and I will get the figures in the past, each and every year, of what South Australia has built. It's obvious that we haven't been building enough supply. Blind Freddie could tell you that, any man in the street could tell you that, anybody trying to rent a home could tell you that.

All I am trying to do is give you some context about why we are where we are. It's because of the actions of previous governments: the Marshall government, the Morrison government. They overcooked in one year. We all know what happened with HomeBuilder, where they stretched supply

lines, where they nearly broke the industry, where we had a profitless boon. What we're going to do is release land into the market, we're going to put civil infrastructure in, we're going to work with industry to build homes and we're going to work with them to sustainably increase the numbers over the next following years.

EDITHBURGH SPORTS AND COMMUNITY CLUB POWER SUPPLY UPGRADE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister advise if there is potential to reimburse community groups to meet the cost of mandatory new power supply upgrades for community facilities used as refuge centres? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: The Edithburgh Sports and Community Club got a \$30,000 bill from SAPN to connect and upgrade power supply for its facility upgrade project in order to meet the extra load requirements over and above what they would have had to have as a simple sporting club. Their new facility is funded from a Black Summer bushfire recovery grant and is designed to be an emergency refuge and coordination centre in the event of an emergency. As a result, their overall budget has blown out and the club is in danger of not being able to complete the project.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:23): That is an excellent question. Just for some background for the house, as you connect to the grid, with the way the market works those costs are borne by the person wishing to connect to the grid if the grid requires an upgrade. These aren't costs that are usually socialised across the entire network. However, this sounds like a fairly unique situation where a community not-for-profit organisation is receiving commonwealth funding or state funding to build a refuge for an essential service during a bushfire or natural disaster, and the system somehow here has fallen through the cracks that this organisation is not being able to be either reimbursed or have these costs smeared.

I will undertake to the house to go away and have a look at this case and see if there is something we can do. It might require a rule change or some sort of ministerial intervention—I'm not quite sure. I need to get the details of it all and I need to know what the upgrade is for exactly. I'm assuming it's generators to operate if they are cut off from the grid. I'm not quite sure why a refuge would require a larger load, but I will have a look at it all and get back to the member with an answer. I thank him for raising this with me.

SERVICE SA CENTRES

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on Saturday openings of Service SA centres?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:25): What you just saw there were the proverbial tyre tracks over all of his colleagues. Throw them right under that bus—it wasn't me. My young friend, he just works here. He wasn't part of the Marshall government, he was an independent Speaker. He was just watching it all unfold before him.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right. Strapped into the back, like a child. Next week marks one year since Service SA centres at Elizabeth, Marion, Modbury, Prospect and Seaford Meadows opened on Saturdays between 9am and 5pm. When the former government announced they were closing Prospect, Modbury and Mitcham centres, they got it wrong.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I know the Leader of the Opposition yells out 'shame' as well. There was zero consideration for the thousands of people affected by closing them. These centres recorded high customer visit numbers and the public backlash was instantaneous and loud.

Despite the overwhelming opposition to those closures, it remained the former government's priority to close those centres. I do point out to the house that every one of those members representing those electorates was defeated at the last election.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It could be one of the reasons. What we have done is we have honoured our election commitment, we have listened to the people of South Australia, and 89,918 transactions have occurred since 6 May 2023. People are interacting face to face with a real person: applying for a licence, renewing a licence with a new photograph—which I need to do very, very often (actually, I try to keep the old one for as long as possible)—transferring interstate and overseas licences, submitting a certificate of fitness, applying for a concession and applying for a disability parking permit with the convenience of a Saturday, as there are now new types of ways that families interact with services.

Additional friendly, hardworking full-time staff have been allocated to Service SA. On behalf of the South Australian government, I would like to thank them for their service, their work and their kindness in working on weekends. I look forward to updating the house on the continued success of Saturday openings.

I know that members across the parliament on both sides of the chamber realise the error of the former government's ways and we are seeing now these Service SA centres operating on Saturdays. I would like to see how this works over a couple of years so we can get a better understanding about how well it's working and how well South Australians are interacting with Service SA centres.

That doesn't mean that our work is finished. A lot of people want to do work online and not have to go into the Service SA centres, but we should have both those options open for people according to their needs. We will be doing the work to make sure we can do more online servicing for people who don't want to have to go into a Service SA centre, and those in our community who feel more comfortable or are required to by us in this house to attend in person, we will make sure it's open and as accessible as possible.

MENTAL HEALTH REVIEW

Ms PRATT (Frome) (14:28): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on the commencement and completion dates for the independent review committed to by the Chief Psychiatrist relating to the recent incident at Glenelg? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms PRATT: An incident occurred at a Glenelg real estate agency on 22 April following the release of a mental health patient from hospital that day. The Chief Psychiatrist has indicated that an independent external review into the case will look into the care that she received over the past 18 months, including discharge procedures, communication with other agencies and appropriate improvement recommendations for the care of people in similar situations.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:29): Thank you very much, member for Frome, for this important question. This matter was brought to my attention last week, and obviously I was concerned to hear about the matter and raised it with both the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network and also the Chief Psychiatrist. Obviously, broader matters in relation to this are before the courts and I will be careful in terms of how I comment, but suffice to say that, following discussions that I had with family members involved here and also discussions with the Chief Psychiatrist, the Chief Psychiatrist has commissioned an independent review into the circumstances of the care of this patient in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

He has already appointed a reviewer, which is Dr Danny Sullivan, who is a consultant forensic and adult psychiatrist from Victoria, so somebody from interstate has been brought in to do this review. Dr Sullivan has conducted similar reviews of a serious nature and provided evidence to coronial inquests across the country, I am advised, and so has a level of insight that the Chief Psychiatrist believes he will bring to the investigations into this matter. The Chief Psychiatrist has

said that he expects that the review will take between three or four months, but obviously will be guided by what the independent reviewer believes is necessary in terms of making sure that he is able to address the terms of reference.

When I met with family members, we provided them with the draft terms of reference that would be provided to the independent review, and we have given the family the opportunity to give input into the terms of reference as well before they are finalised.

SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:31): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is the government taking action to ensure that all SAPOL employees are afforded a safe and inclusive workplace? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: The media has reported today that a SAPOL officer identifies as a cat. SA Police indicated that they were not aware of anyone who identifies as a 'furry', and it is incumbent on the agency to ensure that appropriate policies and support structures are in place to support all employees.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:32): I thank the member for Flinders for his question. I have been advised that SAPOL are not aware of any person who identifies in the terms that the member for Flinders has described. As well, I add that operational and employment matters are entirely a matter for South Australia Police.

GRAIN HARVEST

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister reassure South Australians that the existing grain harvest code of practice will remain unchanged for the 2024-25 harvesting season, and the farming community will continue to use the Grass Fire Danger Index measurement this year, with the cease harvest threshold of GFDI 35?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:33): I thank the member for Hammond for his question. This is a matter, of course, which flared aggressively in the life of the previous government, and there wasn't an opportunity for there to be a resolution to the satisfaction of many regional members.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: The South Australian Country Fire Service and Grain Producers SA have had effective and ongoing dialogue in relation to the South Australian grain harvest code of practice and, in particular, the cease harvest threshold, often referred to as the CHT, as the member for Hammond will undoubtedly be aware. The current government and especially my predecessor has successfully supported CFS and GPSA in building their ongoing effective engagement and their relationship.

Prior to harvest last year, CFS and GPSA agreed to maintain the status quo in relation to cease harvest thresholds, with a firm view to maintain both safety and harvest productivity. This is a principles-based approach that acknowledges the historical impact of harvest-related fires, the commitment of South Australian grain growers to safe harvest practices, and the importance of maintaining grower buy-in, of course, as well.

The CFS and the GPSA also agreed to work together throughout and following the recent fire danger season to ensure that the CHT is clearly communicated and commonly understood. The CFS and the GPSA also agreed to actively review the progress of the season at regular intervals and at the conclusion, which has, I am advised, occurred. Through this process, a commitment was also made by both parties to record relevant data and share it with each other as an empirical measure of the level of success, with a debrief to occur so that the entirety of the harvest period can be evaluated and lessons learned be applied in years to come.

Certain post-harvest statistics are available. I will take that particular aspect of the question on notice and provide a more detailed answer in relation to those statistics to the member for Hammond. I am sure they will be of interest to him. There were three formal review meetings between the CFS and the GPSA during the season and, as I said, I will certainly provide those additional statistical materials to the house, in a tabulated form.

There was also informal contact, as you might expect, throughout the season. Subsequent to these reviews, the CFS and the GPSA have maintained their position of not altering cease harvest thresholds and a commitment to maintain their ongoing and positive relationship and engagement. It would seem that that positive relationship and engagement is impervious to political influence. It is a good and strong relationship. It continues. I am sure there will be continuing investment in that relationship in the years to come.

FIRST NATIONS VOICE TO PARLIAMENT

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Why is the Premier going ahead with a State Voice to Parliament when there is no mandate from the South Australian public? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: In October 2023 the constitutional referendum on the Voice was rejected by the Australian people. South Australia had the second highest no vote, behind Queensland, with nearly 65 per cent saying no. In the recent election of the state-based Voice, less than 10 per cent of those who were eligible to vote actually voted. People in my electorate believe the millions that the SA Voice would cost taxpayers would be better spent on improving cost-of-living pressures and health and education in our regions.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:37): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question. It does provide an opportunity for the government and I to explain our position in regard to the issues that the member for MacKillop raises, which I think aren't unreasonable. There are a couple of things, though, that are worth pointing out. You might characterise it as 'nuanced' but I actually think it is quite fundamental in nature.

The first thing is this: the member for MacKillop in his question refers to the constitutional referendum, as he well should. The distinction here, of course, is there has been no amendment to the constitution with respect to South Australia's Voice to Parliament. It is entirely legislative.

The second thing is that at the last state election, which of course happened well prior to the federal election and, indeed, occurred prior to the referendum, hundreds of thousands of South Australians voted for political parties—not party, but political parties—whose position was to pursue a legislated Voice to Parliament. On this side of the house, yes, we absolutely went to the election with a position to institute a Voice to Parliament.

But that was also true on that side of the house. Indeed, if you don't mind me saying so, member for MacKillop, you went to the last election endorsing it, as a member of a political party and a government at the time whose policy was to institute a Voice to Parliament. In fact, I don't want to seem cute, but we were at one on this issue only two years ago.

Having won the election, we delivered on our commitment to introduce a Voice to Parliament and that legislation passed this parliament well before any referendum. I suspect that those who would seek to weaponise this issue politically will not be projecting that message to those who would see this issue as fertile ground to sow political discontent, but nonetheless they are the facts that are recorded into history, and I am more than happy to talk about them in this place.

In respect to the Voice to Parliament and how it has been legislated, the elections have occurred. The new members who will represent the Voice to Parliament have started to engage with one another and in due course, in the not too distant future, they will go through their own process as is provided for in the legislation to determine which two members of the Voice will ultimately end up with the responsibility of being able to make a contribution in this place—a significant privilege and a significant honour.

But do you know what is also a significant honour and a significant privilege? For this country to be home to the longest living culture that human history has ever known. I have held the view consistently and it hasn't changed, and my heart has been on my sleeve on this from the get-go because it was the very first policy that the team that we had in opposition announced to the public—the very first. I am of the view that the longest living culture that history has ever known should be afforded the opportunity just to be heard and that is all it is: they don't get to make decisions, they don't get to decide policy, they just get to be heard. I am okay with that. Others might not be, but we have legislated for it, and I am looking forward to it happening.

SMALL BUSINESS

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Small and Family Business. Can the minister update the house on how the government is supporting South Australian small business?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:41): Thank you to the member for Dunstan for her question. I think we all appreciate her advocacy and passion for small business that came out through her wonderful first speech only on Tuesday. It is a timely question. We are in the midst of Small Business Week, which has a theme of 'helping you get on with business'.

Just this morning, I attended and opened the Small Business Expo, which I am proud to say was a sold-out event. We had 500 small business owners register and be part of the expo down at the Entertainment Centre all day today. Alan Kohler was the expo's keynote speaker. He provided some invaluable insights into the state's economy and the outlook for small businesses in South Australia. If anyone is interested, his hot tip on interest rates was that they weren't going to be cut but they also weren't going to increase for the next two years.

The expo today features over 20 experts presenting on different topics relevant to small businesses through a number of presentations, workshops and panel discussions. Topics covered include cash flow management, sustainable business practices, how to attract and retain staff and many others. Moreover, the day encompasses sessions on mental health management, which is acknowledging the often overlooked yet critical aspect of wellbeing for small business owners.

Attendees at the expo are also going to benefit from tailored advice, referrals and supports provided through the Small Business Commissioner's *Gov to You* exhibition. This initiative aims to streamline access to government agencies and support organisations, really consolidating resources in one accessible place for small businesses.

Of course, Small Business Week is more than just the expo today. There have been over 30 events and workshops, with over 40 expert speakers right across metropolitan Adelaide and, importantly, Mr Speaker, in regional areas, such as the Adelaide Hills, Yorke Peninsula and, as you will be interested, Kangaroo Island as well.

Complementing these events is a suite of online resources that will allow business owners to access the information that is useful to them when they need it. These resources are published through the Office for Small and Family Business website, which is business.sa.gov.au.

To round out the week, the Premier and I are going to attend the Empowering Women in Business Breakfast tomorrow. The breakfast starts a full-day professional development program for female business leaders to learn how to respond to challenges that are specific to female-run businesses. This valuable event is a really key part of the Malinauskas government's highly successful Women in Business Program.

All of these initiatives, whether they are in-person events or online, serve as catalysts for connection, for education and really for inspiration for our small business owners. They provide small business owners with the avenues to enhance their capabilities, to build their networks, to learn from experts and to explore opportunities available to their businesses. We have had over 1,300 registrations throughout the week, and many of those events have been sold out. We have had an overwhelmingly positive response, and I am really pleased for the team that has put such a fantastic program together.

Of course, our small business commitment is not just for this week. We have established the Office for Small and Family Business. We have a \$14 million Small Business Strategy. We are implementing 20 initiatives to futureproof South Australian businesses throughout that strategy, and there are many highlights and programs available for people to access.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. What action is the minister taking to finalise disciplinary matters relating to CFS staff and volunteers? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PEDERICK: The opposition has been advised of circumstances where paid staff and volunteers have been subject to suspensions from the CFS without having received the specific details of the alleged wrongdoing.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:45): I appreciate the question from the member for Hammond. The member will be aware that there is consideration being given to the drafting of new regulations and policies to inform those regulations. These regulations control the disciplinary process. I am very hopeful that approval will at some point reasonably soon be given to ensure that there can be adequate and widespread consultation in relation to new regulations. It will better inform the disciplinary process that CFS and SES volunteers are subject to, keeping well in mind that certain disciplinary processes in relation to the Metropolitan Fire Service are otherwise controlled by provisions in the act.

The house might well know that there are approximately 21 disciplinary matters relating to the CFS. I am informed that all but six of these relate to criminal matters. I am informed, too, that in relation to the State Emergency Service there is one disciplinary matter that also is informed by criminal proceedings. It is certainly a matter on which I have taken detailed advice. It is a matter about which I care deeply.

As the member for Hammond will appreciate, there are many, many CFS volunteers in the regional community of Mount Barker, throughout the Adelaide Hills, throughout the Fleurieu and, of course, right across South Australia. With respect to the CFS, as is well known in this place, there are about 13,500—just slightly less—volunteers. In terms of the SES, there are 1,700. We care very deeply about the welfare of all of these volunteers.

I also should acknowledge that the member for Hammond is a volunteer himself, joined by other volunteers in the house. Most notably, I think it would be right on this occasion to acknowledge the member for Waite, who of course most recently brought before the house a motion to recognise International Firefighters' Day. When the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: No, this isn't a laughing matter. This is not a laughing matter.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: This is not a spectacle. This relates to the welfare of individual volunteers. It is not a matter that should be the subject of humour from you, from you or anyone further from your 14 members—14 of you. That is outrageous! It is not a spectacle. The welfare of these individual volunteers is something about which I care very deeply, but I am concerned very much by that response. Can I say and emphasise to the house, that is very poor judgement from you—very poor judgement indeed.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: standing order 98. I think it would be better if the minister got back to the subject.

The SPEAKER: I think the standing orders don't allow for interjections, so if members on my left don't interject then it's not possible for the minister to respond. I think it's been a nice, calm, quiet week, and I thank all members for that. I put that down as a one-all draw, and as an umpire

who likes to see play on and the whistle kept in the umpire's pocket I was willing to let that one run. The member for Hammond.

Mr PEDERICK: My question—

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Sorry, there's a minute left in my answer.

Mr Pederick: You sat down.

The SPEAKER: He sat down because of the point of order, member for Hammond. Now you will sit down and the minister will resume his answer.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection and also the call that's important for me to illustrate that there are certain disciplinary matters that fall within the standing orders. No doubt, you will be familiar with those, of course.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Two in due course. Can I emphasise an additional three matters to the house? I really want to emphasise these points. The first is this: requests were made of previous ministers in the former government, as is the evidence before a committee in another place, that action should be taken in respect of these regulations. Was any action taken? No. It was not adequate to meet the needs of those volunteers, and that is why we find ourselves in this place. To my second point, there will be consultation in relation to proposed regulations. Of course, the policy will inform those regulations, and third—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Third point—we definitely can count. I can count 14 of you.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister provide an update to the house about whether the examination into disciplinary regulations in the CFS, launched in September 2023, has been completed? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PEDERICK: On 31 October last year, it was reported that the then minister had launched an examination into disciplinary regulations.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:52): It is absolutely right for me to acknowledge in this place the work of the member for Cheltenham, the former minister. He was diligent, proactive, thoughtful, careful, and he did one thing that you didn't do: he listened. He formed the view that it was the best course to listen carefully to the views expressed by the volunteer associations. Those views were as they had been expressed to two former ministers, as the evidence before, as I understand it, the committee in the other place is fairly described. He acted on those requests, initiated a review process.

We are now towards the end of the internal considerations from the agencies in respect of the regulations that need to be brought forward, which I hope will, subject to consultation, replace the regulations that are existing as well. But members must keep closely in mind that the regulations are informed by a policy. They are informed by policies that will also need to be developed, and they are informed by the decision-making of individual officers. I will continue to listen very closely to the views of the volunteer associations. We are absolutely committed to ensuring that there will be consultation on new regulations. I look forward to that process as it develops.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:53): Supplementary: will the minister commit to publicly releasing any recommendations arising from the examination?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:53): What I can commit to is to doing what you didn't do, and that is—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Listen, you had four years to do it. You are a volunteer. You are a volunteer, and you had four years to fix it, and what did you do? Nothing—absolutely nothing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, you are warned.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: You're quibbling with the dress sense of other members of parliament. That's how seriously you take this issue.

Mr Telfer: Do you seriously think anyone thinks you're a smart actor in this?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Well, I'm not sure that's necessarily the question.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: No, no, that isn't the question. The question is going to be this—

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta on a point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. The question was whether the minister will release publicly recommendations from this review he has talked about. Standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I bring the minister back to the substance.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Very well. Let me share this very important context with the house in relation to the consultation process, evidenced from another place:

Concerns were raised with the association back in June 2020 in relation to the way CFS was managing the discipline process. We then met with the Chief Officer of the time, Mark Jones. We also raised the issues with two previous ministers—

two previous ministers—

in relation to our concerns and our request that the process be reviewed.

This part is particularly important, I think. I will emphasise it to the house by way of context:

At that stage, absolutely nothing happened. We have continued to lobby and push for a review of the discipline process and in August of this year—

that is, last year—

we have actually had an undertaking that the review will occur and has commenced.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: That's a thoughtful, careful and important process, one you couldn't deliver; and there will be new regulations put on the table. But can I say, in relation to an earlier point put to me about the judgement that might be brought to bear on all of us, the question will not be the one that was put by the member for Flinders, it will be this: who is the better government? And another question will be: are you an alternative government?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Are you an alternative minister?

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Morialta on a point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I barely know where to start, sir. That was extraordinary. Let's go with standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister may have completed his answer. The member for MacKillop.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Is the government aware of any funds from the federal government allocated towards affordable housing and other housing needs? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: It was well known through the Marshall years, when we were seeing the beginning of this housing issue bubble along and get worse and worse, that the federal government and the housing minister had \$700 million at their disposal and didn't do anything with that \$700 million, contributing to why we have ended up where we are today. Can the minister elaborate?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:58): I will have to get the exact figures for the member but, as he is aware, there was a range of funds set aside by the Morrison government—I think the quantum was slightly smaller than that—for infrastructure for housing. One of the great pities is that the Morrison government, I think, did allocate that money in good faith and they wanted to find projects that they could put infrastructure in, but, sadly, those funds were not allocated. It seems incredible that we could have a national housing crisis and we could have this issue that we are all feeling in our own electorates, and that money could go unspent.

I notice that with the HAFF and with other funds, the Senate has delayed them. It has been the Liberals and the Greens, which is a strange combination, but we have seen that in other areas in recent times, too, a strange combination of political foes, that join together to oppose progress. If you like, this government has a very strong disposition towards the supply of land and infrastructure to unlock that land because, as the member knows, there is no point in just rezoning land. That is a step but it is one of several to deliver homes. We all know that that is complex and we all know that that takes time. It has always taken time. It took time to found Elizabeth, it took time to build Marion and other places post war.

We are absolutely committed to accessing the funds set aside, and there are various different funds, and I have talked to both Minister Collins and Minister King at the federal level about what South Australia might do to get its fair share of those federal funds. Of course, I have an open door to the honourable member and, indeed, any of the other members if they want to talk about regional housing.

It is pressing in the regions. In many places, the rental vacancy rate is really less than zero. I think in sections of the honourable member's electorate, in Bordertown, there was one vacancy that was listed—one in the entire town. There is unrelenting demand, mainly driven by the workforce requirements of the meatworks and many of the other really dynamic employers there as well in the industrial park just outside Bordertown.

We are starting behind the eight ball because money that had been allocated was not spent. There was land that could have been rezoned in the last period of the Marshall government. Concordia could have been rezoned, could have begun, we could have been further along the pathway to getting that land to market. That work has to be done now. We know that not a day goes by when the Premier doesn't press me about the urgency to provide supply into the market. What we have done is unblock the pipeline and primed it with 90 code amendments, over 4,000 hectares of land under consideration, and we will keep doing that to bring both rents and prices—and to moderate housing prices so that people might get their foot into the market.

SCHOOLS UPGRADE FUND

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister provide the house with information on any recent infrastructure grants to South Australian schools?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:02): I thank the member for Elizabeth for his question. We have had some positive news this week for public schools in South Australia with round two of the federal government Schools Upgrade Fund being announced. This was \$17 million collectively for 18 schools right around the state, each to receive at least \$250,000 for a whole range of projects, including upgrading of food tech spaces, home economics classrooms, installing new playground equipment, and resurfacing sports courts.

I want to thank the federal government for their support. We had, of course, a great deal of interest from public schools in South Australia that were asked to put in an application. I don't for one second pretend that these 17 projects and \$18 million is going to meet all the need that is out there in terms of infrastructure upgrades, but it was very, very welcome and will be put to absolutely good use as well.

One of the things I think that people in this place will find pleasing—certainly, a number of members of parliament on the other side—is that there were a number of regional, rural and remote schools in South Australia that attracted funding, and I thought I might use this opportunity to run through a few of those projects.

The member for Giles isn't here today, but a number of schools in his electorate received funding. We had the Coober Pedy Area School that received \$1 million for toilet and change room upgrades; Flinders View Primary School, new covered sports courts; the Hawker Area School, a covered outdoor learning area; and Hincks Avenue Primary School, which is in Whyalla, received a new administration building upgrade.

Fisk Street Primary School, also in Whyalla, received new fencing and gates, locks and resurfacing to existing courts as well. In the member for Flinders' electorate, Kirton Point Primary School received \$250,000 for playground equipment and a fitness station as well; Koonibba Aboriginal School received \$1.4 million for refurbishment and the building of a new administration building and upgrades to fencing; and Lincoln Gardens Primary School received \$400,000 for a new playground.

In the member for Hammond's electorate: Murray Bridge South Primary School, \$1.1 million for the refurbishment of student toilets and shade structures over playgrounds. In the member for Elizabeth's seat, a number of schools as well: Elizabeth East Primary School receiving \$400,000 for primary classrooms and corridor refurbishment; Elizabeth Grove, upgrade of the admin building and new toilet facilities; Elizabeth Park, \$1.5 million for STEM centre redevelopment and classroom refurb; Kurna Plains, \$900,000 for an extension of the admin building, and a new gym building as well.

The member for Stuart: the Augusta Park Primary School is getting \$3 million for the resource centre upgrade and outdoor learning environment upgrade; Marree Aboriginal School, \$850,000 for upgrades to outdoor areas, including shade structures and pool repairs as well. The member for Narungga: Central Yorke School is getting \$410,000 for new nature play spaces and the refurbishment of the gym and the home economics space.

The member for Hurtle Vale: Hackham West Primary School, which I know was a school that was in great need of a bit more funding—almost \$1 million there for new outdoor learning spaces. The member for Taylor: Swallowcliffe School, which is a school I have been to on a number of occasions—almost \$400,000 there for the refurbishment of indoor and outdoor learning spaces.

I want to put on the record this government's thanks for the support from the federal Minister for Education, Jason Clare, and the federal government more broadly. We know there is a lot more to do in this space, but we know that this money will be welcomed; it will be put to good use. I think a number of those schools in some parts of our state that don't always get the same attention as metropolitan schools are the ones who are benefiting most from the \$18 million that has been announced here.

*Grievance Debate***ANZAC DAY**

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:06): I rise to talk about ANZAC Day and the commemorations that were held recently. Obviously, ANZAC Day is all about the legend of Australian service men and women over many, many years now—about 125 years if you include those who fought in the Boer War—who landed on the Gallipoli Peninsula and held on for several months. This was a battle that included 489,000 allied troops and 316,000 Turkish troops. Out of those 56,000 allied troops who were killed, there were 7½ thousand Australian troops who made the ultimate sacrifice and 18,500 were wounded. Fifty-six thousand Turkish troops were killed defending their own country. This was a fight that defined Australia.

I want to salute all the service men and women who signed up to serve this country, whether they have served here or overseas. We have had over time more than a million service men and women operate in our armed forces, and it is heading north of that number now with around 103,000 sadly paying the ultimate sacrifice—and it is a real credit. At Edinburgh air base one day I said there is no greater thing than to have someone sign up for the armed forces because they are prepared to literally lay their life down for their country.

I am very proud to hold the position of shadow minister for veterans affairs. We always need to do more for the mental health of those who have come home from war. I had an uncle who survived the First World War. He got shot through the nose on the Somme—a sideways sniper shot, walking between two people. I had three uncles who served overseas in World War II and my father served here at home. I will never forget that one of my uncles had shellshock from Tobruk, and from the effects of that he blinked all the time.

Certainly, there are people who have served on other fronts. I had one uncle who served in the Navy in World War II and then he served in the Army in Korea. They had a Kapyong lunch the other day and there were four Korean veterans there and it was great to sit and talk with them.

I want to acknowledge all those from all theatres who have gone overseas and especially our Vietnam veterans who were not thanked when they came home. A lot of them are loud and proud now, or some of them do it quietly. Whether they look after the interests of returned service men and women in the RSLs, that a lot of them are heavily involved in, or in other ways, it is a great thing to recognise what they did. Obviously, over time, there were more modern conflicts where people have served.

On Saturday, I was privileged to lay a wreath with my brother Chris who served for 23 years. He served in Rwanda in 1995. Originally in his career he was an infantryman, then became an assault pioneer and then decided that if he wanted to do anything after the Army he needed to get a trade so he joined the Engineers and came out with a diesel mechanic trade. For the first time since he has been home, and with myself in this position, it was a real privilege to lay a wreath at Murray Bridge.

In the few closing seconds, I would like to acknowledge all that people lay down for this country. It is the injuries you do not see, mental health and that sort of thing. I want to add one quick story before I sit down. Recently, I met a person out one night who had served in the SAS and this person, sadly, is very damaged goods. He had served for 19 years. He had basically been blown up in Afghanistan and when I gave him my card I said, 'Come and talk to me. That's all you need to do. I don't need to do anything with it.' He said, 'At least you know a little bit because your brother served.' When you see the damage that service has caused to people—and we do not even know where they served in those special forces, I really take my hat off to everyone who serves this country.

ANZAC DAY

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:12): I thank the member for Hammond for his poignant words. I thought I might actually take the moment myself to acknowledge some of the really beautifully celebrated ANZAC Day events in my own community. I, of course, attended the Tea Tree Gully dawn service, as I have for many years. It is the only dawn service in our local community. We believe 3,000 or 4,000 people came out to Memorial Drive this year, which is a really beautiful garden that we have to commemorate the ANZACs.

On the street of Memorial Drive there is also a beautiful Stobie pole painting exhibition that has been put together as an intergenerational project by the members of the Tea Tree Gully RSL and students at Tea Tree Gully Primary School. They are memories, thoughts and reflections on war from the students alongside the veterans at the RSL who have served. When going to the RSL or to the school I like to take a moment to acknowledge the work that has been done as part of that intergenerational learning project and, of course, consider the reflections from the students, our younger generation, on just how important it is to remember those who have served.

The Tea Tree Gully service was a really wonderful one, as always, and I was joined by a number of colleagues, both state and federal, cross-partisan and local councillors. I want to acknowledge the work of the Tea Tree Gully RSL and the City of Tea Tree Gully in putting that service together each year. Afterwards, we often go for a coffee at the Tea Tree Gully Coffee Shoppe, just up the road, and Jamie does an incredible job of putting on coffee for a cast of thousands after the service, which is always much appreciated, before going off to the Ridgehaven Scouts where I attend an ANZAC breakfast each year. That is another wonderful tradition: the Ridgehaven Scouts lay a wreath at the Tea Tree Gully dawn service. Having breakfast with them after the service and hearing from the young Scouts about their thoughts and reflections with respect to ANZAC Day I think is really important.

That morning, after I went home to quickly bake some ANZAC biscuits, I then went over to Ridgehaven Rise, one of our large retirement villages, to attend a church service inside the village put on by Reverend Jo, who is from St Luke's, Modbury (Wynn Vale). She presided over the church service in the village. It is an opportunity for members of the village to attend a service later in the day from the comfort of their own village, knowing that many are not able to get out to the dawn service or to church in the way that they may like to.

Something I was able to bring along with me was this beautiful donation from a cookie maker in Hope Valley named Carly. She donated this whole box of cookies with poppies on them and other beautiful tributes and asked me to take them with me to a local group as her commemoration of ANZAC Day that she wanted to give back to the local community, and so I brought that along for morning tea, and we had a really wonderful time. It was really interesting to chat with the residents, particularly those who had served. It was another lovely ANZAC Day in my community, and I felt privileged, as always, to be part of so many different events throughout the day.

I would also like to take a moment to talk about an event I hosted this morning, which was my teal morning tea in recognition of World Ovarian Cancer Day, which is next week, on 8 May. This was a really wonderful opportunity for me to acknowledge my personal connection with ovarian cancer, having had a number of loved ones who sadly have lost their lives to ovarian cancer, including a dear friend who died at just 27 in 2022. Today we were joined by a number of groups. We were joined by Natasha Stott Despoja, who was a really wonderful special guest to have up in the Balcony Room in her capacity as a former ambassador for Ovarian Cancer Australia.

We were also joined by a survivor and advocate from the OCRF, as well as TerryWhite Chemmart, representing the OCA, and also a large group of wonderful women from OC Challenge, which is South Australia's dedicated ovarian cancer charity. OC Challenge do some incredible work. They actually have two part-time nurses who go out to support women throughout their ovarian cancer diagnosis. It was really wonderful to have them with us today, as well as those who founded the charity, Debbie Gracie, Dr Margaret Davy and Carol Martin, who some would know from Port Adelaide Enfield council. They are group of women who got together to support the cause and also to provide supports to women living with this insidious disease. It was a pleasure to have everyone join us for that cause this morning.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley.

GIOVINE, MR M.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (15:17): Thank you, sir, and what a sterling job you have done in your first set of question times this year.

The SPEAKER: Thanks for all the handy driving hints, too, former Speaker.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: My absolute pleasure. It is all about continuous improvement in this place, so best of luck, sir.

Today, I would like to discuss a very serious matter. I want to talk today about Mario Giovine. Mario Giovine is 99 years old. He is the oldest living war veteran of Magill RSL, and I want to thank him for his service. He is an absolute champion. I am looking forward to celebrating 100 years with him in the not too distant future. I stand today to pay tribute to this true Australian hero, Mario Giovine. He is 99 years old, as I said, a war veteran in my own electorate of Hartley. I have had the honour of meeting him several times but again recently during an ANZAC Day dawn service on 25 April at The Gums Reserve.

Mario Giovine was born in Canelli in the north of Italy. His service number was S112033 and he was better known as Lance Corporal Mario Giovine. He was born into a farming family. Unfortunately, his father's farm had some challenges at the time. The Italian government knew the troubles that many of these farming families were having, and so what they did was provide a small amount of money to assist families to migrate to new countries. The family came out to Australia, not knowing the language, not knowing what to expect, but they had a crack and they made a new life of it. Of course, he also contributed and even went to war for his new country.

When he was four years old, Mario's family took the offer and found themselves settling on a farm in Summertown. He moved to various places since then, and now, of course, he is in Magill. He was only 13 years old when he left school. He found a job at Rossiter's boot factory and was a bootmaker right through until his retirement at age 60.

At age 18, Mario enlisted in the Australian Army at Wayville on 18 January 1943 to serve his new nation during World War II. He trained at Woodside before he was sent to several locations, including Dubbo in New South Wales and also Queensland. His first deployment came just over a year later on 20 January 1944 in the 4th Infantry Battalion, 8th Brigade, serving in places like New Guinea, Markham, Ramu Valley and other various campaigns. His second deployment was on 1 May 1945 in the 4th Infantry Battalion AMF serving in New Guinea campaigns again.

Mario said that he later met with the Japanese enemy when he was guarding camp in New Guinea post-war. Hearing his comments, he was quite remarkable. He did not take any of it personally despite, of course, the extremely traumatic events that he would have seen and potentially would have had to carry out as well. He was so stoic about the experience. He went on to say that 'it was a good experience, that was; the Japanese fellas weren't bad fellas'—they were there to do their job and he was there to do his job. That is absolutely powerful stuff. He even said that one of the Japanese fellas made him silk pyjamas from a parachute.

Lance Corporal Mario Giovine was discharged on 26 July 1946 and returned to Adelaide. As mentioned, I had the honour of meeting him again only last week or so, where he shared his stories of his service through his grandson, Drew, who did an absolutely amazing job. It was fantastic to see thousands of people who were gathered there at The Gums Reserve paying tribute to all those who have served our great nation.

As I pointed out, Mario is the oldest war veteran to have served our country still involved at the Magill RSL. I want to thank him for his extraordinary service to this country. He joined the RSL in 2012 because by then he was probably around age 90 or so. He found that he had stopped marching because no-one from his unit was left to march with, so he joined the RSL.

The RSL has given him this new sanctuary, as stated by his grandson, Drew. It now allows him to meet with fellow veterans with similar stories. He now joins them in marching, sharing a drink with his RSL comrades as well. He is a regular at Friday schnitzel night. He also enjoys going to the Hectorville Football Club, where he is a life member and where G's Cafe is actually named after him and his late wife, Jean.

Mario, congratulations. I wish you all the very best for your 100-year celebrations. I am looking forward to catching up with you for a parmy and a beer on your 100th birthday.

VIOLENCE AGAINST WOMEN

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:22): Last Saturday I joined thousands of people across Australia, including our Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, demanding an end to violence towards women. I was angry that I was marching on this issue again. I am, however, much angrier that women are still being killed by men and, in most instances, by a man they know—often a partner or ex-partner.

I was determined to speak on this issue in our state parliament and I looked up the figures for how many women have been murdered by a man this year. That was on Saturday. These figures are incorrect already. In Australia in 2024, a woman is being killed by a man every four days. In April alone, 13 women have been killed by a man in Australia. This equals the number of Australians killed by terrorism in 108 years. This is a crisis and it has been for a long time, especially for First Nations women, who are 33 times more likely to be hospitalised than non-Indigenous women are.

I am of the belief that the language used in mainstream media plays a big part in how our community views women. There is certainly an increase in distaste, disrespect and disregard for women in many of our major media outlets, otherwise known as hate speech. This hate speech is also prevalent online. The communication of contempt for women is nothing new. However, the proliferation of digital and online media means that the prevalence of sex-based vilification is increasing and is more easily observable than before. Such speech represents a crisis of democracy through its silencing of women and limiting our democratic participation.

Of course, I cannot touch on all the elements contributing to this crisis in the time allotted, but I do wish to draw attention to the reporting of these crimes in the media. How often we read that the murderer is a good bloke, a top footballer and a lovely grandfather. He is not. He is a killer.

Domestic violence is also worse in Australia at Christmas and New Year's. There might be financial pressures, tensions negotiating custody of children and differing expectations around festivities, and they may be isolated from their usual community and supports. On top of this, there is an increase in the use of alcohol and other substances. It can also be harder for women to stay safe when family members are on holidays and in the home more than usual. There are better choices that men can make. They can choose a Christmas without violence and control, a Christmas filled with love and respect.

In addition, there is also an increase in violence against women after major sporting events. In Australia, this has been associated particularly with the AFL grand final and the Melbourne Cup, notably two events with high levels of gambling involved. Statistics also show that increases in violence are roughly the same whether the perpetrator's team wins or loses. There is also often alcohol at these events, but women drink alcohol at the football too and we are not killing our male partners.

With this behaviour in mind, I would like to draw attention to the Raiise program, supported by our government. We know the underlying cause of violence against women is gender inequality. The goal of Raiise is to support healthy, respectful environments and to contribute to the prevention of domestic and family violence. If you, or someone you know, are experiencing domestic and family violence, please call 1800RESPECT.

SCOTT, MS G.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:27): I want to pay tribute today to Glyn Scott. Glyn Scott, as many in the chamber will know, was a nominee this year for South Australian Senior Australian of the Year. She is the founder of a foundation named the Love, Hope and Gratitude Foundation and I say this because it has informed her extraordinary work in the community.

Glyn Scott survived years of violence and sexual abuse, first as a child and later in her first marriage. Not quite 20 years ago, Glyn gave evidence to the Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry about her childhood experience of sexual abuse. Her personal experience led to the High Court decision in 2012 that ruled that there was no marital exemption to rape and that in turn changed commonwealth law nationally and set that important precedent which has paved a pathway and that has been a significant response that has been led by Glyn Scott.

Glyn founded the foundation in 2015 and through it has been providing counselling, advocacy and educational programs to domestic violence survivors and shelter for adults, children and pets. There have been other contributions in the house this week about events, including last weekend. I draw particular attention to the vigil that was convened by Embolden at the Pioneer Women's Memorial Garden adjacent to the parade grounds just last evening. I was grateful to have the opportunity to attend that occasion, happening as it did on the evening of the first Wednesday in May.

I want to reflect on some words that Glyn Scott shared back in 2019 and which informed the previous Marshall Liberal government's policy in relation to funds to assist where it is necessary to escape from violence. At that time, my colleague the Hon. Michelle Lensink, as the responsible minister, made the observation that it is very important for survivors to know where an accused perpetrator is. It is important that they are safe from harm and from risk. To that end, it is important that there are places of refuge for victims.

One thing that the previous government also responded to was something that Glyn Scott I think put particularly well, and that was Glyn's belief that:

...taking the perpetrator out of the equation makes a huge difference to the end result, so that's very important to me ongoing, and even today the same situation is with the women and children I talk to on a daily basis.

I want to emphasise in this contribution that it is so important that safety at the key intervention is at the heart of the response, and in particular, in circumstances where we are hearing about the federal government's new commitment of money, that police have power to intervene immediately and that perpetrators are the ones bearing the onus of being removed, so that victims are both safe and not disturbed. That work continues. It is important work, and it is well that governments, state and federal, continue to place great priority on it.

INTERNATIONAL WORKERS' MEMORIAL DAY

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:32): International Workers' Memorial Day is acknowledged around the world on 28 April. It is a day of remembrance and action for workers who die, are disabled, are injured or become unwell through their work. On Monday, more than 200 people gathered at the Pilgrim Uniting Church in Flinders Street for the memorial service organised by the Voice of Industrial Death (VOID).

Anyone who has ever attended this annual event will, I am sure, support me when I say it is an emotional service—very sad, with a candle burning bright for each life lost to a workplace death or illness. When a worker leaves home, their loved ones expect them to safely return at the end of their working day. They expect to have their daily and life plans fulfilled, their hopes and dreams come true. Sadly, this is not the case for almost 200 Australian families each year whose loved one is no longer with them. As one family member of a worker who lost his life in the workplace explained:

There is no looking forward to their return at the end of the working day, no weekend to look forward to—all there is is a place missing at the table every day, and at Christmas, birthdays and other family celebrations.

He's missed at our children's school graduations, on the sidelines at their footy and netball...you never get over it...and I worry about the safety of our children with their after school and weekend jobs. I will never forget and I will never stop worrying.

Workers' Memorial Day has become an annual reminder that we cannot and should never ignore the importance of workplace safety.

I would like to acknowledge here the important work carried out by trade and professional unions and associations in recognition of the dangers in the workplace and advocating for their members across the many workplaces here in South Australia, with the sole aim of keeping them safe so that at the end of their shift they return safely home. I know, for these unions, their job is not always easy, that they take their worries about doing their job successfully home with them at the end of each day. So, today, for each of our unions that plays a significant role in workers' health and safety, to each industrial officer and organiser, I thank you.

Workers' Memorial Day coincides with World Day for Safety and Health at Work. It recognises the dangers and provides an opportunity for loved ones, friends and workmates to acknowledge the importance of each life lost. The work of the not-for-profit organisation, Voice of

Industrial Death, often referred to as VOID, gives a voice to the victims of largely avoidable workplace fatalities in Australia every year. As its name suggests, it recognises the void left in the lives of the many families, friends and workmates of those who are no longer with us.

The grief and trauma experienced by workmates who may have actually witnessed a fatal workplace incident does not end on the day. As one friend explained, it stays with you always. Its impact can be dire. It can lead to no longer being able to attend the workplace, so you throw in your job. You cannot sleep. You replay it over and over in your mind. And you come to rely on medication, first to get some rest and then to get through the day.

In addition to those whose lives are lost each year in Australia, a further 2,000 die from workplace-initiated related conditions, including mental health, cancer, asbestosis, respiratory illness and circulatory diseases. Others develop serious health conditions, including eczema, hearing or sight loss. But it does not stop there. Each year, another 125,000 people are seriously injured, with injuries that can impact their ability to work or work at their chosen career. Our government understands this and has legislated to create safer workplaces.

Most employers do the right thing and make sure they follow occupational health and safety guidelines, but for those who choose not to, those that are not considering workplace safety, their negligence can result in life changing and sometimes life-ending outcomes. That is why the industrial manslaughter bill passed in this place should serve as a stern warning to any employer who ignores workplace safety that leads to death in the workplace as a result of reckless or grossly negligent conduct.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

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

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 14 May 2024 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPPLY BILL 2024

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:38): With regard to the comments I was making prior to the break and commencement of question time, I was starting to address the history of budgets across this government and how we have entered the position that we are in now both in terms of large infrastructure projects but also the broader budget position. I touched on the significant election commitments that were made by this government prior to the election; the fact that on coming to government and the preparation of their first budget, they quickly realised that there was an issue in being able to deliver those; and the fact that we saw the two most significant infrastructure projects in the state shifted into a review to determine what they were.

Those on this side of the house, certainly, were of the view—and I think that if you asked people outside of this place as well, there would be a fair portion who would share our cynicism in regard to why that was the case and why those projects needed to be reviewed. What we saw was, essentially, a shifting of the spend profile for those particular projects. They were shifted back considerably, and outside of the budget forward estimates in some circumstances.

But the broader question still remained unanswered around what role the CFMEU played in that decision, and also how they will benefit from the state's two largest infrastructure projects, noting the significant change that has occurred within that union since the change in government, where we had John Setka and the Melbourne-based branch come to South Australian and effectively take over the local branch. We had seen a level of union activity that we had not seen previously, and

disharmony on work sites within South Australia on some of our bigger private infrastructure projects. But the question remains.

It is difficult now to drive around South Australia and Adelaide, particularly on the back of the disbanding of the federal Australian Building and Construction Commission (ABCC), without seeing the CFMEU flag adorning the majority of construction sites. The question that remains in regard to, as I said, those two big projects—the Women's and Children's Hospital project and the north-south corridor—is the role of the CFMEU and the collective bargaining around those particular projects, and also the benefit that may be borne out on the back of those projects. I particularly note that the review has significantly increased the cost and budget of those two projects, shifting them from what was in the order of \$12 billion to \$13 billion to now reaching \$20 billion, if those cost estimates are to be stuck to.

In the last little while, there have been questions put in this house—and more broadly across the infrastructure industry by the MBA, as well as others—in relation to what efforts the government was undertaking regarding the industry benefits scheme, also known locally as BIRST, and the scheme that the CFMEU was keen to take its place in South Australia, Incolink.

We had received assurances from the Premier in this place that everything would be done to ensure that Incolink would not become the fund of choice for South Australian construction workers and projects, because that would mean we would have money being expended by South Australian investment—and in the context of public infrastructure projects, South Australian taxpayer money being expended—but we would then see those funds transferred interstate. The Premier stood here in this chamber and said that would not be an ideal outcome for South Australians. We share that sentiment on this side of the house. It is not a sensible outcome for those funds.

The question is: what has happened since then? I think it would be helpful for the Premier to provide an update to the house about how his efforts are going to curtail the shift of Incolink into both government contracts—and also, more broadly, private building companies here in South Australia—because what we are hearing on the ground is that the shift has been quick and that it has already been taken up by a number of builders through the contracts that are negotiated with the unions.

So what real action did the Premier take? Did he take any real action and what is the current state of those negotiations? But the more pertinent question is: what will the fund of choice be for those two biggest projects in our state's history to this point?

Will the Premier preclude Incolink having any involvement in those two projects? That is an open question that the Premier of South Australia needs to answer, because if he is serious about standing up for the rights of South Australian construction workers, if he is serious about supporting the efforts of the Master Builders Association and those that represent the building industry and the building sector in South Australia, particularly those in the commercial building sector, then he will ensure that happens. The question is: will he?

More broadly, there is certainly talk around town at the moment that the CFMEU are looking to take up more and more and have more and more influence within the South Australian Labor Party. We have certainly heard rumours that there is a push to have delegates on the floor, something that we would love to have answers on from the member for Reynell, the minister, if she is keen to dispel those rumours here and now. I would love to hear what the government's view on that is. It is a scary, scary situation for the South Australian building and construction sector at the moment where we have entered a phase that has been unlike the harmony that we have seen across our work sites for a prolonged period of time.

In regard to other issues that we will be watching closely as we shift through the budget process, before I get more specifically to a couple of measures, this government came to office promising a lot when it came to local procurement, a lot when it came to policies being very well articulated, some of which were not very clear. To this point, it has been almost impossible to get straight answers from the government in terms of whether they have actually achieved any of the policies that they have set out to.

While we have had some commentary around the ability for government departments to pay contractor invoices within 15 days, there were a large swathe of commitments that sat around their

procurement policies. I would perhaps like to touch on a few of those and indicate now that we will certainly be asking questions through the estimates process and expecting answers from the government in terms of what is actually being delivered versus what was promised prior to the election.

With some of these, we would certainly hope that at the very least we can get some clarity around what their commitments actually were. Some of those included mandating that South Australian workers deliver 90 per cent of labour hours on major infrastructure projects. There are questions that still sit behind that particular policy. Does 'SA workers' mean that they are employed by a South Australian company but they may live interstate? Does it mean that they are workers who live, pay taxes and are permanently based here in South Australia? Do the hours that go into that calculation include the hours that were undertaken by public sector employees in the preparation for that particular project? None of this is outlined anywhere.

Further questions are: how is it being reported, who is measuring it, and are departments publicly displaying this information anywhere? Some of the other commitments include requiring government agencies to buy local uniforms and locally manufactured PPE. Again, that is not something that anyone necessarily disagrees with but where is the proof that these things are being achieved?

Another commitment is setting aside 1 per cent of government project funding into a subcontractor support fund to enable the state to directly pay subcontractors on government projects where the lead contractors are delaying payments. Again, it would be helpful I think for the government to provide updates. We see the Treasurer come in here from time to time to provide an update on his interpretation of the state of the economy, but I cannot really remember an update in regard to some of these substantive policies being delivered to the house.

To require chief executives to sign off on procurement outcomes where the successful tenderer is not South Australian is the one that, from a practical perspective, I would love to understand further and how it is actually operating. We know from the SA Tenders website, plus a range of other sources, that there are a number of government contracts that are still being awarded to interstate companies. I would find it difficult to believe that every single one of those, no matter the value, is being signed off by the chief executive of the relevant department.

Perhaps the minister can give me an assurance that every contract that has gone to an interstate company has been signed off by her CE. I do not see that assurance coming from the minister. But the broader question is: is there even a cut-off or level that the government has decided on where this is practical? Are we talking about every single procurement outcome? Is there a limit in terms of dollar value where this becomes worth more and is more sensible than the use of the CE's time on signing off on those outcomes? Again, nobody necessarily disagrees with the fundamentals and the principles of this, but be clear about what is actually being recorded and whether it is being achieved. These are things that should be in the public domain.

The final commitment is as clear as many of the others that I will pull out. There are a number of further commitments, but there is one in particular prior to the one that I will touch on finally: to require the use of South Australian manufactured products on public housing construction and maintenance programs where available. Again, there are a range of questions. Is this being reported anywhere? What has the outcome been to this point?

Again, nobody disagrees with the sourcing of local content, local goods. Obviously, to a degree we have to understand the cost implication and whether any of that is actually being communicated. Given we cannot get much information out of this government in terms of contracts that they enter—nor can the Auditor-General for that matter—it seems difficult to ascertain what the actual benefit of these policies have been, and it seems like something that should be communicated if it is being achieved.

Finally, I want to touch on one of the final policies to which the opposition has certainly had a level of feedback from industry, which is to require that apprentices, trainees, Aboriginal workers and long-term unemployed deliver 20 per cent of labour hours on major projects. While nobody necessarily disagrees with the principle, or with what is trying to be achieved with that policy, we have certainly had members of different industries come to us and say that that particular policy has

been prohibitive in them being able to enter a tender for a particular procurement. These are South Australian companies that have been raising that issue with us.

Again, it would be helpful to get some sort of assessment from the government as to whether they believe that this has been helpful in the broader context of delivering the outcomes that they were seeking to achieve, if they have had any feedback from industry in terms of the appropriateness or the ability for South Australian companies to comply with some of the requirements they have put in place—but see what the cost implications are for the South Australian taxpayer by putting in some of these requirements. That is the very least that we should expect from these sorts of procurement policies, that there be clear and concise answers to some of these questions.

I now shift to some particular issues that were raised in last year's budget and perhaps that have surfaced over the last year or so as well. In particular, I would like to start on energy rebates. Clearly, electricity prices are an issue in South Australia. They have escalated since this government took office. What we saw last year was a program to provide assistance to those people on commonwealth concession payments, a smaller range of state concessions and also to small businesses, which was obviously warmly welcomed.

I have certainly had some feedback to my office. There were some changes made to the program around small businesses in embedded networks that have had significant difficulty accessing the program to this point. This is now nearly nine months since its inception. I have contacted the Minister for Small Business who was helpful in helping me direct those businesses to the right place; however, I do note they unfortunately had no luck in their endeavours to contact the Office for Small and Family Business who were not aware of the process to make those applications. Unfortunately, we still have small businesses in South Australia who have been wanting to access those concessions from last year who still have not had the ability to do so.

More broadly, it sparked the conversation about what more can be done to assist with electricity prices in the short term. At the state level, we obviously understand that the levers that we have for cost of living are reduced compared with the federal level. That does not mean that we obfuscate all responsibility at the state level by any stretch of the imagination. I have just listed off the top of my head a range of different areas, including ESL, water bills and others from the previous Liberal government that sought to reduce the cost of living for South Australians. We can talk about CTP insurance and a range of others on top of that.

What we still do not know a month out from the budget is the future of those rebates into next financial year. Is the government going to continue those rebates? Is the government going to widen those rebates? Is the government going to adhere to the call from the SA Business Chamber to double those rebates? Those questions are still unanswered.

In regard to another specific initiative that was announced in the last budget, one that this side of the house welcomed in principle because we, quite rightly, supported it, is what I would call concession, and what those on the other side, particularly in the days post-budget, referred to as abolition of stamp duty for first-home buyers, with a number of asterisks attached to the end of it.

It did make sense that we do everything within our power, as best we can, to assist first-home buyers to get into what has been a very difficult market and a market that is only going to continue to be if the predictions of media commentators today are correct that Adelaide house prices are on a trajectory to outperform or become greater than Melbourne house prices in the not too distant future. What we always had an issue with was the prescriptive nature of the initiative and the way that it was sold to young South Australians looking to buy their first home.

Not that long ago, a couple of weeks ago, we met up with a young couple who had just bought their first home in, I believe, Torrensville. The house was right on the border of two suburbs, so it was difficult to ascertain exactly where the house was. Their story was much like those that the opposition has received since the introduction of this measure. They felt duped by the way in which this was presented to the South Australian public.

We had billboards on the backs of trucks rolling around the CBD on the day of the budget, if my memory serves me correctly, with essentially the words, 'We are abolishing stamp duty for first-home buyers'. None of the asterisks were there at first communication, that this needed to be a

property under \$650,000, that it needed to be a construction that was a new build. If you looked closely at the finer detail at that point in time, from my memory, it was just over 20 per cent of suburbs in greater Adelaide where the median price matched that cut-off. Already, the prescriptive nature of just where you could potentially buy a house that would fit this criteria was well and truly limited.

Over the last nine months, the last three quarters, since that program was announced, we have only seen the increase on increase of property prices in Adelaide, meaning that it is now well below 20 per cent of houses in suburban Adelaide that are actually under that threshold now. We called this out from day one, that the prescriptive nature of this particular initiative was not going to meet the proposed objectives of the government in regard to this particular scheme, because to this point there is no other way to describe the performance of this scheme but entirely lacklustre.

To have first-home buyers under the impression that buying their first home would mean that they would not pay stamp duty on it was, I think, at the very least completely misleading. The way that it was presented was completely misleading, in my view. We then learn, on the back of a Budget and Finance Committee not too long ago, that the ambition was to have 3,800 deferrals—not deferrals; I will call it more like what it is. Perhaps the best way to describe it is abolishment, to an extent, with a couple of asterisks, if you meet the criteria. Effectively, the expectation of the government was that 3,800 households, for lack of a better term, would take up the scheme in the financial year.

We learned that to 25 March 2024—so a good nine months into the scheme, where we remember the bulk of communication for this scheme was provided right at the very start of the financial year at around the time of the budget—there had only been 1,300 applications received, only 1,169 of those applications had been approved and there had been a number above 60 that had been denied. So we are talking effectively about a scheme that, to this point, has been lucky to acquire 33 per cent of the expected take-up for this financial year.

It was almost like this scheme was built to fulfil a headline that the government was looking to put out into the market—"We are doing what we can to abolish stamp duty for first-home buyers"—when the reality is it came with three asterisks, when the reality is the take-up rate has been significantly below what was expected. It was almost like the scheme was actually set up to return money to the state coffers, because anybody could have looked at the restrictions that were put on the scheme from day one and realised that it was just not possible for the number of people that were expected to apply to do that.

So most likely—and again, goodness knows, there may be some drastic uptake in the last three months—on current projections there will be a significant amount of money returned or unspent in that particular scheme this year. The Master Builders Association have called for a cut-off in terms of price for this particular scheme to be fixed to the median price within suburban Adelaide. Again, on face value, that does not seem like a silly idea by any stretch of the imagination, because at the very least there is a broader amount of property available for first-home buyers to be able to take up this scheme.

As I said, we support the scheme in principle; we think it makes sense. But this scheme was set up to fail, it almost appears, by this government. It was set up for a headline that could be shifted around on LCD screens on the backs of trucks the day after the election, but the reality of what it has delivered is nothing like the outcomes that were sought for this program.

Finally, in regard to specific measures, I wanted to touch on the GP payroll tax issue. We have seen a pretty significant divergence in the public commentary from the Royal College of GPs and the Treasurer to this point. I think, from memory, one of the questions that was asked by this side of the house during question time this week was whether the Treasurer was aware of a statement from the Royal College of GPs that essentially said, to paraphrase, that their experience to this point was like banging their head up against the Treasurer's door in trying to get some movement and some clear indication of what is happening moving forwards on this issue.

The Treasurer in his response said that he has had nothing but productive conversations to this point with the Royal College of GPs. I am not too sure how those two descriptions at all align by any stretch of the imagination. My view of productive conversations does not often involve a description of struggling to get one's head in the right place to have a conversation.

It is an issue that is going to really fundamentally shape access to GPs into the future and, in the representations made to us and publicly by the Royal College of GPs and others who have closely looked into this issue, there is a view from those groups that this is going to put significant increased pressure on emergency department presentations in South Australia—at a time when we are on the back of record of ramping, despite what was promised by those opposite, essentially the core and only commitment that was made during that campaign.

But those worries about how the states are dealing with the GP payroll tax issues, and in particular South Australia, do not just come from this side of the house and they do not just come from the Royal College of GPs. They also come from the Labor federal health minister, who in the headline of this article published on 22 April this year says that he is 'very worried' about payroll tax impacts. I will quote directly from this:

Federal Health and Aged Care Minister Mark Butler has added his voice to growing calls for state governments to reverse their payroll tax grabs, warning its implementation is at odds with recent health investments.

Again, a very different sentiment that has been presented in this place to this point by the Treasurer. He goes on to provide further commentary around the particular issue and then towards the end of the article we have some comments that have been made by the President of the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners, Dr Nicole Higgins. I will again quote directly from this article. It states:

Several states have introduced payroll tax amnesties for practices to help prepare for the change, but GPs say a lack of long-term certainty remains.

The most pressing need for change comes in South Australia where its amnesty ends on 30 June this year, while in Victoria, GPs can only request ex gratia relief with no amnesty period on offer.

'The healthcare system is being undermined by state greed when they need to be looking at the big picture, because having the added payroll tax on Medicare will lead to increased ramping and overflowing emergency departments, which will impact their own hospitals...

It is, as she has described, 'an own goal'.

'GPs are starting to have conversations with patients around what payroll tax will mean and the impact that will have on increasing the gap and reducing bulk billing.

This government came to power with what can only be described as an ambitious goal that to this point instead of achieving has only made things worse. The approach of this government to this point and the interactions it appears to be having with the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners around this issue beggar belief.

Even the Treasurer will not necessarily say how many practices were actually paying payroll tax on their contractor GPs. He is very precise with his language in this place, simply referencing that some medical facilities have previously paid payroll tax. That statement does not mean that GP practices have been paying payroll tax on their contractor GPs' income or revenue. He knows I know that the vast majority in this industry have been operating on the assumption that GP contract revenue was not captured under contracting provisions within the Payroll Tax Act.

Just because a decision of a court confirms that that understanding was wrong, just because a decision of a court implies that it was wrong historically, does not mean that that understanding was not there. It does not mean that historically GP practices have not been paying this tax on those wages. It does not mean that, if enforced, the cost to South Australians to go to a GP to access a GP appointment will not go up. That is the very crux of this issue.

On the back of the amnesty ending, the expectation is that steps need to be taken in this budget. That goes without saying. The question is: what will this government do? Will they, as the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners has said, conform and have the healthcare system undermined by state greed? To this point, if you look at the actions that they have taken in pocketing revenue, whether that be across payroll tax, stamp duties, GST or otherwise, one can only suspect what the outcome is going to be in a couple of weeks' time when the budget is provided.

In regard to my local area, I think it is always helpful in supply contributions to discuss some of the issues that we hope will be, or that have been previously, provided funding through the state

budget process. In particular, in preparing for this contribution I had a good look at the comments that I made to the house previously, in last year's supply bill debate.

As part of that debate, I recounted the particular issues that were happening in my community in regard to the coastline. It is an issue that has gone on for a significant period of time, where we have effectively seen the erosion of, in my view—again, I am slightly biased, representing this part of beautiful Adelaide—some of the best beaches in South Australia.

To walk back through the history of this issue only heightens the frustration of both myself and my community, to know the solution that was put forward by the former government, that was researched, that was well and truly communicated, that involved a significant and prolonged period of consultation, that involved significant scientific work, that resulted in a signed contract for delivery of this solution—a sand recycling pipeline—and to have so quickly on coming to government that contract torn up and then to have been in this state of waiting and waiting and waiting, now for over two years, for what the alternative proposal was.

The Labor Party came to government with one intention in regard to this issue: to tear up the contract. Did they understand the issue in broad terms? Did they really closely apply themselves to understand what was actually possible, to understand what options were viable, to understand the cost implications of other potential methods? It does not appear so.

The ultimate irony of this issue is that it was the Labor Party themselves that proposed this solution nearly 15 years ago. They proposed this solution but then did not find the funds to deliver it. I have been in this house with the member for Gibson now for two years. I have yet to see her walk into this chamber and tell us that the sand recycling pipeline that operates down to her community, that provides sand to her beaches, where it is recycled from the end of its section of beaches on our southern coastline, should be turned off.

I am yet to see her walk into this place and tell us to turn that pipeline off. I am yet to see her walk into this place and say that there is a significant environmental issue in the operation of that sand recycling pipeline. Funnily enough, I am yet to see anybody from the Labor Party walk into this chamber and say that the sand recycling pipeline operating from Glenelg to Kingston Park is a bad idea.

As it turns out, there was a second part of that plan, which involved a second pipeline running from Semaphore to West Beach. The only problem was, of course, that the Labor government of the time was not able to find the funds to prioritise that section of beaches. We have seen the complete turnaround of the beach at Kingston Park, which 20-odd years ago looked like it was essentially going to be clay and rock.

We have seen other jurisdictions around the country—up in Noosa, up on the Gold Coast, through some of what are the most pristine tourism-centric beaches in Australia, with councils or responsible governments of all persuasions—undertake these sorts of solutions. In fact, we have a council in Noosa with a significant involvement of Greens members who have replaced their sand recycling pipeline because it was the best option available to them.

And what do we have here in South Australia? We have a continuation of procrastination, a continuation of sourcing what is some of the most expensive sand in our history, taking it from a quarry down to West Beach only for it to all move further down the coast, to have stopped a mass replenishment program that would have seen the rebuild of the beach at West Beach to the point where it could have withstood some of the more damaging weather events that no doubt will come over the coming years.

It is nothing but disappointing and pure hypocrisy from those opposite, purely motivated by politics, and this is an issue that did not need that. I was happy to come to the table saying that this is a Labor Party idea. The former member of my seat, the Hon. Paul Caica, as a former environment minister, and the former Premier, also from the western suburbs, were the very people proposing this solution 15 years ago. But, here we are, nearly 2½ years later, having had significant events in Henley, with hundreds of people turning up asking for one thing: tell us what you are doing and do something about it now. That is it. It is that simple.

I have been entirely up-front to this point. If there are other long-term, sustainable options available to us, I will not disregard them. I will have an open mind, but tell us what they are. To this point, the government has gone out to consultation, again, through a two-year process, on a range of options that were not even assessed for viability. There was no clarity about whether sand sources were even available. There was no clarity that the technology being proposed was even possible to come to South Australia at the time.

It is a fundamental issue that could have been solved, that could have had an operating sand recycling pipeline replicating the one that runs through the member for Gibson's electorate, that deposits sand on her beach, that has rebuilt Kingston Park and that saw very little resistance—certainly none that I am aware of—from the former member for Morphett at the time, that this was proposed to go into his seat. He saw the bigger picture. He understood that we should be looking at sections of beaches on our western coast in suburban Adelaide. It is not just about the little patch that we represent but about the bigger system of beaches.

We are at the point again where we have, for lack of being entirely accurate, 100 or so semitrailer trucks driving straight past a boat ramp, driving down a ramp outside a sailing club over one of the most frequently used pedestrian paths in South Australia, that being the coast path, to dump sand on a beach that is eroding. There is a better way; I am convinced of that. There is a way to make it safer. I am convinced of that. There was one thing that every section of beach did agree on: that trucks are not the answer.

We are at the point now where essentially we are seeing Henley South degrade to the point that there is no high tide beach again, where you cannot walk from Henley Square to the outlet because the sea is that high based on the fact that the sand is so low, where we have had the bottom of coastal access stairways exposed. How is it that we have got to the point where we have the local council and the state government bickering over who is responsible for replacing this infrastructure because the state does not want to admit that it is their policy of sand erosion that is causing these issues? Is it going to take the likes of Joe's kiosk to have to be closed, because the infrastructure is that badly affected, before this government actually does something about it?

The irony is that, if the only viable solution is a pipeline to recycle sand, how much more is it going to cost now than it would have, had the government actually undertaken what it should have been doing, which is to look out for the best interests of all South Australians and the entirety of the South Australian coastline?

The other issue that I want to briefly touch on is in regard to the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club. It goes without saying that the two issues are intrinsically connected. The process involved, as the former minister and those on this side are well aware, was long and protracted in terms of identifying how and where the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club was going to be rebuilt.

The club has its roots in what was originally a tin shed at the end of West Beach Road. There is a group of clubbies who are colloquially known as the Tin Shedders based on their involvement in building the original club. We had the most recent iteration—before what is now the fantastic facility that sits at the end of West Beach Road—that served the club very well for a significant period of time, but it had certainly seen better days. I think that would be the easiest way to explain it. The balcony that overlooked the beach had, at times, been questioned for its structural integrity. I know they had done everything absolutely correctly and, without a shadow of a doubt, it adhered to every OH&S requirement that needed to be adhered to, but it had seen better days.

The previous government was very happy to support the rebuild of that club. Many members of the committee; former presidents, by way of Peter Zuill; general committee members Kevin Richardson and Paul Rafanelli; current president, Graeme Cunningham; and so many others—I will not name anyone else because I am sure to miss somebody out—had been part of that process of deciding how and where to rebuild the West Beach Surf Life Saving Club.

Over the period, there had been discussion about potentially shifting much further north, maybe even up to the same site as the Henley Sailing Club at the end of Burbridge Road. There had been talk—in fact, very initial designs were even drawn up—regarding the car park directly to the south of Harold and Cynthia Anderson Reserve as perhaps being, at that point in time, the only

potential and viable place to rebuild the club. That had some pushback from some of the neighbours and also had some broader issues in terms of beach access.

The fundamental reason that the club always entertained and continued to entertain the desire to rebuild on the existing site of the club was twofold: if they did move, it would provide an easy out for a future state government—potentially this one—to not continue with the rebuild or bringing sand to West Beach. That was the first.

The second reason was their desire—and rightfully so—to continue to service and patrol the beach directly adjacent to West Beach Parks caravan park. It is an area that the club has patrolled for a significant period of time and one that they have always prided themselves on patrolling. The fact is that over the holiday periods, whether that be the long summer holidays or the term 1 or term 3 school holidays, it is a service they saw as part of their responsibility to provide that water cover and to provide that service to our broader local community because, funnily enough, the highest percentage of people who visit the West Beach caravan park are actually from suburban Adelaide. I have not quite worked out how that is the case just yet.

They saw it as their responsibility to continue to patrol that area. It had been difficult for them to do that over the recent past. There were times, unfortunately, prior to the work of the previous Liberal government, where it was impossible for them to actually access that beach except by going up to the Adelaide Sailing Club and accessing it directly from the south. There were times—and I certainly had correspondence come through my office—where it had gotten so bad there that nippers were not even able to access the beach from the ramp outside the surf club.

I am proud of the advocacy work that I undertook to try to seek and find a solution for this issue. What I am more proud of is the commitment of the local area—local residents and members of our local surf clubs who have continued to put this at the forefront. It is not just about them as local users. It is about the broader economic prosperity of our state if we cannot invest in what are some of our best natural assets.

It is incredible to me that this issue has reached this point and it is a crying shame that this issue has been politicised to this point. Ultimately, it really, really is, because (a) the amount of money that is being wasted—and could be wasted in future years based on the decisions to this point—is frankly concerning and (b) this deserved to be fixed so much sooner than it has.

The fact that we have now had multiple issues, the fact that it had taken the erosion to shift down to Henley South and to Henley to further illustrate the point that carting is not the answer, the difficulty that this government has had in recent weeks of finding a way of getting a semitrailer full of sand across the outlet of the River Torrens at Henley South only 100 per cent exemplifies the issue that we have.

It is not sensible to continue with trucks. They are having to wait for essentially no rain over a prolonged period of time and to have earthworks equipment situated in the right place at the right time and available to be able to shift enough sand into an outlet's mouth that is sturdy enough to carry a semitrailer laden with sand across a river outlet to then be dispersed onto a beach which has effectively disappeared. What is happening at the moment is insanity.

The irony is that, had a recycling pipeline been in place that had an outlet at Henley South, sand could have been dispersed onto that beach at any point in time. That is the reality that we are faced with. Again, I reiterate I am not bound to a particular technology solution. I do notice what other states and other jurisdictions are doing—and I can tell you it is very similar to what was proposed by the former Labor government and the former Liberal government—but what I do say is: get on with it.

It has been two-plus years, and the minister has had to recuse herself from her portfolio responsibilities to undertake the review despite the fact that she was the very architect of the policy to instigate a review, which is not lost on me or my community either. Just do the right thing; that is the one thing that our community is calling on this government to do. Do the right thing. Fund it and let's get on with it, and let's fix the beach once and for all.

Finally, in regard to local issues, I want to touch on what has been a disappointing development in regard to the Breakout Creek project that had been undertaken under the life of the

former government and the early part of this government. It was a significant project that the state had undertaken over a number of stages, with the first one commencing I think nearly 25 to 30 years ago: the section of linear trail and the River Torrens that sits between Henley Beach Road and Rowells Road or Findon Road, depending on which side of the bridge you are sitting on. The second section was undertaken in the late 2000s, early 2010s, which was the section between Henley Beach Road and Tapleys Hill Road. That left this last part of the project to be finished, which had not been funded for what was a good 15 or so years.

We have seen that project designed and now implemented. I still have some outstanding questions about when the horses are going to return to their custom-built equestrian facilities at the Apex Park corner. Their staging facilities, for lack of a better term, are still on the Breakout Creek footprint. There has been a level of investment there that I hope facilitates their return. Unfortunately, this government removed one of the most important aspects of that project, which is the second river crossing that was towards the western end of the project, close to the outlet and Seaview Road.

Unfortunately, we now have a situation where we have paths leading down to the river's edge, where prams and bikes have to turn around because the crossing that was meant to be put in place was not. We have fundamental access issues based on that fact. The agreed plan or design was done so on the understanding that one of the key issues we were looking to increase was accessibility to Linear Park.

Hand in hand with that, given the significant number of students who access Henley High from the West Beach suburb, came a viable safe way for them to cross closer to school, which is level with Military Road. So I certainly hope the government would be willing to commit to and to provide my community with a level of assurance that that second river crossing that was removed will be reinstated.

I am pleased today to learn of the commitment from, I believe, last year's budget on road crossing initiatives. Certainly, I have made representations to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport around the particular issue on the crossing at the end of Wright Street at Henley, abutting Grange Road. I am pleased to see that that project has been included, and I look forward to seeing the plans for that particular crossing as soon as possible. I will be writing to the minister in short order to request that from him.

Before I finish my remarks, I want to close on the fundamental underpinnings of the first two years before we shift into the latest budget from this government. I again go back to the Premier's paraphrased comment that was reported in the media precis yesterday that state revenues remain strong. Never has the Premier spoken truer words.

For every increase in property prices, for every worker who has been added to a South Australian business that previously did not pay payroll tax that now does, and for every household that has paid more because of inflation on their everyday goods and services, that revenue has flowed through to the federal government GST pool and then to this state government. Those increased stamp duty payments that have been made by first-home buyers who did not qualify for the stamp duty exemption have also contributed to those additional revenues. Those small businesses that have reached the payroll tax threshold because they are doing nothing more than employing more South Australians have contributed to those increased revenues.

This government has been one of the luckiest governments in the state's history. They have benefited from what the Treasurer himself has described as 'windfall revenues'. But they have not been fiscally prudent. They have seen blowouts across basically every government department. They have baked in that increased spending over the forward estimates. The question remains: what happens when the rivers of gold do not flow quite as strongly? That question remains.

I finish on this point: this government promised no new taxes and no tax increases. Do you think South Australians believe there have been no tax increases? Because every South Australian has paid more in stamp duty, in fees and charges, and in payroll tax than they ever did previously. And not even that, you ask those small businesses that have now reached the payroll tax threshold and you ask those GP practices that will be for the first time likely paying payroll tax next year whether they have seen new taxes and, I tell you what, I think they would say that they have.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (16:42): It is an absolute pleasure to stand and speak to the Supply Bill and to use this opportunity to talk about some of the exciting and positive projects that are happening in my community of Davenport.

I will kick off by talking about the upgrades that are scheduled for the Flinders Medical Centre. Earlier this week, I was there with the Premier, the health minister, the federal member for Boothby and the member for Waite to celebrate the opening of another 20 beds at the Flinders Medical Centre. Those 20 beds will form part of the 160 beds being opened across FMC and also the Repat now and over the next 12 to 18 months.

It was really exciting to be there and speak with some of our newest health workers. In fact, there are 1,432 new health workers we have brought on deck since we have been in government, which includes 691 nurses, 329 new doctors, 219 new paramedics and 193 allied health workers. It was really exciting to be there and speak to some of those new health workers. They were particularly excited to check out the new ward and the 20 new beds that they will be working with starting now. This week they started working in that space. It is a beautiful area. It is not what you expect going into a hospital. It is so fresh and modern with beautiful peaceful colours and design.

I am quite familiar with the Laurel Hospice further up the road. Sadly, my mum spent her last few days there, but it was a beautiful space for her and many others to spend their last few days. It has a beautiful team of staff. It is like they have hand-picked the best quality and the best possible talent out of our health workforce to have them caring for and looking after those people in their last days.

I feel like this particular ward that we opened on Monday has been designed with similar design principles. Most of the rooms have a beautiful window with a view looking out onto some big gorgeous gum trees, a nice green space, which we know is a really good thing for the mental health not just of patients but also of health workers who are working hard every day to provide a good care experience for South Australians. I could not be happier that this new upgrade is being delivered for those in the south, who deserve quality health care. It is great to see these beds being progressively rolled out, along with the incredible health workers that we are continuing to recruit to support those beds.

The new upgrade at the Flinders Medical Centre will not just see those extra beds but also an expansion of the Margaret Tobin Centre, an increase in capacity in the intensive care unit, additional operating theatres, increased capacity of emergency and elective surgery, an upgrade and expansion of medical imaging services and a new eye surgery clinic. It is a generational investment that we are seeing there—\$498 million is being spent, which is a partnership between the Albanese and Malinauskas governments. I know that all southern MPs, as well as federal MPs, are particularly excited about this upgrade and look forward to getting along to more releases of beds as they open.

This is just another step that we are taking for our state to reduce the strain on our emergency departments and reduce pressure on ambulances. I am really proud to be part of a government that is dedicated to delivering on that, and we are seeing huge improvements already. I know, after talking to some of those health workers at Flinders on Monday, they are certainly seeing and feeling a change, feeling less pressure and knowing that they are supported by a government that is prioritising improvements for health right across our state.

Moving up the road further south, another project I am particularly excited about is the Majors Road on/off ramps at the Southern Expressway. This is a project that people in the south have been asking for for years and years. I am very excited to be part of a government that is delivering on that commitment. Strangely enough, the former government made it one of their number one priorities but were not able to deliver on that promise. The southern community felt pretty let down by the former government when they did a bit of a flip on that priority. I think the member for Black said it was his number one priority, but then he quickly changed his mind when he got into government. I am really pleased that our government has made that a priority.

It is another project that we are partnering with the federal government on. It is a \$120 million project, so fifty-fifty between the state government and the federal government. It is really going to improve drive times and drive experience for people in the south and also for people heading south. For my community, particularly in Davenport, most of the benefit will be for people heading further

south, so those who want to get onto the expressway and head down to Fleurieu Peninsula and enjoy beautiful McLaren Vale and all the fantastic wines it has to offer, or head down further to Victor Harbor.

Those drive times will be much faster, and people in my community will not be having to navigate their way through the suburbs of Happy Valley and Reynella to get on the Reynella on/off ramp. That is pretty exciting for my community. It is also exciting for the community of Black. People in Hallett Cove are particularly excited to be able to get on and off at Majors Road. It has been a long time coming, so the community is very excited.

I also thank the community for their patience through the roadworks. There have been some reductions in speed limits along the expressway there. A lot of the works are happening overnight, but there are progressive works over probably about a 12-month period. We do appreciate people's patience, and I know that road users know that it is worth it and it will be fantastic when it is completed.

Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill is becoming a real hive of activity. We have Riding for the Disabled up there, and the new RSPCA building is opening up in a couple of weeks, which is very exciting. They have just closed down their operations at Lonsdale and are heading over to O'Halloran Hill to this incredible facility, which I cannot wait to share with the public. Also up there on Majors Road, of course, is Glenthorne National Park, which our community absolutely love. It was not that long ago that we were able to open a new nature play area that many families in my community and surrounding communities are getting out and enjoying.

We also have the fairly new soccer facilities up there and the recently reopened BMX track. This is an international facility which is now able to host international BMX events. That is open and running and there is a fantastic popular pump track outside of the BMX facility, which I have never seen so many kids enjoying. It is a real hive of activity up there, and having this new on/off ramp to allow people to easily access this new and exciting part of our community is really important.

I am also very pleased that the MFS and ambulance station up there on Majors Road at O'Halloran Hill, whilst they are right in the centre of a massive project and are right in the middle of the site for that project, have been very well looked after. I was pleased to touch base with them and learn that they have been very well accommodated up there.

They have a new access ramp already functioning where they are able to get onto the Southern Expressway quite quickly, and that is reducing their response times too. They are really happy about that and it has not caused too much disruption to them so far. I know that there is actually some exciting news coming their way for some upgrades for them too, which we will be able to share more about soon. That is a very exciting project that I am really looking forward to being able to finally deliver for our community.

If we head down the road, still in O'Halloran Hill, we get to a site that I visited this morning. It is where there are around about 20 properties being built. Unfortunately, the home owners there fell victim to the collapse of Felmeri, which happened not that long ago. What happened was that when the developers went under and were not able to complete those builds they also were not able to complete the infrastructure around those homes. The road that people would use to access their homes and for builders to access their homes was not finished, and neither was the underground infrastructure that should have been completed to go with that.

Home owners who were already paying towards the mortgages of their builds and having to pay rent or live on a couch or live with family in the meantime have been through almost four years of absolute hell and were crying out for some support. I was really pleased that our state government was able to step in and assist with the build of that road. This morning I was able to go out there and see that bitumen finally go down, with all the beautiful assets underneath ready for home owners to connect to.

I know that the home owners there are particularly excited to be able to now finalise their builds and move into their properties. If someone were able to finish their build today, they would be able to move in today with regard to the access and the underground services. I am really looking forward to those homes being completed and being able to go out there and have a fun street party

and crack a bottle of champagne and really enjoy that these home owners are finally able to get into their homes that they have been dreaming about for a long, long time.

Further down the road, towards Flagstaff Hill, is a project that is also underway at the moment, which is the upgrade of Main Road, Cherry Gardens. The member for Heysen might also be interested to see this road being built. It has been a long time coming. It is an extremely dangerous road. There have been 36 crashes there over five years and, member for Heysen, I am sure you remember that there was, sadly, a fatality there of a young man I think back in 2018.

The RAA deemed it to be, I think, the third riskiest road in the state, and that meant that it made it eligible to receive some funding through the \$120 million Adelaide Hills Productivity and Road Safety Package. So \$10 million of that is going towards upgrading Main Road, Cherry Gardens. It is a section from the end of Black Road at Flagstaff Hill, and it winds all the way up the hill to where it meets Chandlers Hill Road. I think it is about a four-kilometre section. The road is being widened and it is being resurfaced. The curves are becoming wider and there will be new guardrails going in, which hopefully will make this road much safer.

I know the residents who live along this road have particularly been crying out for years. There is a resident along there who has reached out to just about every possible politician he could over the last 20 years asking for these upgrades. His name is Nick Villios. He is a very passionate man, and I am looking forward to going to visit him tomorrow to check out where the upgrades are at so far and how much we have progressed.

Again, on that project, I thank the local community for their patience with these ongoing roadworks, but it will absolutely be worth it in the end. It is already looking much better, and I know our community is excited about it because at the moment people avoid the road altogether because it is so dangerous. Nick Villios would tell me and anybody else that he has a chance to speak to, often through tears, that his own daughter will not bring his grandchildren to visit him because she is so scared about driving on the road. He, too, feels scared about her coming to visit him with the kids because it is such a scary, dangerous road, so I am looking forward to being able to deliver on that road safety initiative for our community.

If we then head a little bit further south to Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley, there is a project that I have been working on. It was an election commitment of mine to deliver a traffic study for the intersections between Happy Valley Drive and Windebanks Road and also Happy Valley Drive and Chandlers Hill Road. Currently, at peak hour, school drop-off times, mornings and afternoons and also Saturday mornings, you often could be waiting. There will be a queue of cars almost half a kilometre in each direction from those intersections, slowly getting through those intersections at a snail's pace, so for quite a few years the community has been raising their concerns around these intersections.

There are safety problems there, too, and there are frequently crashes. Fortunately, I do not believe there have been any serious injuries yet, but there have been plenty of small bingles here and there and a lot of frustrated drivers having to wait on their way to and from school pickup and drop-off.

So what we have done is a traffic study to determine what kind of solutions could improve traffic flow at those two intersections. The department has done a fantastic job. We have had a huge amount of engagement. We had almost 700 people reply to the surveys online and almost 100 people come out to our community street-corner meeting to have a look at the concepts that are being proposed and provide their feedback on those concepts.

What we are looking at is a proposal for a new roundabout at the intersection of Windebanks Road and Happy Valley Drive and generally the community is pretty happy with the concept that is being proposed. I know they would like to see an additional lane inserted into that roundabout, so we will see what the department thinks about that. At the existing roundabout at the intersection of Chandlers Hill Road and Happy Valley Drive, we are looking to increase the size of that roundabout, so ultimately providing left-turn lanes in each corner. We are hoping that would really get the traffic flowing there. The next step now is to progress those designs and see if that project can get funded into the future so we can improve things on the roads for people in Happy Valley and Aberfoyle Park.

With the time I have left, I would also like to talk about a pretty exciting project that we launched only a couple of weeks ago. I had the Premier out to help me launch it, alongside the City of Onkaparinga Mayor, Moira Were. It is called the Minkarra link trail and it is a trail that my community has been calling for for almost 30 years.

It was exciting to have the former mayor of the former Happy Valley council Geoff Simpson out there with me. He had original plans that he had come up with as his vision almost 30 years ago. This project ultimately is a 700-metre section of trail that links existing trails in my community and means that there will be a consistent trail all the way from Chandlers Hill through Happy Valley, through Aberfoyle Park to Flagstaff Hill and down the hill onto the flats so that people can safely walk or ride pretty much anywhere they like from the south into town, which is very exciting.

It wraps around the Flagstaff Hill golf course, so it is a beautiful setting. There are seating points along the way, particularly around the golf club dam, so you can sit and really enjoy the environment and nature. The council has done a great job of installing some educational signage throughout the trail so that as you are walking around, particularly with kids, you can teach them about the native plants and the native wildlife and butterflies and birds and really take it all in and enjoy it. It has been so popular.

What I have really enjoyed about this project is that they have done a great job of weeding out a lot of the olives from around the Flagstaff Hill golf course, which means when you are driving down Happy Valley Drive, which is a significant main road in my community—most people in my community would drive that road every day—you can now see into this section of our community that most people would never have even known existed.

It is really exciting that we have opened up a part of our community that we have never had access to before. That is a project the community is absolutely pumped about, and it is great for me to drive past each day and see big groups of families out walking with their dogs and enjoying our beautiful environment in Flagstaff Hill.

With the last couple of minutes, I would like to talk about a project that we are working on now, which is the upgrade of the Aberfoyle Community Centre. This is a \$1.5 million commitment from our government and ultimately it will increase the capacity and ability for Aberfoyle Community Centre to keep delivering the fantastic programs that they already deliver.

We are particularly focusing on youth programs. It is something that the northern part of the City of Onkaparinga council area has not been able to deliver as well in the past. There is no youth centre in my patch and so young people, particularly teenagers, have been crying out for something else. We have a skate park and a couple of basketball courts, but this is something that they have been really crying out for.

This will be a space where young people can come together and enjoy programs that will be delivered by the City of Onkaparinga and a safe place for them to come and meet and be mentored by others as well. I am really excited about that project, which we will be rolling out over the next six months, and I am looking forward to the day when I will get to bring along the Premier again, with the Mayor of the City of Onkaparinga, and open that fantastic new community centre for our community to enjoy.

In addition to that \$1.5 million, there is an additional \$40,000 which is going specifically towards shed services, which is something that my community is extremely excited about, so that they will be able to store all sorts of tools and run all sorts of shed programs for people in the community to come together and build things and connect and enjoy each other's company.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:02): I rise in support of the bill, if that is the best way to describe it. The Supply Bill 2024 would appropriate the sum of \$7,706 million from the consolidated account for the financial year ending 30 June 2025. It is a process that we are all well familiar with in terms of the appropriation. Importantly, that will take us well beyond where we are now, just at the two-year mark, already a substantial way down the line in terms of this Malinauskas Labor government.

We will then be well beyond the three-year mark and really close to the conclusion, and so it is well that at this time, when it is customary for us to be considering appropriation and the way in which the government is applying the scarce resources that are available for public works and the

meeting of commitments and indeed the day-to-day good government and management of the state, that we reflect upon both the past and the future.

As other members have, we reflect on some of the things that are going on in our local area. I recently published, as I do, my seasonal newsletter, which I have circulated to my constituents. In it, there are there referred to a number of key matters that are underway or being achieved as a result of public funding, indeed, through the provision of resources available through the budget.

One of those is the works that are being undertaken to upgrade the park-and-ride facility at Crafers. I highlight that partly because it is something I have been calling for. I advocated for it, together with improvement of park-and-ride facilities throughout the Hills, as a candidate back in 2017 and then throughout the period since. The upgrade of the Crafers park-and-ride was a matter for which the former Marshall Liberal government committed to provide funds for 140 car spaces much needed at Crafers. That is now being undertaken, albeit delivering a lesser number—85 car parking spaces—but it is an improvement.

I thank the government for not cancelling that project. It is happening at a place that is a logical place for the car-parking facility to be made. It was an area that was used by those who were conducting much more substantial works in the delivery of a third lane on the freeway between Crafers and Stirling, both sides of the freeway, and the complete renovation of the freeway from the Tollgate all the way through to Stirling and beyond during the course of the last government. To see that this upgrade of the Crafers park-and-ride is underway and due for completion fairly shortly this year is a positive step.

I urge the Malinauskas government to not then abandon altogether the Hills and regional roads. We have seen over the course of the last period, unfortunately, Labor governments, state and federal, abandoning in their entirety works that were committed to solving the Hahndorf traffic congestion by a bypass, walking away, state and federal, \$250 million, and, to a relatively similar and significant amount, walking away entirely from the Truro freight bypass, which also in turn has flow-on effects for congestion through the Hills.

Roads and infrastructure investment in regional South Australia remain a massive priority for my residents in Heysen. I look for continued investment that will enable them, enable all of us, to as safely as possible navigate the freeway, to the extent that we can leave the car at a park-and-ride and take public transport on the freeway and, then, when driving locally in the Hills, to be as safe as we possibly can be. It is no surprise that the bulk of my seasonal newsletter to electors has a focus on roads large and small and the improved effects that investment in them can have for local residents.

I also note in passing the good news that has come just in recent weeks that, after a campaign running for the better part of the last year by local residents in terms of engaging with the Stirling Community Hospital board, a decision has been made that the hospital stay at Stirling and stay open. The threat had been that it would close and move to rented premises at Mount Barker. It is certainly a big headline in this current newsletter. I say, with respect to the budget, it is no thanks to the Malinauskas state Labor government.

As early as the middle of last year, upon my first concerted appeals for support from the Labor government, the Minister for Health just immediately washed his hands of it entirely, describing it as a private institution which the government will not be involved with and not providing support for. I might say that it was not too far from the attention of the Minister for Health to have come up a few months earlier and attended a ribbon-cutting at the opening of an improved surgery suite and facilities at the hospital.

It is a pity that the Malinauskas Labor government has not been showing any indication that it will provide support to our local hospital at Stirling. The fact that it continues at Stirling is the result of now more than 90 years of community solidarity, and it needs to continue at Stirling for the long term. There are, of course, many other matters locally on which the budget will have a positive effect. I highlight those two in particular.

The consideration of the Supply Bill is a moment to reflect on the government's management of those scarce resources, as I have indicated, and, indeed, to reflect on election commitments that

the government made on coming to office. It is one thing that the Malinauskas Labor government has made much of over the course of these last two years: this idea that it is committed to meeting all of those election commitments. We know that already the signal election commitment of the government has been more or less completely abandoned. We have seen it in the course of debate only in recent days in the house, but it goes much broader than that.

Over, now, the bulk of the last year the government has set out to recast what was its signal promise to fix ramping in South Australia. Instead it has been confronted with the reality that it has delivered not only a failure to fix it but record ramping and in fact more ramping in less than two years than the former Liberal government's entire four-year term—with the result that patients and paramedics have never spent more time stuck on the ambulance ramp—and as a result there is significant concern throughout the entire community but no more so than among those hardworking frontline health workers and South Australian patients who are feeling it firsthand.

The government was confronted with that reality as recently as earlier this week in the chamber, and it just refused to debate it. It recast it and instead wanted to talk about anything but that signal failure. But it is not the only one. People in South Australia would be well to keep that very much front of mind—the ramping failure—because, of course, we know that health and its management is a central obligation and commitment of any state government, and an adult view of those challenges, investments, commitments and outcomes involves all sorts of complexity. It is therefore to be acknowledged that the challenges that are facing our health system at all times are of complexity and difficulty.

But all the more so in those circumstances should we see an adult response and a response that matches words with conduct and matches words with outcomes. It will be a promise that will weigh on the government now and each day and each week and each month as we lead towards the end of the Malinauskas Labor government in March 2026, because it is a signal failure to deliver on that central promise.

There are now emerging a number of other key matters, and I seek to address just a couple because they appear to now go to the character of the Malinauskas government that has emerged over the last couple of years. We have recently seen a debate in the context of major sporting events between a focus on the one hand about investment in sport, and on the other a relative neglect of the arts. Just to illustrate that, we have recently seen another round of LIV Golf and before that we had the Gather Round in the Aussie Rules football.

Leaving aside a debate about the merits and the success of those events, it is worth bearing in mind that we have got some national attention. I refer to the observations in recent days of Professor Jo Caust, who drew attention to the concern that taxpayers should have about this keen focus on sport and, from Professor Caust's point of view, the real concern that that is coming at the expense of the arts.

But it goes more deeply than that because, to go back to Labor's election commitments—and key among them a document described as Women: Safety, Wellbeing, Equality—For the Future—we saw that the then Malinauskas opposition, seeking to be elected to government, published the following proposition. After indicating that Labor will work to achieve gender equality, the document says:

A Malinauskas Labor government—

and there is a big red tick following that—

Recognise that women were disproportionately affected by the pandemic and invest in those industries in which women make up a bigger share of the workforce such as tourism and the arts. Labor commits to—

and at this point one might start to see descriptions of commitments that might have been met that relate to women, safety, wellbeing and equality. What is the first headline cab off the rank? 'Major event funding of \$40m over four years'.

So in order to address Women: Safety, Wellbeing, Equality—indeed, more particularly recognising that women were disproportionately affected by the pandemic—the Malinauskas Labor opposition coming into government promised, number one, to invest in major event funding of \$40 million over four years. Leaving aside wrestles between sport and the arts, I do not see anybody

really seriously getting around South Australia advertising either the Gather Round or the LIV Golf as being core to promoting the safety, wellbeing and equality of women, but it certainly goes to characterising the nature of the priorities of the Malinauskas Labor government.

In relation to Aboriginal affairs, again, I go back only to recent weeks, because we know what we have now seen over the course of these last two years in terms of the signal election commitments of the Malinauskas Labor government. By the way, it committed—as part of its celebrating Aboriginal people election commitment—number one, to commit \$1 million to the design and delivery of new statues and monuments, and to consult with South Australians to identify the first six Aboriginal leaders to be commemorated in the first term.

There is an expression of hubris but, let alone that, 'during the first term' means during these years, two of which have just passed, of the Malinauskas Labor government, and working with local councils on the co-funding and finding prominent homes for the artworks and developing online virtual histories, and seeking ideas for further monuments and so on that might be delivered should the electors of South Australia be good enough to deliver yet another term to the Malinauskas Labor government.

We have not seen any indication of that. We are bit more than two years in now, and I think Aboriginal people, to the extent that they were interested in that particular direction, will be starting to feel particularly underwhelmed. Then, in relation to those very public debates that we have seen carried out on the national stage, as well as in this state, we have seen a national debate about a constitutionally enshrined Voice, and a referendum in that regard.

Prior to that, we saw the state Labor version of a legislated Voice that was passed about a year ago, and we are yet to see that in action. I have had a bit to say about the consequences, two of which are that for the better part of a year we have not had a constituted South Australian Aboriginal advisory committee, something established back in 2006 by a former Labor government. It had been functioning, therefore, for the better part of 20 years until the current Labor government dissolved it.

Secondly, and closer to home, we have seen that the government has decided that there is some sort of virtue in dissolving the dedicated Aboriginal affairs parliamentary standing committee, both of which I have had a bit to say in terms of the deleterious effect that has had on the capacity to work towards improvement. But, looking to the future, we see in the Malinauskas Labor election commitment document a commitment to invest more than \$2 million over these four years, to restart the Treaty process, to consult about that, and to establish a truth-telling process in South Australia.

Just a couple of weeks ago, in April, I asked the Premier about what that means, and put to the Premier that the government had previously committed to progressing Treaty and Truth as identified in the statement, and that the Premier had said, 'After the Voice is established and up and running, the government will turn its mind to Treaty and Truth.' The only response from the Premier at that point was, 'I stand by my remarks.' So, we wait, and we might see.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:23): I rise to speak on the bill today. It is my absolute pleasure to provide the house with a bit of an update of all the wonderful things that are happening in my local community. I know how valuable a strong and connected community is, and I entered this place determined to do all I could for mine, to ensure that we have the best possible supports in place and to help meet the evolving needs of my local community, both for the immediate need now but also for the years to come.

I am very proud that as a member of the Malinauskas government we have been taking decisive action in this space. Take health, for example. We know that there needs to be significant investment into the health system and we agree, and we are determined to build a bigger, better health system, and we are not wasting a second to get that done. In fact, you can drive down The Grove Way now and you will not be able to miss the ambulance station that is getting built there, right in the heart of Golden Grove. Even better is that 32 of the paramedics that will be based at that station are already active and servicing our local community. With that in mind, a huge thank you to the amazing crew at Parafield for housing them while this build is underway.

I have had the pleasure of meeting quite a few of the crew members who will be based at this station. What I love seeing is that a lot of these guys are based locally, have lived in the north-east or continue to live in the north-east. They know their area really well and they are completely invested in doing absolutely all they can to help the community that they value so highly. That goes for all the paramedics who will be based there. They are wholeheartedly committed to what they do because they love what they do and we certainly appreciate what they do for our community as well.

It is important to note that not only will it help improve services in my community with the current immediate needs but this station has been designed in a way, in consultation with the SA Ambulance Service, to ensure that it will help meet the needs of the population of my local community for the years to come. As I said, we are not here for short-term fixes. We are certainly thinking about and investing for the needs of the future in the interests in the long term of our local community.

I am also enjoying seeing the flow-on effect that this build is having in my local community, for people like Frank, who lives in Greenwith. Funnily enough, he is also a lad from Pirie who has chosen this amazing part of the state to call his home. He is working for a business that is helping with the build. Frank's company is going to be providing the walls that will go up as part of the station.

Frank was telling me at a recent presentation day at the Golden Grove Little Athletics just how great it has been to be able to drive past on the way to drop-off and pick-up with the kids and being able to show them a bit about what he does and loves to do for a living and also that this particular piece of what he is doing is getting invested into our community and going to have such a positive impact on them as well.

We know that more needs to be done in addition to the ambulance station to help improve our health system, and I am really pleased to share that we have many other initiatives underway in my local community to see this done. One that I am really proud of is our commitment and initiative to support Saints Chemist Warehouse to open 24/7.

It is something that I have had not only parents excited about, who have had that experience of needing to have some teething gel or Panadol in the middle of the night when there are high temperatures and not having anywhere else to go, I have also heard from shiftworkers who work during those typical nine-to-five hours and need to get their prescriptions but are unable to do so.

I have also had wonderful experiences from constituents such as Christine who shared with me the difference that this would make, particularly with the understanding that having something like this available is going to help so many people in our community access health care and support without needing to go into the emergency department.

Christine shared with me that she actually burnt her arm whilst cooking dinner one evening. It was quite significant and she has quite a few different health ailments. She had to have her husband take her in their car and they drove around for hours looking for somewhere to get some support, something to clean it up and something to wrap it with to protect from further infection.

Unfortunately, during that experience, there was nothing available for Christine at that time, and she recognises now, should it happen again—and, hopefully, it does not happen again—she will be able to just nick down the road five minutes away, get what she needs, seek some advice from a professional, and get that under control as well. It is certainly something highly valued and so much so that we are not even two months into having it being open 24/7 yet and we have seen over 10,000 people present themselves to that pharmacy out of hours seeking help and support.

I appreciate not all 10,000 of those visits would be people who may have otherwise gone to emergency departments but it is important that there would be a percentage of those who, had they not had that as an option, would have considered going into emergency because there simply is not any other option available to them as well.

Speaking of our hospitals and emergency departments, things are progressing well at the Lyell McEwin Hospital where we are building an additional 48 beds, which are due to come online a little bit later this year.

So much thought has gone into the design of these beds in this space. I had the great pleasure of having a look through recently with the member for Newland, with great appreciation to Built for showing us around, but also to the department for showing us exactly why things have been designed the way they have and the fact that it has been designed to meet the needs of our local community that the hospital services itself. They have had a really good look at what is coming in, what support people are needing and where the gaps are, and they are doing all they can to ensure that this build meets that need and will certainly meet that need for quite some time to come.

Over at Modbury Hospital things are progressing just as well. I am really excited that the new mental health precinct we will build there is being designed in consultation with those with lived experience, because that is extremely important. We want to make sure we are doing everything we can to have the maximum impact for those who need help and assistance.

The cancer clinic is a welcome addition to our community, something that has been deeply needed. I have heard time and again from constituents in my local community that for those who need treatment it can be really difficult. It is a time when you need as many supports as possible around you. You are not necessarily in a healthy state yourself to be able to commute backwards and forwards to treatment facilities. The further you have to go the harder that is. We want to make it easier, we want to have your health care accessible, and we know this will be a tremendous support for those going through those processes as well.

We also know the unique needs for parking in the area, whether or not you are going to the hospital. We have expanded the park-and-ride as well, and we know that we need a few more parks at the hospital to meet the new services that are coming but also to meet the current demand we have. I am really pleased that as part of our upgrades to Modbury Hospital we will be building additional car parks—more than 300—to make sure we are meeting the demands for quite some time to come. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SENTENCING (SERIOUS CHILD SEX OFFENDERS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

SECOND-HAND VEHICLE DEALERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 11, page 5, line 1 [clause 11(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

At 17:33 the house adjourned until Tuesday 14 May 2024 at 11:00.