

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17 June 2025

The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) took the chair at 11:00.

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Bills

APPROPRIATION BILL 2025

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 5 June 2025.)

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (11:01): I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. What is a budget? A budget is more than just numbers. It is a commitment to prioritise the needs of our people, to allocate public resources wisely and to uphold the promise that South Australia will support those who work hard and contribute to our state. It is about ensuring families can afford homes, businesses can thrive and communities are safe and prosperous. A budget should reflect the aspirations of South Australians, not betray them with spin, excessive debt and broken promises—yet that is exactly what this Labor government's budget delivers.

South Australia is a state of boundless potential built by generations. Those generations believed in a simple promise: work hard, do the right thing and this great state will have your back. My own family, like many families, arrived here in the 1950s with nothing but a suitcase, a dream, an aspiration and an unshakeable belief in that promise, and this state and this country have been nothing but a place of abundance for those people. South Australians still believe in that promise, but, today, South Australians are facing mounting pressure. The cost of living is crushing. Home ownership is slipping out of reach. Our health system is under incredible pressure. Crime is spiralling. Our regions are in drought, desperate for support.

I have had the great privilege of travelling the length and breadth of this state over the last 12 years as an MP, listening to drought-stricken farmers recently. We are seeing young people now who have been locked out of home ownership. We have seen families let down by Labor's health system. Hardworking South Australians, at the moment, cannot make ends meet.

This budget was Labor's last chance before the election to deliver real relief, to restore hope and to stand with our regions. Instead, what do we get? One of the worst budgets I have ever seen. We got a shrug—literally a shrug. We got an arrogant, visionless budget from a government that seems like they have stopped even pretending to care: no ambition and no big ideas, just more debt, more excuses and more broken promises. Labor's election budget is built on arrogance, not outcomes. This was Labor's last chance to lay the foundations for South Australia's future, not paper over the past.

If this is Labor's pitch for re-election, let me tell you, it is dangerously out of touch. Let's look at what they have delivered in government: a 44 per cent spike in electricity prices for the average household; rising rents that are swallowing more than a third of incomes; no clear plan for housing or innovation; a worsening ramping crisis, now 36 months of the worst in our history despite their ironclad promises; and ballooning debt, now projected to cost \$6.7 million a day in interest.

All the while, the Premier, what does he do? He attends concerts and attends events. Apparently, there is another bill today, a very important matter we have to deal with straight away about a golf course, and ignoring the core issues facing our state. You might be wondering, sir, at a time like this, why is party Pete so focused on events? Well, we have seen this episode before. It goes way back, just as the Roman emperors did with the gladiators and the Colosseum; it is about distracting the rest of us from the issues right on our doorstep. That is why they are doing it today.

They think the people of South Australia are stupid. Well, they are not. They are not stupid. Look at where we are as a state: the housing market here in South Australia is the sixth least affordable in the world; our tradie shortage is growing; youth crime has skyrocketed, with breach of bail offences up by almost 60 per cent in some instances; and regional families are being ignored right across our state. Labor's hydrogen energy plan: what happened to that? A multimillion dollar failure. It is not just incompetence, it is betrayal: it is the betrayal of working families and it is the betrayal of our future and it is time that this government stopped underestimating the people of this great state.

With an election just months away, South Australians might be asking: can we afford four more years of Labor—it is a genuine question; four more years of broken promises; four more years of rising costs; four more years of crumbling systems and four more years of excuses? Or is there another way forward? The simple answer is there is another way forward: a Liberal way forward, a Liberal alternative that will ease cost-of-living pressures, that will build more homes, that will slash red tape, that will restore responsible financial management and deliver safer communities and better services and focus on future industries like defence, AI, and robotics. It is a Liberal vision to restore the promise of South Australia, where hard work is rewarded, where every family can own a home and where our communities are safe, prosperous and proud.

Right now, we know that South Australians have lived through a tough three years under state and federal Labor governments. Behind the glitz and glam of this good-time party Premier lies a much dimmer reality. Labor has shattered the intergenerational promise that hard work ensures opportunity for future generations. Right now, young South Australians cannot afford to even get into a home. The cost of living is a gut punch and hope is fading fast.

Labor talk about priorities. Remember what they were elected on? They were elected on a slogan of the right priorities. Remember that? Remember the corflute? Remember the little thumbs up in the corner? We all remember the signs. It is no surprise to members on this side of the house that in government Labor has been focused on anything but the right priorities. They could have brought any bill forward that was of importance today, but what do they want to talk about? A golf course in North Adelaide. Pathetic! During the worst drought in living memory in this state's history they want to talk about a golf course.

They have spent over \$100 million on government advertising, including classics like the State Prosperity Project. What a joke that has been. Remember the one that said: 'Building a better health care system'? That was not on the corflute the last time I checked.

Labor are not wise stewards of taxpayers' money. They clearly do not respect it. They have spent millions of hardworking South Australians' taxpayer dollars sending Labor ministers on overseas trips to places like the Cannes Film Festival and flying around the world spruiking a failed hydrogen experiment. Labor disrespects taxpayers' money. It is one thing to do these trips and then bring back a benefit, but when you go to Spain to see a train and you do not bring a train back, and when you go to Europe to look at some of these festivals and you do not bring a festival back, that is a waste of money. Labor disrespects taxpayers' money. They waste millions on frivolous trips and failed projects.

Since the election, the Premier has been riding the wave of event after event, often on the taxpayer dime. The Premier spends his time living it up on that dime with the likes of Sam Smith, FISHER, the Tindalls, Greg Norman and Katy Perry. That is where he is most comfortable—right? And who does not like Katy Perry? We like the events too. They can generate interest and dollars for the state, but that cannot be the whole plan. You cannot run an economy on just events, not when we are facing serious statewide issues.

Remember, South Australians were told to vote a certain way, like their life depended on it? We saw the ads they made. Labor made an ironclad promise at the last election to the people of South Australia to fix the ramping crisis. We are now in the fourth quarter. We are now in the fourth quarter, around 80 per cent of the way through this term, and Labor continues to preside over record levels of ramping—36 months of the worst ramping in our state's history. Hang your heads in shame. Just last month, South Australians endured the third worst month for hours lost to ambulance ramping in the history of our state. Are these the right priorities that South Australians were promised?

Ramping, hydrogen and the right priorities are not where the broken promises end though. Remember, Labor promised to deliver a \$593 million Hydrogen Jobs Plan by the end of 2025 that would reduce wholesale electricity prices by 8 per cent. How has that gone? They have broken that promise too. And too many South Australians today are choosing between putting the heater on and eating, yet this budget is silent on bringing down the cost of electricity or forging a proper new plan for our grid following Labor's hydrogen disaster.

Recently, even in my own electorate, in Felixstow, I was standing in a supermarket and a lady came up to me. Her name was Maria, and she had three jumpers on. I said, 'Maria, why are you wearing three jumpers?' This is a true story. It was on a Saturday morning. She said, 'Vincent, at the moment I can't afford to keep the heater on.' There are stories like this, especially amongst pensioners, right throughout the state.

Right now, ESCOSA figures show that under Labor the average household is paying something like \$798 more on their annual power bill—nearly 44 per cent more—a substantial rise for SA families during a cost-of-living crisis. We have all received complaints from businesses that are doing it tough at the moment, where the disparity is even worse. The bill crunch has flowed onto small business, with electricity prices for small businesses rising from \$3,679 under the former Liberal government to \$5,364 under the Malinauskas Labor government, an increase of \$1,685, or nearly 46 per cent.

This Labor Premier promised a hydrogen power plant. It was meant to power 60,000 to 90,000 homes by the end of 2025. It was a very clear promise. They said the hydrogen power plant was meant to reduce wholesale electricity costs by 8 per cent, but we know prices have skyrocketed for households and businesses alike. Millions of dollars have been wasted on Labor's failed hydrogen experiment. It has been a farce, it has been an embarrassment—not just a state embarrassment, but an embarrassment to the rest of Australia.

Now, you would think that they would hold those responsible with delivering or not delivering these projects accountable, right? Wrong. The Premier today talks about concerts like AC/DC. At least AC/DC gave us some high-voltage rock'n'roll, because all this Premier has done is give us high-voltage power bills, wasting millions on a hydrogen vanity that is all spin and no spark. It is a flop and it fizzled before it fired.

What did they do with their \$600,000-a-year mate? Labor has promoted him, their mate who is getting paid \$600,000 a year, to delivering now as the state lead for the Whyalla Steelworks industrial transformation. That is how they look after their mates. This Labor Premier's hydrogen fail is just another promise from just another politician.

In hydrogen, we see a theme repeating: Labor does not respect taxpayer money. They have ended an era of responsible financial management. It is gone. The state's near \$50 billion of debt projected in the state budget has sparked a credit warning from credit agency S&P Global, which warned that new spending could nudge South Australia closer to the downside threshold for our rating on the state.

This month, Labor delivered a budget that will see an eye-watering \$6.7 million a day needed, on average, in interest repayments by the end of the forward estimates. That is over a billion dollars lost to interest each year. That is money that could go towards hospitals, schools and services. Instead, it is going to pay debt. Labor is raiding our kids' piggy banks and they are locking in debt for generations.

My wife and I are expecting a child in about a month's time. Unfortunately, it looks like what every child who is born in this state will inherit is a debt from the state of something like \$24,000, and where will it end? It was once said:

If we are consciously going to burden future generations with unprecedented debt, then the least they are owed is a plan to pay that debt back while also inheriting a better society.

Do you know who said that? Those are the words of the now Premier when he stood where I stand only four years ago. By his words he will be judged by young people today and generations to come. We need a government that does not just talk big on debt management but delivers. That is why, if we are elected, a Tarzia Liberal government will commit to delivering a debt management plan in government so that South Australians can have confidence that state debt remains at a sustainable level.

Only a Liberal government will arrest Labor's out of control debt growth and fix the budget. As I begin to lay out some of our plan, I want to talk about housing, because we know that housing is the beating heart of the South Australian dream. Unfortunately, it is now locked behind Labor's wall of inaction. As Darryl Kerrigan said, 'It's not a house, it's a home.' The Australian dream has long been built around a place to call home, a stake in society, a place to conserve, a place to protect. I still believe in that dream, but I fear it has already slipped out of reach for many.

Liberal Party founder, Sir Robert Menzies, championed his vision of a home-owning democracy, because he understood that the foundation of a strong society lies in empowering individuals to build lives of stability. Because when people own a home, they usually stay, they build wealth, they invest in that home. Home ownership develops invested citizens whose long-term buy-in helps to grow the economy.

Unfortunately, what we have seen from eight consecutive quarters is net interstate migration that is going backwards here in South Australia. Today, the home ownership vision is under threat. Home ownership is slipping beyond reach. It is eroding the very aspiration that fuels many of our shared values. South Australia is in the grip of a housing crisis. It is crushing dreams and hollowing out our future economy.

Our capital city, Adelaide, is now the sixth least affordable city in the world in which to buy a home. According to Demographia, Adelaide homes are impossibly unaffordable, ranking us as the sixth least affordable city in the world, worse than San Francisco and worse than London. It is a crisis and Labor has no answer.

According to ANZ, Adelaide is now the least affordable capital city in which to rent and the second least affordable in which to buy in the nation. South Australia faces a housing supply shortage of a staggering proportion; already 1,500 homes short of targets in just six months with a projected 34 per cent under supply by 2029. Worse, we are on track to be 30,000 workers short across construction, property, and water industries by next year under a scenario where all policy objectives are achieved. Migration has surged, but infrastructure has not kept up.

The Labor government, what did they do? They agreed to a National Housing Accord, promising 1.2 million homes nationwide—remember that? So far it is failing, with South Australia on track to miss its target, according to the UDIA, by 34 per cent. Red tape, combined with up to \$237,000 in government fees, charges and taxes on new homes, is limiting increases in supply. Graduates, tradies, young families are now the faces of a generation that are locked out of home ownership. Key workers, police, electricians, childcare workers, cannot afford to buy, or even rent in some cases, where they work.

Meanwhile, what is rent doing? It is eating up 34.6 per cent, on average, of income—worse than Sydney or Melbourne—making it harder to save. In fact, saving a deposit now takes on average 11.8 years. I often hear from young people going through this challenge. On the weekend we were out in the north-east with a guy called Michael who is 30 years old; he only saves around \$5,000 to \$10,000 a year. Young people are becoming trapped in this vicious cycle.

It is not just a housing problem: it is a betrayal of hardworking South Australians by a do-nothing Labor government. Twenty years ago an Adelaide home cost four times a household's income, with 35¢ per dollar servicing a mortgage. Today, it is nine times the income, demanding

56 per cent. It is nearly as bad as Sydney. For too many, homelessness has begun to be an all too possible threat, and we are seeing that across our suburbs, across Adelaide, right now.

The crisis is not just about homes. It is killing our economy. Unaffordable housing: what does it do? It shrinks families, it limits jobs mobility, and it stifles innovation as well. The question is: do we want to live in a state where the only young South Australians who can buy their own homes are those with parents who can help with a down payment? Is that what we are becoming? Is that what we want here in South Australia?

It is no wonder, with these conditions that have been created after nearly 20 out of 24 years of Labor government, that young people are feeling the need to flee our state for better opportunities—all while the Treasurer gets up in the media in the week of the budget, and what did he say last week? He said, 'I don't think anyone could suggest that the government should be doing more on housing.' If that does not show a government that is out of touch, I do not know what does.

At the same time they are raking in billions, billions from stamp duty, to prop up big government spending. The Labor Premier, what does he do? He hides behind empty promises, grand announcements like golf courses. We will not wait around. Labor promised more homes; they have barely laid a slab on any land release sites since 2023. We have the land, we have the best builders—I know, because a lot of them are in my electorate—we have the plumbers, we have the electricians. We just need this Labor government to get out of the way and stop treating the housing crisis as a cash cow.

Our plan is bold: slash red tape, fast track training of skilled apprentices, open more land for housing where it is appropriate to do so, reduce cost barriers for first-home buyers. This is because aspiring homeowners are forking out almost \$50,000 in stamp duty on the median price Adelaide home, according to Domain's latest capital city quarterly data. Stamp duty remains one of the most inefficient taxes that there is. It is time we got serious about stamp duty relief for first-home buyers, just like they do in every other state in Australia, because under Labor at the moment a multimillionaire first-home buyer can purchase a newly-built luxury home and forgo paying any stamp duty—read into that what you will—while a first-home buyer looking to purchase a modest, say, existing home, a unit maybe, or a townhouse, pays an exorbitant fee of tens of thousands of dollars to this big-spending Labor government.

We do not think that the balance is right. Aspiring first homeowners can barely afford their rent, let alone simultaneously fund a new build, that the numbers are telling us will take an average of 15 months to build, according to the MBA. If given the opportunity, a Tarzia Liberal government will act where Labor has failed. A Tarzia Liberal government will rebuild the South Australian dream brick by brick. We will provide serious stamp duty relief for first-home buyers. It is targeted, it is measured. Under a Tarzia Liberal government a first-home buyer purchasing an existing home of up to \$1 million will not pay one cent of stamp duty, and this will save first-home buyers up to \$48,000 in upfront costs on the purchase of their home.

Today I can announce that we will also waive the \$192 mortgage registration fee for first-home buyers, and this will save them the cost of their first grocery shop when moving in. Our plan does not just stop there. We will boost apprentices and tradies. We will fast-track apprenticeship courses in critical industries, like construction, hospitality and defence, responding to industry cries for skilled workers.

Further, by exempting apprentices and trainees from payroll tax and lifting the payroll tax threshold from \$1.5 million to \$2.1 million will empower small businesses to hire and train the workforce needed to build more homes. The government cannot do it on its own, we need the private sector to do the lifting. This builds on previously announced commitments to establish a one-stop shop for the building industry, modelled on the Australian Building and Construction Commission. The commissioner will cut red tape, resolve disputes and support builders, ensuring projects are delivered on time and on budget.

In addition to all of this, we know we need housing built where the infrastructure is, so why are we not doing more to build up our CBD? As the Liberal opposition, we see great merit in increasing supply in the city centre, and I am happy to stand here today and signal that our supply

policy will speak to this ambition. We think we can increase housing capacity in the CBD to assist in building homes for more than 25,000 people.

The CBD might be one of the biggest brownfield sites in Australia, so we should be considering how we remove barriers to increasing housing in our city, in our city square. We want young people to have the option to live close to their workplaces, close to their families, close to universities, close to their communities. Not everyone wants to live an hour away from the city. The opposition has a vision for the CBD, and if Adelaide is going to host world-class events then we should have a world-class flourishing CBD, and we need to provide more foot traffic to businesses in the city that are struggling since COVID times.

From suburban homes to regional infrastructure we will get South Australia building again. These policies are not just about housing, it is also about hope. They are about ensuring that every South Australian who works hard can own a home, raise a family and live in a community that reflects their values. We will stop Labor's habit of piling costs onto households, like the \$85 annual SA Water bill hike that everyone is paying at the moment, and will deliver real housing growth, not empty promises. We will fight for a state where hard work buys a home like it used to and where families can thrive.

As Liberals, we know our suburbs are the hearts of our communities, but Labor's previous 85 per cent urban infill targets have threatened their character. Under the former planning minister John Rau, my community was affected more than any other community, so I know exactly what they did in terms of destroying parts of the community.

Moving on to the environment, along with our plan for Linear Park and the River Torrens to fund environmental and recreational improvements that will enhance green spaces, we will also enable more recreation and strengthen biodiversity. We want to protect and enhance our suburbs. That is why we will introduce a single heritage act under one heritage minister, simplifying the process for listing local and State Heritage Places too.

We will re-establish the heritage conservation grants program scrapped by Labor in 2022 and expand it to \$2.5 million per year, allowing owners of local heritage places to apply. We will also introduce powers to remediate derelict heritage buildings, preserving our history for future generations. We will tighten demolition controls to save heritage homes and empower local councils with earlier, wider community consultation on developments. It will be communities, not bureaucrats, that will shape our suburbs.

We will grow tree canopy by reinstating the Greener Neighbourhoods grant scheme and incentivise private land owners to maintain and grow our urban forest. We will enhance our Parklands by pursuing World Heritage listing for the Adelaide Parklands and establish a committee under Green Adelaide to boost biodiversity and grow their open space by 5 per cent by reclaiming unused built areas. In this way, our Parklands will remain a global treasure for generations to come.

Moving on to the drought: while our cities struggle with housing, our regions are battling a drought that Labor refuses to take seriously. There is an opportunity today to debate a bill, maybe about drought, maybe allowing for a state of emergency to be declared, but instead we are talking about a golf course because of this government—a golf course. South Australian farmers are on their knees. You would have them in your own electorate, sir. They are on their knees, yet this government will not declare it an emergency and is still locking farmers out of vital funding and support when they need it most. I hear this story no matter which pocket of the state I travel to.

This budget provides little relief to South Australia's drought-stricken farmers and regional communities doing it tough. Despite worsening drought conditions across vast parts of the state, the budget contains no funding for no or low-interest concessional loans, despite many in the sector calling for it, and just \$2 million towards the Rural Business Support grants as the government's contribution, equating to just over 1,300 grants of \$1,500 each. Last year, the Liberal opposition urged Labor to prioritise drought preparation, but so far their response has been nothing but disgraceful.

I was in Mount Gambier on Friday, and I was hearing the same thing: lengthy delays, restrictive relief packages, barriers that leave many of our farming businesses ineligible for help.

Labor's latest drought support package only allows those on the Farm Household Allowance to access ESL and work vehicle registration rebates, which is something like only 6 to 8 per cent of our entire farming community. We say that all those badly affected by drought deserve support, because it is farming that has held up this state for over 150 years.

Create a drought hardship registry. Fast-track the relief with targeted rebates, water carting subsidies and low or no-interest loans for fodder and fertiliser in farmers' time of need. Farmers do not need Labor's platitudes: they are hardworking, they are pragmatic people. What they need is a government that stands with them and takes their concerns seriously. Today was a day we could have gone about that, but instead, what are we doing? We are debating a golf course that the government concedes is something urgent that we need to do today—how pathetic.

Regional cost-of-living pressures have also been ignored. I personally welcome what the Treasurer is doing in respect of public transport in terms of a fair discount for young people, but this government thinks that a school student public transport fare discount is a cost-of-living relief measure. You know what? You cannot catch a bus that does not run in your town.

Farmers and small businesses need practical, immediate support, not spin and token gestures. This government has repeatedly failed our regions and our primary industries. They have failed on the drought; they have failed on plant biosecurity, crippling our tomato export markets. This is an area I can talk about—tomatoes.

I stood with the members for Frome and Narungga when I was in the Adelaide Plains recently. I stood with migrant families—Italian, Greek. These people, their families, have been through war. They have been through famine overseas. They have come to this country with no English. They have faced adversity. But you know what they have not been able to get over? They have not been able to get over the incompetence of this government that has now forced these people into bankruptcy, which is an absolute disgrace. They have failed to retain key employers like SA Tomato, Beston and Seven Point Pork. They have failed to manage a tomato virus that is treated very differently in other parts of the world.

We saw it coming. We asked questions in this house. Do you know what? There are now mortgages that have been handed over to the banks. There are now car repayments; cars are being repossessed. There are now students who have been taken out of schools because of this government's inaction and arrogance.

They have failed on SARDI. They have failed on fish deaths at West Beach. They have failed to support our struggling wine grape industry. They have failed on meaningful investment into regional roads. They have failed on any significant investment into regional health care. How many more times does this government need to fail our regions and the people who put food on our plate, clothes on our back, who build our homes and keep Australia running? This budget was an opportunity to step up, but Labor has failed.

Our regions deserve better. If given an opportunity, only a Tarzia Liberal government will acknowledge and respect the hard work and contribution of our regional communities. Only a Liberal state government will stand alongside them to deliver the targeted and practical investment that they truly deserve, not because of an election cycle, not because of a marginal seat, but because it is the right thing to do. Why? Because, as Liberals, we believe in rewarding those who do the right thing.

Hard work, responsibility, rewarding aspiration, community spirit should be celebrated, not punished. That is why we will introduce practical policies to ease the pressure on South Australia, policies we have already announced like the driver incentive policy to ensure young provisional drivers who go three years without an offence can have \$71 of their full licence renewal covered for the following year. It is a small but meaningful reward for safe, responsible driving, giving young South Australians a leg up. It is important in what is another bad year on our roads.

We will introduce a baby seat installation rebate. Full disclosure: I might benefit from this, but we will see. We know that new parents face enough costs. A capped price rebate will enable initial baby seat installations, ensuring that every child travels safely—and they are hard to install, let me tell you.

We will extend more accessible public transport to Mount Gambier. We want to trial an on-demand service to improve mobility for regional families, ensuring access to jobs, health care and education. We will also explore expanding this model to other regional centres too. These measures send a clear message: if you work hard, if you play by the rules, if you contribute to our state, an alternative Liberal government will have your back and back you every step of the way.

Liberals at the state and federal level had a lot to say about the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass during the election. They have long advocated for the delivery of the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass, not only for the productivity gains it would deliver but also to get trucks off our suburban streets. Through this budget, we learn that the state and federal Labor governments have only budgeted something like \$656 million for stage 1 of the High Productivity Vehicle Network, despite the project reportedly likely to cost around \$1.05 billion, leaving a \$400 million shortfall. Further, \$480 million of the \$656 million funding is pushed beyond 2028-29, meaning the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass quite simply does not look like it is fully funded, with no clarity on whether it will ever be under Labor.

The Albanese Labor government initially committed to a fifty-fifty funding split, but the state Labor government is now describing the project as a \$650 million 80:20 arrangement, despite the higher likely cost of \$1.05 billion.

Labor is trying to rewrite history and hope that no-one notices. South Australians do not seem to be getting the full network, and they are not getting any of it any time soon. The opposition and federal Coalition committed to delivering the full project, and quickly, because freight operators, exporters and local communities cannot afford to wait.

The HPVN was meant to ease pressure on Portrush Road, Cross Road and the South Eastern Freeway by moving heavy freight to a dedicated corridor. Instead of fixing congestion, Labor is letting the problem pile up. Every year they delay, more trucks hit our suburban roads and the economic benefits of the project are lost. If this project matters, Labor needs to fund it properly and get on with it because South Australians deserve more than political spin and budget trickery.

South Australians also have the right to feel safe. They have the right to feel safe in their own homes and out in the burbs—safe in their homes, safe at their workplaces, safe in their communities—but this is no longer the case for many since Labor took office. They have turned our criminal justice system into a revolving door, and you only have to look at what is almost a 60 per cent increase in breach of bail by youth offenders during a period under their watch.

Labor has made a mockery of the justice system. Look at the court backlog and what is happening with our frontline police. Our hardworking police are sick and tired of arresting young offenders, only to see them released out into the community to reoffend. Some young criminals are racking up over 100 charges in 12 months, as the media has reported.

Let's look at some of the facts. Since Labor came into office we have seen acts intended to cause injury up by 36 per cent, sexual assault and related injuries up by almost 30 per cent, theft up by 14 per cent, serious criminal trespass up by almost 9 per cent, and other offences, like threatening behaviour and harassment, up by 73 per cent. Labor says crime is down when it suits it, but these statistics say otherwise.

Let us not forget the tragic circumstances that led to a surge in deaths of women in our community due to domestic violence. It took, literally, women marching on the steps of parliament for this government to eventually even take action, and this budget is basically silent on any contingency around the funding of recommendations of the royal commission.

We know services are currently struggling to handle the volume of calls that they are receiving each day, yet they did not receive funding in this so-called law and order budget. Let's look at that, and whether it actually was a law and order budget. What did Labor's secret state mean? It meant that South Australians will not be able to see the report that actually examined the state of policing here in South Australia. Why will they not release it, despite the Commissioner of Police claiming that it would be in the public interest for them to do so? It is interesting.

Well, we know that we do have a shortfall of around 200 police, and last year the same number of officers basically left the force as were recruited. Without the right incentives, Labor's plan

to recruit more police is destined to fail. They just will not do it. If they cannot do it now, they are not going to do it into the future. If a Tarzia Liberal government is given the opportunity, we will not sit on our hands when it comes to keeping South Australians safe. We did it during COVID and will do it again.

We will make sure that our criminal laws and penalties are in line with community expectations. We will ensure that community safety is the primary consideration of decision-makers and that we take real measures to break the cycle of reoffending. Under Labor, South Australia has become a gangster's paradise, with new youth and street gangs continuing to emerge and be recruited from interstate.

Labor has sat on a recommendation from SAPOL that more resources be put into fighting youth crime for a year, and they will not release the report that I mentioned. They half-heartedly responded to growing pressure on the youth crime crisis with what? A glossy pamphlet and round tables with no results. We will continue to hold this weak government to account when it comes to community safety. We have led the way with knife law reform, protecting our community from assaults, and we are only just getting started.

The cost of living is also worth mentioning because it is crushing South Australians at the moment and Labor has no plan to fix it. You only have to look at the budget: limited cost-of-living relief in this budget does not go far enough. While we welcome efforts to reduce the cost of public transport for students, there is so much more that could have been done and should have been done.

We know on this side of the house that South Australians know how to spend their money far better than the government. The cost of living is crushing South Australians. Under this government recently we have seen electricity is up around 44 per cent, eggs are up 38 per cent, bread is up 26 per cent, rent is up 19 per cent and insurance is up 47 per cent. As I mentioned, the average household now pays \$798 more on their power bill per year. Labor promised no new taxes but, as we have heard, they then delivered an \$85 average water bill hike for households and introduced a GP payroll tax grab that is making it more expensive.

A Tarzia Liberal government will roll back this pain. We will abolish Labor's water bill price hike. We will scrap Labor's GP payroll tax grab. We will slash stamp duty for first-home buyers, including on existing homes. We will reduce wasteful spending, we will cut red tape, and we will deliver affordable, reliable energy with policies like our home battery scheme. This will save households thousands in up-front costs, it will push down peak demand and it will help drive down prices for people to ease the cost-of-living crunch. Only a Liberal government will put more money back into the pockets of hardworking South Australians.

When it comes to health, Labor's failure is, quite frankly, unforgivable. Their broken promises have left us sicker and waiting longer, and South Australians deserve better. They promised to fix ramping—simple as that. It is worse than ever. We have now endured 36 of the worst months of ramping in South Australia's history. In May, 4,791 hours were spent on ramps, over double the figure from February 2022. We are into the fourth quarter: it is not the first quarter and it is not the second quarter, we are around 80 per cent of the way through.

We need to move away from looking at the stats here and remember what this means for people as well, and what this means is that sick South Australians are left stranded outside our hospitals, desperate to get in for the care that they need. Even in my own community I have seen what has happened to a beloved Hectorville resident at the time, Eddie, who was described by those who knew him best as a 'gentle giant' and who was living in disability care, and who died after waiting 10 hours for an ambulance to arrive. These are the stories: the real-life tragedies behind the statistics, the stories of those let down by a government that was, quite frankly, elected on a promise to fix ramping but has fallen tragically short—tragically short.

While our Premier hangs out with celebrities or helps design new golf courses, why are we not talking about ramping today? Why we are talking about golf courses again? While he hangs out with celebrities or helps design these new golf courses, less than half of emergency patients are seen within 10 minutes, which is something like the worst rate in Australia. The Women's and Children's Hospital is reportedly delayed by years. Professionals signed off on minutes with a

two-year difference in the time delay. They cannot even recruit senior people and keep senior people in the hospitals. Where have we got to?

A Tarzia Liberal government will rebuild our health system. Today, I am delighted to announce that a Liberal government will fund a GP after-hours increased access trial to support GP clinics and provide after-hours care to South Australians, including until 8pm Monday to Friday and from 9am to 1pm on Sundays. This will be a two-year trial that will give more South Australians the opportunity to access routine and preventative GP care outside traditional business hours.

I have been that young parent, I am that young parent, who sometimes will do anything to try to get their child into a GP. You go online and you cannot get in and you make a phone call and you cannot get your child booked into a GP. That is exactly what this policy will seek to address with many parents at the moment who cannot get their child into a GP. Why should people have to go to an emergency department to get a GP to check out their child?

We are very proud to announce that policy. It is a two-year trial and will give more South Australians the opportunity to access routine and preventative GP care outside traditional business hours. GP clinics under our plan will receive a grant of \$150,000 per practice per annum to meet additional costs of operating after-hours, including wages for practice staff, on-call allowances and facility costs associated with keeping practices open for extended hours because we need to do everything we can to keep people out of our hospitals if they do not need to be there. This is an initiative that would support that.

In 2020, there was an Australian Health Panel survey conducted by the Consumers Health Forum that found 67 per cent of respondents had accessed after-hours primary care at least once in the previous five years, with most after-hours care being accessed between 6pm and 11pm on weekdays. After-hours options allow people to access their GP without taking time off work. This complements our existing commitment to abolish Labor's GP payroll tax grab so that you pay less to see a doctor.

We will deliver long overdue radiotherapy to the South-East because why should your post code deliver your health outcomes? This will help to bridge the funding gap to deliver critical cancer treatment closer to home, sparing patients long, exhaustive journeys. We will also prioritise regional health services and mental health support, addressing the root causes of crime, but also social strain, because South Australians deserve a health system that saves lives, not one that leaves them waiting.

In terms of small business, we as Liberals believe in a South Australia where every business has the opportunity to thrive and every worker has the chance to succeed. Labor's 44 per cent electricity price hikes and water bill price hikes are crushing families and crushing businesses even more. We are seeing small businesses that are closing weekly, unable to absorb these costs. Over the last year, we have seen confidence levels in SA hitting the lowest confidence level since COVID, and 2,500 more South Australians have left the state for other parts of Australia than have come in the over two and a half years to the September quarter.

We will turn this around and only a Liberal government will provide tax reform to support small businesses. What will we do? We will lift the payroll tax threshold to \$2.1 million. We will give small businesses room to grow, room to hire, and room to innovate. Only a Liberal government will fix the outdated shop trading hours restrictions. We will give businesses more freedom to choose when they open and South Australians the flexibility to shop when it suits them. We will boost local economies; we will create jobs; we will unleash an innovation boom; we will invest in skills training; reduce red tape to reverse the brain drain; attract young talent; and foster entrepreneurship. South Australia will be a hub of opportunity, not this state of missed chances. These policies will unleash South Australia's potential to create a vibrant economy where hard work pays off.

We have reflected on where Labor has led us. They promised to fix ramping but it is worse than ever with 140,000 hours or so lost since they took office. They promised no new taxes, yet they delivered water bill price hikes and a GP payroll tax grab. They promised cheaper power but households pay \$798 more annually, a 44 per cent increase. They promised homes, yet Adelaide on the facts, on the stats, is the sixth least affordable city globally, and supply is falling short of targets.

This budget is not a plan for South Australia's future. Under Labor, it is a blueprint for failure. Labor's near \$50 billion in state debt is set to cost \$6.7 million a day in interest. It raids our kids' piggy banks and locks in hardship for generations. South Australians face a stark choice: four more years of Labor's broken promises, skyrocketing costs, unaffordable homes, a health system in crisis, or a Liberal government that delivers.

Under a Tarzia Liberal government, we will restore the South Australian promise, the South Australian dream. We will make home ownership a reality. We will reward hard work. We will build safer, stronger communities. We will stand with our regions, with our brothers and our sisters in the country. We will protect our heritage. We will deliver a health system that works.

Let me paint a picture of the South Australia we will build. It is a state where young people can buy their first home in a safe community with a good school, with affordable and reliable essential services nearby. It is a state where households can rely on abundant renewable energy and not have to choose between eating and heating. It is a state where our regional communities are respected and supported by a government that values their contribution. This is the South Australia that we are fighting for, a state where every key worker, every family, every dreamer can afford a home, turn on their heater, put food on the table in a community that is safe and that is proud. It is a state where hard work is rewarded, not punished. It is a state where the promise of opportunity is kept, not broken.

Only a Liberal-led government will build the homes and cut red tape, will lower taxes for business and fees for households, will deliver more accessible and reliable essential services, and return dignity and respect to our regions. This coming election, South Australia is at a crossroads. Labor's path is predictable. We have seen it. We have seen it for three years: spin, debt, broken promises, bad priorities—just like they are pursuing today. The Liberal path is crystal clear: homes for the next generation; affordable, reliable, essential services there when you need them; a budget that honours taxpayer dollars; safer streets, stronger regions and a booming economy.

Let me paint the picture of the South Australia we will build. It is a place where every young person can afford a home, a place where young families thrive in safe, vibrant communities, a place where small businesses grow, innovators stay, and every South Australian gets a fair go. The promise of South Australia should never be a memory. It should be a reality for every citizen in every corner of this great state. It is time to restore that promise. It is time for a government that listens, that acts and delivers on its promises. It is time to return South Australia to its rightful place as a beacon of opportunity, and it is time for a new Liberal government.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:58): We just heard the question posed: 'What is a budget?' A budget to me is opportunity. A budget is the opportunity for my community to grow, to learn, to be cared for, to have a brighter future. So my answer to that question is: a budget is an amazing chance for South Australia and an amazing chance for my local community of Badcoe.

I am actually struggling to figure out how I am going to get through everything that is in this budget and everything that it promises to deliver, and will deliver, in the short amount of time that I have. Indeed, I might even draw attention to the fact that I do not have a clock yet, so maybe I will just go on for quite some time. I wanted to talk about some of the highlights of this budget and then go into some of the continuing projects that are rolling out in my electorate, and which are providing that opportunity that I spoke of.

I want to start, though, by thanking and congratulating the Treasurer and his team. Devising a budget is no small feat, and he should be congratulated on the incredible work that he has done to put forward a budget that promises a great opportunity for our communities, and I have no doubt will absolutely deliver.

This budget delivers for my electorate in terms of schools, in terms of sport, in terms of the outdoors—recreation, open space and trees—in terms of the environment, in terms of transport and infrastructure, which my community is receiving a large amount of investment in. It delivers for the young and for the not so young.

I have to say that there are more than a few things to get excited about in the budget papers this time around. Definitely, the thing that my community has been most encouraged by, is the most thankful for and has given me the most amount of feedback on so far is the student fare discount for

public transport. It is tough, and of course people are trying to save every dollar they can—I know I am—to make sure that they can meet the cost of living and deliver for our kids in particular.

The quite substantial reduction in the student concession Metrocard will make a huge difference to so many people. I have been at our local tram and train stations, of which there are many across Badcoe, in the last week or so speaking to people about this, and I cannot say there is a single person I have come across who has thought it was a bad idea. Everyone is very encouraged by the fact that they will be getting that discount.

Especially for families with several kids, it is going to mean a really significant saving for them. The convenient byproduct of this is people having more confidence and more incentive to be using public transport and encouraging their children to take public transport, of course when they are old enough and able enough to do so. There has definitely been a lot of great feedback on that. People have been really encouraged in my community as well by the materials and services charge reduction, and that is also a real hip-pocket saving for people.

Mr Speaker, you may be aware that there has been a campaign for some time in my electorate to save the Adelaide Koala and Wildlife Centre at Plympton. I have been part of that campaign, pushing hard to make sure that what is really an institution for the rescue and the rehabilitation of wildlife in our community at Plympton is not lost.

This centre has been backed for many years by a very generous benefactor. That is a gentleman who has spent his life caring for animals and in fact has three vet practices. One of them is the Plympton vet, and I choose to send my kittens to the Plympton vet primarily because I know that some of the proceeds from that vet, and two others, go to looking after the Adelaide Koala and Wildlife Centre and making sure that our wild animals are looked after.

However, sadly, some months ago it was not possible for that arrangement to continue, and of course the search started for a more sustainable long-term way to fund the Koala and Wildlife Centre. Of course, that triggered discussions from me with many in my community, including with the environment minister. I was really encouraged by the depth of knowledge that our environment minister has. She is an incredibly impressive person.

Of course, the minister thought holistically about this problem. Rather than looking at it as one centre, she looked at the whole sector and what we should be doing for wildlife across not just the metropolitan area but also our regional areas. From that hard work, we see a \$7.6 million package in this budget to address the wildlife sector and make sure that it is more sustainable. Unfortunately, we are seeing vet bills and surgery costs for our most injured animals go up, and that is leading to pressure for these rescue and wildlife organisations.

Although the Adelaide Koala and Wildlife Centre, I am pleased to say, received \$1.4 million over four years, securing its future and making sure it can keep doing wonderful work from Plympton, this wider package of \$7.6 million will mean that even more animals right across the metropolitan and regional areas will be looked after. What it will mean is that some of the costs of those veterinary services, if they are not being looked after at the Plympton centre, will be met or helped to be met, and that is a wonderful thing. Unfortunately, our wildlife are the casualties of some of our modern life—particularly cars—and it is good to know that there is an army of incredible volunteers out there who are doing amazing work. I am really pleased that this budget is supporting them.

Regarding school upgrades, the Goodwood Primary School loos have been an issue for a really long time, and they are now getting a bit of a boost. There will be two new loos built at Goodwood Primary School, literally a great relief to students as well as staff and parents there at Goodwood Primary School—maybe not the sexiest thing in the budget, but it is definitely incredibly important.

I am really pleased that there is additional funding for road safety cameras. As an MP who has several major roads in my area—South Road, Anzac Highway, Goodwood Road, Marion Road—those are all roads on which, unfortunately, we see too many accidents. We want to make sure they are safer, so those investments in cameras are certainly welcomed.

The new ambulance headquarters is firing ahead on Richmond Road. That will be of incredible benefit for my community, and will certainly please many across my area in their hour of

need. Obviously that sits alongside the investment that has happened with the Edwardstown ambulance station as well, so we are being very well looked after by the health minister in terms of investment in ambulance services. I am looking forward to seeing the HQ take shape and become a reality.

Of course, we are seeing investments in this budget in the Women's and Children's Hospital and Flinders upgrades, which will benefit my community, and also in public transport security, which is very important. I have some 20 railway stations and tram stations in my electorate, and a population that does prioritise public transport has chosen to live in our area because of the public transport options. They will, of course, be able to feel safer and more secure and travel at extended hours.

One thing that I am personally quite passionate about that is included in this budget is the expanded scope of practice for pharmacists. Those in this place will probably know that I have put a lot of work into, and conducted a parliamentary inquiry in recent years into, expanding the capabilities of pharmacists to prescribe UTI medication and also contraceptive refills. To me, this is really the next step.

We should be making sure that our pharmacists—who are incredibly talented and well-trained individuals—are working at the peak of their capacity, that they are employing the knowledge and training they have received both at university and in extension courses, and also on the job, and that they are using that to their maximum capacity to relieve the pressures on our health system.

I really do feel they are part of the answer in making sure that we are all getting timely and accessible health care and relieving the pressure on our EDs, so I am thrilled to see that work is continuing. What we are really saying to pharmacists is, 'We value you, we know you can do more, you can contribute more, and we are going to give you the opportunity to do that.' That is an incredible investment of state funds.

It will probably come as little surprise to members that I read through the papers, in some detail, listed under the amazing headline of '\$1.9 billion for early childhood services'. As a new mum myself, I am obviously quite attuned to my child's development, to providing him with the opportunities he needs to meet his milestones and also to be his best, and to have a great life, to have a life that is full of engagement with others, that is full of physical activity, full of learning, full of language and music and movement. So it is amazing to me to see that we are accelerating three-year-old preschool; if not my son, then certainly his little friends will be benefiting from that particular policy as we roll it out.

It is also really important that we are prioritising rolling it out in areas of most need. I really want to see young people getting every opportunity in their first five years of life, because we know what a difference it makes when those children then go to school in how they progress through the school system and into high school and university or TAFE, or the workplace, if they choose. Those first five years are incredibly critical, and I think the state really does have a role in making sure that all children, every last child in South Australia, is given the opportunity to thrive in future. I am very encouraged by that and also the kindy care trials and the low-interest loans for the care providers, which is all critical work.

The brainchild of the next policy is sitting in the house and she will be happy to hear me say that I am absolutely thrilled about the \$20 million investment in multicultural communities. I am very fortunate to have quite a multicultural community. I have a very strong Indian and Nepalese population and also people of Chinese origin—a broad range of people from different cultural backgrounds.

One of the great thrills of being an MP—and you would have heard this many times in this chamber—is attending citizenship ceremonies and hearing people's stories as to how they have come to Australia, and also, of course, being out in the community and meeting second and third generation migrants and seeing how they are getting on and celebrating and keeping their culture while also embracing the Australian way of life.

I feel that my local community of Badcoe is so much richer for the contributions of people from all over the world, and I am looking forward to particularly those groups in my community, who

are seeking to celebrate their own culture, language, dance, food and music, having this additional opportunity to be able to do that. It can be tough, of course, especially for some of the smaller groups, to raise the funds to be able to engage in events or even train up their own people to be able to run associations and groups, and so I think that is an incredible investment.

I would also just like to give a shout-out to the arts and cultural policy. This is a \$13 million investment. Something I am very passionate about is the arts. In a past life those here would know that I was a court reporter with various commercial networks, and I am very passionate about our courts and justice system. I also volunteered advocating for victims' rights. The investments that we are seeing here in our court system I think are well deserved and, although it is tempting to think these are things that will benefit lawyers and judges and so forth, I actually think that it will make a difference for victims.

We often hear the expression 'justice delayed is justice denied' and when our court system struggles, the entire delivery of justice is delayed, and what that means is the elongation of painful periods for people who have gone through crimes, or even civil wrongs. I think that this investment really means that we can make sure we are delivering justice in a timely way and as efficiently as possible, which can only be a good thing, particularly for victims of crime.

I applaud the Attorney-General and the Treasurer for the investment that is being made in court infrastructure and also security, which is incredibly important. There are additional resources to the Crown Solicitor's Office and District Court associates. A big one for me is Forensic Science SA. Often as a court reporter I would sit in court and hear cases being adjourned due to the forensics not being ready. This investment will provide better, more modern facilities. Investing in the incredible technology that is employed at Forensic Science SA certainly goes a very long way to making sure that people get their day in court, are treated fairly and that they have all the evidence needed, whether they are on the prosecution or the defence side. Of course, cases that are brought in a timely way benefit everyone involved in the justice system.

Finally, I just want to touch on some of the things that are being delivered in my electorate at the moment through this budget. I am very excited that there are some 25 election commitments that I made that are either completed or nearing completion now. Regarding Plympton International College, the \$3 million works I committed to at the last election for a kiss and drop, about a dozen extra classrooms and also road safety upgrades are complete. We are just waiting for one more light to come from overseas and be fitted especially to light up one of the roads outside Plympton International College, and then we will be having a lovely opening for those works. Excitingly, that is not the end of our work at Plympton International. There is another \$14 million being rolled out for additional classrooms.

This is a school that is an amazing success story, and I really do credit that to Susan Close in her time as education minister. Deciding to make this school a bilingual school and changing its name to Plympton International really gave the school a new focus. What we are seeing now is it is one of the most, if not the most, popular public schools in the area. It has the longest waiting list and in fact next year will exceed its capacity, hence needing to invest in it and make sure that we have the classrooms to fit this influx of enthusiastic students who want to be part of a school that is really cutting edge.

It is a school where you have your lessons in both English and Mandarin and where classes start with tai chi. It is an absolutely beautiful practice at the school. The school bell rings, and there is a little tai chi lesson at the beginning. It makes everyone lovely and calm and makes their mental state ready to go to learn. I have really enjoyed being involved with the school, delivering that \$3 million election commitment, but of course I am very excited, and the plans are getting quite well developed now, for the \$14 million spend on additional learning areas.

Black Forest Primary School not too long ago opened its \$5 million multipurpose hall, new library and additional classrooms. That was actually an election commitment of mine from 2018, so it is good that that one has finally been delivered. Richmond Primary School has a new playground. It is pretty cool. It has a ninja course, and the kids are pretty into that. They are much more gymnastical than I ever have been. They absolutely are managing to get all of their energy out in

playtime and lunchtime and then are ready to go back into class and learn from the brilliant teachers there at Richmond Primary.

I would also like to mention that the upgrade to Aldridge Avenue Reserve that I committed to has now been delivered, as has the Beare Avenue Reserve community garden. It is producing some amazing fresh vegetables and lovely flowers in our community. It is a thrill to see little kids down there planting new plants; maybe not so much while it has been raining, but in the summer it has been brilliant. I am still working hard to make sure that irrigation is developed at Teesdale Crescent Reserve, which is also a key commitment of mine and something I am quite dedicated to achieving.

The SASMEE workshop will be open soon. That is our model engineers and model train operation at Millswood. If you have not been, make sure you go. Take the grandkids, take the kids. It is an incredible day out for barely any money for what you are getting. I managed to obtain \$151,000 at the last election for a new workshop there. What this means is that the guys—and it is mostly older guys, but there are a few other people as well, younger people and a few women—who work on these model trains and build them do not have to do it in their back shed, particularly if that is not practical for them anymore.

They now have a space where they can work with their fellow volunteers to build these amazing machines and share them about twice a month with our community. Make sure you go down there and check it out. I will certainly be cutting the ribbon on that new workshop in coming weeks. Lastly, I would just like to thank the Treasurer for his work and commend the bill to the house.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:18): I rise to make an address in the budget reply. I cannot help but talk about the disappointment for me as a regional member, for other regional members across the state and essentially for the people of South Australia for the lack of vision in this budget that has been handed down, this budget of \$23 billion, which matches somewhere around \$7 billion as far as the previous Appropriation Bill in this place to take the state's budget to over \$30 billion. It is just disappointing, more than disappointing, to see that there is no real support in the regions.

One thing I really want to exemplify is about the drought, the drought that is the worst in living memory. No-one across the state can tell me when their forebears saw a worse time. We originally had figures that this was the one-in-100-year drought, but it went back. People had records that went back 115 years and then people have looked at records from previous times of European settlement, and it is the worst in living and non-living memory.

What that means is we are in a crisis. We are in a crisis in this state with our rural producers, with many farmers not being able to access finance. When I talk about that, there are farmers who at the bare minimum spend hundreds of thousands to put a crop in. They are just the input costs I am talking about, not the plant costs that run into the millions as well and the many millions of dollars worth of land that people need to own just to feed the state. But it increases to where there would be quite a few people investing at least \$1 million in inputs, and I know of several farmers who will be spending north of \$4 million just on their inputs to try to grow a crop to resolve the issues from last year. And, yes, some of us have seen some rain but it is not right across the state. It certainly has not gone right across the state and it does not mean the drought is over. What it does mean is, yes, it gives hope. It gives hope.

We all knew it would rain, but it was a matter of when, and people are suffering. People have got mental health struggles. Sadly, some people have taken their lives and that is too high a price to pay. As I indicated, some people just cannot get the finance or have waited four to five months for their bank to say, yes, you can put the crop in and you can pay the bills. But the issue is they have already sown their crops dry in the previous months. In some cases, those crops have come up but have died and now, because of no rain and because people have to get their crops in to get the maximum yield, they have to go back and resow—more fuel, more wear and tear, more seed that has to be sourced to put these crops in.

It is amazing when you look at the limited amount of funding that is supplied to around 9,000 farmers across the state, who produce in a reasonable year about \$17 billion worth of product for this state. Essentially, we saw the first round of \$18 million, with \$10 million of that as money that was reannounced for rural financial counsellors, who do a great job. They do a really great job. We

saw that topped up to \$73 million, and a lot of that was for drought infrastructure grants like water tanks or irrigation infrastructure, etc. But the problem is you have to do a lot of paperwork and some of this was taking up to three months and you have to spend money that you do not have to access these grants. We believe over this side of the house that probably less than \$20 million of that money has been allocated to our rural areas and our farmers who do so much in feeding our state, our nation and the world.

Just for a comparison, and I know I have said it in this place before, I believe we do need a sovereign steel industry, but at what cost because \$2.4 billion has been pumped into Whyalla. That is a comparison of just those two things. I just hope that we have a good record year this year or at least a better than average year to get through. We have the many organisations doing hay runs. We have people helping out their neighbours, even though they are under stress as well. We have stock that are starving. We have people having to sell off stock in the many thousands of numbers, if not the hundreds of numbers of cattle. Thousands of heads of sheep have had to go to the chopping block and even mothers in lamb, ewes in lamb. So our farmers need more support, they need real support, they need low or no-interest loans and it needs to be got on with so that our farmers can prosper.

Looking at our health budget, we have the government spruiking about something well over 2,000 health professionals that they have hired in this state. Sadly, we do not see too many of those, if any, come out to the regions. We have had to fight for many months to get a doctor to come back to Karoonda. It was in my electorate but it is in the member for Chaffey's electorate now. I have close ties with the town, and it has taken many months to get a doctor there.

We then had the news only the other day about the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network. Even though they said they were not involved—and even the head of that network, Wayne Champion, said he did not know anything about it—an eviction notice was served on the local clinic where doctors meet the vital medical needs of Tailem Bend and run the clinic there. I find that very hard to believe. The minister expressed in the house that Wayne Champion informed him that he did not know about it, and I find that more than odd.

It is more than odd that the head of the Riverland Mallee Coorong Local Health Network would not have known about an eviction notice, supposedly related to \$54,000 in unpaid rent back to COVID times for medical services at Tailem Bend. Thankfully, after I asked a couple of questions in the house the other week, some reality happened. The clinic shut on a Friday night and was opened on a Wednesday—so that is good news for Tailem Bend. It is certainly a hospital that we have been very attuned to as a family. As one of our local ambulance drivers indicated, he used to take my father there on his too many visits with his hip issues, and I have certainly attended a couple of times because of farm emergencies.

So we need more people in health. We do not just need health professionals working in the cities—and I salute them all. We need them supporting our country hospitals and this government is not doing that. It is not getting those people and those services that are needed to the people in rural areas like the people in Hammond, like the people in Mannum, like the people in Murray Bridge and like the people in Langhorne Creek.

Strathalbyn does not have a properly functioning emergency department anymore. It has an emergency department that runs if you make an appointment. I do not know how that works, but I do not think it does. It is a nurse-led clinic—and all tribute to the nurses who run that clinic. This is no criticism of the staff who run that clinic, but essentially it is a bandaid and patch-up, so most people either go through to Mount Barker or head straight through to Adelaide where they get confronted with the ramping crisis.

We have already heard the leader today talk about energy in this state. We have heard from Premier Malinauskas about the so-called state prosperity plan and the hydrogen plan, which is now the hydrogen bomb as I have described it often in this place. In regard to the so-called prosperity that has been offered to the people of the Spencer Gulf, they have seen so many promises before and this is another one that has blown up in their faces. There was the promise of \$593 million to go into hydrogen, which is experimental technology that many others will not go near because of the sheer cost and the sheer amount of power that has to be generated to produce that hydrogen energy.

Essentially, all those thousands of solar panels and thousands of wind turbines that would have been needed at Whyalla—the thousands of acres covered with this renewable technology—80 per cent of that energy from that so-called green technology would have been lost on the transfer through to so-called green power. It does not sound too green to me. Thankfully, the turbines that have been bought can burn on gas as they would have had to under the hydrogen plan anyway. That is just a failed project that has not brought down the cost of power in this state, and it is a disaster for the Iron Triangle because it promised false hope and it is just not happening for the people of that area.

I look at the funding allocated for regional roads. There is nowhere near enough funding allocated. There is only dribs and drabs, such as around \$10 million more funding for regional road repairs. We need hundreds of millions of dollars more funding allocated to regional road repairs to make our state's roads, the 23,000-kilometre network, far better for people to travel on and safer across the state.

Then we look at the High Productivity Vehicle Network, a project that has been ongoing and discussed for many years in different iterations. It is good to see that there are some budget lines about it but, literally, the first major work to start on this project—which is the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass—is about five years away. That is beyond the forward estimates.

The federal government, only after one of their backbench candidates panicked when it was not in the federal Labor government's promises for the recent federal election, put up 50 per cent of the funding. That is going to be not even close because, here, there has only been \$125 million put up against that, which only gives us \$656 million for a \$1.05 billion project. That is what it is budgeted for now; I would not be surprised if it blows out by the time it is completed in probably about 10 years' time, according to how I see it running past the forward estimates and its beginning time.

This is a major project, as I have indicated in this house before: a major project that does need building to streamline the freight network that is already in place with those trucks bigger than B-doubles, and to get that freight off Portrush Road and Cross Road to make our roads safer in the city as well. But it needs major work. It needs the duplication of the Swanport Bridge. I will tell you how I see my reading of this plan: I believe, and we can flesh some of this out more during estimates, that the Swanport Bridge duplication is probably—and from opposition you have to surmise a bit—one of the first things that will get done, because unless it is duplicated you cannot get triple road trains or 53-metre trucks across a single-lane each-way bridge.

That will be welcome, but then there is other major work: the new turn-off for that road at Monarto, with a major roundabout and infrastructure to be put in there; roads upgraded with doglegs cut out on the connection through to Mannum as it goes past the entrance to Monarto Safari Park; up towards Sedan and Cambrai, and those two little towns deserve a bypass to be built around them as well; up to the Sturt Highway at Halfway House Road, where that intersection has already been built for triple road trains; and then heading up towards Truro, where the freight bypass around Truro needs to be built. Sadly, my quick crunching of the numbers shows that unless the Labor government fronts up with the extra \$400 million, I fear for either that end of the project—the Truro freight bypass—or the Swanport Bridge because \$656 million of total funding is just not going to cut it.

Along with that project, I look at another project that we commenced back in 2020, the Strzelecki Track. Yes, it has copped a heap of rain at the minute and it has copped some reasonable falls previously as well at different times, but I do not think the government has maximised the time it could have to get roadworks on that 472-kilometre project up to speed. It is only 40 per cent completed. There has been some damage caused by the recent rains and that project has been pushed out to 2028. It is a vital connectivity project through to the Cooper Basin and from that end you can cut through from Innamincka to Brisbane as well. Hopefully, that project is still on track at \$215 million, but we will certainly be keeping a close note of that.

I look at other things that have happened recently with the recent storms and sadly, as I have known in farming for many years, unless you get a high wind sometimes you do not get rain. We have had plenty of wind lately with fallen trees and other issues to deal with, but certainly what we have seen is a lot of damage to marine infrastructure, a lot of jetties, whether it is across suburban Adelaide or, as we have seen in recent times, the Port Germein jetty taking a belting today.

The government needs to make sure that this vital infrastructure has plenty of funding allocated to it, not just for commercial fishing but for those many hundreds of thousands of people who enjoy the recreation of fishing or accessing these jetties just to have a bit of mental health time, walk out on a jetty and take in the air. It needs to be addressed that there is plenty of funding allocated to support councils. Councils have just run out of money. They do not have the rate base and they are not getting the federal grant funding that they need to maintain their regional roads and other infrastructure, on which they are struggling to keep up. We need to make sure that those things get paid for and it needs many tens of millions of dollars for those right across the state.

I have talked in here about the environment food production areas and my thoughts about that where I think it is another level of red tape we did not need. When the bill came out, we offered to put more land in and that was let go. The Labor Party just denied looking at those clauses to add extra land. It was refused and it would have allowed for more people to access housing into the future.

The problem we have with all these developments, like the big one at Murray Bridge, Gifford Hill and the extended project there of 17,000 homes and many other areas, is that there is no funding. There is no funding for water connection and no funding for sewer connection. It is just a disgrace that this government has not funded the infrastructure we need in place so that we can build the homes of the future that are needed.

I want to talk about some of the things that the leader emphasised today that we will do into the future. We will lift the threshold on payroll tax to \$2.1 million; we will take stamp duty off for first-home buyers who purchase established homes to match other states across the country; and we will also have a home battery scheme in place to reduce those ever-increasing power prices. We have a vision and that vision was greatly exemplified by the leader this morning. I am just so disappointed with what we have seen from this state Labor budget.

Mr DIGHTON (Black) (12:38): I rise to speak on the Appropriation Bill 2025. This budget delivers on community safety by increasing the number of police on our streets and investing in our correctional facilities and the broader criminal justice system. It makes critical investments in our health system and provides meaningful assistance to families and small businesses facing cost-of-living pressures. Furthermore, it advances our educational reform agenda by accelerating the rollout of preschool for three year olds and supports more South Australians to realise the aspiration of home ownership sooner.

I want to start by talking about the importance of the initiative for three year olds to attend preschool. As a former teacher, I know the benefits of having three year olds attend preschool will be important not only for their academic achievement but also, importantly, for their social development and their emotional regulation, which is really important to prepare them for school. Having early career teachers supporting three year olds will really assist with that development, and I think it is a really important policy initiative for our South Australian community, and the benefits will be obvious in the years to come.

The budget outlines the government's capacity to consistently respond swiftly and decisively to the challenges facing our state. None of that is more apparent than in relation to Whyalla. Over the past year, the government became increasingly concerned by reports indicating the steelworks were under serious threat, accounts of businesses going unpaid, workers being laid off, critical maintenance being neglected, safety standards being compromised and major investments delayed. It became clear that decisive action was required and this is why this government acted and took the step of initiating the placement of the Whyalla Steelworks into administration. This intervention was necessary to protect thousands of South Australian jobs, support hundreds of local businesses and safeguard Australia's capacity to produce critical steel products.

Under this government's leadership, the people of South Australia will not be misled or exploited by individuals who fail to honour their commitments to our state and to our community. In partnership with the commonwealth, a \$2.4 billion rescue package will stabilise, modernise and secure the future of the steelworks. The initiative is not just about saving an industry, it is about rebuilding it, reimagining it, providing it with a long-term future and, arguably more importantly, it is

about not only ensuring that our country has steelmaking capacity but ensuring the long-term viability and future of both the city and a community.

The budget will also support cost-of-living measures for families, including the extension of a \$200 reduction to government school materials and services charges, and that will continue for a further four years. This measure alone will save parents of the more than 120,000 school-age children an estimated \$96 million over that period.

In addition—and this has been very popular when I have talked about it in my community—the government is reducing the cost of public transport for school students, a move that will benefit families across our state. Again, as a former teacher, I would often have to stand at the bus stop supervising our kids as they waited to use public transport. Sometimes I had to jump on the bus and remind them that they had to tap on, which was something they often did not do. Maybe this measure will ensure that there is better use of their Metrocards because of the fact that it is now cheaper.

This government understands the daily logistical financial challenges parents face while juggling school drop-offs, pickups and work commitments. This low-cost transport ticket system for school students, which is a 28-day pass priced at just \$10, equates to approximately 25¢ per trip over a typical month, and will also cover unlimited travel on weekends and public holidays.

By lowering the cost of public transport, we not only reduce household expenses but encourage more students to travel independently to and from school. The initiative supports parents and caregivers by easing the daily pressures associated with the school run, helping them to better manage their own responsibilities and commitments.

Along with measures to ease cost of living, this budget also helps to ensure the safety and security of all South Australians. In the budget there is \$9.6 million, which will be invested to strengthen security on our public transport system, including upgrades to CCTV at key interchanges. One of those initiatives—a key recent initiative—which this government committed to in the by-election, was the redevelopment of the Marino train station, which will include CCTV. It was an important commitment due to crimes that have occurred at this train station, to ensure that users of the train station feel safer whilst accessing it, and that is exactly what we want. We want people to feel safe when they are using our public transport system.

As the Treasurer outlined in his budget speech a couple of weeks ago, at the heart of any government's responsibility is the protection of its people. Whilst crime rates have declined over the past three years, there is more to do. This government is toughening laws, expanding correctional capacity and ensuring our police and justice systems have the resources they need to keep our community safe.

The budget delivers the largest boost to police funding in South Australia's history, with an investment exceeding \$170 million over the next six years to build the largest ever police force. By 2028-29, there will be an increase of sworn police officers by 243, with a further 83 to be added by 2030-31. In total, the addition of 326 sworn officers will bring the South Australia Police force to a record 5,000 officers, cementing South Australia's place as the state with the highest number of sworn officers per capita in the nation.

Of course, it is not just about recruitment. There is also a focus on ensuring that SAPOL officers are where the community needs them more, and that is on the front line. To support this, the budget also outlines the funding of police security officers to build on the 189 positions they currently have. These officers will be deployed in regional areas, freeing up sworn officers so that they can be more visible and active in our community.

A further \$9.7 million will be provided to support the ongoing civilianisation of administrative roles within SAPOL, allowing 20 more sworn officers to return to operational duties. South Australians want to see their police in their communities and this budget helps to ensure that. We know the impact that that visible presence has on deterring crime, so we need to make sure that our police are visible and that the community can see them.

Over the next five years, the government will invest \$72.4 million to expand our prison capacity by 116 beds, bringing the total number of new beds funded over the past budgets to 468. An additional \$6.8 million will enhance prison security to reduce the trafficking of contraband,

including drugs and weapons. Beyond that, we need to understand how important rehabilitation is within our justice system. This budget commits \$8.1 million to establish a 30-bed bail accommodation support program designed to create remand to bail pathways, support rehabilitation and contribute to Closing the Gap targets.

The budget also includes investment in our criminal justice system. The Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions will receive an additional \$9.4 million, with Forensic Science SA benefitting from \$5.5 million to expedite the judicial process. The budget also includes \$20 million for critical core infrastructure upgrades and to improve security at court facilities across South Australia.

Of course, community safety extends beyond our streets and courtrooms. It also includes our roads. Far too many lives have been lost and too many families have been devastated by, arguably, some preventable road trauma. The budget includes investment in road safety initiatives to try to reduce the numbers of those who are injured. The government will continue to deliver budgets that protect and strengthen our communities.

I want to talk about the investment in health. This budget again delivers a significant boost to our public health system, with an additional \$1.9 billion to meet the growing demand for our services across South Australia. With this latest investment, this government has now committed more than \$9 billion in new health funding across four consecutive budgets. This sustained investment has allowed the government to recruit record numbers of frontline health professionals—doctors, nurses, ambulance officers, allied health workers—and to significantly expand capacity.

By the end of this calendar year the government will have delivered an additional 330 beds across the state. These efforts have had a tangible impact; ambulance response times have improved markedly in the past year, ensuring South Australians in urgent need of care are being reached more quickly and more efficiently.

But there is more to do, and that is why the government has included \$170 million in new funding for mental health services. This includes the delivery of 130 new mental health beds to support those experiencing acute mental illness and to relieve pressure on our emergency departments. I also want to again outline, as I have in this chamber before, the significant investment that is taking place in the southern suburbs, including the Flinders and Noarlunga hospitals and the Repat, which is increasing the capacity of hospital beds by 226 beds in that particular area.

Another key funding in the budget was \$13.9 million to expand the South Australia Police Mental Health Co-Responder program. In speaking to SAPOL about this program and about how important it is, it was identified to me that this program helps support members of our community who are suffering from mental health concerns but also helps to ensure that police officers are able to allocate their resources to be used more effectively in our community. It is great that this Mental Health Co-Responder program will be expanded to include the southern suburbs.

The government is also supporting innovation in primary care, and so in the next three years \$2.2 million will be invested to expand the scope of services that pharmacists can provide. This will allow more South Australians to access timely care in the community and avoid unnecessary trips to already stretched emergency departments. The budget also outlines and includes funding for the fourth 24/7 pharmacy, which is going to be in my community of Hallett Cove.

Those expanded services and expanded hours are demonstrating the different ways this government is committed to supporting the health care needs of South Australians. The budget reaffirms the commitment to build a stronger, more responsive and more accessible health system that is capable of meeting the needs of our growing population and ensuring also every South Australian can access the care they need.

The budget also builds on the government's sustained and determined efforts to address the housing supply and affordability crisis, which is affecting not only South Australia but the entire nation. This government has committed \$3.2 billion to expand public and social housing, unlock new land, invest in enabling infrastructure, and reduce taxes to stimulate supply and improve housing affordability. Through the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan the government has mapped out where 315,000 new homes will be delivered over the next 30 years.

The road map is accelerating planning approvals to ensure houses can be built faster in the right locations and at prices South Australians can afford. The budget outlined funding for \$30 million to prepare the Onkaparinga Heights site for residential development, which is expected to provide at least 2,000 residential houses. This development, along with other developments such as the Port Stanvac redevelopment—which is going to include 3,500 houses along with commercial, retail, education, and industrial zones—will expand the significant supply of houses in our southern suburb areas.

This budget will ensure there is further momentum to invest in our homes across the state, and together we will support construction businesses and ensure that there are homes for young families, for key workers, for people seeking stability and security in an increasingly difficult housing market.

The other initiative that was announced in this budget is a rent-to-buy scheme, allowing long-term renters the opportunity to purchase one of 100 homes currently under construction by the South Australian Housing Trust. This is about opening new pathways to home ownership and breaking the cycle of permanent renting for those who aspire to buy their first home.

I want to finish by recognising the efforts of the Treasurer and his team for their work in delivering this budget, and commend the Appropriation Bill to the house.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:54): I, too, rise in support of the Appropriation Bill. I was rifling through some storage boxes just the other day and happened to come across my year 12 jumper from Naracoorte High School, about circa 2003. I helped design the jumper, which was a rugby jumper, the Canterbury brand which was still the rage in the early 2000s. It had the Southern Cross on the sleeve and our school logo and motto 'carpe diem', which means seize the day.

The main feature, of course, was my high school nickname in big, bold white letters on the back that spelled out 'Goose'. I am not sure if I should publicly admit to the fact that this was not because I was a fan of the Top Gun movies—I have actually never even watched them—it was more in reference—

Mr Pederick: Shame!

Ms HOOD: Shame; I know, it is on the list. It was more in reference to Lucy Goosey, which was shortened to 'Goose'. So while thankfully I did not keep my high school nickname, I did keep my high school year 12 jumper because it was a reminder of how my public education changed my life.

That is why I am so proud that we committed, with the Albanese federal government, to the Better and Fairer Schools Agreement (Gonski), which will ensure public schools in South Australia receive more than \$1 billion over 10 years—\$16 billion nationally—so that public schools will be fully funded for the first time ever.

We do this because we believe that every South Australian child deserves access to a world-class education and the opportunity to thrive, regardless of their background, where they came from, or their parents' income. That is why this Malinauskas government is making such significant investments in this space. I know I would not be here without public education. The impact it had on me actually inspired me to go on to become an education journalist, so that I got to tell the stories of public schools and students and educators all across our state.

The Malinauskas Labor government is now writing a new chapter in our education system and at its heart is the aim that every South Australian child does deserve the best possible start in life. That is why our government has such a strong focus on education starting from the earliest years, committing to the universal rollout of three-year-old preschool.

Due to the incredible response to this policy, we are fast-tracking the delivery of our commitment, which will start rolling out from next year. It will create 2,000 additional places at long day care sites while we continue the kindy care trials and provide low-interest loans for non-government schools, not-for-profit early childhood educators and care providers, to build the capacity for three-year-old preschool.

We are also already very proud of having the largest network of autism inclusion teachers in the country, which creates more inclusive classrooms across the state, and we are supporting

students to pursue vocational pathways by building five new technical colleges, giving young people the opportunity to graduate into a guaranteed career.

This is something I am personally very proud of. I have three brothers—we will not mention the eldest one here in this place—but one of my other brothers, I can honestly say, is one of the smartest of us, but he was not considered the smart kid in school. He could pull apart any kind of machinery on the farm, or a motorbike. He could pull it apart and put it back together without an instruction manual, but he probably did not excel at maths or English or history. He was incredible with his hands, but that was perhaps not recognised in mainstream schooling.

These technical colleges recognise that not all kids are necessarily academic, but they are some of the best and brightest minds in our state. I think my brothers would all agree that Toby is probably the most successful of us and he has made such an incredible career out of trades. I am so excited to see all the kids that will go through our technical colleges, making a career out of it, thriving and reaching their full potential. With those comments, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

SUPPLY BILL 2025

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (SAFETY AND SUPPORT) BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Report 3 of 2025—Proton therapy project: SA Government context and insights
[Ordered to be published]

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

Remuneration Tribunal—

Determination No. 3 of 2025—Minimum and Maximum Chief Executive Officer
Remuneration

Report No. 3 of 2025—Minimum and Maximum Remuneration for Local
Government Chief Executive Officers, 2025 Review of

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

Rule made under the following Acts—

Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Magistrates Court Act 1991,
Youth Court Act 1993, Environment, Resources and Development Court
Act 1993, Mining Act 1971, Local Government (Elections)
Act 1999, First Nations Voice—Uniform Civil—No. 14

By the Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science (Hon. S E Close)—

University of Adelaide—Annual Report 2024

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

Budget 2025-26—Estimates Committee Schedule 2025—Corrigendum

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

Regulation made under the following Act—

Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products—Prescribed Quantities

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

Correctional Services, Department for—Official Visitor Annual Reports 2024—Report on Response

Regulation made under the following Act—

Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies)—Consultation

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

Regulation made under the following Act—

Strata Titles—Fees Notice—2025 (No. 2)

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I would like to welcome to parliament today some guests in the gallery. We have students here from St Michael's College who are guests of the member for Colton. Great to have you in here; as an old scholar, it is particularly good to have you in here. The Minister for Trade is also an old scholar of St Michael's. So let us be evidence of what happens if you do not do well at school: you could end up in here. I would also like to welcome students from Adelaide Botanic High School who are guests of the member for Adelaide.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:05): I bring up the 142nd report, entitled Hackham West Children's Centre New Facility.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms HOOD: I bring up the 143rd report, entitled Community Drug and Rehabilitation Beds Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms HOOD: I bring up the 144th report, entitled Rebuilt Marion Ambulance Station.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms HOOD: I bring up the 145th report, entitled New Two Wells Ambulance Station.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms HOOD: I bring up the 146th report, entitled Rebuilt Whyalla Ambulance Station.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

AFFORDABLE HOUSING, FIRST-HOME BUYERS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Is the dream of owning a first home over for South Australians? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: While ministers are laughing, Adelaide has fallen to the sixth least affordable city in the world. It takes on average almost 12 years to save for a house deposit. We are only second to Sydney in terms of housing unaffordability in this country. For South Australian renters our rental market is the least affordable in all of Australia.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:07): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The Leader of the Opposition would also be aware of other data, data which comes from independent sources, whether it be the Master Builders Association, showing that construction activity happening in the housing sector in South Australia is up to 16 per cent year on year, or whether it be data from the Australian Bureau of Statistics that shows commencements and completions of housing in the state of South Australia is outperforming the rest of the country. Then, of course, there is the Housing Industry Association, which has made clear that South Australia is the number one jurisdiction in the country in addressing supply, but more than that it is the number one jurisdiction in the country when it comes to actually delivering additional supply.

We have a housing supply problem in South Australia. What we don't have is a housing demand problem. There is no shortage of demand in South Australia for new housing stock because we have an economy that, according to the Australian Bureau of Statistics, is also outperforming the rest of the nation. We saw state final demand figures released recently and we are eclipsing almost every other jurisdiction in the country in terms of state final demand performance. We have a growing economy, more people want to live here, more people want to stay here—justifiably so.

So what we want to do on this side of the house is make sure that we have a policy that isn't just easy to explain, but that we have a policy that actually delivers more homes. The only policy solution that is a serious one to the housing supply crisis is to address housing supply. That is in stark contrast with a recent addition to the housing policy debate here in South Australia where recently the Leader of the Opposition announced his policy. His policy is about stimulating demand; he is going to stimulate demand. It is a vendor's dream. If you are in South Australia and you own your own home, and you want to sell it on the market—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will come to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will come to order, including you, member for Morialta.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —then presumably you would be delighted about the Leader of the Opposition's policy. But if you are a young South Australian who has the aspiration of owning your own home, you would be very concerned about the opposition's policy that's going to help out sellers rather than help out increasing housing supply.

The Leader of the Opposition's policy doesn't deliver one single extra home—not one—which stands in stark contrast to what we are doing on water, what we are doing on land release, what we are doing on rental reform, what we are doing with HomeStart, what we are doing on land supply and what we are doing on tax reform that might actually incentivise the building of new homes rather than everyone staying in existing ones. We understand what makes a difference on the ground to housing supply, which is exactly why independent organisations, one after the other, are lining up all around the country to say, 'If someone wants to make a difference on housing supply copy what South Australia is doing.'

What are the independent organisations saying about the Leader of the Opposition's policy? Well, look at what the Productivity Commission has said. The Productivity Commission independently says, 'If you want to make the problem worse, come up with the sorts of policies that the state Liberal Party now have, which is going to stimulate demand rather than supply.' So don't believe us, don't believe them—believe what the independent organisations are saying about the choices with respect to housing policy in Australia and who will actually make a difference.

STAMP DUTY CONCESSIONS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question, again, is to the Premier. Is South Australia the only state in the country to not offer stamp duty concessions to first-home buyers on established homes?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:11): I am happy to confirm about how South Australia sits in the context of uniqueness with respect to the rest of the country because South Australia is the only place in the country that is seeing a dramatic escalation and acceleration of the number of new homes coming on to the market. If the Leader of the Opposition wants to know how we are different, we are different because we are actually seeing more homes being built, we are seeing commencements, we are seeing completions and we are actually seeing serious policy, which is why we are ranked number one.

Again, I submit to you, Mr Speaker: don't believe me; take your guidance from the independent associations that are marking the scores about who is actually doing well. We know what they are saying; they are saying that South Australia outperforms the rest of the nation. We are not looking to replicate those states that have a problem that is getting worse; we are looking to make a difference where it counts, and that's what we are doing.

STAMP DUTY CONCESSIONS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. What does the Premier say to Michael Graham, who has spent the last five years saving for a house deposit, who still can't get to purchase his own home? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: *The Advertiser* recently reported on Sunday that Michael Graham is currently renting. He has been trying to save for his home deposit for the last five years but said it was an uneven playing field for those without a partner or without access to the bank of mum and dad. He said he welcomed the chance to buy a suburban home and not have to pay stamp duty.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for putting a human face on the debate around housing policy, because it is a demonstration of the challenge that young people confront when they want to own a home.

We take very seriously the fact that there are young people in South Australia who have good jobs. They are working hard, they are contributing to the communities around them and their aspiration is quite simply the ability to be able to enjoy what they have seen their parents being able to enjoy, and their parents before them. I think that it is a major challenge and a major risk for our nation if we see intergenerational inequity emerge because people can't get access to a home, and to be able to own a home, and I am particularly concerned about young people being dislocated from the housing market.

We see that in the rental market, which is why we have worked really hard on rental reforms to give people who are otherwise in powerless positions a bit more of a say or a bit more security than would otherwise be the case. But we are determined to make a difference for young people because it is a serious risk and a serious issue.

What I would say to Michael and anybody else in this position is: we do you a disservice if we come up with something that sounds good but makes the problem worse. What people like Michael look to in political leadership and in government is to not race towards a short-term populist political response. What they look to us to do is to actually do the things, including the hard things, to make a difference.

We have done some hard things. Our position on investment in water infrastructure and its associated impact on water bills is known. Coming in here with a piece of legislation to change a reform that was instituted by a former Labor government is not always the easy thing to do either. We have made these decisions because they are hard and because we know they are the ones that are going to make a difference. It would be wrong of a government, in our view, to make a change that helps one but actually hurts the many.

What we have to try to do here is actually have a structural change in the economic equation that is driving the difficulty for so many young people in particular, and that is the supply and demand equation. You don't have to have done an economics degree to appreciate that housing prices are going to continue to escalate at a pace that embeds intergenerational inequity unless you address supply, and demand is up and supply needs to keep pace. If we give Michael more money to bid for that home and then give Jenny, who also might want to bid on the same home, more money, they both have more money and they both bid that money at an auction, and guess who wins? The person selling the home, not them. That's what the Productivity Commission tells us.

So what I would say to Michael is: the only way he and every other young person in this state will have a better opportunity to own a home at a price point that is moderately affordable is to actually deliver more supply, more stock, into the system—not just to build up the bank of mum and dad that he misses out on by artificially increasing the equity value in their property by inflating the price it gets sold at. What we have to do is aim to get more supply into the system. That is what independent economists have argued for and that is what we are delivering.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Has the government overpromised and underdelivered on housing? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: In the government's media release dated 12 February 2023, it said that construction on the first homes on the Sellicks Beach, Dry Creek and Concordia land release sites could begin in 2024.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:17): If the honourable member goes to the Housing Roadmap, on pages 60 and 61 he will see all the timelines set out for—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, your opposition members were there. They came, they accepted the invitation to sit there for lunch and presumably they were interested in supply. If you look at that document, which is a very public-facing document—we had 1,000 people attending the lunch, one of the biggest industry lunches I think we have had—it sets out the whole roadmap for how we are going to go in housing, including the implementation of important water and sewer infrastructure, and what that sets out for Onkaparinga, Concordia, Sellicks and Dry Creek is the timelines.

So if you go there and have a look at pages 60 and 61, they are all updated in the Housing Roadmap. They are all reported to the industry, to *The Advertiser* and to public radio, and that was the update. That was the road map. We did that because land release is important, but so is infrastructure, and combining the two things together is incredibly important. I can tell you that in terms of our planning reforms, the pipeline of allotments goes a lot further than those four principal announcements. There is actually another 20-odd thousand allotments that are in the system with code amendments all over the city and the state.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Supplementary.

The SPEAKER: We will see if it's a supplementary.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: When will the first homes be built in places like Sellicks Beach, Dry Creek and Concordia land releases?

The SPEAKER: That's not a supplementary.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Why not?

The SPEAKER: Because your first question was: has the government overpromised and underdelivered and this is a completely separate question. The member for MacKillop.

DROUGHT CONDITIONS, LIMESTONE COAST

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about his meeting with primary producers on the Limestone Coast? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: On Friday, the Premier attended an informal get-together at historic Glencoe Woolshed to hear from those impacted by the drought conditions.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and also for the member's assistance to my office in making sure that we got to hear from some primary producers on the ground in and around his electorate last Friday. On Friday, I basically spent the entire day in a really sort of worthwhile exercise to yet again meet with primary producers from various different sectors. We did have one particular engagement at the Woolshed in Glencoe that the member for MacKillop arranged. I know Glencoe is close to your heart as well, Mr Speaker.

It was really worthwhile. It was a rather earnest, I wouldn't say robust, but really earnest, productive and constructive discussion around the impact of the drought. That's always illuminating, particularly for someone who lives in metropolitan Adelaide. There are a lot of briefs from PIRSA and they're pretty high quality. As anyone who is engaged with PIRSA would know, they are a pretty well regarded government department, but briefs don't quite tell the same story that you hear from someone on the ground. There was a lot of that and it's always illuminating because you get different perspectives from different industries.

More than that, there were some quite constructive suggestions around our drought package and things that we can do to inform the way that's implemented and allocated and how we might consider it in the context of any future adjustments. There were also some other ideas that sit outside the drought funding package that are already being examined within government that I won't necessarily go into here without a more detailed response, but I know the member for MacKillop might be able to recall what some of those exercises were.

What is quite interesting in the context of the South-East in particular is there has been rain in some parts more than in others and we do see the impact of that. The South-East is a greener part of our state at the best of times but, notwithstanding that, there are still major challenges and that goes to the timing of the rain, which I thought was quite interesting, particularly when we think about livestock, in particular cattle versus the way that sheep will graze in various circumstances. That is quite telling in the context of people not necessarily appreciating that rain falling is one thing but rain falling at the wrong time is another again that actually only adds layers of complexity.

Apart from livestock, we also had a lot of discussion with the dairy industry and there was another separate meeting that we had with dairy farmers in the South-East as well. As a government, we have demonstrated that we are very keen to provide assistance where we can. This was discussed at length, as the member for MacKillop will recall. Government offers support to the tune of tens of millions of dollars to drought-affected farmers. Whenever we do that, there is always a risk of certain things not being calibrated in the right way even with the best of intent and I do think there is an opportunity for us to make sure we constantly think about how we engineer those support programs to always make sure that the support is going to those people who need it most.

The various phrases around making sure that we support those farmers who are most likely to be able to have a lasting impact on the land and its productive use is something that is not lost on me. We also need to think about the impact of the drought not just on primary producers but on towns and people who rely on all those incomes. It was a really worthwhile exercise and I want to thank the member for MacKillop for his work in facilitating that. He leads his community well in this regard and I appreciate him for his efforts.

NATIONAL DEFENCE

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how South Australia is supporting the delivery of national defence capabilities?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:24): I thank the member for Gibson for her question. The member for Gibson has a background representing engineers in our state who have a great interest in what happens to the naval shipbuilding program, particularly the submarine program, and it has been an eventful period since the parliament met because, of course, President Trump announced his intentions to conduct a 30-day review of AUKUS. More than that, there was a timely event in that regard yesterday in Canberra, where News Corp facilitated the Defending Australia program, which is principally organised by *The Advertiser*, but also *The Australian*, and I thank Gemma Jones and Michelle Gunn for their efforts because it was a bipartisan forum. There were people from both sides of politics there, and a lot of senior members of the military and, also critically, the defence industry. I am not too sure there's a forum quite like it that I have been witness to, to debate all these issues in such a broad way.

The Minister for Defence and Space Industries was there with me yesterday, and it did encourage, I think, some thought about how we continue to tackle this challenge going forward. The reality is, in this day and age, defence posture and foreign affairs policy is going to be increasingly impactful in the way the country operates, but also in terms of opportunities in South Australia economically. What yesterday's forum made abundantly clear, and I think we should have an increased sense of confidence around, particularly with respect to the submarine program, is that this is going to happen because there's no world in which it can't. As tragic as that may be, there is no world where we can't build submarines for ourselves as a nation and that, of course, has to be in Adelaide.

Our job, as South Australian political leaders, is to make sure we are investing our effort to translate that opportunity into a better life for South Australians economically by making sure that young women and men are getting the skills to be able to participate in this industry of tomorrow, which, of course, will have an ancillary positive impact on other industries around it, whether it be in the sciences, in the health sciences, in other engineering fields and the like, which is where we are really doubling down our effort.

But there are also opportunities for South Australian enterprise to increasingly participate in the supply chain for the defence industry globally as well, which is something that we are investing a fair bit of effort and money into. Only in the recent state budget, the minister and Treasurer allocated yet more resources to this endeavour. It is something that enjoys bipartisan support, I am aware. I take this opportunity to reflect on the fact that naval shipbuilding in South Australia is a cause that has been pursued by successive governments, of all political persuasions, and I take this opportunity to acknowledge the Leader of the Opposition for his support and steadfast support for naval shipbuilding in South Australia.

We are pursuing this, and I think South Australians, while I appreciate would be interested, if not concerned by the Trump review—I invite people to contemplate this: there has barely been a moment since AUKUS's inception where there haven't been questions about its future, particularly given there has been change of administrations or political hues in all three countries. This potentially provides a line-in-the-sand moment about what happens to AUKUS in the future. That might yet be a silver lining that comes out of this review. Either way, we are confident in South Australia we will be building submarines here and we continue to get on with the task of making sure that we are prepared to do exactly that.

AUKUS AGREEMENT

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Will the government now support the establishment of a bipartisan parliamentary joint committee on the AUKUS agreement and, if not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: The opposition has called for a parliamentary joint committee to help safeguard this once-in-a-generation opportunity for South Australia; however, the government has continually opposed such a measure to provide vital oversight and transparency on the AUKUS submarine bill.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:29): The government is not averse to proposals of this nature. We will naturally consider it accordingly, principally because where there is a parliamentary inquiry you would expect the government would want to be satisfied that indeed it is going to value-add to the public policy discourse rather than the opposite. I think it's fair to say all of us on occasion have been alive to the chances of inquiries or committees of that nature being used for nefarious political means rather than exclusively public policy benefit.

What I would say is the government stands ready at any moment to hear from the opposition thoughtful policy ideas they may have and we stand ready to consider those on their merits, and we are willing to do that. If we think it's going to be something that is better for the state, we welcome opportunities to adjust policy accordingly. Certainly, we do not see that as being true just for the opposition but also for industry more broadly. In fact, in no small part the Minister for Defence and Space Industries' funding allocation to the Defence Teaming Centre ensures that there will continue to be an ongoing contribution to the public policy effort here in South Australia in this regard.

Yesterday we also put forward our own ideas and I announced that the state government essentially is going to be campaigning and working to see the establishment of a new phase of the development down on Lefevre Peninsula at Osborne. Twelve months ago we really firm in our expectations that we see the advancement of the skills and training academy. That is now under construction.

Twelve months later, here we are and we want to do that again. We are asking and certainly working with the commonwealth to see a comprehensive, chronologically ordered master plan for the work that we have done on the submarine construction yard to be released asap. I think there is some work that has been done, but it needs to be consolidated and released so that people can see what is happening in the market.

One of the challenges that we are going to have is we are going to see major building works commence on the Lefevre Peninsula at the same time we are doing the tunnels, at the same time we are doing the hospital and at the same time that we have aspirations further north of the state. The market, appreciating the size and the volume of the work that is coming our way, with as much notice as possible, gives them the capability to most likely be able to respond adequately.

Similarly, that exercise, if we are able to achieve it, will provide certainty and confidence for young people in our state to know exactly what the plan is and when it is going to happen, to be able to make decisions around what they choose to study both at school and beyond. To young people who might be enduring question time, I would simply say choose STEM where you can, particularly young women. Young women are more underrepresented in engineering fields than most other fields at university, and we need, frankly, every last young mind in the state who is attuned to engineering opportunities, and other trade qualifications, to be taking it up.

Advice I reviewed and reflected on yesterday—and it was a good reflection—was of a young hairdresser that we both had the opportunity to meet down at Osborne who had chosen to give up their hairdressing profession to take up, I think, a fitter and turner trade at ASC and how much she was loving the change. So there is big opportunity for absolutely everybody here. We encourage everyone to get on board and if the opposition have other policy ideas, we are open to them.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Housing. When will water infrastructure be delivered to the Sellicks Beach, Dry Creek and Concordia land release sites? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: At the Budget and Finance Committee meeting last week the Department for Housing revealed that trunk mains construction would not be considered until 2028 for the land release sites at 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) (14:33): As I indicated in the house

before, we have outlined all of this in the Housing Roadmap, and the reason we did that is that we wanted to be crystal clear with the public about what we are doing in terms of housing supply.

If you go to that document—and I encourage the opposition spokesperson to do that—and look at pages 58 and 59, you will see the projects we are bringing online. We are bringing online Playford Alive, we are bringing online Seaton, we are bringing online Noarlunga. If you want to see slabs down, you can drive in any direction you like and you will find slabs down and you will find the building industry busy. That is one of the reasons the HIA on both policy and outcomes makes us number one in the country.

If you want to talk about the government's code amendments, they are outlined in pages 60 and 61, and we are designing whole suburbs here. Obviously, that requires trunk infrastructure, trunk infrastructure that those opposite did not invest in at all in their entire four years of government—in their entire four years of government. And guess what happens?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left will come to order. The member for Chaffey is on his final warning. The member for Flinders and the member for Morialta are also on their final warnings.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Speaker, I will tell you what happens the day they ever form government. They will have a \$130 million hole every year in their government because of the stamp duty cuts. They have to fill it some way, and that is by cutting infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order from the deputy leader.

Mr TEAGUE: Standing order 98(a). The minister needs to answer the substance of the question. Debate and then hypothesising about what this side might do is not answering the substance of the question, which was very specifically about when these water infrastructure—

The SPEAKER: Given one of the projects is in my electorate, I have been listening carefully, and I think the minister is answering the question.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Of course, these projects rely on big investments in water infrastructure and sewer infrastructure. Good news on Onkaparinga Heights: it has been rezoned, it is currently in land division. The proponents are currently discussing it with council: land division and engineering standards. Both are important things for local government to look at.

This is going to be a whole community of 2,000 homes. As well as SA Water infrastructure, sewer and water are also being accounted for. So you can see the progress there, as outlined in the Housing Roadmap. Those opposite should think about this, because what they have signed up to is this weird concoction in their own minds of cutting taxes but somehow having magical infrastructure appearing while they open up areas like Dublin, which will cost billions, or hundreds of millions of dollars.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Housing. How long will human waste continue to be transported by truck from the Riverlea development? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: Last week, the Department for Housing and Urban Development told the Budget and Finance Committee that key private developments, including Riverlea, were trucking away waste while homeowners waited for pipelines to be built.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:37): I am happy to get an update on the case in Riverlea because it is an important development and a lot of housing growth is going on out there. But the reason why we had a tankering issue in the northern suburbs is that, if you go back a few years, those people who were in charge did not make the investments that were appropriate, which is why, if the honourable member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right will come to order.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —wants to see activity, if he wants to see slabs down, if he wants to see pipes going in the ground, just take a drive, mate, out to Craigmare Road, take a drive down to Curtis Road, take a drive down to Angle Vale and Supple Road, right next to the Riverlea estate. You will see those big DN1200s and DN750 pipes going into the ground. They are pipes you should have put in the ground, the Liberal Party should have put in the ground when they were in government years ago.

But, instead of doing that, instead of putting in that infrastructure, which would have prevented tankering—I mean, you've got to be kidding. You are getting up here and asking me, 'Why is there tankering in Riverlea?' Because of you. If you want an answer, go to the bathroom and look in the mirror and the answer will appear. Why is there tankering? I don't know. I mean, have a think about it. Have a think about it.

Here is the thing, when you are establishing estates, you will have tankering for a period. You need it because of the volumes of sewage that are occurring. Initially, there is always tankering, but what you need is a plan to transition off tankering to mains pipes, to sewer pipes, and that is what this government is doing.

SA WATER INFRASTRUCTURE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:39): A supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: We will see.

Mr TELFER: In response to 'there will always be tankering', how long will there be human waste tankered out of the Dry Creek, Concordia and Sellicks Beach developments?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:39): Once these areas are rezoned, there are agreements put in place, called DAFIs, with SA Water. What those DAFIs allow is for developments to be staged and, as you stage them, the pipes are going in and, as the volumes increase, tankering reduces. That is what you are supposed to do, but what those opposite left this government was a situation where there were no sewer pipes being put into the ground that would relieve the tankering situation. That's why we have had to put in \$1.5 billion worth of water and sewer investment.

HAMMILL HOUSE

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update my community as to the current situation regarding the number of vacant rooms in Hammill House, which is the aged-care section of the Port Pirie Regional Health Service? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have been advised that with the recent vacating of the allied health building—which had to be vacated some time ago due to the pigeon infestation there—they have utilised the whole of the western wing and also one room of the aged-care facility, which is in the Hammill House section. I am also advised that there are currently seven vacant rooms that residents looking to go into aged care cannot utilise or be housed in. Is allied health going to utilise the whole of the spare rooms in the aged-care facility of Hammill House?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:40): I thank the member for Stuart for his question, and note his very significant interest in services in Port Pirie, particularly in terms of Hammill House as well.

I think last sitting week we talked about having to temporarily relocate a number of those allied health staff from their office accommodation in the previous community health building into other accommodation, either on the site or off site, while we are undertaking engineering and other types of assessments in terms of the work we need to do to get that old community health building up to scratch to return to office use. As the member has outlined, in Hammill House there was some

capacity, so we have temporarily utilised some of those areas in Hammill House for that work to occur.

In terms of Hammill House more generally, as the member knows, and as he has been a very staunch advocate for, there was a period of time in which the board were considering the future of Hammill House and whether or not to keep Hammill House into the future. Based on the advice from the member for Stuart, I was very insistent that the board go out to the community and consult, and the feedback from the community was overwhelming in terms of the desire for Hammill House to continue.

The decision has now been made for Hammill House to continue, and the local health board, the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network, is going through a process of recruitment of additional staff to enable the capacity to increase. In the meantime, if there is demand on those beds then, of course, there would be a waiting list. The good news is that I am advised we currently do not have anybody on a waiting list to go into Hammill House, and we do continue to recruit.

I understand there was an assistant nurse lead hired in April, and I will certainly keep the pressure on the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network in terms of their future recruitment, because we do want to see the number of residents utilising Hammill House to increase. At the same time, we are working through the longer term arrangements in terms of those community health staff and office accommodation.

SOUTH ROAD

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please inform the house on progress in delivering a nonstop South Road?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:43): I thank the member for Elder for her question, because she is very keen to make sure her community gets access to a nonstop South Road for a couple of reasons: to get the traffic off South Road and into the tunnels, and of course to improve the amenity of the local community.

It is a record infrastructure build over the next four years—\$27.3 billion dollars, which is a remarkable number—and we have commenced main construction works on the nonstop South Road, which is the largest and most complex infrastructure project in South Australian history.

As part of that, heavy machinery—for those of you who have noticed—is already on site, constructing the massive, concrete precast manufacturing facility at Waterloo Corner, a significant milestone in the project. This precast facility will supply more than 55,000 locally made tunnel-lining segments—segments that each and every South Australian will at some point in their life probably drive through and see for themselves—made here in South Australia. The concrete slab that forms the base of the shed of the facility is almost complete.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That must have been a really deep and informed comment. Frames have been raised, and 500 tonnes of Australian steel is being used for the shed, all of which has been sourced locally. Once built, the concrete plant will supply 280,000 cubic metres of concrete required for the segments, which is the equivalent of 112 Olympic-size swimming pools. Once manufactured, these segments will be transported to the tunnel boring machine launch areas, where they will be used to construct the tunnel sections of a nonstop South Road.

So as the tunnel boring machine is drilling through the roads, the tunnel segments go up in its wake. It is a remarkable process that will see the nonstop South Road progress. Each ring is formed using 10 precast concrete segments, with each segment weighing 12 tonnes. The precast facility is expected to start segment production later this year, with the first tunnel segments to be installed by the middle of next year.

The facility will create jobs here locally for South Australians. It is expected that at peak construction, 60 workers will be working on the site of the precast facility. Local company Ballestrin was awarded the contract for the concrete slab works, with the construction of the shed by another local company, Ahrens. Earthworks at the site, which commenced earlier this year, are being

undertaken by a local Indigenous company, Karta. The Torrens to Darlington project has committed, as a result of our election commitment, to 90 per cent of the labour hours being undertaken by South Australians as well as a minimum 6 per cent of Indigenous employment.

These are lofty ambitions and goals for one of the most important infrastructure programs this state will ever undertake. A nonstop South Road project will allow motorists to bypass 21 sets of traffic lights and save up to 40 minutes of travel time from the River Torrens to Darlington. When you equate that from Gawler in the northern suburbs all the way through to Darlington, we are talking potentially an hour in savings.

These are dramatic savings in time, productivity and efficiency in freight, making sure that South Australia continues to move. South Australia is the last mainland jurisdiction in the country to operate on a grid network, which means it is putting pressure on things like Winston Avenue. It is putting pressure on Brighton Road, Marion Road, Goodwood Road and Unley Road because South Road is so congested, with the average speed now only 25 km/h in the peak. This is a vital project, and we are getting on with it.

SANTOS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:47): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier discussed the proposed sale of Santos with the federal Treasurer ahead of the considerations of the Foreign Investment Review Board, and if so, what was the nature of those discussions?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:47): No, I have not had a chance yet to discuss the matter with the federal Treasurer. I know that our Treasurer is in regular discussion with Jim Chalmers. I was in Canberra yesterday though, naturally, and discussed the matter with a number of officials, but it was not discussed with the Treasury. Yesterday, I met with the Deputy Prime Minister. I also took the opportunity to meet with other members of the defence political group, namely Peter Khalil, who is an assistant minister, to discuss defence estate planning.

I also had an opportunity yesterday to have a really important meeting with the Minister for Industry along with our Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Energy and Mining regarding Whyalla. The meeting with the Deputy Prime Minister, the defence minister and Minister Ayres were the most important meetings yesterday. The discussions we had around Whyalla but also other matters to do with the Upper Spencer Gulf, including Port Pirie, were lengthy and important in nature.

Yesterday, amongst all that, we did schedule a time for me to take a call with the Abu Dhabi-based company that has announced its pursuit of Santos, and also, obviously, I have spoken to the CEO of Santos as well. The state government is going to pay very close attention to this indeed. We are not alarmed by it, because there were no surprises for us regarding these events, but we are concerned to the extent that we want to make sure that any change of ownership of Santos could only occur—as far as we are concerned, should only occur—when it is in the state's interests.

Let me put on the record something I said in caucus this morning and elsewhere. Santos directors and management have a duty to their shareholders. We respect that duty and obligation but appreciate that it is very, very different to the duty that we have within the government. Our duty is to the people of South Australia, who ultimately in our view own the resources below the ground, and we want to make sure that if there is a change of ownership in Santos that it only occur if it is in the interests of South Australia and its people. That invites a different consideration, a different set of variables that need to be examined versus what the board and shareholders will consider.

It may well be the case that those interests align but it may well be the case that those interests diverge and that will be informed by a whole lot of detail, detail that will be thoroughly examined over the months and months ahead. This is not going to be a short process, it is going to be a long one.

But let me be plain about something. While Santos is an important and big company in this state, we don't owe them anything. We care about them and we are interested in them, but what we owe the people of our state are the best economic opportunities in the future, which means first and foremost Santos is going to stay in South Australia, certainly its headquarters, but there may be other conditions as well.

If we form a view on the basis of all the best advice that we can procure that this change of ownership is the wrong way to go for our state, we are going to oppose it and we are going to fight it. If, however, this represents a significant economic opportunity for South Australia, then we will seek to facilitate it where we can. That work we take seriously and will consider in great detail over the months ahead.

SANTOS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:51): My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier sought advice in relation to the impact of the proposed sale of Santos on local jobs? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: Santos employs almost 1,000 South Australians, from frontline trainees and apprentices, university graduate positions, experienced engineering roles, office workers and executives.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:52): Of course, the government will be seeking and pursuing all of that advice. We will make sure it's detailed and thorough, so of course that will inform the government's deliberations.

SANTOS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:52): My question is again to the Premier. Will the Premier be instigating an independent expert review of the proposed Santos sale to advise the government whether such a sale is in the best interests of South Australians?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:52): Again, the government will go through a process to ensure that we are able to procure the best possible advice to inform the judgements that we make in this regard.

FORESTRY INDUSTRY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the importance of the forest industry to South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: On Friday night in Mount Gambier over 280 guests celebrated the 150th anniversary of the state's forests and timber industry.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:53): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question and acknowledge his advocacy for the forestry industry that is currently enjoying the benefits of his thoughtful policy pursuits that the government is now delivering. And the reason why we are delivering those things isn't exclusively because of the member for Mount Gambier's advocacy, although that has played a role, but because we believe in this industry very much.

The great thing about the forestry industry is that it is one that aligns with the state government's strategic economic interests.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I will come to that. What we see here is a sustainable industry that if done properly can be environmentally friendly, it has a role to play in carbon reduction and it is sustainable economically, but also with respect to the environment if it is done in a way that is regulated and thoughtful. We have that here in South Australia. This is a \$3 billion industry that employs countless South Australians and has a steadfast commitment to being done in concert with the environment around it.

One of the great things about the forestry industry, as the member for Mount Gambier is well aware, is that it is an example of an industry that doesn't just have a commodity that we produce and then export, but that we value-add in the Green Triangle. If you look at the massive investments from

Borg industries amongst others, what we see are examples of every last instance of that fibre being produced, being put to good productive economic use, elsewhere in the economy. That is the type of virtuous cycle that we think has a lot of merit, and hence why government support is worthwhile.

I have acknowledged publicly that I think it was the mistake of a former Labor government to engage in the policy of the sale of the forests. I said that early on in my time as Leader of the Opposition. Rather than just acknowledge that, we have actually done something about it by issuing a policy that represents the biggest investment in forestry that we have seen in a very long time. Indeed, I am not aware there was one at all by the former government.

We have the Forestry Centre of Excellence, \$22 million; \$2 million in the master plan; \$2 million in technological use, in terms of AI around fire detection; critically, a massive investment in TAFE; and then the main big investment is a \$35 million technical college that is being built in the heart of Mount Gambier using CLT and GLT that comes from the South-East or the Green Triangle. These are big policy commitments to the future of this industry that has the opportunity to continue to maintain its status as one of the most productive forestry sectors anywhere in the world.

There have been a whole range of innovations that we have seen come out of the Green Triangle, whether it be around the use and the methods of growing and sustaining radiata pine through to the introduction of CLT and GLT, which continue to take a more substantial role in the construction industries in our state, both residential and commercial, but particularly commercial. These are big developments and innovations that we see coming out of the South-East: everything from the seedling going into the ground to the final product.

We are innovative. We are investing in that science, we are investing in that research and we are investing in those skills so this continues to be a beacon of prosperity, not just for the South-East but for the state as a whole.

NATIONAL POLICE LEGACY DAY

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister inform the house about National Police Legacy Day?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:57): I thank the member for the question, and I also recognise those members who are wearing the Michaelmas daisy in reference to National Police Legacy Day, which is an important day where all states and territories that have Police Legacy organisations take the opportunity to recognise and promote the work of Police Legacy.

While a number of members in recent times have made contributions to this place about the number of police both in South Australia and in other parts of the country who have lost their lives in the course of serving their communities, Police Legacy not only supports those impacted by those losses but also supports the families of police officers with other losses and other impacts to their families. This is incredibly important work and so today, 17 June, is the day that we nationally recognise the work of Police Legacy.

I was fortunate earlier today to attend the annual event which is put on by Police Legacy South Australia to acknowledge the work that Police Legacy does here in our state, and also recognise some of those families who have been impacted—whether it has been through a loss of life that has occurred in the course of a serving police officer in their duty or whether it has been through some other impacts.

I have to say that it is one of the most impactful experiences I have had as a member of parliament today, sitting and hearing Peter Shanahan talk at length about the loss of Joanne Shanahan—just over five years ago, on ANZAC Day in 2020, Peter and Joanne were the victims of one of the most horrific traffic collisions on our state's roads—and what the impact had been on him and his family. I also acknowledge one of the other attendees at lunch today, Paul Ashenden, a journalist at *The Advertiser* who, as members would be aware, has written a series of articles covering the impacts on Peter and his family, including Peter and the late Joanne Shanahan's children, Nick and Eleni, and about what their journey has been over the last five years.

This is a really important organisation and I am really grateful to all the members who have shown their support today acknowledging the work of National Police Legacy Day. In the last 36 years since 1989, \$2½ million has been disbursed by the South Australian Police Legacy organisation to support the thousands of police families who have been impacted by tragedy or loss in so many different ways. I want to acknowledge the organisations that support them, in particular Police Health; the Police Association of South Australia; their patron, of course, the police commissioner; and the many other organisations and charities that provide their time, effort and, particularly, financial support to allow them to continue doing the really important work that they do out in the community.

HOMELESSNESS

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Will the government publish rough sleeper data from the Homeless to Home database, and if not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: It was reported in *The Advertiser* yesterday that many suburban councils had recorded a rising number of rough sleepers in their respective areas. The South Australian Alliance to End Homelessness has called on the government to publish the data, which outlines annual client data by council area.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (15:01): I thank the member for the question. There is data published by the Institute of Health and Welfare and also on the alliance's website for the Zero Project in the CBD. That particular data that was discussed yesterday was a breakdown of data presented by the specialist homelessness services to local governments to help them in their local responses. There are a number of data sources. We are happy to share information when people ask us. There was no secret data; the way that that article was couched was incorrect.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Is the government proceeding with its proposed garage size requirements under the vehicle parking amendment bill? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: Public consultation on the government's proposed vehicle parking amendment bill closed on 10 March 2025. The proposal has been criticised by South Australia's business sector for adding \$60,000 to \$110,000 to the cost of a new home and reducing the number of dwellings able to be built in new developments. Industry groups, including the UDIA and the Property Council, argue that the policy fails to address congestion and instead worsens housing affordability during a supply crisis.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:03): Of course the government will fulfil commitments that we made before the election, and of course we will negotiate with industry about how best to do that with an eye to the outcome because we want bigger garages in which people are more likely to park; that is a virtue. Only today in the opposition leader's reply he was talking about the effect of infill on some communities. I think parking is a big factor in that, so we want garages that people will park in and that are fit for use. We also want to negotiate with industry and think carefully about policy around homes to absolutely minimise the costs associated with providing that additional garage size.

Just on the matter before about Riverlea, I might update the house: SA Water have given me an update that tankering in Riverlea stopped in May because infrastructure had now been constructed.

Members interjecting:

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:04): There's a line that goes with that sir, but I won't. It's unparliamentary. My question is to the minister for Housing. What is the current number of vacant public housing homes?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:05): I will get an update for the member because I want to give an accurate figure. We have been working very closely with the new executive of the Housing Trust and have put in place a program to absolutely limit the number of vacant homes that are lettable.

Regretfully, there are two types of vacant homes. Some are vacant that are lettable and, obviously, you will always have something of a vacancy rate in the system. It is a large system, with some 33,000 properties, and there will always be some vacancy rate as people move in and out of properties. There is another category of housing where homes are frankly unlettable, they need either major maintenance or demolition because they are at the end of their useful life.

I will get a figure for the honourable member, but this government's commitment is to add more money into the maintenance contracts and limit the number of vacant lettable homes because we know there is a lot of demand both for public housing and for community housing, and more generally a very tight rental market.

It is that tight private rental market which, of course, has been the focus for the government's rent-to-buy initiative. The rent-to-buy initiative is solely focused on long-term renters who have some capacity to get into home ownership but who are constantly defeated by this endless cycle of saving for a deposit and then seeing a house price rise. The government wants to make sure those people can tap into HomeStart, shared equity loans and the government's rent-to-buy scheme.

*Grievance Debate***STAMP DUTY CONCESSIONS**

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): I rise today to speak about the great Australian dream of home ownership. Recently, we were out with people such as Michael. Michael is around 30 years old. He has been trying to save for a home for a few years now. He only saves around \$5,000 or \$10,000 a year. For him, and for many young people like him, this dream of home ownership is getting so far away.

We know that the Australian dream has been long built around a place to call home, a stake in society, a place to conserve and a place to protect. Certainly, we on this side of the chamber believe in that dream but unfortunately it is slipping away for many young people.

The Liberal Party founder, Sir Robert Menzies, who championed this vision, this concept of a home-owning democracy, understood, as we understand, that the foundation of a strong society actually lies in empowering people to build lives of stability. We know that today, unfortunately, that vision is under threat because home ownership is slipping beyond reach, eroding that very aspiration that does fuel many of those values that we share.

We have been quoting, and we will quote again, the 2025 Demographia International Housing Affordability Survey that shows that Adelaide is actually the sixth least affordable housing market in the world. ANZ's Housing Affordability Report ranks Adelaide, in fact, as the second least affordable capital city in which to buy and the least affordable capital city in which to rent in the entire nation. It goes on to talk about over 56 per cent of an average South Australian's income is now swallowed up by a mortgage. Many people would actually call that mortgage distress.

It is not just a personal crisis, it is also hurting our economy. That is why we feel the need to act. One of the biggest impediments, one of the biggest barriers to realising the dream of home ownership is: what can we do as a state to alleviate that? One of those is stamp duty. We know that stamp duty is an inefficient tax and it punishes ambition. Other governments in the past have seen fit to get rid of stamp duty on commercial properties. What about in respect of residential properties?

For this state government, we know that so far this tax has been treated, this sector has been treated, like a cash cow bringing in billions of dollars in revenue.

For first-home buyers, the up-front cost of tens of thousands of dollars can crush their hopes of entering the market, and we know that there are many aspiring first-home owners in South Australia who see stamp duty as a major hurdle. It is a tough tax. It is a tough tax that hits new buyers hard and diminishes their purchasing power. It reduces their ability to bid for a property and that also restricts economic growth.

As opposition leader, my team and I have announced a policy of stamp duty relief for first-home buyers. This is a step to restore fairness. I have been really quite pleased to see the take-up and interest in this, whether it is real estate agents, whether it is mortgage brokers, whether it is young people who are trying to get into a home or whether it is their parents. There has been a lot of positivity around this announcement because we know and they know that by lowering the stamp duty impost for first-home buyers we can boost housing turnover and also affordability for the next generation as well.

The housing crisis is threatening more than just individual aspirations. It undermines the idea of a society where hard work leads to home ownership but also responsibility. We have seen that the average size of a new home loan in South Australia and Australia has surged in recent times, while full-time earnings have failed to keep up. This gap traps young families, draining disposable income, and it also comes at the opportunity cost of investments and things like their skills, education and also household essentials. Without reform, we risk a generation that will be disconnected from the values that we hold dear, like a place to call home, family and opportunity.

Menzies knew that society thrives when people have something to protect and home ownership is that anchor. Unlocking home ownership for young people can open the door to future families. Under Labor we see the brain drain has resumed again with young South Australians looking interstate for opportunities. Housing affordability, no doubt, is also a significant factor in making the decision to uproot your life and also move. I want to see South Australians, young South Australians, choosing to live and work and stay in South Australia because we know home ownership is a cornerstone of financial security and personal stability and empowers South Australians to build a brighter future. It is one of many parts of the housing challenge, but by addressing this barrier of stamp duty for first-home buyers, we can revive this vision, empowering young South Australians to build, and also contribute to a thriving state.

VICTIMS OF CRIME FUND

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:12): I rise today to talk about a Mount Gambier resident who, through no fault of her own, has been left significantly out of pocket, highlighting the shortcomings in our current compensation system when it comes to supporting innocent bystanders impacted by criminal or emergency incidents. This resident is a nurse who works at our Mount Gambier hospital, someone who has dedicated her career to caring for others.

On the day in question, she was simply doing her job, attending her usual shift at the Mount Gambier hospital. Unbeknown to her, an incident had occurred in the hospital car park involving a patient in the midst of a mental health crisis. Police were called to the scene, and during the process of apprehension her car was significantly damaged. The total cost for repairs was over \$2,000. While her insurance covered the majority of the cost, she was left to pay \$700 in excess, money that came straight out of her own pocket. Obviously, on top of that, she now faces increased insurance premiums through no fault of her own.

This nurse has accepted the need to lodge an insurance claim, but what she cannot accept and should not accept is the financial penalty she now bears for simply going to work. Personally, I am not sure I would be so forgiving. A frontline health worker walks into her work at the beginning of a shift and walks out to a damaged vehicle—\$2,000 damage in total—\$700 poorer and a higher insurance premium. This is not just unfair; I think it is wrong.

I fully respect the role of SAPOL and the need for rapid response to ensure public safety. Sometimes incidental damage is an unfortunate consequence of those operations. But what I do find hard to understand is how this nurse, who had absolutely nothing to do with the incident, has been

left to deal with the consequences alone. Neither SAPOL nor SA Health have offered any support. Instead, she has been left to navigate the system on her own.

It is obviously not a once-off problem. It raises a broader question of how we support people who are caught in the crossfire of public incidents through no fault of their own. I have written to the Treasurer seeking his intervention and I sincerely hope a resolution can be found. This was, of course, after writing to SA Police, who basically say that it is not their problem and they will not be supporting this nurse with any funds.

Of course, the opportunity to consider a broader policy also exists. South Australia has a Victims of Crime Fund, a substantially significant pool of money, reportedly sitting at around \$200 million, established to support those who suffer harm or loss due to criminal acts. I do support the fund. Traditionally the fund is focused on direct victims, but perhaps it is time to broaden that definition. People like this nurse, who was an innocent bystander affected by criminal activity, or the response to it, may also be—or, in my opinion, should be—eligible for support.

It would be a relatively small financial gesture, one with a significant message, that we value our frontline workers and everyday South Australians, to make sure that they are not left to wear the cost of events that they had no control over and are, in fact, just innocent bystanders. We ask a lot of our nurses, and our police, our paramedics and our essential workers. The least we can do is ensure that, when they are inadvertently harmed, or even in the proximity to it, they are treated with fairness, dignity and support.

I call on the government to urgently review this case to see ways of reimbursing the \$700. The nurse is quite accepting of the fact that she has to go through insurance. She has done that and all she is asking is that the gap be paid, knowing that her premiums will be increased over the forthcoming years. It is something that she had no direct involvement in and it is one of those unfortunate situations that can occur from time to time. We must stand up for those who stand for us.

MONARTO SAFARI PARK

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:17): I rise to talk about some of the history and some of the new goings on at Monarto Safari Park, and certainly the new resort. Back in September 1982, the then minister for environment and planning announced that 1,000 hectares of Crown land would be allocated for the establishment of an open-range zoo. Stage 1 of the development was completed in 1983 when the Department of Environment and Planning established Monarto as a breeding and pasture area. A feasibility study was conducted in 1990 and the decision was made to change Monarto from a special purpose breeding area, closed to the public, to an international standard zoo.

Two young female bison were imported from Auckland Zoo and they were the first residents at Monarto. This was followed by roughly 150 animals from Adelaide Zoo and another 40 animals that were being held on pasture at a Penola property. Adelaide Zoo had been experiencing overcrowding, so the transfer of animals to Monarto helped ease this issue.

In October 1993, Monarto Safari Park opened to the public with an official opening ceremony, which was attended by 260 guests. In 2008 the Chimp Viewing Platform was opened by renowned primatologist Dr Jane Goodall, and the chimp home is the largest in the Southern Hemisphere. On 21 April 2022, I had the privilege of opening the new \$16.8 million visitor centre, alongside the member for Barker, Tony Pasin. This included \$11.25 million from the federal government and \$4.55 million from the former Marshall Liberal government.

It was with great joy that in the last week of May I attended the opening of the brand new Monarto Safari Resort. This was built by Gerry Ryan, who is the owner of Jayco. It was quite pleasing to see those Victorian funds come in to support something in South Australia. It was more than a \$40 million investment. It was pleasing to see that Gerry's wife and daughter were there for the opening. Gerry had to be overseas, but he has done a magnificent job with the build team getting the resort in place.

There are rooms overlooking the watering hole or the wild plains. There are two outdoor pools at this resort, two bars, a restaurant and a luxurious day spa with massage facilities. Visitation

numbers are well over 200,000 per annum and are only going to increase with the opening of the resort and the glamping tents, which are hoped to be available early in the new year.

Monarto Safari Park has grown to more than 1,500 hectares. To put that into perspective, you can fit every major zoo in Australia inside the park and there will still be room left over. Over 500 animals now call the park home, the newest of which are the five Asian elephants. We have Burma, Permai, Putra Mas—who is still on his way, Pak Boon and Tang Mo.

Burma was the first to arrive back in November from Auckland Zoo. This was followed by Permai, who settled in at the end of January following a 40-hour, 2,700-kilometre journey across the Nullarbor from Perth Zoo. The newest additions were Pak Boon and Tang Mo, who made the journey from Taronga Zoo, Sydney, back at the end of April. That just leaves Putra Mas, who is set to be relocated to Monarto later this year. He is the big male elephant. I think they are sorting out the logistics of a big box to transport him across from Perth as well.

This development also complements developments like the Lions 360, where you can go in the cage and the lions can crawl all over the top of the cage, which is quite an experience. I must congratulate all involved, especially with Gerry Ryan making that commitment to build this resort. It has taken three or four years to get it where it is. I congratulate Journey Beyond on teaming with the Monarto Safari Park to operate the resort. I encourage everyone to get out to Monarto to have a good look and enjoy all the facilities.

INTERNATIONAL CLEANERS DAY

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:22): I rise to acknowledge International Cleaners Day, recently celebrated on 15 June, and to offer my sincere thanks to all cleaners across South Australia. Cleaners are a quiet force behind the functioning of our schools, hospitals, workplaces and public places. Their vital work is often done behind the scenes, outside the hours many of us keep. They keep our environment safe, healthy and dignified, and they do so without fuss or fanfare. In that spirit, since I have been elected I have made it something of a tradition to mark the occasion with a polite ambush, presenting a hamper to a randomly selected local cleaner. It is a small gesture but one that I hope shows just how much they are appreciated by me and the communities that I am privileged to represent.

This year, it was Ruchira at Riverdale Primary School's turn. He could not have been more gracious or more deserving. His kindness, warmth and pride in his work are evident in everything that he does. Last year, it was Lilly and Maria at Hollywood Plaza. I will never forget the joy on their faces when they received their goodie basket offered on behalf of a grateful community.

In my workplace, I also want to acknowledge Carla, who currently looks after our office. She may not share our usual working hours but she is absolutely part of the team. Her care and consistency make our space not only clean but safe and more productive. I also thank Dhrumil, who looked after our temporary office at the former Florey site with both diligence and pride. On my numbers, South Australia is home to around 10,000 cleaners working hard in schools to clinics to shopping centres to aged-care homes. They keep our shared spaces clean and safe and they are very much worthy of praise.

I may be stating the obvious, but we should not overlook their work and how it impacts our health, safety and our wellbeing. Cleaners prevent the spread of illness by removing germs or allergens, they improve our air quality and reduce risks like slips and falls. In kitchens, clinics and hospitals they play a crucial role in preventing infection and contamination.

During the COVID-19 pandemic their work was nothing short of life-saving. Thousands of lives were protected here in South Australia through their vigilance and efforts, and they maintained sanitised hygienic spaces under extraordinary pressure while others stayed home. They kept showing up quietly, consistently and with courage.

Cleaners also lift morale and improve productivity. A clean space helps people focus, feel safe, and be more effective. It creates strong first impressions, reduces absenteeism, and protects surfaces and equipment, saving money and extending the life of essential infrastructure. Above all, cleaners provide something deeply human: dignity. In every finished mop floor, every wiped surface

and every bin quietly emptied there is a message—that this place matters, and so do the people within it.

That message is so often delivered by people who can at times receive little recognition, so today I want to pause and recognise them. You may notice that the names I have mentioned—like Ruchira, Carla, Lilly, Maria and Dhrumil—are names that, respectfully, may strike you as belonging to people born overseas, and indeed many of our cleaners are proud migrants. As someone who grew up around the Polish community I understand it can take time to find your voice in a new country. With this in mind, I stress that our gratitude must go beyond words.

It must include support when times are tough. While most employers do the right thing, we know cleaners often work to tight deadlines and under pressure. If ever they face unfair or unsafe conditions, please know that they are not alone just because a lot of their work happens when most of us are arriving, departing or fast asleep. We value their flexibility, note that they work odd hours, adapt to changing environments and carry out physically demanding work.

We may not always see them, but we always benefit from what they do, and we must therefore have their backs when things get tough. So this week, I encourage everyone at their local school, office, cafe or shopping centre to take a moment to say thank you. A small word of appreciation can mean the world. To Ruchira, Carla, Lilly, Maria, Dhrumil and the thousands of cleaners across South Australia, thank you. Your work is essential, you are valued and, on behalf of our entire community, we are deeply grateful.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:27): I rise today to recognise the farmers in my electorate of Frome, and to speak with some poignancy but also with great affection and admiration for the hay run that we saw take place in Jamestown just 10 days ago. The Rapid Relief Team were responsible for delivering a record number of hay bales to South Australia. They totalled 1,500 and were gratefully received by the farming community in my community of Jamestown.

Of course, it had a two-hour radius in any direction, so what we saw on the ground on a chilly Friday morning were lots of beanies, lots of people gathered around barrels and fire drums grabbing a cup of coffee in reflection and in comradeship of the big fight they are in at the moment and that they have been in not just for a few months but for a couple of years now—and that is the drought.

It is endemic across the state, and whether it is described as a green drought or the worst drought in a generation, a drought is a drought—and it is hard. The sentiment and atmosphere on that chilly Friday morning was one of mixed emotions. Farmers on the day were really quite upbeat, full of laughs, like farmers always are, ready for a chat, ready for an opportunity to swap stories and anecdotes and examples, swap science, swap strategy, swap hardship.

But sitting underneath that, underlying those positive reflections, it was not difficult to see—it was quite palpable—that if you lifted your head up away from the hot meals, the free fodder, the toys for the kids, and looked past the oval, there was a line, a cavalcade, of utes, trailers, trucks and any implement or any vehicle that was available from the farm to come to Jamestown to collect a load, and it was a line of people who did not really want to be there.

Farmers are some of the most reluctant people in Australia, I think, to accept what they might see as charity. We describe it as charity. The associations that bring that hay are charitable associations. But the farmers were really at a point where they needed the hay, and no-one would ever turn away such a gesture like that. It was a record delivery, as I mentioned, of 1,500 bales, yet the reluctance comes from the desperation that farmers are in at the moment, having done everything they possibly can to remain independent.

They are innovative and resourceful people. For the last 18 months to two years, if they needed to cull stock, they did. If they needed to change their practice, if they needed to preserve water, if they needed to reduce the number of crops they were seeding, they have taken every step they could to inoculate themselves against the drought. Everyone in this state—the government, the opposition, industry—believes that farmers have done everything they could to put themselves in a fighting situation, but if it does not rain, it does not rain. We certainly need to see those dams fill up.

I had fantastic conversations with Councillor Keith Pluckrose, James Lang and Mark Blake. We sought some comfort under the marquee with Lorna Woodward from the Lifeline crew, who was there on the ground for the better part of six hours. We heard from Justine Reynolds, who runs Woodleigh Hills, who came in for a load but also diversifies with her own Woodleigh Hills natural beauty brand, and Sarah Voumard from Mannanarie, who not only was running the shearing centre of excellence but was there to get feed for her stock. We thank the Rapid Relief team for their delivery, and I wish the farmers well.

REGIONAL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:32): Today, I rise to share some stories from across the Mid North region, from the paddocks of Fischer to the heart of Jamestown and a local government regional meeting in Orroroo, each a powerful reminder of the strength, spirit and determination of regional South Australia.

On 2 June, I had the privilege of joining the Prime Minister, Premier Malinauskas, ministers Collins and Scriven, Senator Wong and representatives from the National Farmers' Federation and Primary Producers SA at the Fischer family farm in the Northern Adelaide Plains. This fourth-generation property, run by Nette and Troy Fischer and their daughters Isabelle, Indigo and Elke, is a shining example of resilience and innovation in the face of adversity.

The locality of Fischer itself draws its name from this pioneering family, who settled in the area after migrating from Prussia in mid-19th century, part of the early waves of European settlers who helped shape South Australia's agricultural legacy. Over time, the family came to farm much of the district, and in the 20th century their land formed part of the state planning for a new satellite city to ease Adelaide's urban expansion. The roots run deep here, quite literally. It was wonderful to reconnect with the family, and young Elke was graciously granted a Prime Minister's pardon for missing school to tour Mr Albanese around the farm, a moment I know she will always remember.

Our farmers are among the most efficient and resilient in the world, but even they need support in times like this. That is why the Albanese government's announcement of an additional \$2 million for the Rural Financial Counselling Service is important, building on over \$1 billion in national rural support alongside the South Australian government's \$73.4 million drought assistance package. They are the lifeblood of our regional economy and food security, feeding our nation, sustaining local jobs and caring for the land through good times and bad. With the announcement that the 2025 National Drought Forum is to be held in Gawler, we are ensuring regional voices remain at the heart of any solutions.

Last week in Jamestown the resilience of our farming community was matched only by the generosity of those who rallied behind them. More than 200 farmers came together for the Farmers Community Connect event, led by the Rapid Relief Team (RRT), a group that continues to step up when it matters most. Their convoy of 27 trucks delivered over 1,500 donated hay bales from across the driest regions in New South Wales, a symbol of unity and compassion in challenging times. It was a privilege to stand alongside so many committed volunteers, including Rapid Relief Team's Mick Dunn, who reminded us that while the drought is testing, the spirit of rural Australia remains unbreakable. To hear him share that people were lining roads across New South Wales and Victoria, waving Aussie flags and cheering them on, tells you everything you need to know about this country's character. Also, I would like to acknowledge the various support services who were at this event.

I want to acknowledge the state government's \$195,000 grant to help cover transport costs, complementing RRT's own \$250,000 contribution in hay, catering and volunteer hours. Together they ensured each farmer received premium grade hay, food boxes and, just as important, a sense that they are not alone and there are people out there who care for them.

While these efforts do not erase their hardship, they do offer a lifeline. A warm meal, a conversation, a community of care: these things do matter. To every farmer, volunteer and supporter, thank you. Your strength is a backbone of our state and it was a real privilege to stand there with you. It was also a real pleasure to attend the recent Northern and Yorke Local Government Association (LGA) meeting held in Orroroo and to spend time with dedicated mayors, councillors and staff who are working tirelessly to strengthen their communities.

These gatherings are a vital forum for collaboration where local leaders share their aspirations, challenges and ideas for the future of the region. I was especially grateful for the warm welcome and the opportunity to listen firsthand to the issues that matter the most to those people in the region. These conversations are essential in shaping how our state government can better support local government and rural communities. The Northern and Yorke LGA plays a crucial role as a regional voice advocating for fairer funding, sustainable landscapes and stronger social cohesion across Yorke and Mid North. Their work helps ensure that no community is left behind.

As a parliamentary representative, I am committed to following up on the matters raised and ensuring that the voices of our regional councils are heard by our Malinauskas Labor government. It is clear that when we work together, local and state, we can deliver real outcomes for the people we serve.

Private Members' Statements

PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:37): I rise today to recognise the fact that WorldSkills Australia National Championships are going to take place in South Australia in 2027, specifically in Adelaide. This is something that the opposition is very, very excited about seeing. Quite simply, it is very clear that the education and skills minister has developed a penchant for pinching policy as it turns out.

Former shadow minister for skills, the member for Morialta in this place, has done a fantastic job. I acknowledge his input, both to this parliament but more broadly to the Liberal Party, in policy development. As it turns out, this is the second of seven policy points within the boosting apprenticeships policy that the government has now taken on themselves.

But we are not disappointed by that fact. It is a good thing. We call for it because it is good thing and we are glad that the government is doing this for the opportunity for our young people to develop skills, to have the opportunity to see firsthand the best of the best competing, representing South Australia, and to undertake this venture at the same time that we will be hosting the Adelaide Careers and Employment Expo. Giving people the opportunity to quite literally walk into a new profession is something that is much needed when we have significant shortages in construction, manufacturing, health, hospitality and many other areas. This is a good step forward, and I am pleased to see the announcement.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:39): I rise to say how happy I am that our community campaign to bring back Australia Post to the centre of our community has proven successful. Approximately two years ago, Australia Post closed the very popular office in Oaklands Park, at Marion shopping centre, an office that quite often had queues out the door. It was remarkable that they shut it down and, of course, the community were rightly outraged. I ran a petition online, but also stood outside the post office day after day to speak to community members to hear directly from them what their concerns were about their inability to access a public service. We continued that fight.

I would like to acknowledge the member for Boothby, Louise Miller-Frost. We held a street-corner meeting together with the community about it as well, and I am so pleased to say that it just represents that when a community comes together and fights, and has an advocate in their corner, you really can make positive change. In only a couple of weeks, a new office for Australia Post is opening in Warradale not far at all from where the last one closed down. A few of us in the community got together on Saturday to stand outside the new office and check it out, and to celebrate and eat cake.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:40): Today, I want to speak about how well the Liberal Party's announcement on removing stamp duty for existing properties under the price of \$1 million has gone down in my electorate of Unley. You only have to go to an open inspection of a two-bedroom apartment in Unley—many of them are selling between \$600,000 to \$800,000—and you will see who is there buying them. They are first-home buyers there with their parents. They are either single women in their late 20s or young couples wanting to break into the housing market. They do not want to live in a new property or a new house miles away from where they grew up; they

want to live nearby and they want to get into the market. It may not be their lifetime home, but it gets them in there.

As we know, when you are buying and selling in the same market you are never going to be disadvantaged, but it is getting into that market in the first place that is the hardest thing. Of course, what this policy does is enable them to outbid those investors who are also there looking at those apartments at the same time. The stamp duty paid on the median house price in 2022 was \$28,830 and today it is \$39,830—\$11,000 more. That is why this is such an important policy.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:42): Last week was Men's Health Week, and I want to shine a light on the health of men and boys in rural and regional Australia where the challenges are real and the stakes are high. Men and boys in regional areas are more likely to face chronic conditions like heart disease, diabetes and mental health issues. In fact, men living in remote areas die up to 13 years earlier than those in the cities, and rates of potentially avoidable deaths are 2½ times higher. These are not just numbers, they are fathers, sons, brothers and mates.

In the Mid North and across the Adelaide Plains, I have seen firsthand the work being done to turn this around. Our local Men's Sheds offer connection and purpose, but even stories of farmers getting together monthly for a dinner, like Roseworthy farmer Peter Kemp who has organised one in the region, helped men talk about their challenges and realise they are not alone.

We have initiatives in our community, like Save Our Mates—run by Anthony Hart and our own Gavin Schuster, a fifth-generation farming family in Freeling—dedicated to early intervention, sharing tools, tips and resources blokes can use to better confront life's challenges and just have conversations, but we need to keep breaking down the stigma. Real strength is found in asking for help, in booking that check-up and looking out for each other. To every man in our region: your health matters; and to every group working to improve it: thank you. Together, we are building healthier and stronger communities.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (15:44): I move:

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

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: An absolute majority not being present, please ring the bells.

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

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:46): The opposition opposes the motion. I indicate for the benefit of the house that this motion to suspend is moved in circumstances where the opposition has been notified of the bill that I think the minister has named in the title of the motion, but that is about all. The government has afforded the opposition a briefing on the bill that commenced at around 10 minutes to one this afternoon. That was after the Premier and the minister, so far as I could tell, in company with one or two members of another place, gave a media conference at around midday.

All of that is to provide some context, then, to the question that was asked at the briefing: what is the urgency that might lead to the desirability from the government's point of view, let alone the necessity, to move with such haste as to suspend standing orders here today in the midst of the second reading debate on the budget? I think I can put it as bluntly as: at least just immediately prior to the Leader of the Opposition getting on his feet at 11 o'clock this morning, this was new news to the opposition.

I think we have heard some reference to the fact that the government has told all of us on this side of the house, let alone all South Australians, that in the midst of the second reading debate on the budget, the government has decided to interrupt what is undoubtedly important government business, arguably the most important bill of the year, which needs to be passed within the next couple of days so that we can get on with a committee of the whole house over an extended period of time in the estimates process, in order to introduce this bill.

So what is the urgency? The question was put in the course of the briefing, I think in a whole range of different ways to the minister, to the minister's staff and to the departmental adviser who was gracious enough to come along and do what could reasonably be done to walk us through this bill—but, I stress, a little more than a couple of hours ago. There is no particular answer that has been given to the opposition about what the particular urgency is.

Members in this place, I am sure, will be forgiven for not having acquainted themselves with the contents of this bill in any sort of detail at all. I know that the bulk of the members of my party made themselves available at particularly short notice. I appreciate the opportunity for a government briefing. I appreciate the invitation for all of us to come if we possibly could, but that is far from all of us. There is a good reason why, when a bill is introduced by the government, let alone one that has just emerged out of the blue like this, it sits on the *Notice Paper* at least overnight: so that those who need responsibly to discharge their obligations to their electors and their legislative duties have at least that period of time in which to consider what is on the government's agenda.

Of course, par for the course, the usual run of things is that we see the government business sitting on the *Notice Paper* for considerably longer than that for debate to be allowed and so on. But the haste with which this has been brought to the parliament in the particular context of being, as I say, in the midst of the early stages of the budget second reading debate, begs the question: is this some sort of attempt to run interference on the budget being the focus at this time? Is there some other reason for changing the subject in the midst of that important debate?

While the government could not answer the question about the urgency at that briefing a couple of hours ago, one thing that the government could give a clear answer to me about was the response to my question: has the Adelaide City Council published a view about this bill? The answer to that question was no. And the following question: has the Adelaide City Council seen the bill? The answer to that question was no as well.

I have not got this firsthand from the Lord Mayor but I understand it on reasonably good authority that the Lord Mayor happens to be away on business overseas in Europe and that this might be coming as news to the Lord Mayor of the Adelaide City Council while she is away in Europe undertaking, as I understand it, council business.

What is the Adelaide City Council to make of a bill that, as far as I can see, resembles more a contract than a piece of legislation, the sort of document that looks a little bit like a contract where one party is being told what is going to happen and it is not clear what that other party's view is? All of this goes to the question as to why, in these circumstances, it is desirable, let alone necessary, for this house to grant the government its desire to suspend the standing orders.

Surely the government is not afraid of the Lord Mayor or something, afraid of what the Adelaide City Council might do if it were given the proper amount of time to take this in. Surely the government is not afraid of the sort of scrutiny that would come in the ordinary course of a bill like this. Many might have thought that the government would be very happy to see this aired in the proper and usual way.

I can stand here and indicate from the opposition's point of view there is surprise, to say the least, that we are somehow at nearly 4pm on the Tuesday of a sitting week that is dedicated to the budget debate sidelining all of that so that we can urgently progress debate in this place about a bill that is of central importance, undoubtedly, to the Adelaide City Council, which is the responsible entity that it affects, and all of those residents and businesses, stakeholders—large groups of them—that I expect are similarly, understandably, none the wiser about this legislation.

What I would be seeking to persuade members of this place of the merits of at this relatively late hour of the afternoon is that there not be support given for the suspension of standing orders this afternoon, but rather that the minister instead move in the usual way to progress the bill as soon as tomorrow, if that is his wish. The minister has chosen not to address the motion on the suspension, and so even right now on the floor of this place we are none the wiser. The motion to suspend is without merit, and it should be opposed.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes26

Noes.....15
Majority11

AYES

Andrews, S.E.	Boyer, B.I. (teller)	Brown, M.E.
Champion, N.D.	Clancy, N.P.	Close, S.E.
Cook, N.F.	Dighton, A.E.	Fulbrook, J.P.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hood, L.P.	Hughes, E.J.
Hutchesson, C.L.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.B.
Michaels, A.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K. (teller)
O'Hanlon, C.C.	Pearce, R.K.	Picton, C.J.
Savvas, O.M.	Stinson, J.M.	Szakacs, J.K.
Thompson, E.L.	Wortley, D.J.	

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Batty, J.A.	Brock, G.G.
Cowdrey, M.J.	Ellis, F.J.	Gardner, J.A.W.
Hurn, A.M.	McBride, P.N.	Patterson, S.J.R.
Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G. (teller)	Pratt, P.K.
Teague, J.B.	Telfer, S.J.	Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.	Tarzia, V.A.
----------------	--------------

Motion thus carried.

Bills

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (16:00): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to facilitate the development of the new North Adelaide Golf Course, to provide for its ongoing use as a championship golf course and public facility and for other purposes. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (16:00): LIV Golf Adelaide has delivered major economic benefits to South Australia, contributing \$136 million to the economy in its first two years alone. LIV Golf has served as a vehicle to showcase South Australia to a global audience, with a broadcast reach of more than 500 million viewers across 80 countries.

The inaugural event in 2023 attracted over 77,000 attendees, with 43,000 international visitors to Australia from 37 countries. The 2024 tournament drew more than 94,000 attendees and generated over 79,000 visitor nights. During this event, approximately 40 per cent of ticketholders came from outside South Australia. Proving the event's popularity, 2025 delivered bigger and better impacts for the state with a record of 102,000 attendees.

Adelaide has hosted the Australian fixture at the Grange Golf Course since the first event in 2023. The initial agreement to host LIV Golf in Adelaide was for two years, with an option to extend for a further two years up to 2026. The state has secured an extension of the LIV Golf agreement for a period to 2031. The North Adelaide Golf Course will be the exclusive home of LIV Golf in Australia

following a redevelopment by Greg Norman Golf Course Design. This firm has delivered more than 100 iconic golf courses across 34 countries and six continents.

The redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course is necessary to provide the required facilities and amenities to accommodate year-round use for the public world's best tournaments and tourism for South Australia. Our National Heritage listed Parklands have had a golf links since the late 19th century. As part of the evolution of the precinct, the North Adelaide Golf Course was developed in the early 20th century and is the most centrally located golf course complex in any Australian capital city.

The necessary redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course carries arguably the greatest potential of any public-owned golf facility in the country. The development will make it a world-class landmark venue to secure major tournaments, as well as drive national and international visitation and tourism to South Australia.

Considering its unique location within the Adelaide Parklands and sightlines to the Adelaide CBD and River Torrens, a new North Adelaide Golf Course is an amazing platform on which to showcase our state to the rest of the world. The economic potential of golf tourism is significant with the average domestic and international golf traveller spending significantly more per trip than non-golf travellers in Australia.

When a round of golf is played, there is a 43 per cent increase in spend on international trips. The average spend increases by 38 per cent on international travels and 72 per cent on intrastate trips. This is an economic multiplier which adds to our multibillion dollar tourism industry. The redevelopment will create one of the world's best public golf courses for year-round use for all South Australians. No matter who you are, or your background, this will remain a public golf course in public hands.

Golf has seen unprecedented growth across Australia in the past five years. Emerging is an increasingly younger and more diverse player base. Off course and alternative format golf also tends to attract a younger audience due to the reduced barriers to entry, such as time constraints. Off Course Golf often acts as a feeder to more formal participation and future growth within the sport.

The existing North Adelaide Golf Course is currently comprised of two 18-hole courses on approximately 75 hectares of Parklands, together with one par 3 golf course. The current golf course does not contain a dedicated driving range facility or the amenities and infrastructure for the development of the sport at the scale required. This is also about getting more people more active more often.

The City of Adelaide, through successive councils, had investigated options for the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course, but this has never progressed. The operations of the existing golf course are also limited by restrictions on the current permitted uses. It is essential that we respond to the economic opportunity which presents itself. A new North Adelaide Golf Course will create an accessible, high-quality public golf venue, encouraging expanded accessibility that caters to golfers of every age and skill level.

The redevelopment will enhance the Adelaide Parklands for both non-golfers and golfers alike. The upgrades will connect the spaces to improve public access and movement in and out of the city through the Parklands. This is incredibly important due to the increase in development at such key areas as Southwark and Bowden.

This legislation will ensure that the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course can go ahead as soon as possible to host the LIV Golf tournament in 2028. This will not occur at the expense of the Adelaide Parkland's public amenity, environmental importance or character. The state government and the City of Adelaide have already been working together on additional design and planning activities for the redevelopment works.

The legislation commits a positive duty to consult with council on the development and to resolve the future ownership and operating structure of the North Adelaide Golf Course. The redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course will be constructed on what is defined in the legislation as the 'project site'. The 'project site' will include the area currently operating as the North

Adelaide Golf Course as well as the intention to include Park 27A, also known as John E Brown Park.

The use of Park 27A will see the transformation of an underutilised area of the Parklands to provide more usable space and will reduce the impact on trees. The legislation has outlined a significant protection of trees within the golf course precinct. For every tree removed, no less than three new trees or seedlings must be planted within the project site or support zones. This policy for vegetation management will provide significant visual and environmental enhancements to the Parklands and golf course.

The legislation also ensures that future operations and maintenance of the golf course are not restricted and allows the staging of tournaments and other events as required. Under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course will be classified by the Planning and Design Code as 'deemed-to-satisfy'. This approach will ensure that planning controls will still remain and building rules consent will still be required, mandating quality, safety and integrity of any facilities constructed.

It is important to highlight the cultural significance of the Adelaide Parklands for the Kaurna people. The application of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 is not affected by this legislation. No ground disturbing works will proceed without consultation with traditional owners and the relevant approvals under the act.

The legislation establishes safeguards and limitations on the various components of the site and its surroundings. To avoid the environmental impact, it defines the project site and support zones which will be utilised to facilitate construction, but with clear limits about what can occur in these zones. The support zones are explicitly for developing facilities and amenities for the golf course and the future staging of events. Additionally, the legislation imposes an ongoing obligation for those areas to be made good once their use is complete.

This is a project that will facilitate the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course to be a world class facility that will support world class events. The golf course will remain as a public golf course for anyone and everyone to enjoy. The redevelopment will enhance and protect the environmental features of the Adelaide Parklands and build on South Australia's presence on a global stage.

This is a project that builds and drives economic, social and community benefit for generations of South Australians to come. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

This clause is formal.

2—Commencement

The measure will commence on assent.

3—Interpretation

This clause inserts definitions for the purposes of the measure.

4—Effect of Act

The measure has effect despite any other Act or law of the State. It applies to land notwithstanding the provisions of the *Real Property Act 1886* and the *Land Acquisition Act 1969* does not apply to a vesting of land under the measure.

Part 2—Project site

5—Project site

The project site will be delineated in a plan or plans to be deposited in the GRO and identified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette but is to include the area currently operating as the North Adelaide Golf Course as well as Park 27A in the North Adelaide parklands and certain road reserve areas in the vicinity of such land.

6—Cancellation of leases and licences

All leases and licences existing in relation to the project site are to be cancelled in accordance with this clause.

7—Preparations for handover of project site

This clause requires the Minister to consult with Adelaide City Council in relation to the handover day. The Council must vacate and handover possession of the site to the Minister on or before the designated handover day and the Minister is able to issue directions to the Council to ensure an orderly handover.

8—Vesting and care, control etc of project site

On handover day the project site vests in the designated Minister in an estate in fee simple, free from all dedications, encumbrances, estates and interests other than those indicated in the plan or plans deposited under clause 5. The Minister to whom administration of the Act is committed is vested with care, control, management and use of the site.

Part 3—Carrying out the project

9—Consultation requirements and protocol

This clause requires certain consultation to be undertaken by the Minister with the Adelaide City Council and the development of a consultation protocol.

10—Application of *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988*

The *Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988* applies in relation to any Aboriginal sites, objects or remains found in the course of the carrying out of the project on the project site or the support zones.

11—Application of *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* etc

This clause specifies requirements of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* the are to apply to a development proposed to be undertaken, for the purposes of the project, on the project site or the support zones and that such development will be taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed-to-satisfy development for the purposes of that Act (and that the State Planning Commission will be taken to be the relevant authority for all purposes under that Act).

12—Application of other State laws to project

Except as is specified in clauses 10 and 11 or as may be determined by the Minister by notice in the Gazette, no assessment, decision, consent, approval, authorisation, certificate, licence, permit or permission and no consultation, inquiry, notification, process or other procedural step is required under a State law in connection with the project or the performance of functions under the measure.

13—Requirements relating to trees

The Minister must ensure that for every tree that is removed during the project not less than 3 new trees are planted within the project site and support zones.

14—Support zones

Support zones and support services and facilities are defined. Specified powers are conferred on the Minister for the purposes of the provision of support services and facilities in support zones in connection with the development on the project site. Provision is also made in relation to the exercise of those powers.

15—Roads

The Minister is authorised to open or close any roads in connection with the development on the project site (both temporarily and on an ongoing basis).

16—Minister may make provision in relation to vesting etc of project land, structures or property

This clause allows the Minister to make provision in relation to land, structures and property by instrument in writing, in order to implement leasing or other arrangements that may be agreed between the Minister and the Adelaide City Council or for any other purpose connected with the operation of the measure that the Minister thinks fit.

Part 4—Operation of golf course

17—Interpretation

This clause defines certain terms used in the Part. The Part applies to the North Adelaide Golf Course as in operation following the completion of the project.

18—General operation of golf course

Subject to this Part, following the project the North Adelaide Golf Course must continue to operate as a public golf course and must not have permanent fencing around its perimeter for the purpose of excluding members of the public from the course (subject to subclause (2)).

19—Use of golf course for approved events

The Minister can, by notice in the Gazette, approve an event, specify a *declared period* for the event and temporarily close any roads as needed.

20—Minister to have care, control etc of golf course for declared period

The care, control, management and use of the land comprising the North Adelaide Golf Course vests in the Minister (to the extent that it is not already so vested) for the declared period for an approved event and the rights or interests of any other person in or in relation to the land are suspended.

21—Approved event support zones

Support zones may be created for an approved event in accordance with this clause. No permanent buildings may be constructed pursuant to this clause and the Minister must, after the end of the declared period for the approved event, ensure that the public amenity of the approved event support zones is restored.

22—Temporary fencing of land by Minister

This clause deals with fencing for the purposes of an event.

23—Application of *Major Events Act 2013*

This clause allows the regulations to modify the application of the *Major Events Act 2013* in respect of an approved event.

24—Application of certain laws to events and activities

Various laws do not apply during an approved event and an activity carried on by or with the permission of the Minister on the North Adelaide Golf Course will not constitute a nuisance.

25—Application of *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*

Future development on the North Adelaide Golf Course land will be taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed-to-satisfy development for the purposes of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*. The *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* does not, however, apply to or in relation to any works within the North Adelaide Golf Course or an approved event support zone that are certified by the Minister as being necessary or desirable in connection with the conduct of an approved event.

Part 5—Miscellaneous

26—Other actions to give effect to Act etc

This clause provides for the making of alterations to the Planning and Design Code (or other instruments), that are, in the opinion of the Minister, necessary or desirable to give effect to this Act or for the ongoing operation of any facilities on the project site or support zones. The clause also provides for the grant of a statutory authorisation at the request of the Minister if that is, in the opinion of the Minister, necessary or desirable to give effect to this Act, for the ongoing operation of any facilities on the project site or in connection with an approved event (whether on the project site or an approved event support zone).

27—Delegation

This is a delegation power for the Minister.

28—Duties of Registrar-General

The Registrar-General may be required to take certain steps for or in connection with action taken under the Act.

29—Evidentiary provision

This clause provides for facilitation of proof of certain matters by evidentiary certificate of the Minister.

30—Certain fees etc not payable

Fees and charges are not payable to the Adelaide City Council in respect of the exercise of functions under the measure.

31—Regulations

Regulations contemplated by, or that are necessary or desirable for the purposes of, the measure may be made by the Governor.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (16:10): I rise to make a couple of comments on this bill, and initially would like to bemoan the process we have gone through to get to this point. We heard the Deputy Leader of the Opposition rise and criticise the process and bemoan the lack of consultation they were afforded as a part of the development of this bill process but I have to report, as a crossbencher and on behalf of the crossbench, that we were afforded even less.

We saw the Deputy Leader of the Opposition brandishing a copy the bill with some notes on the front, and reported a briefing that was offered at 10 minutes to one, or 10 past one—I cannot quite remember.

An honourable member: It was 10 to.

Mr ELLIS: Well, that was in excess of what we were offered. We have now had this bill presented to us, and I think I can report on behalf of the crossbench that we have all seen it for the first time. We have had this bill presented to us for the first time, 14 pages of it, and now presumably, on account of standing orders being suspended, we will be expected to vote on it one way or the other—after having received it just now. It is a tremendously frustrating process.

This is something we would have liked to be able to take back to our communities and report to them the basis on which we cast our vote, one way or the other. Plainly and simply we will be unable to do so because of the fact that we have not been afforded an explanation both of the need for its imminent passing and of the contents of the bill we have been presented with. It is extraordinarily frustrating: we have not had the briefing, we have not had a discussion with colleagues, we have not had any sort of investigation of the merits of this bill, yet we will be expected to vote on it one way or the other in the not too distant future.

We could tolerate that if it were an isolated incident but, as an estimation, I think this has happened at least half a dozen times over the course of this parliament, where we have had a bill sprung on us with little to no notice and we are expected to make our minds up on it with very little opportunity to consider the pros and cons. I get it that when you have a considerable majority in the parliament it must be extraordinarily tempting to treat this place as an inconvenience and try to bypass it as best you can.

It is a mere formality, the outcome of a vote in this place, and it probably does not matter a great deal which way one person votes or another. It will be 27 or 28 (I cannot quite remember) votes all cast in one direction, which in essence will mean that the bill passes, or does not pass, in accordance with those votes. I understand the frustration and the wont, I suppose, to treat the crossbench and, to a lesser extent, the opposition with disdain and just ram it through and not necessarily worry about whether we have been afforded the opportunity to consider it properly, but it is an important part of the process.

We will be held to account by members of our electorates on the votes that we cast under the expectation that we have had an opportunity to consider how it will impact them and serve their best interests. That is just plainly and simply impossible for us to do right now on this bill, and it is an incredibly frustrating thing.

I think I can speak on behalf of the crossbench—if I cannot, they will stand up and correct me—that we would beg and plead with the government that where this is necessary, for whatever reason they deem fit, to please keep us in the loop. We could have been presented with the opportunity at least to have a look at it this morning, to have a discussion about why it needs to pass this afternoon, and to have a quick question and answer on the content of the bill so that we could attempt to understand what is being enabled here.

We have asked it before and we will ask it again: please keep us in the loop. It is a courtesy, if nothing else, and it is much appreciated by us here when it does happen. To be fair, it happens more often than not. More often than not, we are afforded briefings and offered briefings on bills, from the most trivial to the most impactful. But I would estimate that on half a dozen times throughout the course of this parliament we have suffered this lack of process, where it is sprung on us with little to no notice and we are expected to cast our vote. I would plead with the government to attempt to do better on that front.

Having said all that, based on my reading of the line on the front page of this bill, which is all I have had the chance to read at this stage, I do not necessarily intend to stand in the way of it. I can well see the benefits that LIV Golf coming to Adelaide will have for our state. If it is an imitation or a copy of the benefits that the bringing of footy to the city has had, it will be a welcome thing. The liveliness that has brought to the city and the economic activity that has brought to the surrounding businesses has been a tremendous benefit to our city and has really generated interest and envy around the country for what bringing sporting events to a centralised location can do for a capital city. If this initiative has the same impact as the footy, it will be a wonderful thing.

I can also see the benefit of having a publicly owned world-standard golf course. I do imagine that it will be one of the best ones in the world. There are some pretty impressive challengers for that title. Pebble Beach is a publicly available golf course that has hosted numerous US Opens. Torrey Pines is owned by the City of San Diego, I think, and it hosted two PGA tournaments this year, including Tiger Woods's event. So there are some really good ones. Bethpage Black is a publicly owned golf precinct in the state of New York.

Mr Cowdrey: You forgot the Patawalonga.

Mr ELLIS: The Patawalonga could well be on that list, if it is long enough. There are others. Of course, the home of golf, St Andrews in Scotland, is publicly available. But they all have a similar problem in that when there is a world-standard course that is publicly available, the waiting list for people to attempt to play that course is astronomical. In Scotland, you literally have to enter a ballot to try to get on that course. So while it is publicly available and theoretically available to everyone and anyone, it is a difficult thing to get onto those courses.

Out here behind us now, we have two 18-hole courses, which to my understanding are full for most of the time, and we will be condensing that down, I presume, to 18 holes and half as much golf course. It will become all the more competitive for players to try to get on that course, and there will need to be a system where we can ensure that people who want to play on that course have the ability to do so and there is not an astronomically expensive green fee in line with the demand that the course will drive as a result of being such a high standard.

So there are teething problems that will need to be figured out to ensure that it is actually accessible for everyone, it is affordable for everyone and it is not the same people booking tee times every week to ensure that they can hoard those time slots. It might be a ballot system, it might be something else, but there will be teething problems to ensure that it is truly accessible to everyone and anyone.

The other point, the final point that I would like to make—and this is something I have put in writing to the government—is that I would love to see the state of South Australia seize this opportunity to provide some benefit to regional South Australia as well. I think the wonderful benefit of Gather Round has been in Mount Barker, where we have a new oval, and it has been in the Barossa, where we have a new facility. It has been spreading that benefit across South Australia so that we are all brought along for the ride, so to speak.

This golf course in the middle of the city will be a wonderful asset to South Australia, but I would like to see some of that benefit spread. I have put to the government previously that it would be wonderful to see nine more holes built at Port Hughes to bring that up to an 18-hole golf course. In 2010 or so, Greg Norman, the architect of LIV Golf, the person who brought it to Adelaide initially, designed a course in Port Hughes. The developer started building it in accordance with his design before, unfortunately, going bust in around 2012 and leaving it half finished.

So now we have what I will call—and it might be disputed—a world-standard nine-hole golf course at Port Hughes that is half finished and partly surrounded by vacant land that could host the next nine holes, and there is no meaningful way that we can investigate the completion of that course. There needs to be some assistance. The community club that has taken over the running of that course now does not have the means to ensure its completion, and there is no opportunity, as far as we can see, for the developer that has taken over the residential part of it to invest in the completion of the golf course.

So we need some assistance. I think it would be a tremendous synergy to have Greg Norman, who kickstarted The Dunes Port Hughes and designed the course, who brought LIV Golf to Adelaide, to have both of his projects finished at once—the North Adelaide course and the Port Hughes course. I think it would be a wonderful way to spread the benefit around the state as opposed to locking it in North Adelaide and the city. I think it would be a really impactful tourism drawcard for our region to bring another nine holes, which would make it two full courses with greens. For the first time we could be able to attract people to our region to stay the night, play 18 holes at Wallaroo on Saturday and 18 holes at The Dunes Port Hughes on Sunday before driving home.

I have put it in writing for the government before and received what I would describe as a lukewarm response to ponying up the money. But I would urge them if they are not willing to fund the next nine holes then please assist me and please assist the club in developing a method that we can try to get that completed because it would be a tremendous synergy for Greg Norman, it would be a really wonderful thing for our region and I think it would spread the benefit from the LIV Golf windfall around the state and ensure that we have widespread acceptance of it for the future to come.

Again, just to summarise, we would tremendously appreciate if the government would find the time to consult the crossbench before these things are done. I really congratulate the government on consolidating their golf course in the city and making it a world-standard publicly available golf course, but please can we bring Port Hughes along for the ride and finish that course to its standard to provide for our region.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:21): I rise this afternoon to make a contribution to this bill and indicate that I am also the lead speaker for the opposition in regard to the bill that has been put before us. I suspect that my contribution may be a lengthy one, one that sets through the events that have taken place up until now, that works through some of the broader issues that have been identified in the very short period of time that we have had an opportunity to peruse the bill.

But I think the best place to start in regard to my contribution is about process, and I come making this contribution in the house today in a position that is less informed than what would be ideal, and I am in this position purposefully, not because I wanted to come to this debate less informed than I otherwise should be, but because the government has made sure that those members of the opposition, and more so members of the crossbench, are walking into this place being asked to make decisions, being asked to make contributions, knowing full well that they have brought a bill into this place for the purpose of ramming it through this house in an undemocratic way, in a way that is a clear abuse of process. And they do this for what purpose?

This is the question, because if we set out where the vast majority of parties that sit in this place are positioned in regard to LIV Golf, it is very clear: the government clearly are supportive of LIV Golf, the opposition clearly are supportive of LIV Golf, we have members of the crossbench who have indicated their commitment and their support of LIV Golf. So the question that naturally comes from presupposing that the vast majority of members in this place in fact support LIV Golf is: why in the world would the government do what they are doing today? If their working understanding is that the vast majority of this chamber supports LIV Golf, why would they not come to the opposition, why would they not come to members of the crossbench, and simply say that there is an issue?

Publicly, to this point, if we turn back the clock to the announcement of the Premier earlier in the year with regard to LIV Golf moving to the North Adelaide site, we had a commitment from the Lord Mayor and the Adelaide City Council that they were supportive of LIV Golf. To the best of my knowledge that position has not changed. So why in the world—if there was an issue with timing, knowing that there is goodwill in this chamber in regard to support for LIV Golf—would the government chart the course that they have of introducing this bill today, with no pre-warning for the crossbench in this chamber at least, having put the bill in front of the opposition at 12 past 12 this afternoon? It just does not make any sense.

If there were a legitimate need for this bill to be debated this afternoon, then the government would have come to the opposition prior to today. They would have come to members of the crossbench prior to jamming it into the house at two seconds to noon—and this is a pattern. It is a pattern that those on the government benches have taken in regard to legislation in this place. I am running out of fingers, unfortunately, in terms of the number of bills that have been forced in with zero

or a very small amount of consultation, coming into this chamber with standing orders suspended to pass them through.

I do not begrudge that there are at times sets of circumstances that put themselves in a position where immediacy is at the forefront. There was the bill earlier in the session of parliament around AUKUS, and the site that was involved there, and obviously there was the Whyalla rescue bill. All these pieces of legislation were introduced in this way where there was a clear articulation of need, a clear articulation of why the government was undertaking what it was undertaking. There can be a degree of understanding on both sides of the chamber when that is the case, but it does start to venture into the territory of *The Boy Who Cried Wolf* when we start seeing additional instances of these bills being introduced with no clear understanding or articulation of why the need is now.

It is hard to take a view when you have been given less than a couple of hours to go through a document of several pages that clearly has significant consequences for the state, for the Adelaide City Council for that matter and, more broadly, residents of North Adelaide one would assume, and residents of Adelaide City Council certainly in regard to potential impacts to their ratings base based on revenue shortfalls that may or may not occur off the back of the piece of legislation that has been put before us today. It is hard for us to form a view without actually undertaking consultation with the affected stakeholders.

I certainly have not had a chance to speak with the Adelaide City Council Lord Mayor or any of the associated elected members of that body, I have not had an opportunity to speak to anybody at the North Adelaide Golf Club or to any of the other proprietors or leaseholders of other organisations or council facilities that sit around the North Adelaide Golf Club as it is at the moment, and the opposition certainly has not had an opportunity to speak to any of the North Adelaide or Adelaide residents who may or may not be affected by what is being debated today. The question remains not just on our side. It is very clear that we have not had that opportunity; we have not been provided that opportunity. The question is: has the government?

It was only give or take a couple of weeks ago that we saw pictures on social media of the Premier arm in arm with the Adelaide City Council Lord Mayor at the SDA dinner looking like there were no issues with the relationship whatsoever. I might just read for the benefit of the house the statement that has been made by the Lord Mayor on her social media today in regard to the issue. I quote directly from that post:

Council was deeply disappointed to learn of today's announcement through the media.

The Lord Mayor added, 'It is also worth noting that, as at the time of writing, it appears members of the Legislative Council have not seen the legislation that they are being asked to vote on today.' I pause to note that members of this particular house who are being asked to vote on this piece of legislation today, as evidenced by the contribution made earlier by the member for Narungga, have also not had that opportunity to see the piece of legislation prior to being asked to vote on it—the opposition, of course, only with a couple of hours' notice. I continue to quote:

From day one [of the announcement about LIV Golf moving] to the city, the Lord Mayor [asked that council have a seat at the table so it could] work hand in hand with the State Government to achieve a mutually beneficial arrangement.

After all, Council has managed and invested in the North Adelaide Golf Course for more than 100 years.

...the Council has been negotiating in good faith with State Government [since the announcement] and we understood we had an agreement to move forward together [and to come to]...a decision that not only suited the government but suited the community.

It is unacceptable for the Premier to leave Council out in the cold in the middle of [a negotiation]. I do not agree that our...involvement would drag the process out to make the event unviable.

What is unviable is for the government to intervene [in the way it has with] legislation like a sledgehammer when we are in the middle of [a negotiation].

Just last week, the Lord Mayor attended a briefing where the Premier updated North Adelaide Golf Course staff...

The Premier made no mention of dissatisfaction with negotiations to date or of the process being dragged out by Council.

It is also incredibly disappointing this announcement was made while the Lord Mayor is overseas trying to help secure COP31—the most important conference in our state's history.

A great deal of work and countless staff hours have gone into trying to assist the State Government with its plans.

Council remains committed to the North Adelaide Golf Course remaining publicly owned and operated.

Council will...fight to ensure there is a minimal loss of trees and that any fencing would be temporary and only relate to the staging of the tournament...

Like everyone, we [await the details of the legislation]...but it is impossible to describe this as anything other than a Park Lands takeover.

Those are the comments from the Lord Mayor of Adelaide in regard to what we have before us today: an insinuation by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide that this is bullyboy tactics by the state government trying to get their way in a commercial negotiation. That is scandalous. What we are being asked to do today is scandalous, if that is the case. If that insinuation of bullyboy tactics in the middle of a commercial negotiation is what is occurring before us today, then we have a scandal on our hands in this parliament.

There are further questions in relation to consultation that go beyond what we have seen to this point. Has the Law Society of South Australia been consulted on the legislation that has been brought before us today? Have any of the planning stakeholders been consulted in regard to what is being brought before us today—essentially, legislation that is asking for all existing planning processes, all existing state laws, to be put to the side. Has the member for Adelaide been consulted on this bill? Was she asked her opinion on this bill prior to it reaching this chamber?

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: Does she support it?

Mr COWDREY: And does she support it? Will she support it? Will she support the bill that has been brought into this place?

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, the member for Colton has the floor.

Mr COWDREY: I suspect that the idea to bring this legislation did not dawn on the minister last night, that he had ample opportunity to consult with others to bring this to other parties prior to introducing it to this place. But this has been a premeditated and executed strategy to avoid scrutiny on this bill and the question is: what are they scared of? Do they not want this in the public debate? Do they not want to have a conversation about what this means for the Parklands moving forward?

Troublingly, if you go through this bill, I do not know about others in this place but in my rudimentary and early understanding of the proposal of redevelopment, there had not been any mention of additional Parkland sites being included in that proposal. This is the first that I had heard that John E Brown Park or Park 27A, as it is known, was to be included in this proposal. It is still not clear exactly what areas may or may not be included in the proposal because effectively this bill is asking for unfettered powers for the minister to determine at his discretion, at his will, at a timing of his pleasing, whether he wishes to expand, contract or bring in, bring out new pieces of Parklands to sit within the project site.

It has been alluded to as a frustrating process. I certainly back up those comments that were made by the member for Narungga for a range of different reasons because I think there has been some additional context that has perhaps been provided through the statement that I read out earlier by the Lord Mayor of Adelaide. Working through this document, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, who is much more learned in the legal profession than I, alluded to this bill effectively looking like a lease agreement or a contract.

Perhaps that is the genesis of this, the commercial negotiation, the commercial terms that the government was wanting to reach with the Adelaide City Council; perhaps that is why we are here, that effectively they were not able to reach terms. Usually when a lease agreement or a contract is drawn up it is done so on terms that are mutually beneficial or at the very least agreed to by two parties.

Effectively, what we are being asked to vote for in this place today is a set of terms, a lease agreement, a contract, that is being forced on a party without their knowledge, as it turns out. It is also not clear, given the significant scope that is being provided within the clauses of this bill, exactly what is being agreed to because it can be changed at the discretion and will of the minister.

Far be it for the opposition to be able to provide a considered position in regard to the bill, given the process that we have had to get to this point. Again, we will be asking the government to explain clearly why the need for haste here, given the number of years that are still to transpire, given the comments of the Lord Mayor of the Adelaide City Council, and given the fact that not a single member of the government to this point has raised any concerns publicly, as far as I am aware, that there was any crunch point being reached in terms of the negotiations with the Adelaide City Council.

If I start to work through clause by clause, what is troubling as I go through is the concentration of power that is being potentially provided to the minister in this instance, and the erosion of accountability that comes with both the process that has been undertaken to this point and what is being included in the bill today.

Let's be very clear again that the opposition supports LIV Golf. As has been indicated by members on the crossbench to this point, they support LIV Golf. Again, without fully understanding what we are being asked to vote on, what we are being asked to consider here, potentially at first blush we are being asked to support legislation that grants sweeping executive powers with minimal scrutiny. Watching established legislation being put to the side without any consultation having been undertaken with the vast majority of stakeholders that are being directly impacted is actually quite difficult. It is quite difficult to be put in this position and, again, all for an end that leads to reduced scrutiny and a government that is running from scrutiny as fast as they possibly can.

It is not necessarily that there are members in this house who oppose what is being proposed by way of redevelopment, by way of event, but the way that this has been gone about is scandalous. It goes to the arrogance of this government to waltz in here and lay this down without having spoken to the vast majority of parties involved, both within the deliberative function and at the passage of the bill through this place, and the numerous stakeholders who will be directly and indirectly affected in the South Australian community.

Clauses 5 and 6 in particular, as we walk through the bill, were explained to us very briefly this afternoon. The bill is segmented into five or so sections. The first indicates the project site and, in particular, clauses 5 and 6 define as best as possible the existing area of the golf course, again with the addition of a particular section of Parklands—John E Brown Park—that again, to the best of my knowledge, has garnered no mention in the government's public debate to this point that they would be making a Parklands grab on an additional area not discussed and not provided publicly prior to this bill being introduced into this place today. The definition of that site and the ability for the minister, by looks, to effectively change the site is concerning.

Regarding the cancellation of leases and licences, we do not know what currently exists. The minister, when asked the question in the briefing today, was not able to furnish us with any understanding of how many leases exist on the existing site and who they are. That was not able to be provided, despite the fact that there is a section in the act that specifically deals with that issue. I would have thought the minister perhaps would have at least had a rudimentary idea of how many current leases are involved, how many potential small businesses are going to be affected, and the impact on those lease and licensee holders.

The other question in regard to all of this, as we start to slowly move through some of the initial clauses, is timing. When is the government proposing to take over this site? Again, it is a question that has not been answered by the minister to this point.

In relation to 'Preparation for handover of the site', again a rudimentary first glance of this provision effectively provides the minister the opportunity to at least consult, in this instance, on what he would like to see undertaken on the site prior to handover, but the terms must be specified by the minister. So it is not really clear if the Adelaide City Council will be undertaking a range of remediation activities, all paid for by ratepayers of the Adelaide City Council, if those are the terms that the minister wishes to impose on those ratepayers. It is not clear whether the state government will be

making any contribution to those particular things that he sees as being necessary for preparation of the site prior to handover.

With 'Care and control of the project', again, there are a number of provisions here as we slowly work through. Words in the minister's earlier remarks that stood out to me were 'improved connection for those moving through the Adelaide Parklands site'. Within the powers in this bill, under clause 8, there is certainly the opportunity for roads to be closed, changed, rerouted, moved. Again, something that I think at the very least the government could come clean on is whether it intends to keep War Memorial Drive in its current form and whether there are any plans for War Memorial Drive to look differently from what it does today.

The other issue that stood out to me in the briefing that we received earlier from the minister and his staff was, in particular, a question around the land to the city side of War Memorial Drive. There was a question about the par 3 site, and I believe from my memory again, and I am doing my best to recall, it was the adviser from DPC that provided an answer. But it was a question in relation to the use of what is the existing pitch and par 3 site, or in fact it may have been a reference to the John E Brown Park, which the minister referenced as being an underutilised area of Parklands.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: Have you ever walked through it?

Mr COWDREY: I have actually.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: It is pretty underutilised.

Mr COWDREY: 'Underutilised' was, I thought, an interesting term, in reference to the vast majority of the Parklands. I actually understood that was what we were trying to achieve: underutilisation of the Parklands. But the answer that was provided was that that space would be used for the driving range, potentially. Then we went on to ask other questions, obviously given the nature of the redevelopment, going from, essentially, two 18-hole courses, a 71 par and a 69 par, down to one championship course.

In a later answer the minister said that there was significant land that was not going to be fully utilised through the remainder of the golf course lands. So it does beg the question: if there is existing land on the North Adelaide side of the already golf course developed side of the land, then why would the driving range not be on that side? Again, these are questions that it is hard to even have a considered opinion on without first at least having sat down and spoken to some people or at least being afforded a couple more hours to provide a more sensible series of debates.

Requirements relating to trees are included at clause 13 of the bill before us, which is under part 3—Carrying out the project. Again, it says that, except for those laws set out at clauses 10 and 11, those being the application of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and the application of the PDI Act, all other state government laws will not be applicable to this site unless they are determined by the minister. It is not clear whether the EPA act or some of the other pieces of legislation that oversee developments in South Australia—the litter control act, the Local Government Act and a range of others—will have an impact on this particular proposal.

If we move to trees and clause 13 of the bill, we still have not had an answer in regard to how many trees are going to be removed. However, it is interesting to note that the minister has allowed himself sufficient wiggle room. If we talk about the requirements under existing state legislation in regard to native vegetation, replacement of it and those schemes that exist, this has simply been whittled down to one sentence. Clause 13 provides:

The Minister must ensure that for every tree that is removed in the course—

I hope that 'in the course' also relates to the rest of the land, not specifically the golf course itself. I assume that also applies to any other development on the land that has been designated as the project site. Although, again, it does not appear to be overly clear—

...not less than 3 new trees (or seedlings for not less than 3 new trees) are planted within the project site and support zones.

We will get to that in a moment. There is sufficient scope for the minister to potentially take down numbers of mature trees and replace them with seedlings. Again, if we had some further context in regard to at least a ballpark figure of what the minister is proposing, it would give us more opportunity

to provide a sensible response in regard to the proposal. But, alas, no such luck in regard to that issue. If we move on to clause 14—Support zones, it provides:

- (1) The support zones are the areas of land indicated, from time to time, as support zones in a plan or plans to be deposited...identified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette...

In those support zones can be a range of functions to support the redevelopment. Again, the ask was made this morning as to what those particular pieces of land may relate to. The response still baffles me slightly, in that the answer given was again that this new piece of Parklands that had not been discussed before, the name of which I will find in a second, would be a potential spot for one of the support zones to go, noting that that is already in the project site. So why would you need an additional clause in terms of capturing additional Parklands, let's assume, for support and storage, for utilisation of utilities, etc., in regard to the developments?

In terms of the operation of the golf course—and again, this is where things start to get probably more interesting from the perspective of Adelaide City Council rate payers and the Adelaide City Council itself—the council is being asked, effectively, to enter some sort of negotiations post the project being undertaken to determine a structure for what the operation of the golf course would look like moving forward. That is, essentially, what was described to us, but not that that needed to happen. The government could retain control and operation of the golf course for perpetuity, should it wish.

The key operative word in the legislation is 'if': 'if' the government wants, 'if' the minister wants. So we would like to understand what the minister's intentions actually are, and if the minister's intention is not to keep this land, this golf course, in government hands moving forward, then why include it in this legislation? Why not simply set out that the land and the operation of the golf course would be returned to the Adelaide City Council at the conclusion of said project being undertaken? If there was no intent for the government to keep that land in perpetuity, why even include it in this bill?

There are more questions than answers that come from what is being proposed today. It certainly is not a positive reflection on the processes of this house to be asked to come here today, with little to no notice, to debate a bill of such significance that potentially jeopardises a revenue source for the Adelaide City Council—and, again, potentially effects ratepayers bills through that council—without any pre knowledge, without any understanding, without any clear justification from the minister in terms of the urgency.

It is a poor, poor reflection on a government when it simply resorts to numbers, to deal making, to pass legislation, to avoid scrutiny, and to inflict their will on the people while circumventing true democratic process.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (16:57): Well, here we go again—another Parklands pillage from the Malinauskas Labor government, another arrogant minister from the Malinauskas Labor government coming into this place trying to introduce extraordinary legislation to seize even more of Adelaide's Parklands, another broken promise from the Malinauskas Labor government that promised us, only a few years ago, that it would protect Adelaide's unique Parklands.

They have absolutely trashed that promise ever since, just like they are seeking to trash parliamentary procedure today by expecting us to pass this legislation after only seeing it for a couple of hours, just like they are trying to trash the Adelaide Parklands at every available opportunity.

We have seen this film before—and you did not like the ending, you did not like the ending last time. It was two years ago that very similar legislation got introduced here when Malinauskas Labor last tried this trick, trying to seize a bit of the Adelaide Parklands and dispel all the rules, allowing them to do whatever they wanted with a patch of Parklands.

That was at Park 21 West, one of the most biodiverse areas of the entire Adelaide Parklands. They tried to do that with no consultation, no consultation with groups that had cared for the Parklands like Bush For Life, no consultation with First Nations people, no consultation with the Adelaide Parklands Authority, no consultation with Adelaide City Council.

Is it starting to sound familiar? Here we are again, the exact same situation. It was only stopped last time because of incredible public backlash to their latest Parklands land grab after

promising they would protect Adelaide's unique Parklands. Here we are, a couple of years down the track, trying to do the exact same thing in the exact same way, without any consultation. We are seemingly going out of our way—

The Hon. N.D. Champion: It's a golf course becoming a golf course.

Mr BATTY: The minister interjects that this is a golf course becoming a golf course. I think he is right that most fair-minded people would not mind if this was simply a bit of green open public Parklands currently operating as a golf course remaining as a bit of green open public Parklands operating as an even better golf course, but that is not what this piece of legislation seeks to do. It is totally lost on me why, if we want to achieve that aim, we need to pass this bill today in record time without any consultation.

It is totally lost on me today why we need to give the minister unfettered power not only to that patch of Parklands, the golf course, but to any other bit of Parklands he wants. It is not just a golf course becoming a golf course. If the minister believes that, he has not even read his own bill that he is introducing into this place. Once again, it is Malinauskas Labor trying to engage in a Parklands land grab, treating the Parklands like their own personal land bank, giving themselves extraordinary power instead of going through proper processes to get LIV Golf into the city, something we all want, something we all support.

We support LIV Golf. We support LIV Golf in the city. We do not need this bill to make it happen, because what you are trying to do is not just get LIV Golf into the city but do it in your typical fashion and try to also kill a bit of Parklands along the way. We have seen the film before. Why has there been no consultation? Why come in here with a bit of secret legislation to seize more Parklands and not tell anyone about it?

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Secret? You're holding it.

Mr BATTY: I am holding it as of two hours ago. Has the Lord Mayor seen it? This is totally secret to the Adelaide City Council. There is no secret about that because the Lord Mayor, from 16,000 kilometres away, has taken to Twitter to tell us that she has not seen it. It is a ridiculous process that we are in here. The only reason for the urgency, as far as we can tell, is to try to get this done while the Lord Mayor is away. Why are you afraid of the Lord Mayor, applying a bit of scrutiny and having this go through the proper process, engaging with Adelaide City Council like the Lord Mayor tells us via her social media missives she has been doing in good faith over this time?

No, instead we have to come in here: the Malinauskas Labor government, dictator style, grabbing all the power, doing whatever they want, not consulting with anyone and taking Parklands along the way. That is all this bill seeks to do. It is an extraordinary land grab from a government that constantly treat the Adelaide Parklands as their own personal land bank. Last time, it was Park 21 West in the South Parklands. This time, we learn from clause 5 in this bill that it is a parcel of Parklands currently operating as the North Adelaide Golf Course. That, of course, is Park 1 of the Adelaide Parklands, currently operating as the North Adelaide Golf Course and also known as Possum Park.

But it is not just that. Again, it is a bit disingenuous for the minister to be constantly interjecting that it is just a golf course turning into a golf course, because then we move on to the next section: you are also taking the area known as John E Brown Park or Park 27A. It has not been explained to us why, or why we need to pass this extraordinary legislation effectively to vest this in the minister and suspend the law of the land at that particular piece of Parklands. There are certain road reserves surrounding it as well, and here is the kicker: the minister can also determine any other section of the Parklands that is necessary or desirable to include in the project site.

So if the minister over here desires any more Parklands, what this legislation says is that he can go and take it, and we know they have a habit of taking Parklands. It is in their DNA. After promising that they would protect Adelaide's unique Parklands, what we have here is a minister walking into parliament trying to get us to legislate that he can have any bit of Parklands he desires. It is ridiculous for him to keep saying that this is just a golf course turning into a golf course. We are more than happy with a golf course turning into a golf course. We are more than happy to see LIV Golf

in the city. What we are not happy about is the minister coming in here with legislation we have not seen, trying to take every single bit of Parklands that he so desires. It is outrageous.

Along the way there will be no rules applied, no rules applied to the minister as well, because they just get in the way, don't they? They get in way of your Parklands land grabs because, if we look at clause 12, he makes it very clear that no assessment, decision, consent, approval, authorisation, certificate, licence, permit or permission is required under the law of the state for the minister's newly seized bit of Parklands, wherever he may desire. Furthermore, no consultation, inquiry, notification or other process or procedural step is required under any bit of Parklands now that the minister so desires.

What else are we excluding? He says there will be no fence. If we go to clause 18, nothing in here prevents the erection of fencing or other barriers in relation to particular areas forming part of the North Adelaide Golf Course, if the minister desires it. What else are we excluding? Why not exclude the Environment Protection Act as well for any bit of Parklands where the minister so desires? Why not exclude any regulations or by-laws under the Local Government Act for any bit of Parklands that the minister so desires? Why not exclude the local nuisance act while we are at it, the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act, for any bit of Parklands that the minister so desires?

Do not come in here and tell us this is a golf course in the Parklands turning into a golf course in the Parklands. What it is is seizing any bit of the Parklands that the minister so desires. We can have LIV Golf in the city without this legislation, and that is the really sad bit about what we are doing today. It does not have to be this way.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BATTY: It does not have to be this way. I thought you might have learnt your lesson. You might have learnt your lesson, but here you are. Because we can have the golf, we can have the golf in the city; that is something I support, that is something you support, it is something we all support. But it is totally unclear to me why we need this bill to achieve that end and it is certainly unclear to me why we need to give you any bit of power you want over any bit of Parklands. It is totally unclear why the government would come in here with a sledgehammer, putting a sledgehammer right through the negotiations that Adelaide City Council was entering into in good faith with no consultation with any relevant party. What a nuisance. But it does not matter because the nuisance act does not apply to the Minister for Planning anymore in any bit of Parklands that he so desires.

So, I think this is a very sorry state of affairs we are in. We have an arrogant government that does what it wants, that treats this parliament like some sort of inconvenient rubber stamp, and it is a really big contrast that we have seen in parliament today when it comes to priorities. It is also a really big contrast you can see in this parliament today when it comes to Parklands policies. On the one hand you have had the Leader of the Opposition outlining in his budget reply speech today, Liberal policy about protecting the Parklands, talking about our plans to World Heritage List the Adelaide Parklands, not if—we will probably trying to exclude that as well, won't we, if the Minister for Planning can get his hands on it?

We have had the Leader of Opposition talking about our plans to World Heritage List the Adelaide Parklands. We have had the Leader of the Opposition in his budget reply speech today talking about our plans to return more green space to the Adelaide Parklands, and what do we have in contrast? We have a Labor government who walks in here, suspends standing orders to introduce extraordinary legislation that vests in the minister any bit of Parklands he so desires and says that once he has it, once he has his hands on it, none of the normal rules apply. The law of the land does not apply. They are above the law for any bit of Parklands that the minister wants to seek.

I think this is a very, very sorry state of affairs. It did not have to be this way. Most, if not all, people in this place support LIV Golf, support LIV Golf being in the city. What we do not support is giving you the entire Adelaide Parklands. What we do not support is you trashing parliamentary procedure just like you have trashed your own Parklands promises.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (17:09): I am not going to repeat what other members have said, but I will use this opportunity to do what I do at every opportunity, and that is to speak up for

women who are oppressed and women who are victims of domestic violence, whether that be coercive control or discrimination. We need to look at who the government is in business with on this project—Saudi Arabia.

We all know that women face extreme and often outrageous forms of discrimination in Saudi Arabia, and there are some striking examples of the male guardianship system where women are treated as legal minors. They need permission from a male guardian—whether that be a father, a brother, a husband or even a son—for travel abroad, marriage, leaving prison or accessing some healthcare services. It is government policy and law in Saudi Arabia, and until 2018 women were banned from driving—the only country in the world where that was the case.

We know that there is punishment for activism. Women's rights activists pushed for reform, such as the right to drive, and were arrested, imprisoned and allegedly tortured. Even women who successfully campaigned for the right to drive are punished today. They are imprisoned and punished today for the activism that actually delivered change in Saudi Arabia.

There are restrictions on dress and public behaviour. Women are required to wear the abaya in public, which is a full-length cloak, and headscarf. The muttawa—religious police—patrol streets and detain women for not dressing modestly enough or for interacting with men who are not their relatives. There is segregation in public places.

Public life has been highly gender-segregated in Saudi Arabia for many, many years. There are separate entrances for men and women in restaurants and public buildings. We saw that in South Africa for white and coloured people—and the whole world turned against South Africa; they identified that discrimination of race was wrong—but for some reason the world is ignoring discrimination against women in many other countries of the world. This is no different. You do not choose what race you are born, you do not choose what sex you are born, yet the whole world tackled South Africa and they won, yet the world is still doing business with Saudi Arabia.

Of course, there are limited roles in public-facing jobs and in the media. There is employment discrimination, and many women are barred from certain professions. In some sectors, women are not allowed to work without male permission or presence. Until recently, women could not serve as judges or hold high-ranking positions in many public offices.

Of course, there is a lack of legal protections for women. Domestic violence was not recognised until 12 years ago. Until 12 years ago, domestic violence was not a crime in Saudi Arabia. However, the testimony of a woman in court is only worth half that of a man in certain legal cases. There is no such thing as 'he said' or 'she said' in Saudi Arabia; it is what 'he said' and 'she said' and 'she said'. You need to throw in one extra woman in order to turn the balance around—two against one—in order for there to be any consideration of the evidence that is being presented by those women if they are giving evidence about any situation in Saudi Arabia. It is usually about the treatment of women when this is most damaging.

Women face immense difficulty in proving rape and may be charged with adultery if they cannot produce four male witnesses who saw them being raped—a near-impossible standard—and if they cannot do that they are then charged with adultery. It is an extraordinary situation that this still happens in 2025. Why do we continue to see governments enter into business arrangements and completely ignore this? I just wonder whether there was a conversation with the Premier or any of his advisers about that, using that opportunity to disapprove of those practices. It was a perfect opportunity to speak up for women and raise women's rights in Saudi Arabia when signing this contract.

Of course, in marriage and divorce laws, girls as young as 10 have been married off and despite the fact that they claim this has been restricted in recent years, it still happens. There is a blind eye that is turned. Women seeking a divorce face many more legal and financial hurdles than men—and do not forget, women do not control the finances of the family. They do not have access to the finances of the family, so where are they going to get the financial resources to initiate a divorce of their own? Fathers nearly always receive automatic custody of children over a certain age.

There is an extraordinary difference in the way women are treated in the civilised world, in countries that are run by democracies and in countries that have recognised that old cultural practices

of many years ago, when women in the West were expected to give up their jobs when they got married, were wrong. We have all realised how wrong that was. Unfortunately, Saudi Arabia still does not see any of the faults in the way they treat women in their country.

Although we are debating a bill that will excise a large part of the North Adelaide Parklands in a manner that has severely restricted the ability of the public and other members of parliament who are not members of the government to examine the bill, understand the bill and actually question the bill as to whether the bill is appropriate, we know the parliamentary process often delivers amendments to what the government first puts forward in this place. That is why the convention has been, through the history of the Westminster system, that new bills sit on the table before they are debated—but not with the large majority and the arrogance with which that majority is being used by the Malinauskas government.

This is a warning of what will come if the Malinauskas government is returned without losing a seat, or even gaining seats, and how much more arrogant they will be in their second term of government in those circumstances. They are behaving like they want to be an emperor or a king, much as Saudi Arabia is ruled by a king. The contempt for the parliamentary system that we have seen from this government is just extraordinary, and that is what happens when you have governments with large majorities. The number of times that the Premier is not in this place when there is a division, even though the Premier has not sought a pair, shows complete disrespect and disregard, again, for the parliamentary process.

I know that my constituents would not be happy and that groups like Focus and others that are very interested in the Parklands in particular would not be happy. The Adelaide Park Lands Association is an organisation that has been around longer than most of the people in this place have been alive, and it has survived government after government, personality after personality and mayor after mayor to protect that asset that was delivered through the foresight of Colonel Light nearly 200 years ago.

I think men in this place, in particular, need to use every opportunity to call out discrimination and violence against women, and remind everybody that we still have a long way to go in fixing that issue not just here in Australia but around the world.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:19): I rise to address this second reading debate that we are having now a little more than an hour on from having just indicated to the house all the reasons why the opposition opposed the motion to suspend. I will not reflect on that vote of the chamber, but here we are having a second reading debate, therefore, not much the wiser than what a few hours has afforded.

What has emerged since I was last on my feet in relation to this bill is that the Lord Mayor, or perhaps the Acting Lord Mayor on behalf of the Lord Mayor—it is not abundantly clear to me—at or about precisely the time I was on my feet explaining the reasons why the Liberal opposition opposed the suspension of standing orders, opposed the pushing through all stages of the bill immediately this afternoon, just as I was speaking about that, a statement that is attributed to the Lord Mayor of Adelaide and published at about a quarter to four this afternoon, and which might have emanated from council, has made it very clear in a way that I was not quite fully able to, because I did not know, that the bill, in fact, and I knew this much, is news to the council. The council, therefore, does not have a view about the bill, for obvious reasons.

What the statement that I understand my colleague, the shadow minister, the member for Colton, has read into the *Hansard* that has been published by or on behalf of the Lord Mayor, makes clear is that there has been active engagement and that has now been, as it were, interrupted or punctuated by this bit of legislation that the house has now been moved to debate as this matter of unusual urgency.

I encourage those who are interested in the debate to read and to take on board the view that would appear to be a view expressed on behalf of the Adelaide City Council. One can be left in no doubt from that statement that the council has a keen interest in being involved in the process. Indeed, the statement refers to the council's management and investment in the golf course for more than 100 years. That is the assertion in the statement, as well as a clear assertion in the statement

that, in circumstances, with the announcement of the LIV Golf moving to the city, the council is interested to be a participant in that process.

Clearly, those matters will out over the course of the time ahead. It is what it is. But if it is the Lord Mayor making this statement, then I have to hand it to the Lord Mayor, because it would appear that if she is, as I understand, in Europe presently, then she has managed to issue this statement at or about shortly after 8 o'clock this morning local time so that it can reach us in the course of this debate. Indeed, if it is issued by the Acting Lord Mayor on behalf of the Lord Mayor, then much the same might be said to say how quickly the councillors have been able to express a view about where they find themselves. I think it is regrettable all the more that there is not just in the ordinary course an opportunity for that view to be expressed beyond this sort of extraordinary urgency that the government has decided this bill merits, although without any more particular reasons being provided.

In terms of the ordinary course, I just refer specifically to clause 10 in the bill, and another of the relatively new processes of this place that has followed on the establishment of the Voice in South Australia. I understand that in a way confirmatory of the way that the standing orders ordinarily operate, the practice of the parliament—in accordance with our new sessional orders and the act—is that once a bill is introduced, then the Clerk, or a member of staff on behalf of the Clerk, will write to the Voice the following day and give the notice that that is part of the business of the house, so that the Voice is apprised of it. According to the processes available, the Voice is able then to determine what it might do about legislation that is before the house.

Now, in circumstances of the suspension of standing orders in order to move through more quickly than that, then that function is sort of rendered impractical, not that we have seen the Voice exercise its statutory capacity to come into this place to participate in debate. But it certainly serves as ordinarily an opportunity for that to be picked up and commented upon, particularly in circumstances where it might otherwise not be the subject of specific consultation.

That might be a question for the government in the course of the committee processes as to whether or not, unlike the Adelaide City Council, the government, perhaps knowing that it might be moving this through the house very, very quickly, sought a view from the Voice about clause 10. This is in circumstances where we are making specific provision about this chunk of the Parklands that the golf courses occupy, largely, with the bill going out of its way to stipulate that the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 applies in relation to the land and, in particular, insofar as it relates to the carrying out of the redevelopment works that are to be contemplated in terms of the improvement of the golf course that might be anticipated to follow on the passage of the bill.

There are just two key statutory and governmental participants that one might ordinarily be thought to be not only entitled to express a view about the legislation, let alone the subject of it, but also have the opportunity to consider what is being proposed. I can only assume, to give the government its due, because this bill really does resemble more of a sort of heads of terms of agreement as much as it resembles ordinary legislation, the sorts of terms where one party is being told what is going to happen by the other party. I can only presume that much of the content of the bill might resemble the matters that have been the subject of some negotiation over the journey, especially given what we have seen from the Adelaide City Council in terms of the Lord Mayor or the Acting Lord Mayor's communication just now.

If we are here sort of reading the play, then perhaps we can say there has been some negotiation. Some of the substance of what is in the bill might not be coming as a complete surprise to the Adelaide City Council, if not other stakeholders, but legislation it is out of the blue nonetheless.

As others who have participated in this second reading debate so far have already traversed—and I might say, I think the only contributors to the debate, other than the minister, have been those of us on this side of the chamber doing our best, perhaps with the least amount of notice, to get to grips with it and then make some contribution to the elucidation of what is going on—it would be interesting to hear from members on the government side, who presumably have had more time than the rest of us, more notice, more explanation, the opportunity to debate it within their own party room and so on and so forth, to explain to the house how this has come to be and why the house

should support it. But we have not had the benefit really of any of that kind of contribution from government members, at least so far.

I would be interested, for example—and please jump in to correct me if I have missed some aspect of the debate; I have not been here for the entirety of it—to hear what the member for Adelaide might have to say to contribute to the debate, just as I would like to hear from many other members of the government about how we have got here and how it is going to impact local communities, stakeholders and so forth.

With the limited amount of time that is available to me for the purposes of my contribution, I just refer to some aspects of the bill that I would flag some curiosity in. I think the member for Colton, the shadow minister, has already flagged an interest in the number of such leases and licences that might be affected by clause 6 of the bill, which provides for the cancellation of all leases and licences that are held in relation to the project site. The provisions might be there, but if they are I have not found them, in relation to compensation for any such lease or licence holder that might be affected detrimentally as a result of that. It would be interesting to know what that clause is really directed to achieving and the scope that it is anticipated to cover.

There are interesting matters in relation to the handover of the project site and the vesting of care and control of the project site that are the subject of the next couple of clauses. I have flagged an interest within part 3 of the bill and an interest in how clause 10 came about, and that is the application of the Aboriginal Heritage Act and what appears, on the face of it, to be the inability in the usual course for the house's processes of notification to be enacted.

There are a number of deemed to satisfy provisions, including the deemed to satisfy provision that applies to all development proposed to be undertaken, for the purposes of the project, the subject of clause 11(2). That and the processes within it are a subject of curiosity. The minister's capacity to make provision for the vesting of project land, structures or property at clause 16 is a matter of interest as well.

In terms of the provisions for the operation of the golf course—because I have heard it by way of interjection in the course of the debate—the opposition has been told that it really should not cavil with this too much because it is a bill to render a golf course a golf course. It would be interesting to have on the record the way in which that is going to work, including pursuant to clause 18.

As we know, for the time being the council advertises with some pride, I think, the relatively modest price of access to the three courses. The par 3 course costs in the order of \$20 a round, and somewhat less for concession holders. The North Course costs as little as \$21.50 to get a round, as I understand it, and the South Course costs between about \$27.50 and \$46.50. The provisions the subject of the bill certainly do not address that question of practical access, cost of access and so on.

The balance of clause 18 also goes to a matter that I expect will be the subject of pretty keen public interest, and that is the erection of fencing or other barriers. In that regard, I flag that there appears to me to be nothing standing in the way of the erecting of a more permanent fence if the minister forms the requisite view as to its necessity. So I flag that particular matter, as well as the general public interest in that area of the Parklands remaining as fully accessible and, frankly, beautiful in its amenity for as much accessibility for public enjoyment as is presently the case. I think reference has been made to the exclusion of laws that are found at clause 24.

If that sort of walk-through is some indication of a starting point in terms of some familiarity with the bill, I hope it also provides an indication of just how wideranging and perhaps consequential the bill is and why it merits some scrutiny rather than undue haste in its passage.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (17:39): I rise to speak on this North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill 2025. It is one which, as has already been articulated in some of the contributions, we have not had a lot of time to digest, to fully understand or to ascertain the ramifications of this bill passing this house.

It is fascinating, and I am always amazed, at how much of a more than passing interest people from my electorate have in what goes on in this place. Often in a non-sitting week when I am around the electorate—and I am sure the next time I am lucky enough to be back home, over the

best side of the gulf, the Spencer Gulf, of course—people will be asking me, 'What was high on the government's priority list, what were the hard hitting things you were debating in the house this week?' People are honestly interested in it.

Sometimes I could reflect on a health bill or an infrastructure project or some of the important hard hitting things that the people in my electorate, if not necessarily having a first hand interest in, would understand would be a priority of the government. If I were to say to them, 'Actually, we were debating a bill on the North Adelaide public golf course,' I think it would probably say it all as to what, unfortunately, we are starting to see are the priorities of the government.

When I am back in my electorate on the weekend I will be up visiting and talking to farmers who are suffering from some of the most horrendous drought conditions they have faced for generations. We could be here debating that sort of a bill, to actually be proactive in looking at what is really hurting communities, especially in regional areas, but no—we are debating the North Adelaide public golf course bill.

It is not just that, it is not just a bill that we have got to at the bottom of a long list of different pieces of legislation; it is a bill that, at the start of the day, we did not even know about. It is a bill that lunchtime today was the first time we actually got to have a look at it, a bill that we have only just started to unpack in terms of what its ramifications are just in the last little while.

I am amazed that we can be asked to stop all other proceedings. The Appropriation Bill is what is on the top of the agenda for parliament at the moment. We had to suspend standing orders and we had to go over and above the Appropriation Bill. That should be a priority. We have to have the Appropriation Bill done before we can go into the estimates process at the end of the week; the Appropriation Bill, the budget, the major bill that is what the whole operations of government hinges on. No; that is secondary to the North Adelaide Golf Course Bill.

It is amazing, amazing that that is a priority to stop everything else. It is not the scenario that we saw with the challenging situation with Whyalla, not something like the major state and national economic challenges that have been faced that you stop everything else for; no, it is golf in North Adelaide. Why today? Even when that briefing—which we got right before we started debating this bill—was given to us, the question really was why? Why is it being pushed through today? Why the urgency? The explanations that were given were, 'Well, you know, we have to have this locked in by 2028, so it's gotta happen, it's gotta happen now.'

As I reflect on what I will be trying to tell my constituents about the priorities, I also come at this bill with a mind for what it means for local government, as the shadow minister for local government. There has already been some discussion about what the impact of this is with the City of Adelaide council. Without a clear reason as to why we are discussing and debating this bill at the moment, it makes me reflect on exactly what has led up to the point where the government have decided it is necessary to legislate their ability to hold an event in the North Adelaide Parklands.

Did they get to the scenario through negotiations with the City of Adelaide where they thought that they could not actually get to a point of agreement? I do not know. I do not know why we are debating a bill that, on the face of it, in flicking through it, looks more like a contractual agreement. It looks more like a lease agreement than anything else, an agreement between two parties that you get to after negotiations. Instead it is coming in over the top and saying, 'This is the way it's going to be. We know best.'

Throughout this document, there are a whole bunch of references to the City of Adelaide. The speakers before me have already articulated some of the immediate responses from some of the representatives of the City of Adelaide about exactly what they think of this bill being lobbed onto their responsibilities, and responsibilities absolutely they are. Look at clause 7. It talks about the minister designating a handover day:

- (1) The Minister must, before designating a handover day for the purposes of this Act, undertake consultation (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) with the Adelaide City Council in relation to the handover of the project site.

On face value, that is the height of disrespect. It sets no framework at all as to what that consultation is going to look like. It is whatever the minister thinks is fit, whatever they want. Is that real

consultation? It is whatever the minister thinks fit. Not just that, after that consultation that the minister thinks fit with the Adelaide City Council:

- (2) The Adelaide City Council must, on or before the handover day, vacate and handover possession and control of the project site (and all facilities situated on the project site) to the Minister, in accordance with any directions of the Minister.

So the minister can say what sort of consultation they want. The minister can set whatever condition and whatever direction they want for the handover of this land. This is not a good faith negotiation of a contract or a lease: it is a takeover. It is a hostile takeover. For this to be the basis of a priority of the government, to rush a piece of legislation in, I think says it all. We go on and look at some of the other impacts on the Adelaide City Council:

- (3) A direction of the Minister under subsection (2) may include, without limitation, requirements for any of the following to occur before the handover day (or any later date approved by the Minister)...

So whatever the minister says goes, once again, and that includes tasks to be undertaken and completed by the Adelaide City Council in relation to the project site or any operations on the project site. This piece of legislation says not just that the minister has the power to take that land, take control of that land and that project site, at any time they want with only the consultation that they think fit but that they also can make the Adelaide City Council perform tasks to be undertaken and completed in relation to the project site or any operations on the project site. It includes:

- (c) the handover (on such terms as may be specified by the Minister) of any personal property the Minister thinks necessary or desirable—

the desires or the whim of the minister—

in connection with the project or with the ongoing care, control and management of the project site or facilities on the project site.

What is the project site? We will cover that when we ask questions around the definitions and the like, but from clause 5 we know that it is the area that was, immediately before the commencement of this act, operating as the North Adelaide Golf Course—that is a defined footprint—and the area known as John E Brown Park, Park 27A. We know the footprint of that piece of land. It was described in some of the interactions on this bit as an underutilised or unutilised area of the Parklands. Certain road reserve areas, etc., are included. But then it states:

- (b) if, after the commencement of this section, the Minister determines that it is necessary or desirable—

there is that word again—

to include additional areas of land in the project site or to remove any areas of land from the project site—

well, I do not think that would happen; I think if it is desirable for them to add more in, it will—

is the area or areas of land delineated in a plan or plans to be deposited in the GRO and identified by the Minister by notice in the Gazette for the purposes of this paragraph.

So this bit of wording here basically says this is the project site footprint, or anything else that the minister may desire. It is pretty outrageous overreach from a government that has their priorities as golf in North Adelaide over the top of the debate we could have around the budget.

So it is any bit of land that the minister desires without any real need for consultation over and above what they think fit and, not just that, it is anything that the minister wants the Adelaide City Council to undertake or complete in relation to the project site or any operations on the project site on that footprint at all, whether that is the existing footprint that is in the legislation or whatever the minister desires.

What are the ramifications? We have set out that indeed there is a fair bit of obligation on the Adelaide City Council and there is a fair bit of power well and truly resting with the minister. The bill states:

If the Adelaide City Council fails to comply with the direction of the Minister under subsection (2), the Minister may take any action required under the direction, or necessary for the direction to be carried out, as if the Minister were the Adelaide City Council (including action in relation to any person or any property of a third party).

So, if the minister gives a direction, however outlandish that is, to do with the project site, which is whatever they desire, and it is not done, they can then act as the Adelaide City Council. It is sounding more and more like a dictatorship than any sort of collaboration around a contractual lease agreement. This is what we are being asked to debate and the government wants agreement on.

The Adelaide City Council have been boxed into a corner with this. They have no sort of capacity to be able to negotiate. They have no powers at all because if they fail to comply with the direction of the minister, those powers are going to be superseded and taken by the minister. Not just that, but here is another little kicker in clause 9:

(1) The Minister—

(a) must ensure that Adelaide City Council are (whether before or after the commencement of this Act) given an opportunity to provide the Minister with a statement outlining the matters relating to the project that the Council would like to be consulted on—

what a great privilege for the Adelaide City Council to have at least an opportunity to provide the minister with a statement outlining the matters relating to the project they would like to be consulted on. It does not say they will be consulted. These are things that they may want to be consulted on. The clause continues:

(b) having regard to the statement provided by the Council, must determine a consultation protocol—

Yes, that is alright, a bit of structure—

(containing such requirements as the Minister thinks fit)—

once again, these are optional little feelgood statements within a piece of legislation, but the reality is the minister can just decide to supersede, override and wield their power.

Now this sort of structure within a piece of legislation, if it was an emergency situation, if it was a situation where there was a significant economic risk to the state, like I said, if we were talking about some of the debate which was had around the Whyalla Steelworks piece of legislation, you could start to think maybe this is a necessary measure. But we are talking about Parklands in North Adelaide that the government wants to have a North Adelaide public golf course on. These are absolutely extraordinary powers.

A minister has not just the power to declare at any time that they want to take a piece of land over and above what the footprint already is, but they can decide what level of consultation, if any, they think is fit. They give the privilege for the Adelaide City Council to at least have an opportunity to provide the minister with a statement, and then the minister can do with that what they like. They can put it straight in the shredder with all the powers that the minister may hold in their hands.

At the very same time that the debate has been had in the other place around the Biodiversity Bill, I find clause 13 fascinating. This is 'Requirements relating to trees', which provides that:

The Minister must ensure that for every tree that is removed in the course of undertaking the project not less than 3 new trees (or seedlings for not less than 3 new trees) are planted within the project site and support zones.

The area in North Adelaide we are debating, or certainly the footprint within the designated project site—but also whatever the whim of the minister might be if they want to expand the project site—there is a bunch of trees that are through there, and a lot of them are well-established, big, substantial trees. If a tree is removed in the course of undertaking the project, it is quite alright to just plant three little trees to make up for it, three seedlings, somewhere else that is suitable.

As a regional member who is constantly hearing from their constituents about the challenges of landowners conforming with the Native Vegetation Act, and now what the government is pushing through with the Biodiversity Act, I constantly hear frustrations from landowners/farmers—people who are managing their land in a very effective and sustainable way—and how there is a frustration that, even if they were to seemingly look sideways at an established tree on their property, let alone think about removing it, then the full weight of the law would bear down on them.

For single trees in a paddock that have grown up through a stone heap that may be in the middle of it, there is an obligation on them if they were to dare remove the tree. If we were to give them the opportunity to take out an established tree and then plant three seedlings wherever they

like, well that would be fantastic. I reckon every single landowner out there at the moment would take up that opportunity. I have planted thousands more trees than I will ever take out, and most landowners in regional South Australia are exactly the same.

This requirement, this 'do as we say you will have to do, not as we are actually doing', that for every tree that you replace you only have to plant 'seedlings for not less than 3 new trees' is just another arrogant slap in the face from this arrogant government who have as their priority things like the North Adelaide Golf Course when regional communities, in particular, are going through some of the most challenging times, not just with drought. Also, to have support for investment in infrastructure from government is necessary for those communities to be sustainable into the future. They would be crying out for any sort of financial attention or investment from the government, and those communities would be contributing just as much as a LIV Golf tournament.

So as I start to unpack this bill that we are being asked to consider in due haste with no lead-in time, I reflect not just on what this means to the relationship of the government with the Adelaide City Council, not just how much they are willing to brush off what the Adelaide City Council might think, but also what people in my community would be thinking when this is a priority for a government that seems to be more worried about the fluff and bubble of this sort of thing rather than the reality of the economic challenges that are being faced in their regional community, and the need for there to be health infrastructure and ongoing investment in those communities to make sure that they are sustainable well into the future.

Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:30.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before we kick off the final session of the day's play, I would like to welcome to parliament some guests we have in the gallery tonight. They are members of the West Torrens Historical Society and they are the guests of the member for Colton. Thank you very much for coming to parliament. I hope that the member for Colton has shown you a good time and that you have had a good function and enjoy what you get to see here as democracy at work.

Bills

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (19:30): I am not an avid golfer but I thought I would make a contribution to demonstrate the little bit of frustration that I and the opposition have with the late briefing today. I feel that the state government have played roughshod not only over the process here in the parliament but also over the Adelaide City Council. What we have seen today is that while the Lord Mayor is away, the government will play and this bill has been rushed into the house.

When listening to the brief, my attention was sparked. Obviously, I have played golf at North Adelaide and understand the intricacies of what remodelling a golf course is all about. My son lives on a golf course in the US and I have watched them remodel that course. My future son-in-law is a very avid golfer at Royal Sydney and I also watched that golf course be remodelled. It did take a long time and it did take a lot of money.

What we heard today in the briefing was that the Adelaide City Council will basically lose the rights to the golf course at North Adelaide. Being a former primary producer, someone who has developed a lot of country over my life, particularly with family farms and particularly with native vegetation, it was something that really did grab my attention.

I wanted to bring to the chamber's attention that the removal of vegetation, whether it be native vegetation or introduced species, always raises eyebrows for the authorities to be the authoritarian over those landowners or the custodians. With tree removal, there are a lot of categories particularly on a golf course and particularly on a farm that do not appear to ring true with the same ringing of the bell.

I did refresh my memory with tree removal. Obviously it has a lot to do with the species, the age, the number of trees, the height, the health, and the habitat potential and it comes with a point score. If the score for removal of that tree reaches the lofty heights of 15, it then has to go into an approval process. Obviously, there is an overall impact from the loss. Does it have heritage implications? It did bother me that for the removal of a tree there are no less than three new plants. We could see a very large significant tree being removed. I am sure that there will be a number of trees. I know the talk has been that we will see a minimal amount of tree removal, but let me assure you, when we are going to see a significant remodelling of a very old golf course, with the style that LIV Golf will bring to the game, I am sure that it will be a different format.

We saw some of the images in this morning's paper; some very fancy bunkers and some almost Dalmatian sand spots on the golf course that grabbed my attention. That is why I am wanting, if we are going to see significant tree removal, a little bit more detail: what does that mean with offset? What does that mean with a replacement? Where will those replacement trees be placed and what will it mean to the landscape and the Botanic Gardens that the Adelaide City Council currently have governance over?

As I have said, the government were caught unaware as to why it was being introduced today in such haste and the opposition are also quite intrigued at what the haste was. Why is it that we have to force this through today? Why is it that the government would like to have it through the Legislative Council potentially this week? There are underlying reasons. I have been in this place for a little while now—not as long as you, sir—but I have been here for a while now and it does sometimes make you a little bit cynical and gives you an impetus to look at an alternative motive as to why the government are hastily trying to push this bill through the assembly.

What also grabbed my attention today was a media statement, as I understand it it was from the Adelaide Lord Mayor, who is currently overseas on a mission to try to bring COP31 to Adelaide. As I would understand, she is very upset. She agreed in good faith and now has been left out in the cold, as has the rest of the council, and they feel that they are taking control of the course.

My bearings are not that bad. Obviously North Adelaide has a number of areas in it; the North Course, the South Course and the John E Brown Park. What I would like to know is, are we going to see the entire North Adelaide Golf Course remodelled? Are we going to see a portion of it remodelled?

What will it mean to the longevity of what that course has meant to many, many members and what is it going to mean for those residents who live up against that golf course? Many, or most of them, all have a street boundary between their residence and the golf course.

If the government is going to take control of that golf course, is it going to mean that those residents are going to be impacted on a regular basis, not just as part of the LIV Golf series invitation, but what does it mean for the rest of the year? What is it going to mean to those people who are passionate Botanic Garden lovers? Sometimes they can express their view to the detriment of progress, but I think they have a right to speak and they have a right to voice their concerns. This action today by the government will have the hairs on the back of their necks out, stiff and bristly, and they will be looking to have a comment in tomorrow morning's paper, I am sure.

Obviously, the government's priority is to ram this through the assembly. Should their priority be appropriation? We have to pass appropriation today or tomorrow, so that we can get on with estimates. My office was advised this afternoon that some of the estimates portfolios will be pushed out from Friday into next week. The writing is on the wall that the government's priorities are not right. They are not looking after South Australia. They are looking after the Premier wanting to be party Pete, popular Pete and Pete in paradise.

What we are seeing is that, to push this through in the way that it is being pushed through, everyone should be asking questions as to, 'What is the hurry, what is the haste, and why is it happening in this manner of time?' I am sure that the opposition will be asking pertinent questions to make sure that this bill is dealt with appropriately and we do get to the bottom of it. If some of my sneaking suspicions do come true, if they are not realised tonight they will be realised in good time, I can assure you.

I would like to think that the government, in their haste today, will be transparent and they will give all of the information that is asked of them so that we can enlighten the public, we can enlighten the Adelaide City Council, we can enlighten the residents and, just as importantly, we can enlighten the golf enthusiasts who want to come to North Adelaide and be part of the LIV Golf experience. I look forward to the committee process and getting on with it in due course.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (19:40): I will make a very short contribution thanking members for their contributions. I think we are going to the committee stage and that will give the government some opportunity to explain some of the clauses referred to in the members' contributions. With that, I thank the house and close the debate.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr COWDREY: Minister, it is abundantly clear now that the Adelaide City Council have not been consulted on the bill, unless something has changed in the last little while. Who was consulted on the bill prior to it being introduced today?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We have not consulted anybody on the bill. This has been a matter for the government. We considered that it was the appropriate action to take to secure the event.

Mr COWDREY: Is there any reason that the government did not take a more collaborative approach, understanding that there was clear support in both chambers in terms of finding a bill that was perhaps able to be worked up together with the whole of the parliament? Through negotiation and sensible amendment, perhaps we would have landed on a set of circumstances with a bill that was (a) perhaps less ham-fisted but (b) perhaps less of a sledgehammer but still able to achieve the same outcome.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There has been quite a collaboration with the Adelaide City Council for some time. I do not accept the opposition's characterisation of it, but what this bill does is it essentially facilitates the development approvals necessary to (a) construct the new golf course and (b) then operate it. That is what this bill does. I do not accept the opposition's characterisations of it, and of course, this is your chance for collaboration right now.

Mr COWDREY: If we are going to start in that vein, then I do not accept the minister's interpretation of what his own bill does, because it is clear in black and white that it does far more than what he has just alluded to. There are unprecedented levels of power that are vested in the minister as part of this. There is the opportunity for you to grab extended parcels of Parklands for purposes outlined. There is a range of other things involved in this in terms of whether the land will return to the Adelaide City Council.

So it does not simply achieve those two outcomes that you have outlined to the house today: it does far more than that. You know that, I know that and every other member of this house who has had the opportunity to read the bill knows that. The question for you is a simple one: when does the government envisage taking over the North Adelaide Golf Course or the section of land referred to here in the bill?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I was not sure which clause the honourable member was referring to, but if you go to clause 5(1)(a), essentially the operation of the act, as the member envisages it, comes into operation when the GRO plan is lodged, and that will be done once the design work is completed.

Mr COWDREY: Just a follow-up, sir.

The CHAIR: A follow-up; a supplementary, you mean?

Mr COWDREY: Yes.

The CHAIR: We will see. Go on; test me.

Mr COWDREY: Perhaps I will rephrase the question: when does the minister envisage lodging the plan with the GRO?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Once the design work is completed. That is when we will activate that part of the bill. Obviously, that is complicated work. Once it is completed, that is when that section of the bill will be activated.

Mr BATTY: Can the minister outline what he sees is the role and function of the Adelaide Park Lands Authority, and in light of that, why they were not consulted on this bill?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The government's primary engagement on these matters has been with the Adelaide City Council. They have been the main focus of who we have been consulting with or in negotiations with. Clearly, we want to pass this bill so we can secure the event and so we can, if you like, meet the deadlines. Of course, this bill gives the minister the ability to, I think, negotiate with the Adelaide City Council and other bodies as they see fit.

Mr BATTY: Apologies for my confusion: I think you have just said that the Adelaide City Council is the main body you have been consulting with, but in response to a question from the member for Colton, you said you have not consulted with anyone. Which is it? I suspect it is the latter, which begs the question again: why?

Perhaps you can update the house on how your negotiations with Adelaide City Council have been going. The Lord Mayor is tweeting from the other side of the world that apparently there were some sort of good faith negotiations continuing. The Premier met with the Adelaide City Council at least as recently as last week, and this has been totally sprung on them in the meantime. So can you provide clarification on whether you have consulted with anyone at all and also what the negotiations with council have looked like?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I do not want to play semantic word games with the member, but—

Mr Batty interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, I am just pointing two things out. First of all, I was asked about the consultation on the bill and then we were talking about negotiations with the council—slightly different things. In terms of negotiations with the council, I am advised there have been 17 or so meetings about the North Adelaide Golf Course in an endeavour to negotiate these matters with the council. Obviously, they are important, good faith negotiations; nobody is being critical of the Adelaide City Council. This bill just reflects the government's desire to be able to upgrade the North Adelaide Golf Course and deliver the event for the state.

Mr BATTY: Similarly, can the minister outline his understanding of the role and function of the First Nations Voice and explain why the First Nations Voice was not consulted on this bill?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: In this act there are obviously references to the Aboriginal Heritage Act, and we will come to those clauses in due course. Obviously, we will aim to meet our requirements under those acts. Because of the timeframe that we are looking at—we want to secure the event for the state and we want to get on with building the North Adelaide Golf Course—in this particular instance we have not advised or consulted with the Voice, but I am sure, given that we have the Voice, there will be an opportunity to do that in the future.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Was the member for Adelaide consulted on the bill and, if so, when?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Members on my left!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The CHAIR: Minister, unless you are in your seat, you will not be recognised.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The member for Adelaide has obviously been advised and kept informed about the project. In terms of the bill, she was advised at the same time that all government members were: at the caucus meeting earlier this morning.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Does the member for Adelaide support the bill?

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Members will keep their comments to themselves, unless they want to leave the chamber.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: The minister is not responsible for knowing what another member may or may not vote for.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Has the member for Adelaide been given any special ability to cross the floor on this bill or to not support the bill, as the previous member for Adelaide Jane Lomax-Smith was given in regard to the Motor Sport Board permanent grandstand?

The CHAIR: The minister is not responsible for that. Next question.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: With due respect, sir—

The CHAIR: No.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —that is a ministerial decision, for somebody to be able to breach the Labor Party convention of not being expelled from the party for having a different view from the party.

The CHAIR: Member for Unley—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There is a precedent for that. Jane Lomax-Smith was granted that precedent when she was the member for Adelaide.

The CHAIR: The member for Unley will resume his seat. The member for Unley is not a member of the Labor Party and he does not know how the Labor Party works; it is quite clear. It is not the minister's responsibility for that decision to be made. Next question, if you want to ask another question.

Mr TEAGUE: Just to be clear, we are here debating a bill called the North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill 2025, which has been described by government members as a bill to make a golf course a golf course, or something of that nature, and that clearly transfers a lot of powers from the council to the minister primarily for the core purpose of facilitating the LIV Golf event, and we are here in the committee stage going clause by clause about just what exactly those powers are and how wideranging they are and so on.

At clause 1, the question has been put in terms of stakeholder consultation or the lack thereof, and the circumstances in which this bill has been presented to caucus members first thing this morning—first presented to members on this side at about lunch time, and then moved through all stages, interrupting the budget debate and so on—the unanswered question, it seems to me, is: what is the imperative for doing this today? Why can it not wait until tomorrow, or, if it is so urgently necessary, why not with the benefit of some explanation that can be shared with all of us?

I will indicate two things. I have heard reference to, on the one hand, what have been, we understand, ongoing negotiations with the city council, and I think I have adverted to, in the course of my second reading debate: are we to read between the lines that Adelaide City Council has been a bit hard to deal with, or this stuff is broadly familiar to them but they need it moving along? That would point to the reason for doing it, that it just was not going to get anywhere fast enough.

That still does not answer the question of: why absolutely today and at this kind of unusual short notice? I have also heard the minister just now say this is in order to secure the event for the period that remains, maybe for some longer period—who knows—but, even in that case, why absolutely today? Why is it necessary to be so start to finish and at so little notice?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If the honourable member works back from 2028, which is a key date for LIV Golf and, really, a key date for the state because this is a very important event for the state, it has been a very successful event—as I understand it, the opposition now support the event, even though at the outset they did not, but we welcome their support for the event—if you work your way back from 2028, and this is always I think the challenge for any sort of construction project, you have a design phase and then you obviously have a phase in which you need to construct and build, and in this case turf has to grow, grass has to grow, the course itself needs to get constructed.

So if you work back from 2028, that is the driver here. That is a driver of, if you like, the timeframes. It is important for these projects to have certainty. In order to have investment, and in this case a very significant investment in the Parklands, in the golf course, which I think is welcomed by the Adelaide City Council—and they have had their own previous master plans in 2018 and before that, but it has eluded them up until this point—this bill gives certainty to the project and gives certainty to those timeframes, working back from 2028.

Mr TEAGUE: I thank the minister for that answer. I suppose where we are at is that in this process today, the minister has talked to things that might point to an imperative over months or even weeks, but not to the kind of urgency that we saw, say—without reflecting on the debate at all—with the first bit of legislation to address the dire situation in Whyalla where, for all sorts of reasons, the government asks the parliament to be taken into its trust and we are told there is an injunction-style emergency to being able to act in a really unusual way in circumstances where the value of assets and the whole circumstances of a town are in the balance, and we saw the capacity of the parliament to move something through basically on trust, at no notice, with massive urgency.

Any observer looking at this at this stage would draw a pretty clear contrast between that and what we are dealing with now but over a similar timeframe. So without more, it looks as though it is the government flexing or something. It has chosen to do this now on this day—why not? It could do it this day or it could do it tomorrow, but not to some sort of imperative that is going to be lost unless the thing is passed before midnight tonight or something. So if there is not, there is not, and people can look on and say, 'That's the government's style,' but there is nothing more imperative than, 'Well, this had to get done at some stage, so it may as well be now.'

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I would just refer the member to my previous answer about 2028. While, obviously, he refers to other bills, there have been bills which have been passed by this parliament before on many different occasions in order to create certainty for projects. That is what this bill is seeking: certainty of development approval and certainty of operation and that is a very important thing for this very important event, and we would obviously like to have bipartisan support for it.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Minister, is the passing of this bill a condition of the contract to take this event in Adelaide to 2031? In other words, if this bill fails or does not pass the parliament, does LIV Golf finish in Adelaide before 2031?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The honourable member wanders a little into hypotheticals, but essentially the bill is not a contractual requirement, but it is a contractual requirement to have it in North Adelaide, and obviously this facilitates us being ready in North Adelaide by 2028.

Mr TEAGUE: In light of that answer perhaps—and I think the minister has already answered the question by saying no stakeholders have been consulted on this bill, including the Voice, including the member for Adelaide until this morning, you name it—for the avoidance of doubt, nobody associated with LIV has been either consulted on this bill or its timeframe, and no contractual matters are hinging on this. Again, it is an opportunity to explain why we are here. Is that the case?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Of course, parliament is always the master of its own destiny. We had a bit of a debate before about the Adelaide City Council and the Parklands and the like. I invite members to look closely at those arrangements over the years, but essentially why now and why this bill is a compelling piece of legislation, a necessary piece of legislation, is that we need to be ready by 2028 and have the North Adelaide Golf Course upgraded in order for this event to be held there.

That is why it is important legislation. That is why we are here now. As I said before, we have had a number of meetings. The government has had a long series of consultative meetings with the Adelaide City Council. We think this bill is what is needed to secure the event for 2028, and that is important for the state.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr COWDREY: The question of commencement again comes to timing, because this bill could have been moved two weeks ago, it could have been moved two weeks from now, essentially is—for lack of a better term—the vibe that the minister is putting out. The question then, naturally, in terms of that timeline relative to commencement, is around the negotiations with the Adelaide City Council. Had the negotiations with the Adelaide City Council broken down to a point where they were not reconcilable anymore?

Is this simply a bargaining chip that the minister wants to bring in here to show the power of what the government can do? Is there an intention to actually have this bill passed and use the powers that are within this bill, or is the government still seeking to negotiate with the Adelaide City Council and this is simply an on-the-side bargaining chip? Can we have clarity from the minister as to the status of the negotiations with the Adelaide City Council at this point and whether the government does actually intend to use the powers that are conveyed to it if this bill is passed?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: As my mother said, 'There is no time like the present.' This government is all about taking the necessary action to secure important events and economic growth in this state. As I said before, we have had fairly lengthy and collaborative meetings with the Adelaide City Council. This bill is not a criticism of them in any way.

We want to keep those meetings going, but we absolutely intend to use this legislation to deliver the event. It is important legislation. It is in no way a bargaining chip. It is, in a very real way, a tool to deliver an important event for the state and an important upgrade in the Parklands themselves. This bill, if you like, allows us to do that in a meaningful, collaborative and also very deliberate way.

Mr COWDREY: In response to the minister's answer, was notice given to the Adelaide City Council that the government was going to go down this track and draft its own legislation, in many senses, I assume, to effectively shift what would have been in a lease agreement or a contractual arrangement with the Adelaide City Council into legislation on terms that are, at best, very heavily skewed towards the government's interests as opposed to the Adelaide City Council's?

Was it ever communicated to the council that, 'Effectively, negotiations are no longer fruitful for us as the government. We are going to pave our own path from this point forward and draft up legislation and come in and force this on you'? Was that threat ever made to Adelaide City Council, or have they been blissfully unaware, assuming that the conversations had been going on that the minister has alluded to on multiple occasions as being fruitful, helpful, and positive? Because the two things do not make any sense. I hope you understand that, if all the conversations to this point have been fruitful, helpful and positive, why are we here? Why have we got this piece of legislation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Adelaide City Council and the government talk about a whole range of matters and we talk collaboratively and the government respects the city council, but in this particular case it is not just the lease with the city council that is the issue; it is the deadline of 2028 and all the things that have to go in, all the things that have to be done.

This bill facilitates all of those necessary things that need to be done; that is, the design and then the building and then the operation for this very important event and this very significant investment in the North Adelaide Golf Course and thus in the Parklands. So what we are attempting to do is not close the door on the council in any way, shape or form. We want to keep talking to them, obviously. They are important for the city. They will have an important role to play in events that are in the city. But we need to pass this bill through the parliament in order to deliver the event in 2028 and this bill facilitates us doing that.

Mr COWDREY: I do not doubt that a piece of legislation was going to be necessary in terms of the mechanics of delivering what we have been talking about, but the nature of this legislation is different to what the minister has just alluded to. It is one thing to have a bill without any haste that provides a framework and mechanism for setting out an agreed contractual obligation or lease agreement that has been reached with Adelaide City Council in terms of how the land handover would happen, what the agreed terms would be, who would derive revenue, who would not, who would operate or otherwise. That all makes sense to everybody in this place. I do not think anyone is negotiating that point or arguing that point. That does make sense. There does have to be a vehicle.

But what you have cleverly not really discussed in your answer is whether you had reached a point of effectively having a roadblock with Adelaide City Council in terms of reaching those agreed terms, hence this legislation, or not. But I do not want to pose that question to you because I already have and you have already refused to answer it. So the question is simple. You alluded to a timeframe of 2028 and working back on multiple occasions to this point. Let me assume that you as minister, given the priority that you have given this project and the clear amount of effort and time and focus that has gone into this by the government, were personally a party to the negotiations.

The question is simple: did you give Adelaide City Council a drop-dead date that we need to lock in arrangements by this point in time otherwise we are going this alone? Because it does not make sense to anybody sitting here. If Adelaide City Council were not told, 'This is when we need to lock all this away. This is the deadline. There is no negotiation past this point', we can all go home. It makes sense, if that was the case. Did you give them a drop-dead date to have these arrangements sorted out by? If you have not, this is quite literally scandalous.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We always flagged in public that legislation might be needed in order to facilitate the delivery of the event, and it is not the government's habit or inclination to deliver ultimatums to other levels of government. That is not the way we go about things.

Mr Cowdrey: You just hit them with a sledgehammer afterwards.

The CHAIR: The member for Colton!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No. I just would not characterise it the way the member for Colton does. I think this is legislation that facilitates an important event for the state. It is not an event where there is any doubt that it works. We know that it works. We know that it will work in the city. The member himself admits that we need legislation and is happy, apparently, to facilitate it. Now is your chance.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: When did you start formal discussions with the Adelaide City Council on the proposal that you have got before us today?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: As I said before, we have not consulted them on the bill. We were in negotiations with them around the North Adelaide Golf Course and the lease and all the other important features of, if you like, having LIV in North Adelaide in 2028, and, as I said before, the government has had a number of meetings around those issues.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Sorry, I did not hear that. What was the date you started discussions? That was my question. My question was what was the date? When did you start the discussions?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Not around the bill, but in terms of the negotiation of the lease arrangements around the North Adelaide Golf Course it was late February.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That was late February this year?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes.

Mr TEAGUE: Maybe this is to be clear: there has been a lot of focus on negotiations with the Adelaide City Council, and I will be reminded—you might remind the committee—about the timing of the decision to move to North Adelaide at some stage from Grange. And you have already said that the owner, the operator of the event, has not been consulted on the bill. Is there anything in terms of a monetary consequence, investment or otherwise by the owner that is consequent on the

passage of the bill, the substance of the bill, being secured? And therefore does that provide an explanation? In other words, had there been a conclusion to Adelaide City Council negotiations such as to secure the results that are the subject of this bill would that have triggered some consequence in terms of investment, reward of any kind from the owner of the event, and does this bill achieve such an outcome?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We have been very open about the 2028 date and the movement to the city, to the North Adelaide Golf Course. We think that that is a positive for the event, and we think it is a positive for the Parklands and for the North Adelaide Golf Course, because there is going to be a significant upgrade to that golf course. And of course, this bill facilitates that latter project. Other matters which the member refers to are, of course, properly covered by commercial in confidence, because it is a contract, and you would not expect me to discuss that publicly.

Mr TEAGUE: Maybe then let me put it slightly more directly. Is there any consequence in terms of investment from the owner in the site that follows upon the passage of the bill, or alternatively, had that not been necessary, the conclusion of terms sufficient to secure the site for the project by negotiation with the Adelaide City Council?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, the timelines are all driven by our desire to upgrade the North Adelaide Golf Course by 2028. That is the critical date. Obviously we want to hold LIV Golf in the city in 2028, so if you work back from there that tells you why we are here and why we are discussing this bill.

Mr BATTY: Minister, is it your position that unless this bill passes tonight then LIV Golf will not be able to occur in North Adelaide in 2028?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: This bill is about providing certainty of delivery dates by 2028. Members opposite would be the first to criticise us if we did not meet our obligations and we did not meet that date. This provides certainty going forward about how we are going to do it and the manner in which we are going to do it.

Members can characterise it in various different ways. We often have these debates about other projects in the house. It is important. If you have a legislation of this nature, it provides an important level of certainty about the delivery—and in this case the design—of the upgrade of the North Adelaide Golf Course and, of course, the subsequent operations of the event as well.

Mr BATTY: So when did the minister first realise that there would not be a certainty of hosting LIV Golf in 2028 in the absence of this legislation? It strikes me that there has been a terrible mismanagement of the organisation of LIV Golf if the 2028 tournament is now at risk unless you rush through extraordinary legislation tonight. Did you just think of this today, or when did this realisation strike you that the 2028 LIV Golf tournament might be in doubt in the absence of this legislation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Obviously we have been working on this since February, in discussions with Adelaide City Council, looking at the design work that is required and looking at all of the indicative timeframes that one might have to meet if we are to meet that 2028 deadline. This legislation is, if you like, the consequence of understanding what those timeframes are and understanding what we need to do to deliver the event. That is why we are here and that is why we are discussing the legislation.

Mr BATTY: On what date did you first give instructions to parliamentary counsel to draft this bill?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I think that would be covered by cabinet confidentiality, but obviously government has been thinking carefully about the delivery of what is already a very successful event. Those opposite might recall they opposed the event at the time. I think subsequently, after a leadership change, they thought better of it once they saw the success of the event.

We want to continue to deliver a successful event and we want to deliver it in the city. That will be an exciting opportunity for the city and the state, and it will help drive a whole range of economic and social benefits to the city and the state and a significant investment in the Parklands.

What this bill does is facilitate investment in the Parklands in a golf course that the council itself had a master plan for but could not find the resources or the capacity to deliver.

That is not a criticism of them. It is just an understanding that this is a very significant project for the state. We want to facilitate it through this bill. Members can ask various technical questions, but I think the threshold question for the opposition is: do you support the state? Do you support development in the state? Do you support this event?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: When did you see the first draft of the bill?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Again, the honourable member is asking me a question he knows is covered by cabinet confidentiality. Of course I would not reveal that. Members can be here, asking these questions. The answers will be the same.

The CHAIR: It is not the minister's prerogative to break the confidentiality of cabinet.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That is right. I am bound by cabinet confidentiality. I could quote to you what Chifley said about cabinets and caucuses. It is an important feature of our government, which I think the members were talking about before. It is an important feature of Westminster democracy, cabinet government, that cabinet confidentiality is preserved.

Mr TEAGUE: Having traversed as much as we have, it is still a mystery to me as to why we are sort of guessing as to the circumstances that have been playing out over these last months.

Mr Cowdrey: He is defensive about it.

Mr TEAGUE: Very defensive about it. We have sort of gleaned that there have been negotiations going on with the Adelaide City Council since about February, and we have known that the event is moving to North Adelaide for some little while now. Presuming the government has been going about the consideration and preparation of this legislation in an orderly way and has had this in its back pocket for little while, sort of ready all options—and you do not need to confirm or deny that, but that is just to give the government some credit for not operating in a mad panic—can the minister then advise the committee and rule out that this has been precipitated by some risk that there is another offer somewhere else coming in that is at risk of swooping in and taking the event from South Australia and you needed to act now in order to satisfy the owner-operator of the event that it is all is all hunky-dory, or that there is risk to some other aspect of the investment and the event is in jeopardy, hence the need to act immediately?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Back in February, the Premier quite clearly said that legislation might be needed. The honourable member is a former planning minister, so I think he has some experience in these things. To be clear, we want to deliver this project by 2028 because it will be a good thing for the state, a good thing for the event and a good thing for the city, so it is driven by that desire to invest in the North Adelaide Golf Course.

Of course, the honourable member would know and would have some experience when he was in government that with projects there is a series of metrics. Sometimes you watch the sand going through the hourglass, and you know you need to act. When you look closely at the step-by-step processes that are needed to deliver an outcome by a particular time, in this case 2028, and you work your way backwards and you see all the things that are necessary to make that investment and deliver that outcome, that is what has driven the government's actions, that is why we are here tonight, and that is why the legislation has the provisions that it has.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr COWDREY: In relation to clause 3, 'designated minister' is obviously referenced in several areas of the bill. Will you be the designated minister and, if not, who will be?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If the member reads the section, it says that the minister is designated by the Governor, by proclamation, as the minister in whom the minister will vest under section 8. So it will be to whoever the Governor decides to give that responsibility.

Mr Cowdrey: Answer the question.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That would be a matter on which I would imagine the Governor—not that I want to speak for her—Her Excellency, would take advice from the Premier of the day.

Mr Cowdrey: So, who is it?

The CHAIR: That's a hypothetical question at this stage.

Mr COWDREY: Alright, so you have no confidence that it is going to be you—that is something that is interesting anyway. In regard to the interpretation section, in particular I am interested in the project site and the definition of the project site interpretation. I mentioned in my second reading speech that I had not seen any reference from the government at this point to Park 27A and John E Brown Park. Whose idea was it that it was necessary for the minister to take control and to develop that park? Is that something that was a prerequisite provided to you by LIV Golf? Is that something that has been dictated to you by Greg Norman in terms of design of the golf course? Are you able to articulate why, for the first time, the public of South Australia is now privy to the fact that the government will be taking control and seizing John E Brown Park (Park 27A of the Adelaide Parklands) and why that is the case?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: John E Brown Park has an interesting history: it was named after a specialist in urban forestry who was brought out here from the United Kingdom by the state government and the council at the time, and we named a park after him. It is something of an irony that we named that park after him, because there is not much forestry in it. If the member walks through it he might find many things. He might find landfill that has been dredged out of the Torrens, he might find car tyres that are half buried in some sort of track. Sadly, he will find homeless people sleeping in tents. It is a very important thoroughfare for people in the western suburbs.

Many people would look at John E Brown Park and see an area that has not particularly been well cared for by the Adelaide City Council. The reason that particular park has been identified is that, during the design process, in order to provide a driving range, which is an important feature of golf courses and a particularly important feature in having people come and try and then move on to other areas of golf, which I referred to in my second reading speech, what drove the inclusion of John E Brown Park in the golf course—and that does not remove it from the Parklands and does not seize it (that is the wrong terminology to use; it just includes it in the golf course, it expands the golf course, and the golf course is an important feature of the Parklands, which the council themselves have operated for a very long time). This provides an ability to upgrade that particular park for a driving range, which then means we have to remove fewer trees on the golf course site itself. This is an important feature and has been driven by the design process and by a desire to limit the removal of trees as a result of the design upgrade.

Mr COWDREY: Sorry, I am getting more perplexed the more the minister talks, because he was talking earlier like the design process had really not started and that it could not start until we passed this bill because you would not have the parameters to then go to design. But, now you are telling us that the design has informed the bill. I am a little bit sceptical and confused as to how advanced or mature the design process is or is not, given the minister's answer to that last question.

We will come back to this when we get to clause 5, but I guess at first instance, out of the minister's answer, the pertinent question that arises is: was there any consideration to keeping the driving range within the existing footprint of the North Adelaide golf links given the fact that, as has been alluded to in the minister's second reading speech, the golf course is being reduced from two 18-hole golf courses and a par 3 golf course to a single championship golf course, so significantly fewer holes?

Notwithstanding the fact that there need to be wider fairways and obviously more space between and longer—I understand the practicalities of all of that—but you also alluded to earlier and it was alluded to during the briefing that there was going to be significant space that was available given the fact that we are going from such significant golf course holes to then just a championship course. Why was this not raised earlier with the public, that there was going to be additional land countenanced under the bill? And was there any consideration for keeping the driving range on the existing footprint or finding a way to make that work and, if not, why not?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The nature of design work is you obviously look at different options. That is not uncommon with all park design. That is why we have landscape architects and why we have golf course designers because, as the member would be aware, these are people with significant expertise in delivering world-class facilities and that is what this will be.

At the moment, as I understand it, as I am advised, there is no real driving range. There is an area that is used for driving practice when the golf course closes at different times. This will be a dedicated driving range. Of course, we explored putting it on the existing site, but, as I said before, that would necessitate more tree removals. We think that if the honourable member or the people of South Australia have that choice, more removal of trees versus putting the driving range in an at the moment underinvested in park, John E Brown Park, we think that they will take that choice to upgrade John E Brown Park into something that will get—

Mr Cowdrey: You could ask them. It's called consultation.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The honourable member says 'consultation'. You do not run straw polls on park design, you listen to experts and you have designers and you take the best advice so you can get the best outcome and you get the best outcome.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That is the way. Let's have some respect for expertise.

Mr Cowdrey: Your expertise?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, designers of golf course expertise and the design process. Clause passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The overriding of other state acts, does that mean that acts that cover government land acquisition and planning approvals are also overridden for this project?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The Land Acquisition Act would not apply here anyway. The Adelaide Parklands is owned by the state government. All that has happened historically is that we have given care and control to the Adelaide City Council and that has been a longstanding practice of state governments I think from colonial days. Under the Adelaide Park Lands Act, the previous one, the Adelaide City Council have to consent to any changes in land use. That is the only thing that is adjusted here. The Land Acquisition Act would not apply because it is already state government land.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Say, for example, a permanent structure was required for the event, or a future event on that land, who would make that decision? Would that need to go through SCAP, would it need to go through the Adelaide City Council, or would the minister grant that approval?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Working our way back—and this is in later provisions of the bill—the State Planning Commission is the relevant authority. You still have to go through a planning process, but it is deemed to satisfy and, of course, building rules, consents and all the other consents which are around disability access and safety and building standards will all still have to be met.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Where does it say that in the bill, that those acts are exempt? The disability act, for example; I cannot see that in there. But this bill says that this bill overrides every other act, except the Aboriginal Heritage Act. So how are you going to deal with disability? How are you going to deal with planning codes and approvals if these acts are no longer relevant to this bill?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you look at clause 11—Application of Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 etc—so it does not override it; it just applies in a particular way, and we can discuss that when we get to that relevant section.

Mr BATTY: I am interested in the note to this clause that: 'Nothing in this Act affects the operation of any Commonwealth law...', which I am sure must be enormously frustrating to the minister and a government that seeks total control and power. But I wonder what advice the minister has sought about what referrals, if any, might be required under the commonwealth's Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I have been a member of the commonwealth parliament, so I understand the commonwealth constitution very well. Even though we are a sovereign parliament, and that is a very good thing, we are still part of the federation and our glorious commonwealth. Of course, you would be aware that the EPBC Act has a self referral and if any applicant, or any entity thinks that they are caught up in those provisions they self refer and, of course, there are various provisions that relate to the environment minister and the National Heritage Council and the like. There have been plenty of cases in the Parklands where we have not been found to be caught up in that particular piece of federal legislation.

Mr BATTY: The Parklands, of course, are a national heritage place and my understanding is that a referral is required if it is an action that is going to have significant impact on the heritage value of the site. So my question is: will a referral be required in this instance?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Obviously as part of the process we will work through that and you self assess and self refer. That will happen in the course of delivering this project by 2028.

Mr BATTY: Regarding the minister's self assessment, does seizing power to take control of any portion of the Parklands and do what he wants with it impact the heritage value of that national heritage site?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The bill does none of the things that the honourable member asserts. It simply delivers an investment in the North Adelaide Golf Course, a golf course that has been there prior even to federation, as I understand the history of it, but certainly for a very long time, and it seeks to upgrade that golf course. It does not do any of the things that the member asserts in his question.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr COWDREY: My first question on clause 5 is on subclause (1)(a)(iii), which references 'certain road reserve areas in the vicinity of the areas listed in the preceding subparagraphs'. One would assume that that reference is to War Memorial Drive parking that is associated with the train station that is adjacent, or somewhere around there. Minister, given that you obviously have a sophisticated enough plan to be able to tell us where the driving range is going and you have considered other options for where the driving range could go, I am at the point of refusing to believe that you have no idea what the layout of the golf course is going to look like.

Are there going to be any changes to War Memorial Drive? Will there be a loss of parking along War Memorial Drive for those constituents of mine perhaps who drive into the city and park on War Memorial Drive prior to a football game or prior to coming in to work in the CBD? Clearly you have countenanced it enough to have its inclusion in the bill, and clearly you have a pretty decent idea of where the driving range is going to be, where it is not going to be and where the other holes would be situated. Can you give us some clarity in regard to War Memorial Drive and exactly what you are referencing that may or may not be changed in subparagraph (iii)?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: In relation to War Memorial Drive, it is obviously a very important road for the state and for the member's constituents, and I take his point. The operation of this act will mainly be during the building phase of the project. You might need to have lay down areas and you might need to close off parts of it for certain periods of time in order to facilitate the building, the construction or the upgrade of the golf course. It is for that purpose that we have included it.

Mr COWDREY: So, conclusively, there will be no realignment of War Memorial Drive? There will be no change to where the current road route sits?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There is certainly no desire to do that by the state government. The state government would have powers over roads anyway. The Commissioner of Highways has powers over roads. This just gives important flexibility in terms of getting the project delivered, which is our main aim and the reason we are passing this legislation.

Mr COWDREY: My final question on this clause is again in reference to John E Brown Park. The minister referenced that he had made a decision, anticipating the view that the people of South

Australia would have in regard to tree removal or otherwise, obviously making the assumption that the assertion made by the minister is correct in regard to the location of the driving range. I suspect I know the answer, but can the minister make it clear to the house if any consultation has taken place in regard to the John E Brown Park being included in the proposition to develop a golf course at North Adelaide?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Obviously, it was discussed with the designers because, as I said, it was design decisions that primarily drove the utilisation of John E Brown Park, and it has been discussed with council in the negotiations the state government had with them. Obviously, this is an area that needs investment. I think most fair observers, if they took the chance to walk through the site, would think it was a good thing. Of course, there is always a chance I am wrong about that, but generally speaking, I think people want Parklands to be utilised for some positive purpose. At the moment, John E Brown Park is underutilised. That is a description that I think is being very kind indeed.

Mr BATTY: Does subclause (1)(b) of this clause allow you to seize any section of Parklands to be captured by this act?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It gives the minister power to add areas to the GRO plan. The honourable member again uses language that is not correct. 'Seizing' is the wrong word. This is state government land already. You cannot seize what is already in public control. If the member wants to oppose the bill, he should be straightforward about it. He should be honest with his constituents and with the people of South Australia if he opposes the upgrade of a very important public golf course. In this case, we would only add land to the golf course area if it assisted in the delivery of the project and the upgrading of the course.

Mr BATTY: I guess we just have to take your word for it that you are not going to revert back to standard form, which is taking any bit of Parklands you want. We have seen it before at Park 21 West. Now, we see it here, not only with the two named sections of Parklands but also this extraordinary provision that says you can have anything that is necessary or desirable. What is the distinction between the words 'necessary' and 'desirable'? Why do we have to legislate to give you all your desires, minister?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Again, the honourable member cannot help himself. The state government already—for instance, I am the relevant minister for the cemeteries board. We have care and control of the West Terrace Cemetery. I am the minister for SA Water. There is a very important facility in North Adelaide, opposite the Piccadilly cinema, which is owned by SA Water. The Botanic Gardens are in the care and control of the state government and Botanic Park likewise.

So there are various areas in the Parklands for which different entities have care and control, and Adelaide City Council is a very important one, but the honourable member seems to think that this clause means anything other than it means. As I said before, we are trying to deliver an upgraded North Adelaide Golf Course, which is a public golf course. It represents a significant investment in the Parklands. That golf course has been there for decades and decades. It is now seeing the opportunity for an upgrade. It is very important. This clause just facilitates the upgrade, and the use of the words is necessary to deliver the project.

Mr BATTY: Perhaps I will turn to the two named sites, then. What biodiversity assessment has the minister done of Park 1 and Park 27A, and did that present any concerns about impacts to biodiversity and in particular to the eastern water skink, which is an endangered species found in Park 1?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That is one of the areas that is in the design team's remit, and obviously they look at all of those features. This is a golf course, and of course, as the honourable member said—

Mr Batty interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, it is the North Adelaide Golf Course and John E Brown Park and areas around that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: In paragraph (b) it states:

...the Minister determines that it is necessary or desirable to include additional areas of land in the project site...

In that instance, how would the public be informed? Is there any obligation to inform the public that that is going to happen before it happens? Is there a process or right of appeal or challenge for such a decision?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you read further—it is not hard to read—the plan has to be deposited at the government registry office and has to be put in the *Government Gazette*.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So there is no public consultation, just a government mechanism, and no advertising. Even select committees advertise in the media. When the government has a great new idea or some spending announcement, people get sponsored posts on their social media, they get things in their letterboxes and sometimes we even see ads on TV and on the sides of trams. You are saying that the only mechanism is to hide it in the *Gazette*, which has a readership of about 69 people in this building on a good day. That is the only mechanism that people get. Is it gazetted before it happens, or is it gazetted after it happens?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I have far more confidence in the *Government Gazette* than you do, and the 69 people who might be reading it are all people who are interested in the affairs of the state. So that is why it is the *Government Gazette*. Of course, it happens subsequent to the GRO plan being lodged.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr COWDREY: Earlier today in the briefing, the minister was not able in any way to give us an indication of how many leases or licences currently exist over the proposed site. I hope the minister has taken the time to go away and understand how many small business owners—or perhaps larger business owners; I am not sure—have existing leases and licences over the site. If he could read that onto the public record, and the years remaining on those leases or licences, it would be helpful for us to understand and would give context to the chamber as to how many affected parties there will be from a private business perspective. If he can also outline to us if any contact has been made by the government with any of those licensees or leaseholders.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It would be the Adelaide City Council which is the main entity. Of course, they manage a lease with the North Adelaide Golf Course. I think the Premier has had a number of conversations with the president of the golf course and with the club and the council. Obviously, we are going to be sensitive to those arrangements. There might well be private contractors and employees who work on site. One would anticipate, when you are upgrading a golf course, that it would mean more work, not less work, and more opportunity, not less opportunity. We are going to work through that process with the city council, obviously, and with the affected entities and employees.

Mr COWDREY: It has been alluded to in the media I think over the last couple of weeks—are there any restaurants or other venues that sit within that footprint that are going to be affected by clause 6 of the bill as proposed? As a follow on to that, has the government made any effort to understand the subleasing arrangements for other entities that may well sit under, say, the North Adelaide golf links or other potential restaurants or venues that sit on the area?

Off the top of my head, I am aware of a kiosk that sits up there. I am not sure if that is operated independently or if that is operated by the golf club itself. I do not have that detail off the top of my head. In regard to any other leaseholders, has the government countenanced any sort of compensation for those who are going to be negatively affected by the government essentially coming in and taking control of this land and putting aside existing leases and contractual arrangements that have been in place?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I think the member obliquely referred to the restaurant that faces the Torrens. I think that was one of his concerns. At the moment, the design does not incorporate that particular restaurant. The kiosk that he refers to is operated by the club, which obviously has an arrangement with council. Obviously, we will work with both the club and the council.

The Premier and the Hon. Mr Hunter went down there last week to meet with employees and the club more generally. This should not be a time for anxiety but excitement because it is an upgrade to what is a golf course in a beautiful location in something we all agree is a great cultural and social asset to the state, the Adelaide Parklands, and we want to see a good outcome there. So we will work with everybody we can, including the opposition, as we go forward.

Mr Cowdrey: Now.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, we always endeavour, where we can, to work with everybody along the way. It is not always an exercise in perfection, but we do not let the perfect be the enemy of the good.

Mr COWDREY: Sorry, I had to contain my laughter inside on the back of the minister's last answer. In regard to the North Adelaide Golf Club, I guess consequent to the minister's answer, naturally, the next question involves the government's vision for the North Adelaide Golf Club moving forward. Is it the government's view that the North Adelaide Golf Club would continue to be a lessee either of the Adelaide City Council or of the government itself directly, moving forward?

Will the North Adelaide Golf Club still retain, post redevelopment, the operational licence for the North Adelaide golf links, or is this something that the government is effectively contemplating coming in, taking over and running itself and seeing, potentially, the golf club as a membership organisation to the side of the operation of the facility itself?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, the golf club is an essential part of the golf course and an essential part of this golf course's future. I think I said before that the Premier and the Hon. Mr Hunter met with employees last week and they have previously met with the golf club and its president, I believe. Obviously, there has been a very positive engagement and we want it to be positive. We see them as an important feature of a public golf course and we want to work with them to make a great public golf course, a world-class public golf course, which will be a really good thing for members and for the state and for everybody who chooses to visit our great city.

Clause passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before we go to the next clause, I would just like to acknowledge the Hon. Nicola Centofanti from the other place who is in the gallery. I also believe that behind her is the Hon. Mr Pasin, member for Barker, if my eyes serve me correctly. Welcome to our house.

Bills

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Committee Stage

Debate resumed.

Clause 7.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to the preparation for handover of the project site, as I understand it anyway, effectively the minister may determine what works need to be undertaken by Adelaide City Council to have the site up to his liking or desirable level of handover, and that there may be a range of activities that Adelaide City Council are tasked to undertake, but it does not appear to countenance any sort of compensation for that work being undertaken by Adelaide City Council. So can the minister give a clear idea of the scope of works that are contemplated under the clauses that are included, and whether Adelaide City Council will be provided with a level of funding to undertake those works?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: This clause is a clause that we have not anticipated the use of yet. It is in there—

Mr Cowdrey: It gives extra power just in case.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, you do things once and do things properly and, in terms of this legislation, we want to be able to deliver the project by 2028. This is a useful power for a minister to have in their negotiations with Adelaide City Council, but—

Mr Cowdrey: So it is a bargaining chip.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, it is not a bargaining chip.

Mr Cowdrey: You just said it was.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, I did not.

Mr Cowdrey: A useful tool to have in negotiations is a bargaining chip.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I said it is a useful tool to have because you can direct them if you need to, and then you can work out the arrangements to perhaps compensate them afterwards. It is an important provision. Of course, in all these things, member for Colton, when ministers engage with councils and others, often there is what is in acts and then you obviously sit down and talk things through about how you might deliver a particular project. That is all we seek to do here.

Mr COWDREY: Sorry—I am just getting over the statement that was just made by the minister, because the plain English reading of 'a useful tool to have in a negotiation' is also known as a bargaining chip. Colloquial language would simply tell you that that is the case. Despite earlier asserting to the house that this bill had nothing to do with the negotiation with Adelaide City Council, and that it was in no way a bargaining chip, the minister has just admitted that this is a bargaining chip. The inclusion of this particular section—

The Hon. N.D. Champion: I said the clause was a useful tool.

Mr COWDREY: The inclusion of this particular section of the act is simply here as a bargaining chip with Adelaide City Council to get them to undertake things that the minister sees fit, and then he may or may not contemplate to give them some remuneration for their work after the fact. The minister has quite simply said that he sees, at this stage anyway, no useful purpose for the inclusion but to cover all bases.

I am not sure what we are here to do tonight, but we are not here to grant the minister extraordinary power that he does not even contemplate using. That is in itself extraordinary. The process that we have had to get to this point has been extraordinary. The explanation by the minister has certainly not got close to the mark in terms of giving an understanding of why the government, the opposition, the parliament is here tonight debating this bill. Quite simply, at one point the explanation was because the grass needs to grow.

There is no contractual reason why this bill needs to pass, as came out of the minister's mouth in an earlier answer, so again I will pose the question as simply as I can: what was the impetus for us to be debating this bill today with powers that you are not even contemplating using? Is this a bargaining chip? Is this about negotiations with Adelaide City Council and nothing more than that?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The honourable member keeps working himself into a lather about issues which we have already discussed and countenanced. This is a useful power. Obviously, we will keep talking to council. It is the sensible thing to do. There might come a time in the project's life where it makes sense for Adelaide City Council to do something, and the minister might need this power to do it. If we came back in a couple of years' time with a new bill, the honourable member would be saying, 'Well, why didn't you include that in the bill we discussed?' This is an important power. It is not an excessive power. It is an entirely practical power for the minister to have, and the member is just getting himself worked up on issues that we have already traversed in a very significant way.

Mr COWDREY: I guess I will ask the question plain and simple then: have the minister and the government negotiated in good faith with the Adelaide City Council?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The government has had 17 meetings. That would signify a commitment of time and effort, which indicates goodwill on our part, and we will keep meeting with them, as we have to on so many things, but especially on this project. I understand the honourable member perhaps has to put questions in a particular way, but we are endeavouring to craft a bill that

delivers a project which is important to the state, and ultimately very important to the city and very important to the Parklands. It means significant investment in the Parklands and significant investment and upside for the city itself.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I refer to subclause (4), minister, which provides:

If the Adelaide City Council fails to comply with the direction of the Minister under subsection (2), the Minister may take any action required under the direction, or necessary for the direction be carried out...

Have you been briefed on what circumstances would require such a provision in a clause in this bill? Can you give some specific examples as to where you would use such a heavy-handed process?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That subclause clause really relates to subclause (2), so it is really about the handover of the course and facilitating that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Could you expand on that, then? What situation? Would it be a refusal or would it be taking court action or would it be some other legislation being introduced? How would you deal with it? What are some of the things that you were briefed about that you could actually do to enforce that power under that situation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The member for Unley asks me to sort of peer into the future. To the extent I can, it is simply the enforcement mechanism for subclause (2). You need to have some mechanism, some enforcement mechanism, in order for the law to be effective.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: But you need a tool for the enforcement. Were you briefed on what tools would be available to you under this clause?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is just the provision that obligates Adelaide City Council to comply with this particular clause related to handover. It is quite clear.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: No, it is not.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I have every confidence the Adelaide City Council will—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is not clear at all. Well, why is this here then? Why is it in the bill if you have confidence?

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, you have asked a question. Allow the minister to answer the question.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is in there so that subclause (2) can be brought into effect, and it relates to the handover of the course to the state government.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: In this clause, what prevents a change of use outside of the original purpose of this act once these powers are vested with, say, some future minister? Some future government might decide that it is no longer going to be Parklands. Does this bill actually give the minister the power to do that? Let's say LIV Golf pull up stumps. They do not want it anymore. It is an asset that is now a drag on the government and there is a move to find a solution and someone thinks they could approach the Walt Disney corporation to see if they were interested in that space, for example. The question is: what safeguards are in there to prevent a completely different use of that land that the minister may decide that the land is suitable for?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Clause 18 prevents that.

Mr COWDREY: Regarding clause 8(4), I just want to traverse the issue of War Memorial Drive and the road reserves because this is, again, where I am a little bit confused as to the wording. If we reference again clause 5, we talked about the road reserve areas in the vicinity of the areas listed in the preceding subparagraphs and you agreed at that time that that was in relation to War Memorial Drive as that is the only road reserve that runs between the two parcels of land that have been described. Then at subclause (4) it states:

- (4) For the avoidance of doubt, any areas of road, or road reserve, that vest in the designated Minister under this section will, on that vesting, cease to be areas of road or road reserve.

So does War Memorial Drive suddenly not become a road or a road reserve given that it has been, as the minister indicated earlier, captured by clause 5(1)(iii) earlier in the debate?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No. Later in clause 15 there is a whole section on roads. This mainly refers to small access roads, the likes of which already exist in John E Brown Park, so it is mainly there for that purpose.

Mr COWDREY: Again, just to be clear, clause 8(4) is a catch-all, right? So any of the areas of road or road reserve that vest with the minister are no longer road reserves, right? You said earlier that clause 5(1)(iii) captures War Memorial Drive. We had a discussion about parking and the fact that that would not be an issue and that, in terms of the project itself, there would be no consequences to War Memorial Drive being captured, apart from the fact that it may be closed from time to time for laydown areas or otherwise.

But the minister has sort of given a view to the committee that War Memorial Drive itself would be captured by clause 5(1)(iii). I can understand the minister's position if simply War Memorial Drive was not captured by clause 5(1)(iii), but, given the earlier answer alluding to the fact that it was captured but would only be closed due to there being a need to unload, offload or to secure deliveries or otherwise at certain points in time or to have a road closure, I am confused if it is captured by clause 5(1)(iii). Clause 8(4) seems to be a catch-all. It is irrelevant whether it intends to capture other things. It is captured by its very essence of being under clause 5(1)(iii), which the minister has said was the case.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I apologise for the confusion, honourable member. He was talking about parking and the like in the road reserve around War Memorial Drive. War Memorial Drive will only be captured if it is included in the map that the minister puts into the GRO. It is I think likely that areas next to War Memorial Drive might be captured, because there is an interface there. But if you look at clause 15—later on—there is a whole section about opening and closing roads and the measures, and it refers to the act, when we get to that.

There are two elements of this. There is, if you like, what is in the GRO map and then subsequent to that what the honourable member was talking about—parking on War Memorial Drive. So it would be the extent to which that map might encroach on those parking areas and may or may not be encroaching on the road itself. What this refers to is roads within the project area. So you can think: if the honourable member drives down opposite the Raptis fish markets at Bowden and looks in there is a small access road that goes into John E Brown Park, and, of course, there are access roads within the golf course itself.

Mr COWDREY: Just to 100 per cent clarify, the minister is essentially saying that War Memorial Drive itself will not be captured as part of the project site, despite the earlier answer.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, I was apologising for the confusion. The honourable member asked me about parking on War Memorial Drive. It is a very, very wide not so much road, but the verge along War Memorial Drive is quite wide in places, and some of that area would I think be potentially be in the GRO map. And we were talking about parking. So I think that is where the confusion arose.

What this section of the bill refers to is those roads within the project area. Of course the GRO map will be published, so members opposite and the public will fully understand what roads are included and which ones are not. As I said, clause 15 covers any other road closures that might need to occur.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Will roads that are adjacent to this site be subject to temporary speed reductions as the section of War Memorial Drive that runs by the Adelaide Oval is whenever the football is being played, and how many days of the year will we see 25 km/h zones along the roads from Port Road to Montefiore Hill and War Memorial Drive and other adjacent roads around the site?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Events always require analysis by traffic engineers and safety experts about how best to preserve pedestrian safety and how best to manage the event, so that is, I think, anticipated later on in the bill in terms of not so much the construction of the new upgraded golf course but the operation of the event itself. That gets left to the people conducting the event.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So you are unable to answer whether temporary 25 km/h zones will be imposed around the around the site when events are on?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If the honourable member has ever been to WOMAD, the Adelaide 500, the Supercars bp Adelaide Grand Final, the football or any of those events, these are normal things to manage events. Of course, the event coordinators would be guided by appropriate assessments of what is safe.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So that work has not been done yet; is that what you are saying?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I would not expect it to be done at this stage. We are in, if you like, design and then construct and then when the event occurs that would be a matter that would be anticipated then.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to clause 9—Consultation requirements and protocol, which again, when you look at the clause itself, operationally seems reasonably redundant given the path that has been charted and given the legislation, but I will play devil's advocate with the minister. If the council comes back and says, 'We want to be consulted on every aspect of the proposal,' what does that look like?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Clause 9 does have consultation requirements in the protocol. Again, the member invites me to anticipate what may or may not happen at Adelaide City Council's end. I guess what I could say is that we want to consult appropriately with Adelaide City Council and we are going to keep that engagement up, but we also want to deliver the project by 2028 and we want to upgrade this golf course.

Mr COWDREY: When was the last time the minister met with Adelaide City Council in relation to the project?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It would have been at the last meeting of the Capital City Committee. I would have to find the date for the honourable member. The last time I spoke to the Lord Mayor, I think, was last week on another matter.

Mr COWDREY: Has the minister been party to any of the 17 meetings that he alluded to earlier?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, they have been meetings essentially between the council administration and the state government's Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: How will traditional owners be consulted if Aboriginal remains or objects are found during the excavation and building of the golf link, and what is the process if work must stop for cultural reasons?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: As the honourable member can see, clause 10 outlines that we will fulfil our obligations under the Aboriginal Heritage Act. We have lodged applications under section 21 and section 23, which essentially set out the protocols for exactly the circumstances that the honourable member anticipates in his question. Those protocols allow you to deal with those very important heritage matters.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Has any preliminary work been done to assess the risk, and are you confident that it is unlikely that there will be any delays caused by matters unknown, such as the discovery of remains or artefacts?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: In answer to the previous question, the last Capital City Committee meeting was on 28 May, just for the opposition's information. Section 21 and section 23 of the act put in place protocols which manage that. That act is used on many different projects

around the state. It is an appropriate way of dealing with these matters in a sensitive, consultative manner, so that is the process we are going through.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We are hearing tonight the urgency of this project. What you are saying is that there has been no preliminary work done in this area. There is only one act that needs to be complied with for this bill—this bill does not override the Aboriginal Heritage Act—yet from what I hear from your answer, minister, is that no preliminary work has been done to see if there is even a risk for this project.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, there definitely has been work done as part of the early design works. Given the history of this site, of course that is a prudent thing to do, as is lodging the relevant applications under the relevant act, sections 21 and 23.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So work has been done. What was the result of that work?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The honourable member has to understand the outcome of that work is to lodge applications under sections 21 and 23 of the act. That is the appropriate way to deal with these matters. There are a range of sites around the state. In Noarlunga at the housing development there we have been through this process. Sections 21 and 23 are the appropriate mechanisms under the act to deal with it. You might do preliminary work, but of course you cannot predict what might be found in the course of construction.

Clause passed.

Clause 11.

Mr COWDREY: Minister, I did like the fig leaf that you tried to hide behind earlier in regard to the fact that the Planning and Design Code applies to the development.

The CHAIR: Member for Colton, I have been pretty patient. There is an element of argument and commentary going into the questions. Can I suggest you just ask questions? 'Fig leaf' is actually beyond the question itself, and there have been others that have been made. Can I suggest that you keep the language to specifically asking questions?

Mr COWDREY: I am not sure that there was an adequate description outside of that. At any rate, the claim from the minister earlier in his contribution to the debate made reference to the fact that the Planning and Design Code applies to this development. Of course, what he did not mention is that under clause 11(2):

All development proposed to be undertaken, for the purposes of the project, on the project site or the support zone will be taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed-to-satisfy—

therefore leading to an automatic approval.

There is no mechanism of assessment for the State Planning Commission. That is the authority that gives the vested power under the design code to set out, but it does not have any power to have a look at the development that is being proposed by the minister and to perhaps have any sort of evaluation. So what the minister wants, the minister will get in terms of development proposed on the site, under clause 11(2). I just would like the minister to make that clear to people, because I do not think it is clear within this chamber and within the broader house that essentially anything that is proposed is going to be deemed to satisfy, therefore will be built on the site. That is my understanding.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, it should be your understanding. It was in the second reading speech and, if you check the *Hansard*, it is exactly what I said to you in the previous answer. That is exactly what I said to you. I said there is this whole section about the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, and it all relates to deemed-to-satisfy. Of course, in the speech there is a clause about deemed-to-satisfy being in the PDI Act and about meeting the relevant building rules.

It is important for members opposite to understand that what we are endeavouring to do here is to deliver a project by 2028, to deliver for a very important event a very big upgrade and investment in the Parklands themselves, and this is the mechanism through the PDI Act that we are utilising to deliver that. It is not the only place where deemed-to-satisfy is used. It is used for a range of purposes

in the act and, of course, it allows the relevant planning authority, in this case the state planning authority, to properly assess them.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can the minister advise whether a permanent grandstand and function centre would fall under the deemed-to-satisfy development under this section?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Any works are going to be considered deemed to satisfy. Clearly, as part of the design process here looking at the clubrooms, which I think is important to make an assessment about whether they are fit for purpose—golf clubs need clubrooms, it would seem to be an obvious fact. Of course we want, as I said before, to deliver an event and an outcome for the state that is first class and top quality.

Mr COWDREY: Nobody is doubting what the minister has said—it is just the power that he has given himself in going about what he has in this particular way. The reference to there being other places that we do deemed-to-satisfy developments: yes, that is the case, but usually there is a code that sits underneath that, which has been thoroughly consulted on and gives rise to what is acceptable within that particular area of development that then you would deem something to satisfy against. Whereas what is being given here by the minister through the wording of this legislation, and in particular this clause, is a green light to anything that the minister sees fit, without any consultation with anybody, without any view being derived from impacted parties, perhaps, without there being any consultation from North Adelaide residents or others. It does not matter who it is: there has to be an acceptance from the minister that he is green-lighting himself to approve whatever he proposes.

Nobody on this side of the house is necessarily saying that it is a bad thing if there is some greater degree of framework around it, like saying, 'If that is to do with a clubhouse, if that is to do with a driving range structure that is no more than a certain height and includes what you would understand or see as what would usually be included in a clubhouse', or perhaps if we had some specifics in regards to what the minister was fundamentally wanting to see developed on the site. But the minister has not chosen to do that: he has basically said, 'Look, here's my magic lamp, if I rub it, it is going to turn green and I am approved, no matter what I put in there'. What the minister is proposing and trying to compare it with for deemed-to-satisfy pathways in existing areas where there are zones and clearly a framework that needs to be adhered to in terms of building heights through to—I mean, let's be fanciful. If the minister wanted to build the Walker Tower on this site, could he do that?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: You just proved why being fanciful is rather ridiculous, because in later parts of the act it says it has to be a golf course, a public golf course, and quite clearly—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Come on. I mean, be serious. I do not know what more we can do as a government when we put it in the second reading speech—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is in the second reading speech, it is in *Hansard* in the previous question that you asked me, and it is here in the act. The member can engage in florid language and fanciful propositions, but this act ensures that this bit of Parklands, as it has been for decades and decades, is a golf course and will remain a golf course. We are trying to deliver a good outcome for the state.

Mr COWDREY: Okay, let's take a less fanciful example. I have been to numerous public golf courses that have apartment buildings on site. We know the Labor Party has a propensity for putting apartment buildings in the CBD. I am not saying that that is a good or bad thing, but I am saying that it is possible under what is being proposed here. It is not unusual at a golf course for there to be apartment buildings—that is not an unusual thing by any stretch of the imagination. For the minister to fall back on the fact that they have made it very clear that it has to be in regard to a golf course, the definition of that is not included in the act, as far as I am aware. There is no definition

of what constitutes a golf course, what developments will be prohibited and prescriptive that can only be developed. Is there a definition of golf course in the bill that I have missed, minister?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Clause 18 delineates it as a public golf course. It has been a public golf course for all these decades and it will be a public golf course in the future. That is what this bill will facilitate. In terms of housing, the honourable member's own leader suggested there should be more housing in the CBD today, not in the Parklands, in the CBD, something I am happy to agree with him about. If you look at where the government is putting housing, it is putting housing at Southwark, putting housing at Bowden, putting housing at Prospect, putting housing at Seaton, all around the state, Noarlunga, Smithfield—

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: There is housing going up in the CBD. Go to Tucker Street, go and have a look. You, member for Unley, would be happy to know that that housing in Tucker Street is for over 55-year-old women who are at risk of homelessness. So, let's just be clear: this is about the delivery of a public golf course, not for housing, not for office blocks, not for any of this other stuff, and, obviously, as part of the process, we have given numerous undertakings about negotiating with the club and the council, talking to them, consulting with them, let's not get into fanciful fantasies about this. That is the proposition. It is quite clear what the government is trying to achieve here.

Mr TEAGUE: Perhaps to take another view of it, and let's all get enthusiastic for a moment about what might be among those deemed to satisfy development plans for the project, and, among those entities who would be included in those not consulted about the bill, I take it will be the North Adelaide Golf Club and its members. I understand the patron of the club is the Lord Mayor. Maybe that is ex officio, that close connection. We read that the North Adelaide Golf Club has been in existence since the 1890s. The council has adverted specifically to its association with the North Adelaide Golf Course's care and control for more than 100 years and that points to a longstanding heritage at the site.

Indeed, I think the club goes on to say that it might be the longest lasting club at its original site, so there are lots of continuity and heritage involved. Is there any reassurance, encouragement or indication in relation to the plans, as far as the adequacy of the golf club building facilities, that investments there will look to honour that heritage, enhance what is there, be faithful to the history, all those sorts of things from the golf club perspective or, on the other hand, is it really transformative and yes, there is a long history but it is about to change and there will be quite significant dramatic change altogether?

I am not closely familiar with those clubrooms that are there. From time to time and in my distant memory, I have played the odd round over the years. I cannot think of exactly what shape they are in right now. Just like the old scoreboard and the stands at the Adelaide Oval are heritage that is good to maintain, is it a matter of building on that heritage or is it a matter of a fairly thoroughgoing transformation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I think we covered off on this when we talked about the leases earlier. I do not know if the honourable member was here in that part of the debate, but we talked about the club, in particular, being an essential feature of the future of what is a public golf course, an absolutely essential feature. As I understand it, the clubrooms themselves are not heritage listed. They are not particularly important in that respect, but the club absolutely is. The club has a long history and, of course, as I understand it, there is a fair degree of enthusiasm amongst the members for the future, because obviously they will be members of a better golf course.

Clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Just referring to replacement trees, the clause provides:

The Minister must ensure that for every tree that is removed in the course of undertaking the project not less than 3 new trees (or seedlings for not less than 3 new trees) are planted within the project site and support zones.

How does that compare with what farmers must do, for example, if they are removing trees and what replacements do they need to provide and why are we being so minging with seedlings? Why are we not putting semi-mature trees in? There are companies, interstate, in particular, that actually are in the business of growing trees specifically for this purpose, so the wildlife does not have to wait years before it can return to the trees it was once using in that area where the trees were removed. Has the minister been advised as to whether there will be any century-old red gums that will need to be removed for this project?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The design process continues, and obviously the focus is on absolutely minimising the impact on trees, and there is a vast number of trees on site, so we are trying to minimise that number down. The member makes a fairly good point about seedlings versus semi-mature trees and, of course, that will be up to the designers.

Trees are desirable on golf courses. I heard about the member for Heysen hacking around some golf course. Every golf course I have ever been on—I was just thinking back to Kapunda Golf Course back when they had the old black scrapes. Even there there were trees. He makes a good point and, of course, I think the designers will take that into account.

This just simply lays down a fairly generous ratio in terms of government projects and the operation of the Native Vegetation Act, and I can understand members' contributions regarding it. I come from country South Australia, I grew up with farmers, so I understand the point. But essentially the Adelaide Parklands is not rural South Australia, it is an urban park and so these are the rules that apply on this occasion.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Just so I understand this, I am having a bit of trouble understanding how a park is designed determines whether you plant saplings, which will become semi-mature in five or 10 years, or you put semi-mature trees in straightaway to speed up the process. How does that affect the design? The only reason you would use saplings is being minging and not spending the extra money for the trees that have been grown for the purpose of minimising the impact of tree removal for such developments.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is not the only reason. We do not want to be cheap. We are putting significant public investment in the Parklands, and this is obviously going to showcase South Australia. So it is not a desire to be cheap. The reason why the flexibility is left in there is because there might be an availability issue. You may be able to get semi-mature trees or you might not, and there might be particular varieties, native or otherwise. All of those things might drive the design.

This provision gives a ratio and gives some flexibility in that ratio. Obviously, this is a government that has changed tree regulation fairly significantly. The honourable member himself has lobbied me about Unley city council, and I think that was informative in some of the changes we made. We are not attempting to be cheap. I think this clause gives a ratio and then gives flexibility to the designer within that ratio.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to trees, obviously the development of golf courses and the design of golf courses generally are not necessarily done in the same context as a Parklands precinct that has significant biodiversity requirements, for lack of a better term, that are captured or particular species that are endangered or otherwise that are identified as being part of the Parklands.

My question is: in regard to the design of the course, and in particular trees, are there requirements or was there work done by, say, the Department for Environment or others in regard to what trees should be used on the course? Are we effectively having native trees going in that you would expect to be in that environment? Or is free rein being given to the course developer to put in whatever they see fit in terms of course design? Or is it quite literally going to be like for like in terms of existing local species that have been in place for obviously a significant period of time?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Every so often I look at historic photos of the Adelaide Parklands. It is particularly interesting to look at the design of Victoria Square back around the turn of the century. But if you look on the golf course site, if you go back decades, it does look quite different and there has been quite a bit of planting there over the last few years. I think that planting was more a result of enthusiasm rather than any level of sophistication.

Of course, as part of the design team, we are going to incorporate some thought about how to appropriately replace trees as part of that process. Obviously, you would look at a whole range of things: suitability to climate, an ability to provide the native species and a whole range of other issues when you come to do that, as well as designing a top-class golf course.

Mr COWDREY: The minister referenced the fact that those things would be taken into consideration, but has there been any formal work in terms of due undertaking or a report of, 'This is what we expect to be going in. These are the sorts of trees or species that would naturally and normally be within that particular area'? We obviously had the discussion slightly earlier in terms of endangered species that exist within Park 1.

Has that work been done to this point? If not, will it be done, and will DEW have any input and say over the trees and the species that go into the design of the golf course? Or will it be dictated the other way around, where the golf course designer will dictate and pick what trees go in there without input coming from DEW or others who are better qualified to provide expertise in regard to the species and trees that you would naturally see in the area?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The design team is obviously talking to the relevant government agencies, including DEW, and also the golf course designer, so there is a sort of process there. As we said before, the broad principle—and the Premier reiterated it today—is that we all know that some trees will be removed as part of the redevelopment of this golf course. That is an unfortunate by-product of progress.

But what we are giving here in this clause is a replacement ratio and some broad flexibility within that. If you like, this is sort of legislative protection. Of course, there will then be a whole lot of design work because, as I was reminded before, trees are an incredibly important feature of a golf course, particularly a world-quality one. So every effort is going in to preserving trees and to avoid the replacement of them, and we have given a replacement ratio that I think is appropriate.

Mr COWDREY: Given in the minister's answer he has brought in the golf course design team, it is a question that I have been meaning to ask to this point: what process was undertaken by the government in selecting the golf course designer? Was there an open tender process? What was the process that was undergone to select the golf course designer?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I suppose it is not pertinent to the bill so much as the bill enabling that to go on. There is a design team and then there is Greg Norman Golf Course Design, and they have been contracted by the state government to deliver the public golf course in this case.

Mr Cowdrey: Through what process?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We have contracted them.

Mr Cowdrey: But how were they selected?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I would have to take that on notice and come back to you. It is not in my portfolio area, and I do not think it is relevant to the bill.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can the minister advise how many established trees will be removed? The opposition has been advised that a preliminary figure of about 600 established trees will need to be removed for this project. Are you able to indicate whether that is a figure that is reasonable to expect, or is that an exaggeration or an underestimate of how many established trees will be lost and replaced with saplings?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I would not agree with the way the honourable member characterised the end of his question because he invokes in the mind of the house some enormous tree being replaced by a sapling. Of course, there is a range of trees and plants on the golf course of varying different sizes and maturities. As I said before, the principle of the design process is to reduce the number of trees that we might need to remove, and we have given a ratio in this process.

As I said before, this has been a golf course for a very long time. Obviously, over that time there have been various works on it and various trees planted, and so it will be true of this process. We will get a world-quality golf course in the eyes of not just the nation but—I cannot remember the

figure I gave—some enormous viewership, looking on Adelaide, looking on not the Grange golf course, as lovely as that is, but on the city.

Of course, we want to have the best possible view of that event and of our city. The preservation of trees is obviously an important part of that. Where we do have to remove them, we will be replacing them—and there is a ratio here. There is some flexibility given there, but, as the member for Unley himself admits, there is a range between seedlings, saplings and semi-mature trees, and the design team and the golf course designers will make the appropriate judgements about that in consultation with the relevant agencies.

Mr TEAGUE: I rise to address the clause. Insofar as we have, on the one hand, the expectation of the investment towards a world-class championship golf course with exquisite playing conditions and all the rest—famous courses around the world come to mind, and the Augusta in Georgia is sort of the pinnacle.

The Hon. N.D. Champion interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: We can get parochial about these things. The point is really: what work is clause 13 doing, really, in the context that, as the minister says, it might be expected to be an aspiration to provide something that is going to provide an aerial view for a global audience, no doubt with a view to showcasing the precinct? To have this 'remove one and put in three' seems like a pretty baseline kind of stipulation to include in the bill. Is it not the case that the aspiration would be significantly better than to remove a tree and fulfil obligations, pursuant to a bill, to put in three trees or something? Rather, the questions that have been asked already about who the design team is and what their capacity is to choose the plants and trees and all the rest of it that is going to enhance the golf course are the more important points.

I guess it goes to: why is there this clause in this bill in particular? Why not, if it is just a matter of a blunt replacement of trees, lean on general criteria elsewhere? Surely the aspiration of the redevelopment is to do much better than what clause 13 is requiring?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I think clause 13 gives a positive duty to do something. A design team might go further than that, and that would be a good thing. Obviously, they are setting out to reduce the number of trees being removed, and part of our discussions about John E Brown Park and the driving range—some of our decisions around that—have been driven by the desire to not remove trees. If we did not have this clause in the act and we were relying on some general principle, the member might ask us to put something in, and that is why we put something in. We totally understand everybody asking questions about it, but it would seem to me to be a self-evident, positive action in the bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 14.

Mr COWDREY: This particular clause we have sort of touched on, to this point, in regard to areas designated as support zones to allow for the installation of a range of services or otherwise that may be required. My rudimentary knowledge of the golf course as it stands is that, in particular, the southern course, I believe, is irrigated in a much better way than the North Course—that the North Course effectively requires sprinkler heads to be rolled out from in-ground pots that are then carried out to where the particular spot is on the golf course. If you look at how it is maintained traditionally, I would say that it probably gets a little dry from time to time—the North Course in particular compared to the South Course.

At this juncture, I guess, given in particular that at subclause (2)(a) the very first thing called out is utilities, the question is actually in regard to water and irrigation and what work is actually going to be needed to make this happen, and how that is going to be paid for. Is that something that is going to sit outside of the SA Water reg process? Is that something that is going to be SA Water maintained because I imagine there is going to be some level of upgrade of the existing mains infrastructure required to service what will need to be world-class greens that will need to be watered considerably more than what is going on at this current point in time, let alone getting into the intricacies of who is going to be paying for the water and all those sorts of things down the track?

But at first instance, in terms of the requirements around water main infrastructure, are there any upgrades that will be necessary? I would hazard a guess there is definitely going to need to be some. Who is going to be responsible for those?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: We are assuming, as I think the design team are assuming, that those infrastructure costs are going to be part of the project costs. That said, in terms of the city network, with my SA Water hat on, I can tell you that there are parts of the CBD which have adequate sewer and water pressure, and then there are parts of the CBD where there is pressure on—

Mr Cowdrey: This is North Adelaide?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Not necessarily. SA Water is currently doing network design across the CBD, as they are in many other areas, because we want to make sure we have an understanding of, I often call it the invisible network beneath our feet, which we all take for granted. We all take water pressure, water security and sewer for granted. But we do need to do some analysis of the city. SA Water is doing that at the moment. As far as this bill is concerned and as far as these costs can be anticipated, we anticipate them coming out of the project costs.

Mr COWDREY: Will the expected upgrades to the network be undertaken by SA Water themselves?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That would depend on the scale of the works. Down at Southwark, we have already had to spend a bit over \$20 million in water and sewer upgrades, and you would not have anticipated that—I do not think anybody anticipated that when the West End site first presented itself as a housing opportunity, and same with Seaton and other projects.

Members opposite, I do not want to bore you with water and sewer infrastructure, but the analysis that is needed to be done by SA Water is very sophisticated. Often you find that there are pleasant surprises, but more often than not there is complicated engineering work. It would depend on the nature of the upgrade and the nature of the engineering work.

That said, we have already done Southwark, and I have been advised by David Ryan that the upgrades at Southwark support growth, would you believe, right the way back to Mitcham. So it is an integrated system, but it has often localised, if you like, capacity issues. There will be two processes: the design team's process about local infrastructure and use, and then obviously if there are significant upgrades they might well fall into SA Water's category because they will probably service much more than just the golf course.

Mr COWDREY: You have frequently referenced to this point the design team. Are you able to give us an idea of how many people are in that team within DPC, and are those people entirely dedicated to the design of the North Adelaide Golf Course? You mentioned that there was a contractual arrangement with the Greg Norman design team, but in terms of the design team that sits within DPC, how many people are within that team, how many FTE, and to whom do they report?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Obviously, I want to give the opposition a degree of certainty and confidence. Essentially, there is a team within DPC, and Greg Norman Golf Course Design has been contracted under all the relevant departmental rules to basically provide that service. Obviously, it is a complicated project. This clause talks about all of the things that might be needed, and I think it goes back to when the honourable member was saying, 'Well, why now?' You get an idea, and the honourable member has alluded to some of the challenges. The reason why we are presenting this bill is that this is a really significant complex project. We have a good design team—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, that is a question for another day, it is not a question for the bill. The important thing is we are giving that design team the legislative grunt, if you like, to get the job done.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Minister, will the water infrastructure be an extension of the purple pipe system that went in about 15 or 16 years ago? Are we using recycled water or are we using drinking water to feed the grass on this development?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: That would be something that the design team would have to assess. Obviously, availability, grade of water and what kind of outcome you are going to get from it would all be relevant factors.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Is the recycled system that was installed a decade and a half ago a responsibility of the state government to maintain? Is it still being used? Can it be extended? Have you done any work? It seems a very strange answer to say it depends on a design phase. If you have to put in water infrastructure, it is a decision as to whether you extend the existing recycled system or whether you bring freshwater in that has gone through the desalination plant or come from a reservoir. It is not really a design decision; it is really an environmental decision. Have you given any instructions that you would like to investigate, but with your design team, about whether the recycled system can be extended, and is the recycled system suitable for a golf course of this quality? Is it too salty? Have you made inquiries as to whether it is suitable for the project?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The honourable member in part answers his own question. What will inform the design team's choice is: is the water of sufficient quality to create a world-class golf course? Of course, that will then drive every decision back from that, and these will be things that have to be examined as part of the overall design and as part of the overall infrastructure to support it.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Will any of the money that is being collected with the levy on building more trunk sewer and water systems for new housing developments be used to fund the new water and sewerage services required for the golf course?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No. The \$1.5 billion investment in water and sewerage has been fully allocated. It is a little bit far away from your old stomping ground in Salisbury, but if you go to Craigmores Road you can see the massive pipes that have been installed. They are just about to send a small tunnel-boring machine under the rail line at Elizabeth North and then down Curtis Road in my electorate, and the electorate of the Deputy Speaker, all the way out to Riverlea. We were just talking about that in question time today.

That money is allocated. It is being spent. We have made investments adjacent to the city, at Southwark. Those investments might well assist, because they have a general benefit to the location, but we do not anticipate making an allocation out of the \$1.5 billion worth of infrastructure the government has put in for this project.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Is there a special allocation for water infrastructure from SA Water, or is it coming from DPC, or is it coming from somewhere else?

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, you have asked your three questions.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It is a supplementary question.

The CHAIR: No, it is not. Any other questions?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Well, the minister can answer that question.

The CHAIR: No, I am ruling he cannot.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Why are you hiding it, Tony? It is a cost-of-living question. Why are you not being transparent?

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, you will withdraw that remark, or you will be asked to leave. It is your choice.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I withdraw the remark.

The CHAIR: Right.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

Mr COWDREY: Again, we will go back to roads. We have traversed War Memorial Drive. I think the answer that the minister gave was pretty clear. I did like his sneaky exit out the back door, but that is okay. In regard to roads, and in particular closures, is the government envisaging a point

in time when War Memorial Drive will need to be closed for an extended period, or are we talking, as was sort of referenced earlier, that it will be ad hoc at times to unload or load, as opposed to whole road closures? Are you able to give us an understanding of what is envisaged?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you look at subclause (1), 'by notice in the *Gazette*, temporarily close', that would seem to be quite clear: temporarily closed.

Mr COWDREY: I did not say permanently closed, but temporarily.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: As we discussed before, there will be significant—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I cannot anticipate what the design team and the people constructing it will do occasionally. Move around the city on any day of the week and you will find road closures, which people find annoying. It happens quite frequently. It is happening on Curtis Road very shortly, because we are putting water and sewer pipes under it. If you construct things, there will be temporary closures and there will be partial closures. Obviously, in the construction of any project you try to minimise the temporary inconvenience to others, and I think that is set out in the clause.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to the interaction between roads, the support zones and the site itself, during the construction phase—and again, I am not au fait with the intricacies of the Building Code and requirements in terms of fencing and the likes—will there be a requirement for the whole of the site to be fenced?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is the intention of the design team to do it in stages. I think three holes at a time was mentioned, but it might be a bit more. Obviously, that allows you to appropriately secure a site, as much for public safety as for any other issue. That is the way I think they intend to proceed, rather than fencing off everywhere while they construct it. It will be done in a staged way.

Mr COWDREY: As a follow-up to that question, when you take possession of the site, given the answer that you have just provided that it will be done in a staged way—number of holes, etc.—will either the North Course or South Course be kept open as you start works on presumably the other?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is the government's intention to keep the golf course open for as long as we can while upgrading it in stages. Obviously, there is a benefit: it keeps everything moving. It keeps construction and the upgrade moving, it keeps the golf course working and it keeps workers in their jobs and that is obviously an important thing for a Labor government to do.

Clause passed.

Clause 16.

Mr COWDREY: Minister, we discussed this earlier today in the briefing and the word that was used in the briefing was 'if'. The operative word in the clause itself is 'may'. The minister, obviously, in the construction of this clause, gives himself the ability not to return any of the existing arrangements back to the existing parties, so are you able to make a commitment today that the government will not retain possession of the site after the redevelopment is finished?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The provision provides the mechanism by which a minister would make that decision. It does not oblige the minister to make that decision. As I pointed out before, the state government already has the Botanic Gardens, the West Terrace Cemetery and the very beautiful underground aquifer owned by the state government through SA Water.

Whilst in our mind Adelaide City Council has ownership over the Adelaide Parklands, in reality it is an asset for the people of South Australia and it is managed by various different entities, the council being one of them. It is a very important entity; no doubt, very important indeed. I talk to Adelaide City Council often, as I talk to all local governments. This gives us a mechanism for that process to occur and obviously we will just keep talking to Adelaide City Council in the way we have in the recent past and will do so in the future.

Mr COWDREY: The problem you have, minister, is that you have a great tell: you smile too much when you are alluding to particular issues. I guess we are getting to the crux of this as well. Is this the sticking point? Has this been the sticking point in negotiations? I can understand that Adelaide City Council may be very keen to get back an asset that they have probably invested a significant amount of money and time in over a significant period of time that derives a degree of revenue for them and I can also understand on the state government's side of the equation that, given the amount of investment that is proposed, they may potentially be very keen to hold onto the asset moving forward.

Again, I will ask the question, because all we are simply trying to do here is ascertain your intention and your intention is not made clear by the words that are included in the clause because there is a very strong word within the first three followed by a comma, which is the word 'may'. As you said, it provides you with a vehicle, but it does not ensure that you do that. So, again, I am asking you the intention of the government. Is it the government's intention to maintain the site after the redevelopment is complete, or will you be returning it to Adelaide City Council?

Mr COWDREY: Again, it is not a question of returning it to Adelaide City Council. This is an asset for the whole state. The Adelaide City Council has obviously made an investment over decades, but they themselves did a whole master plan in 2018 and then did not take the decision to invest in this site. That is just a matter of public record.

In John E Brown Park we are talking about dryness. I mean, go down to John E Brown Park. I bet if we ran the LiDAR over there that would show up as a pretty hot space, because bare earth radiates heat. If it was our intention just to continue to operate this, then this clause would not even be in the bill, would it—if that was our intention?

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No, no. What our intention is in clause 16 is to provide the mechanism by which we would reach an agreement with council about how this very important state asset, after it has had a very important investment in it, might—may, and 'may' is the operative word, make no doubt about it, but that is why the clause is there: so we have a mechanism to do that, should the minister, may the minister, wish to.

Mr COWDREY: So again we have, a couple of clauses earlier, a bargaining chip, one to be used as a very powerful tool in negotiations, as referenced by the minister himself, and then we get to this clause. I do not want to cast aspersions on the minister's intent, but I could see how the Adelaide City Council may interpret the word 'may' here as a threat—let's be real.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is not a threat. It is an opportunity.

Mr COWDREY: The minister responds and says, 'It's not a threat. It's an opportunity.' That is similar to how the bullyboys in *Ganglands* and that sort of stuff interpret things.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: An offer too good to refuse.

Mr COWDREY: An offer too good to refuse, as the member for Unley says. I do not think I can ask this in a way that is simple, that will elicit a response from the minister, because he clearly has no interest in responding to the question put to him directly. I simply end the contribution by saying that if the minister's intent as described is there then the word 'may' does not need to exist in this document. It can simply be removed. The minister could have brought it to this place without the word 'may' in two specific places, and exactly what he has just outlined could have been achieved, but he has chosen not to do that.

One can only think and deduce that the intent that has been provided by the minister is not the real intent that sits behind what has been introduced to this place today. I do not think that is controversial to say, but essentially we have the minister here, as he calls it, providing an opportunity to the Adelaide City Council; some would interpret that as a threat. We have a bargaining chip on the table, described by the minister himself as—what was it—a strong tool for negotiation. I think it is pretty clear now what this bill is all about. It is a strongarm tactic, simple as that.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I do not know quite how to respond to that. I mean, the honourable member wants to make me out to be like some sort of Tony Soprano figure, and I am

Mahatma Gandhi. I do not know what you are talking about. I am trying to be very reasonable, as we always are reasonable in our negotiations with the Adelaide City Council, and we are entirely consistent. What this provision I think very generously provides in the future, once a massive investment is made, is the opportunity to reach a sensible arrangement with the council.

Clause passed.

Clause 17.

Mr COWDREY: In terms of the declared period—and again, later in the bill it steps through in more detail—as I understand it, in some of the provisions that we have gone past and I did not ask specific questions on, there can be more than one declared event. My understanding of the public commentary to this point in regard to the golf course is that essentially the use of the course has been described as 'it will be a public course for 361 days of the year'—

The Hon. N.D. Champion interjecting:

Mr COWDREY: —whatever the event timeframe is, over three or four days, and a public course for the remainder of that. What I am trying very hard to understand here is: the minister has obviously left it open for other events to come, so you clearly do not see that public availability will be for all 362 days, otherwise there would be no clause needed to add additional events. So the line that the government has been spinning around this being available to the public for 362 days a year is clearly just inaccurate. Why would they have left in this bill a mechanism for them to declare other events, whether that be PGA championships, state championships or otherwise?

The line in terms of public availability to the course—because remember, we are only talking about a single championship course now, not two courses, where an event like a charity day could take place on one course and then there could still be public availability on the other course if there was an event to be held in the current set-up. What is being proposed by the government limits public availability if an event is occurring. That is clear: there is only one course, there is only one way of skinning the cat.

My question to you is: does the government stand by its public statements to this point in regard to the course being available but for the LIV Golf period and, if so, why have they included a clause in this bill to allow for other events to be declared?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Obviously, this allows for LIV and that is the main event that we have been talking about. But if the state was lucky enough to get more events, that would be a good thing for the state, would it not? That would be a good thing for jobs, that would be a good thing for tourism and it would be a good thing for the state. We like events, as you know: we like car races, we like golf, we like footy. We like events. They are good things for the state: big economic generators and big employment generators. So it is self-evident that your reading of the clause is correct.

Mr COWDREY: So it is an admission by the minister that the course will not be available to the public for 362 days a year as the minister has previously said?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No. It might well be, or there might be future events. I do not know; I cannot predict the future. If the state gets offered a great event, you would be a fool to say, 'No, no, no, we are going to say no.' We would not say no. We like events. Events are good: good for jobs, good for the city, good for the state. So self-evidently this gives the minister the ability not just for LIV but for other events. I am simply saying the member is accurate in his interpretation of the clause but perhaps not in his political rhetoric.

Mr COWDREY: So the minister has just admitted that he wants this course for other events. Do those other events include concerts? Are we opening up the course to host? Are we going to be taking things into the course? 'Other events'—the minister does not specify that it is just golf events that he wants on the course. He likes events, he wants events, he wants events in North Adelaide and he wants events on this new course. It is not going to be available to the public 362 days as has already been committed by the government. So, minister, can you make it clear what events you want at the golf course, and are you saying that there will not be music concerts and festivals that will take place on the new North Adelaide Golf Course?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is a public golf course; it is not conducive to a music concert.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Just think about it logically for 15 seconds.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Just think about it logically for 15 seconds: we already have WOMAD in another section of the Parklands and we have already had other concerts in other areas of the Parklands. We are spoiled for choice in that department. Why the opposition would say, 'You've got some secret plan'—it is just ridiculous. It is a golf course. It is quite clear what it is there for.

Clause passed.

Clause 18.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This clause provides for the general operation of the golf course. It states:

(a) the North Adelaide Golf Course must continue to operate as a public golf course; and

(b) the area of land comprising the North Adelaide Golf Course must not have permanent fencing around its perimeter for the purpose of excluding members of the public from the golf course land.

Does that extend to prohibiting permanent fencing components—for example, fence posts that remain while the fencing is removed? Will you rule out that you will use that type of temporary fencing? So, when LIV Golf or any other pay-to-enter event is occurring at that golf course, will every component of the fence be temporary or just parts of the fence? Will there be permanent parts of the fence with openings that will be closed when the event or other events are happening at the site?

I am really looking for you to confirm, minister, that there will not be signs of fencing when there are no events at the site. It is really quite specific. It says that it does not exclude members of the public from the golf course land. That is the only requirement that the non-fencing period requires, that they can still enter. It does not say that they need to—

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It says 'must not have permanent fencing around its perimeter for the purpose of excluding members of the public from the golf course land'. It is pretty clear.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: No, it is not clear at all. It can be incomplete fencing. It can be components of fencing that remain that are ugly when you are using the site for other purposes—walking the dog, looking out your lounge room window or whatever. I am asking whether the temporary fencing will be permanently removed after every event, or will there be permanent fixtures that temporary fencing will be attached to when it is required?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No permanent fencing—that is what it means.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Either you want the answer or you do not. It is like you are wilfully misunderstanding it.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: And now you are jumping up.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It does not say 'no permanent fencing'. It has a qualification that says that it stops people entering. It does say permanent fencing will not be there. It does not say that. It is only permanent fencing that stops people from entering. That is what it says. It does not mean there cannot be gates. It does not mean there cannot be posts that are left there when the fencing in between those posts is removed. That still allows people to enter. That complies with the legislation. I am asking you: is that the intention of the legislation, or is that an error? Is that an unintentional consequence of the rush to get this legislation into the parliament? It is very clear, minister. The only qualification is that it is not allowed to stop people entering. That is the only qualification.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: You keep saying the same thing like it is the truth. The honourable member just keeps bellowing the same thing over and over again. I do not know how much clearer the government can be: 'must not have permanent fencing around its perimeter for the

purpose of excluding members of the public from the golf course land'. That is quite clear what it means in both spirit and intent.

Mr TEAGUE: Just to contribute to the debate—and I appreciate the member for Unley going there, and I understand that the minister's answer. But it is even more explicit than that in subclause (2), in that subclause (2) just rides over subclause (1) altogether. It provides:

- (2) Nothing in subsection (1) prevents the erection of fencing or other barriers in relation to particular areas forming part of the North Adelaide Golf Course where the Minister is satisfied that the erection of the fencing or barrier is necessary or desirable for reasons of public safety, the security of any property or otherwise for a good purpose.

No bellowing, no repeating propositions. It is clear on the face of it that, if (1)(b) was, in the minister's view, clear enough that it was ruling out any form of barrier fence going up permanently, then subclause (2) just rides over that altogether if the minister at any stage forms a view that it is desirable for a good purpose to put a permanent fence around the whole golf course. That is a matter of legislative drafting.

The minister can give an indication that that is not going to happen, that it is not the government's intent or that a clear objective of policy and the purpose of the bill is to ensure that what you see now is what you are going to get into the future in terms of being able to freely access the golf course in the way that we can all see it now. That's not what the legislation says and, very specifically, it is not what subclause (2) provides for.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The member for Heysen puts a point reasonably. We have set out in the legislation that we do not want a permanent barrier, that we want the public to be able to traverse the golf course just as they do now, but you always need to leave a provision for public safety. For instance, the golf club itself might have to be fenced for security reasons. That is why it is in there and I am happy to indicate that to you, but the government's intent is quite clear: we want this to be a public golf course, we want public access. It is the Parklands and we want to invest in this site for the people of South Australia, not fence it off.

Mr COWDREY: In regard to subclause (1)(a), I just want to get some clarity on future use of the course. I am keen to understand the minister's definition of 'public golf course'. To me, 'public golf course' means available to the public, whether that be me able to go on an app, phone up the pro shop and say, 'Mate, I want to come on and have a hit.' That is what I understand a public golf course to be, where I am not required to pay membership and I have access to the course.

For instance, one of our reputable charities in South Australia might want to have a golf day at the North Adelaide Golf Course, so for a period of time the golf course will be closed while they undertake their charity game. What I am trying to understand is where that line is crossed. Say the state government decides that it wants to rent the thing out for a charity day every day of the year and we are minimising access on the golf course to three hours: does that, in the mind of the minister, meet the requisite of public access?

How many events are to be held at the course in addition to LIV, where we are potentially closing off the golf course for an extended period of time, the whole of the precinct? How many days a year, in terms of hosting events, does he think would overstep the threshold of it therefore not meeting the requirement that he has put in the act of operating as a public golf course, because to me 'public golf course' comes with a requisite of public access to the golfing course itself—not just public access as in people being able to walk through the course. I am keen to understand what the minister's definition of 'public golf course' is because there is not one in this bill and that he gives us some idea of where his thresholds sit in terms of both availability to the course itself in terms of access but also access to playing.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Broadly speaking, my definition is your definition, member for Colton. Clearly, at the moment, the club presumably does its own events on particular days. We would obviously work with the club around that, but I think the definition you gave in the first part of your question, that it is a public golf course and the public would have reasonable access to it, a reasonable chance to play on it, a reasonable chance to traverse it if they wanted to go for a walk or something, is a perfectly reasonable definition to have and one that I would agree with.

Mr COWDREY: The Premier today held a press conference that was given at the same time that we were given the bill, I think. To be completely frank, it is extraordinary that we are at the point where the Premier of South Australia is spending his time at press conferences talking about green fees. In the press conference earlier today—green fees are, of course, the priorities of government—he referenced that locals, those of us who are South Australians, everyone in this room—there are a few who were born elsewhere but we will not talk about that—would pay a lower green fee than those from interstate and that they would be slugged a higher price to access the course.

The point that was also made during that press conference was that he expected there to be a significant increase in people travelling to North Adelaide to play the course, which again I do not necessarily see as being a bad thing. Anything that we can do to promote tourism to South Australia, to have people staying at our hotels, doing all those things, I do not have any issues with. But, again, it comes to the very nature of the bill and the first specific general operation that you have highlighted, which is public access. Are we talking about South Australian public access or public access? Will there be a requirement in terms of local hours and availability for local golfers?

Again, the bit that we have to come back to is there is an existing usage of that course, but there are two courses currently and we are going to a single course and losing the par 3 course as well. The current usage of North Adelaide is most likely already above what is even capable on a single course.

In addition, we have already had the Premier highlighting the fact that they are foreshadowing increased visitation, increased patronage of the golf course. How is the government, how is whoever is operating this, whether it be the ACC, the North Adelaide Golf Club or the government themselves—because the minister will not tell us what he plans to do in terms of the operation of the golf course moving forward—going to ensure that South Australians have access to the golf course, that you still adequately are able to provide access for those interstate, but also ensure that the requirements you have set out in the bill yourself are actually met?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Whilst the member alerts the house, the Premier made it pretty clear today that he did anticipate a differential fee between local South Australians and one would presume that refers to residents, not your place of birth.

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I know, but just for point of clarity you would have to be a—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: You want to inspire people hiring out an Airbnb. There would have to be some—I do not know, a driver's licence perhaps.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I have you got all excited now. The Premier has made it pretty clear that we are building this primarily for South Australians. When we say 'public golf course', everybody understands that we anticipate that primarily being an asset for South Australians. There will be enthusiasm elsewhere for this course and there will be benefits to that too, in terms of tourism and a whole range of other things. The member seems to think there will be less opportunity to play golf on this golf course after it has been redeveloped.

Mr Telfer: Of course there will be. There are three courses there at the moment.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Just wait and see what emerges from the design team.

Mr Telfer: Trust me.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I would not trust you on much, mate, I have to be honest with you. I would not trust you on barely anything.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order, the member for Flinders!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The driving range itself will be a significant opportunity for people to play golf.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes, but just bear with us. So there will be plenty of opportunity to play golf and we have designed this primarily for the South Australian public.

Mr COWDREY: Again, the question gets back to some of the fencing issues as highlighted further down in the provision. In particular, the design team—that you will not tell us how many people are in it, but I am sure we will get to that at a later stage. You have said that the driving range is effectively certainly going on the city side of War Memorial Drive, despite the fact that you do not have any concrete plans and nothing has been developed, but you are very sure that a driving range is going there. That has essentially been the evidence that you have provided to the committee to this point today.

My question is in regard to the driving range itself, because there are driving ranges and there are driving ranges. I do not think there would be many people in this place who are not aware of a brand of driving range, or something similar, called Topgolf. That is a significantly sized driving range and potentially you can have up to six levels of driving ranges on top of each other, with self-loading buckets of balls that pop up. Again, that is entirely envisaged in the bill that the minister has put forward to us today, that we may have some corporatised commercial operation running on the Parklands.

The minister has not really made it clear as to what he is envisaging for this project. There is the potential for permanent fences to go around such developments, if it is for safety and security of any property, or otherwise for a good purpose, of course determined by the minister because there is no definition of 'good purpose' in the bill itself either. The question really is, when you talk about driving range, what scale are you talking? Are we talking Topgolf, or are we talking the driving range at Grange Golf Course, which is a single level, on the ground, with people hitting off a tee?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I do not think it is actually relevant to the clause, but that is something the design team are working through.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Flinders.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The CHAIR: Member for Florey!

Mr TELFER: Thank you for your protection, sir. Just continuing on the question around clause 18. It is fascinating actually: as you start to unpack this bill, it seems like every little aspect (and this is the whole justification for having this as a piece of legislation or otherwise) of this bill that you put in to try to mitigate concerns—clause 18 is around what will we do if people are worried that fences are going to go up?

Earlier on we were discussing what we will do if people are worried about trees? What will we do if people are worried about where the project site is going to be? What are we going to do if we are worried about care and control of the project site? All of these aspects have really fine definitions, like paragraph (b) here: 'must not have permanent fencing'. But every single one of these then has a rider afterwards that actually says, despite what the first part of the clause says, the minister has got the say to overrule anyway.

All the different clauses that we have already discussed and unpacked have that rider. The minister has got the say afterwards. Exactly as has been pointed out, subclause (2) basically says that the minister can change subsection (1) and can do something different with subsection (1) if they are 'satisfied that the erection of the fencing or barrier is necessary or desirable'—there is that word again, minister, that we are seeing a fair bit in this clause. Desirable from whom? It is fascinating to try to understand—'for reasons of public safety', which you have spoken about, 'the security of any property', which you have spoken about, 'or otherwise for a good purpose.'

Minister, can you give me a definition of what you envision, as the minister who is putting this forward to this place, other than public safety or security of any property, what 'a good purpose' would be for the erection of fencing or barriers in relation to particular areas around the North Adelaide Golf Course?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The member characterises legislation in a particular way. What we are trying to do is set out the parameters and then allow the minister to make sensible decisions. You asked me what a good purpose is. I do not know—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you listen, you might learn something. I do not know, fencing something that is dangerous like a power transformer.

Mr Telfer: So public safety? That is public safety.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: But there will be a range of infrastructure on site and you might need to fence it. All it is doing is setting out the things that we are attempting to do and giving the public and giving the house big commitments, and then setting out, well, if the minister needs to make a practical decision they can. The honourable member seems to be accusing us of doing something, but we are bringing legislation to the house.

If we were setting out to do anything other than what we are telling you in the legislation, we would just do that, would we not? We are actually saying that we want public access to the public golf course and setting out very clearly what our ambition is, and then giving the minister some flexibility. Beneath that, in terms of public safety and good order, it is not wildly different from what happens in many bits of legislation, if the member turns his mind to it.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Will the minister rule out the fencing also being a vehicle for advertising, whether it be commercial advertising or advertising the event or products that might be sold at the event, or anything related to a commercial organisation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The clause at the moment is about permanent fencing. We are not going to have permanent fencing, so you cannot have advertising if you do not have permanent fencing.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: No, my question was about the fencing full stop. I did not say permanent.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: If you just wait, later on in the clauses there is another clause which relates to temporary fencing. And guess what? If you have temporary fencing, of course you would advertise the event. The member for Unley must go around kind of like Mr Magoo wandering around the place. I mean, you were part of a government that put advertising over every awning and over every bit of temporary fencing, and you know it, so stop acting like a fool.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: So full of advertising. My question was specific: will there be—

The CHAIR: Member for Unley, you have actually had three questions.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —commercial advertising of third-party organisations? Will BP be able to advertise, for example, or will sponsors be able to advertise on that fencing?

The CHAIR: The member for Unley has decided to ignore my ruling; the minister will not. He will not answer.

Mr TELFER: I could ask that same question, but I do not want to waste one of my three questions.

The CHAIR: No, you cannot ask the same question because I ruled it out of order.

Mr TELFER: Well, it has not been answered, sir. Indeed, I want to ask specifically about the erection of fencing or other barriers, reflecting back to when we were debating clause 7, the capacity for the minister to obligate the Adelaide City Council to do certain tasks and certain works and the ramifications on the Adelaide City Council if they fail to do those works, as we have spoken about before. Are these the sorts of works, e.g. erection of fencing, that the minister will potentially obligate?

Will there be the power for the minister to obligate the Adelaide City Council to do these sorts of construction works as part of the two sections in relation to each other: clause 7, which I spoke about, and clause 18, which we are asking questions about at the moment?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: No. The first section that we were talking about, that original section, relates to the handover of the golf course to the state government, from ACC to the state government: this section relates to the operation of the event.

Mr Telfer: The expectation of the handover.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I am just giving you the answer. Again, you can try to debate it. I am giving you the answer. One relates to one section of the bill; the other does not relate to that section of the bill. It is quite clear.

Mr TELFER: In regard to that obligation with the city council, you speak about the fact that the erection of fencing, from your words, will not be a part of that, but it does talk about any task to be undertaken and completed by the Adelaide City Council. As the process is followed through, we follow the bouncing ball as far as the negotiations, where we get to the point where there is a piece of legislation dropped in our lap for us to consider, as opposed to there being an agreement with the Adelaide City Council. Was the conversation had with the Adelaide City Council about what their obligations would be with the development of the North Adelaide Golf Course, and was the ultimatum given to them that, if they do not comply, you are going to hit them with a piece of legislation?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I do not see how that question relates to this clause.

Mr Telfer: It is about infrastructure.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Yes, but you are stretching—I mean, it is impossible to answer these sorts of tinfoil hat questions.

Mr Telfer: It is pretty easy: yes or no?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: You are zooming between clauses and making assertions about—

Mr Telfer: One piece of legislation.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It is impossible from my perspective, maybe because it is late at night, for me to decipher what you are trying to assert that the state government is saying. I have answered about the fencing. We do not want permanent fencing around the site. There will be event fencing, which will be temporary. It is pretty clear, and guess what? It happens all the time. It happens for WOMAD, no problem. As you point out, it happens for a car race that the opposition opposed and dismantled when in government. We can go through the list of events that occur in the Parklands. It is important to have a guard against permanent fencing as a guarantee for the public, and obviously we need temporary fencing for public safety and for the event itself.

Clause passed.

Clause 19.

Mr COWDREY: Again, we get to the use of the golf course for approved events, and again, the minister has been at pains to point out that the language that has been included in this bill has been very purposeful. He has had it drafted in a way to make sure that his intention is accurately captured. The question is simple, because the minister sort of put his nose up when we said there is nothing stopping other events being conducted on the golf course site. There is nothing in this bill that stops that.

The Hon. N.D. Champion: Except for common sense.

Mr COWDREY: Apart from the fact, minister, that you have provisions in the bill around the fact that it is not quarantined to just golf events. It could have been very easily solved by the minister if he simply said 'use of golf course for approved golf events'. Done. Simple. Black and white. We understand that the government only wants to use the golf course for golf events. All he needed to do was put the word 'golf' in front of 'events' and then it is pretty clear to everybody in this place. If the minister wants to move an amendment right now, I am happy to support it. If the minister wants

to put 'golf events' in the title of clause 19 and if he wants to put 'golf event' in paragraph (b), I am happy to support it right now—it provides great clarity to everybody here.

But the fact that at the moment we have a bill where the minister has specifically precluded the noise and litter act from applying to the site in question does beg the question, given that he is happy for any works to be conducted, as he sees fit, to prepare or set up for 'an event'—not a 'golf event' but 'an event'—to be undertaken on the course. You can see that it is not difficult for people to go $A + B = C$.

If the minister wants to give an undertaking that he will go away from this place, or if he does not want to do it tonight and he wants to consider it in more detail—perhaps it is something that could have been done before this was jammed into the parliament tonight—we can consider it between the houses. I can confidently say that the opposition would be happy to support it, if he is going to go away and make that amendment. But with it not being there it only leaves the door open for people to draw conclusions, not just in this place but I am sure by the public more broadly as well.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, only if you are wearing a tinfoil hat and you are looking for conspiracy theories. Let me give you one very good reason why you would not make an amendment like that: it is because you would then preclude the golf club itself from doing any other event other than golf. What happens if a club—and this happens every weekend in the Parklands, in some form or another, in sporting clubs right across the Parklands in all sorts of events. Let me give you an example. Adelaide Uni has a nice facility just near MacKinnon Parade. They do vacation care for kids. That is an event, and the honourable member's provision would preclude it, would it not? So the very thing that you are trying to preclude would actually preclude the club itself from holding events.

Mr COWDREY: That is possibly the most preposterous answer to a question I have heard in this place in the seven-plus years that I have been here. To presuppose that a club deciding that they would undertake some form of child care would reach the threshold of needing to be an approved event on a piece of state infrastructure is just ridiculous. Tinfoil hat stuff?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The club might want to have tournaments, and the club might want to have a range of events. Let's not—

Members interjecting:

Mr COWDREY: Make it clear.

Mr Brown: It's not my legislation, mate; ask him the questions, not me.

Mr COWDREY: You ask the question. If you are unclear, ask him the question.

The CHAIR: Order!

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It might be that you want to ask another question, then we will report progress.

Mr TEAGUE: I am interested in asking another question. There have been a couple of references to tinfoil hats just lately—it might be the hour—but just to put this into a present-day context: there has been talk about AC/DC coming to Adelaide. I remember those days when AC/DC performing at Adelaide Oval raised the spectre of North Adelaide residents saying that they would be a noise nuisance, and they had to be really careful about the time of night and volume and all that stuff. The minister might remember that as a resident of North Adelaide himself, as I understand.

I am not suggesting, actually, that the minister might zero in on the redeveloped golf club as a suitable venue for an AC/DC concert, but it is not—

Mr Cowdrey: A Day on the Green.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, a Day on the Green. It is far from improbable. I remember just in recent years, in a perfectly suitable sort of way, there was an initiative taken to use the final holes, a beautiful

location at the Mount Lofty Golf Club—it has more recently been named the Stirling Golf Club—on the 18th and there is a grassy sort of bank to have a kind of night-time cinema there. It overlooks a nice area and people can be on the balcony at the club and so on. That on a relatively grander scale could well be something that the minister might deem to be an event contemplated for the purposes of this clause.

When you read that in conjunction with clause 24 that kind of says—and this is for the long term; this is after any vesting under clause 16, and so on—the minister has these levers ongoing, there is an event that merits holding it the redeveloped golf club, 'Trigger clause 24: no possibility of a nuisance occurring here, whether by noise or light or any other thing that might otherwise be a nuisance.'

So whether it is to chime in and back up the member for Colton or to rebut this notion of tinfoil hats, if it is in contemplation that there is this range of potential events that might take on the character of which I have given an example, then it might be good to be clear about that, given that the invitation that the member for Colton has given to specify that it is golf events only. If that is to be resisted, then it might be good to come out and say, 'Well, actually, all these other things are in contemplation.' So it would not surprise me if they were.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, they are not. The reason why we are building a world-class golf course is to have golf events. The member himself outlined all of the places where you might have other events: Adelaide Oval, and there is WOMAD in other areas of Parklands. We are so spoilt for choice that we do not need to contemplate these things. It is probably late in the night and hence I would ask for progress to be reported.

The CHAIR: That was the 100th question tonight. It might be a good time to report progress.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

SOCIAL WORKERS REGISTRATION (COMMENCEMENT OF ACT) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 23:13 the house adjourned until Wednesday 18 June 2025 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***SA HEALTH STAFF**

26 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many nurses were recruited in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of nurses and midwives who commenced employment in SA Health between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023 was 3,073.

SA HEALTH STAFF

27 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many nurses left SA Health in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of nurses and midwives who left their employment in SA Health between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023 was 2,843.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE RESOURCING

28 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the current level of vacancies in the SA Ambulance Service?

1. What is the breakdown of vacancies by SA Ambulance Service regions?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Vacancies vary on a daily basis—as of 21 September 2023 there were 6.61 net vacancies across all SA Ambulance Service regions.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE RESOURCING

29 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many paramedics were recruited in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In the financial year 2022-23, 151 paramedics were recruited by the SA Ambulance Service.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE RESOURCING

30 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many paramedics left the SA Ambulance Service in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In the financial year 2022-23, 50 paramedics left the employ of SA Ambulance Service.

SA HEALTH STAFF

31 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many allied health professionals are expected to be recruited over the forward estimates?

- (a) Which professions will they be from?
- (b) What is the current level of vacancies in each of those professions?
- (c) What is the breakdown of vacancies by local health network?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Recruitment of allied health professionals will be undertaken to fill existing vacancies and those that arise in the future.

SA HEALTH STAFF

32 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many allied health professionals were recruited in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of allied health professionals who commenced employment in SA Health between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023 was 671.

SA HEALTH STAFF

33 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many allied health professionals left SA Health in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of allied health professionals who left their employment in SA Health between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023 was 626.

SA HEALTH STAFF

34 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many midwives are expected to be recruited over the forward estimates?

(a) What is the current level of vacancies?

(b) What is the breakdown of vacancies by local health network?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Recruitment of midwives will be undertaken to fill existing vacancies and those that arise in the future.

SA HEALTH STAFF

35 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many midwives were recruited in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 26.

SA HEALTH STAFF

36 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many midwives left SA Health in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 27.

WHYALLA MIDWIFERY SERVICE

37 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Has a \$2.2 million increase in expenses due to enterprise agreement costs with the nursing and midwifery enterprise agreement 2022 resulted in the withdrawal of midwifery services in Whyalla?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

No.

SA HEALTH STAFF

38 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many doctors were recruited in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of doctors (medical professionals) who commenced employment in SA Health between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023 was 956.

SA HEALTH STAFF

39 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many doctors left SA Health in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of doctors (medical professionals) who left their employment in SA Health between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023 was 706.

SA HEALTH STAFF

40 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the breakdown of the total number of new doctors and number of doctors who have left SA Health in each local health network?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answers for questions on notice No. 38 and 39.

SA HEALTH STAFF

41 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many pharmacists were recruited by SA Health in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 32.

SA HEALTH STAFF

42 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many pharmacists left SA Health in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answers for questions on notice No. 33.

SA HEALTH STAFF

43 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the breakdown of the number of pharmacists employed by SA Health in each local health network?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 41 and 42.

SA HEALTH REDUNDANCY PAYMENTS

44 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What was the total number of redundancies offered and accepted via voluntary separation packages across the department and all local health networks in the 2022-23 financial year?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Thirteen voluntary separation packages were accepted across the SA Health portfolio during the 2022-23 financial year, with a value of \$1.318 million.

None of these packages were accepted by frontline staff.

SA HEALTH REDUNDANCY PAYMENTS

45 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many nurses or midwifery staff accepted voluntary separation packages in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

No voluntary separation packages were accepted by nursing or midwifery staff during the 2022-23 financial year.

SA HEALTH ENTERPRISE BARGAINING

46 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Which enterprise bargaining agreements in relation to health workers have expired?

1. What progress has been made in relation to each enterprise bargaining agreement?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Oversight of enterprise bargaining agreements are the responsibility of the Minister for Industrial Relations and the Public Sector.

SA HEALTH STAFF COVID-19 VACCINE REQUIREMENTS

47 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What are the current requirements around COVID-19 vaccinations for frontline health workers?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

COVID-19 requirements for SA Health healthcare workers are as per SA Health's Policy: Addressing vaccine preventable disease: Occupational assessment, screening, and vaccination. This strongly recommends that category A, B and C healthcare workers to be up-to-date with COVID-19 vaccinations and any additional COVID-19 vaccinations as recommended by the Australian Technical Advisory Group on Immunisation (ATAGI).

COVID-19 vaccination policies for healthcare workers who do not work for SA Health are the responsibility of individual employers.

SA HEALTH STAFF COVID-19 VACCINE REQUIREMENTS

48 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many staff have been furloughed on the grounds of their COVID-19 vaccination status?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Following the implementation of the SA Health Immunisation Policy in November 2022, 245 have been terminated for failure to comply with a lawful and reasonable direction which required compliance with the Addressing Vaccine Preventable Disease: Occupational Assessment, Screening and Vaccination Policy.

AMBULANCE RAMPING DATA

49 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Where can South Australians access the hospital-by-hospital breakdown of ramping?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Monthly data is published on the SA Health website and is readily accessible to the public.

SA HEALTH CORONER REFERRALS

50 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many deaths within the context of the health system have been referred to the coroner?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Deaths occurring in the public health system which are reported to the Coroner are those deaths which meet one of the criteria of a 'reportable death' as outlined in the *Coroners Act 2003* (SA).

Local Health Network staff notifying the Coroner of these 'reportable deaths' are meeting their legislative requirements, but it should be noted that most deaths reported to the Coroner by local health networks do not result in a coronial investigation.

Further information regarding coronial notifications would be best referred to the Coroner.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

51 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Are you aware of any deaths associated with ramping or ambulance delays?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Coroner has been conducting an inquest into three deaths, with findings yet to be provided including whether the deaths are related to ramping.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

52 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many adverse incidents resulting from ramping or delayed ambulance response times have been reported to your office in the past 12 months?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Clinical incidents are reported by SA Ambulance into the Safety Learning System.

AMBULANCE RAMPING DATA

53 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Does SA Health collate data on ramping outside of hospital avoidance hubs? If not, why?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Unlike emergency departments, hospital avoidance hubs accept ambulance patients only when they have the capacity to take them.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

54 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Are you aware of any ramping that occurs outside the hospital avoidance programs in Sefton Park and Daw Park?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

No.

HOSPITAL AVOIDANCE HUBS

55 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the transfer of care time in relation to the hospital avoidance programs in Sefton Park and Daw Park?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 53.

HOSPITAL AVOIDANCE HUBS

56 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the percentage of patients treated within clinically recommended timeframes at the hospital avoidance programs in Sefton Park and Daw Park?

1. What is the breakdown of each category of patient?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Sefton Park

The hospital avoidance program at Sefton Park provides immediate rapid access appointments for patients who are on trajectory to present to an emergency department/hospital admission.

Daw Park

Referral to SALHN hospital avoidance program Complex And Restorative (CARE) at Daw Park is via SAAS/Health navigator/Virtual Care Service/GPs/Residential Care Facilities, directly to the CARE service.

AMBULANCE RAMPING MEASURES

57 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the measures to reduce ramping, how many new employees/FTEs are required above and beyond existing staff numbers to enable weekend discharges?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of additional doctors and allied health staff employed as part of this investment will be determined at the local level. Each local health network has local plans for their implementation.

AMBULANCE RAMPING MEASURES

58 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the additional staff to support the weekend discharge measures, how many additional staff are required to ensure an adequate level of staffing on weekends?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 57.

AMBULANCE RAMPING MEASURES

59 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the additional staff to support weekend discharge measures, will weekend shifts be covered entirely by new staff or by a combination of new and existing staff?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

A combination of new and existing staff will cover these shifts.

AMBULANCE RAMPING MEASURES

60 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the additional staff to support weekend discharge measures, have you had any conversations with any union regarding current staff working on weekends?

1. Were any concerns raised during these conversations?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Consultation with unions has/will be undertaken by local health networks as these measures are implemented.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE BACK-BILLING

61 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How much money is the government expected to recover through the back-billing of South Australians who used the SA Ambulance Service?

1. How many South Australians should expect to receive an invoice over the next three years?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As of 17 January 2024, SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) is currently processing at the expected invoicing key performance indicator. Consequently, SAAS does not expect any further 'back-billing' invoices to be generated.

SAAS will continue to generate invoices for those patients requiring transport and do not have SAAS ambulance cover or private health insurance covering ambulance transports; or for transports as a result of motor vehicle accidents.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE BACK-BILLING

62 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the back-billing of ambulance patients, how many South Australians in financial stress have made an application for a payment plan?

1. How many have been denied and why?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In the financial year 2022-23, approximately 400 ambulance consumers have requested and been put onto varying forms of payment plans.

SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) advises they currently do not record how many consumers have applied for a payment plan and been declined. It is, however, in SAAS's experience, a rare occurrence.

SAAS aims to negotiate and work with consumers to find a solution that is reasonable and feasible to support them to successfully make their payments without causing additional financial stress.

HOSPITAL BEDS

63 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many hospital beds has the government brought online since the 2022 election?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Malinauskas Labor government is opening more beds and hiring hundreds more doctors and nurses across the health system as part of our record investment in health.

This includes more than 600 beds across the system, with 150 inpatient beds to open in 2024 alone to help improve patient flow and reduce bed block.

HOSPITAL BEDS

64 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the breakdown of the number of hospital beds in each local health network over the last 10 years?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Public reports regarding South Australian hospitals and the care they provide are published by the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) each year.

NARACOORTE HEALTH SERVICE

65 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Naracoorte Health Service planning, can you explain the rationale for spending \$1 million on a planning study for health services in one regional community?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The \$1 million allocated to undertake a planning study for the delivery of health services in the Naracoorte region in the 2023-24 state budget is intended to understand further funding opportunities for the Naracoorte Health Service (NHS). This includes the supporting design work for additional staging of capital work priorities, with stage 1 providing \$8 million to support initial upgrades at the site.

The funding will be split with \$750,000 dedicated specifically for the Naracoorte Health Service (NHS), and the remaining \$250,000 to progress a clinical services and infrastructure plan for the entire Limestone Coast region.

The NHS stage 1 projects include upgrades to the emergency department, infection prevention and control infrastructure and priority engineering services.

The NHS is the second largest health service site in the Limestone Coast Local Health Network (LCLHN) and the planning study is expected to deliver a master plan which will incorporate both service and infrastructure planning and integrate with regional LCLHN services and infrastructure planning, which will ensure the long-term viability of the Naracoorte Health Service.

NARACOORTE HEALTH SERVICE

66 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Naracoorte Health Service planning, what specific outputs will be produced from this planning study?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 65.

NARACOORTE HEALTH SERVICE

67 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Naracoorte Health Service planning, will this include in its scope assessment of policy reforms and/or the implementation of initiatives or pilot programs to attract health workers to the Naracoorte region?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to answer for question on notice No. 65.

SA CANCER SERVICE

68 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What funding has been allocated to the implementation of the Cancer SA plan?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Refer to the press release dated 16 April 2025.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

69 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the total number of presentations to emergency departments in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network in the financial year of 2022-23?

1. What is the breakdown by hospital?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Information about the Central Adelaide Local Health Network 2022-23 financial year is publicly available in their annual report.

SA HEALTH PATIENT DATA

70 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Provide a breakdown per hospital of the following in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network in the financial year of 2022-23:

- (a) What was the number of patients treated and discharged?
- (b) What was the number of patients admitted and treated?
- (c) What was the number of patients transferred to another hospital?
- (d) What was the number of patients that left without, or before completing, treatment?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Statistics relating to the public hospitals in SA are publicly available through the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and in the local health network's annual reports.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS WAIT TIMES

71 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What was the average wait time in emergency departments across the Central Adelaide Local Health Network?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Emergency department wait times are publicly available on the SA Health dashboard.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS WAIT TIMES

72 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Provide a breakdown of the average wait time in emergency departments for the Royal Adelaide Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital over the last 10 years?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Statistics relating to the public hospitals in SA are publicly available through the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and in local health network's annual reports.

BREAST CANCER SCREENING

73 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Why has the number of women screened for breast cancer declined in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The lower number of women screened in the 2022-23 financial year reflected the impact of the COVID-19 pandemic and influenza season.

The easing of COVID-19 restrictions in the previous financial year (2021-22) had also resulted in an initial surge in community-driven screening demand, which moderated to below pre-pandemic levels in the early months of the 2022-23 financial year.

BREAST CANCER SCREENING

74 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the government doing to ensure the 2023-24 target of the number of women being screened for breast cancer will be met?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In early September 2023, BreastScreen SA introduced an online booking platform that has significantly improved client engagement with the program. Client feedback has consistently highlighted the importance of providing an online booking option for the women of South Australia, and this is now being reflected in the number of women choosing to book an appointment online.

BreastScreen SA recorded its highest booking month in the history of the program in September 2023, with 12,593 women booking a breast screen, 39.2 per cent of those booking through the online option. 1,593 women booking in were new clients to BreastScreen SA, approximately half of whom booked online.

In addition to online bookings, a new fixed screening clinic introduced at Mt Barker (January 2023) continues to increase accessibility and participation in the Adelaide Hills.

ELECTIVE SURGERY WAIT TIMES

75 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the average wait time for urgent, semi-urgent and non-urgent patients across the Central Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The average (median) wait time across the Central Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist for the month of December 2023:

- 18 days for urgent patients (Category 1 patients)
- 79 days for semi-urgent patients (Category 2 patients)
- 320 days for non-urgent patients (Category 3 patients)

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS WAIT TIMES

76 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What was the average wait time in emergency departments across the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Emergency department wait times are publicly available on the SA Health dashboard.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS WAIT TIMES

77 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Provide a breakdown of the average wait time in emergency departments in each hospital in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network over the last 10 years?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Statistics relating to the public hospitals in SA are publicly available through the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and in the local health network's annual reports.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

78 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What was the total number of presentations to emergency departments in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network for the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Information about the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network 2022-23 financial year is publicly available in their annual report.

SA HEALTH PATIENT DATA

79 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Provide a breakdown per hospital of the following in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network for the financial year of 2022-23:

- (a) The total number of patients treated and discharged?
- (b) The total number of patients admitted and treated?
- (c) The total number of patients transferred to another hospital?

(d) The total number of patients that left without, or before completing, treatment?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Statistics relating to the public hospitals in SA are publicly available through the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and in the local health network's annual reports.

ELECTIVE SURGERY WAIT TIMES

80 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the average wait-time for urgent, semi-urgent, and non-urgent patients across the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The average (median) wait time across the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery wait list for the month of December 2023:

- 17 days for urgent patients (Category 1 patients)
- 84 days for semi-urgent patients (Category 2 patients)
- 360 days for non-urgent patients (Category 3 patients)

ELECTIVE SURGERY WAIT TIMES

81 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the average wait-time for urgent, semi-urgent, and non-urgent patients across the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist for the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The average (median) wait time for patients across the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist for the financial year of 2022-23 was:

- 16 days for urgent patients (Category 1 patients)
- 91 days for semi-urgent patients (Category 2 patients)
- 366 days for non-urgent patients (Category 3 patients)

ELECTIVE SURGERY WAIT TIMES

82 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the average wait-time for urgent, semi-urgent, and non-urgent patients across the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist for the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The average (median) wait time for patients across the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network on the elective surgery waitlist for the financial year of 2022-23 was:

- 15 days for urgent patients (Category 1 patients)
- 69 days for semi-urgent patients (Category 2 patients)
- 277 days for non-urgent patients (Category 3 patients).

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS WAIT TIMES

83 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What was the average time wait time in emergency departments for all patients across the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Emergency department wait times are publicly available on the SA Health dashboard.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS WAIT TIMES

84 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Provide a breakdown by hospital of the average wait time in emergency departments across the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network over the last 10 years?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Statistics relating to the public hospitals in SA are publicly available through the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and in the local health network's annual reports.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

85 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What was the total number of presentations to emergency departments in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Information about the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network 2022-23 financial year is publicly available in their annual report.

SA HEALTH PATIENT DATA

86 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Provide a breakdown by hospital of the following in the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network for the financial year of 2022-23:

- (a) The total number of patients treated and discharged?
- (b) The total number of patients admitted and treated?
- (c) The total number of patients transferred to another hospital?
- (d) The total number of patients that left without, or before completing, treatment?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Statistics relating to the public hospitals in SA are publicly available through the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and in the local health network's annual reports.

HOSPITAL SERVICES

87 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the additional hospital activity measure, can you provide a breakdown of the additional services and/or staff delivered as part of this funding?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The funding for this measure has been allocated to address activity demand pressures being experienced across the system.

In 2022-23 the demand for hospital services increased by 3.0 per cent for hospital admissions, 4.2 per cent for emergency department presentations and 5.1 per cent for outpatient services, compared to the previous year. Activity growth across the system remains higher than the historical average of 1.7 per cent, and this is expected to continue in 2023-24.

The funding has been allocated to the Local Health Networks (LHNs) as activity-based funding in line with the national funding model and aligned to where relevant activity was delivered in 2022-23.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

88 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, how many applications were deemed ineligible in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

To be eligible for Patient Assistance Transport Scheme PATS assistance, a patient must be referred to their nearest specialist service for the particular clinical specialty. Regional local health networks work hard to provide services closer to home, reducing the need for patients to travel unnecessarily, PATS is then used to subsidise travel when these services are not available within 100 kilometres.

Claims are deemed ineligible to receive a subsidy when they do not meet the eligibility criteria.

During the 2023-23 financial year there were 1,647 declined/ineligible claims. This equates to 3.98 per cent of the total submitted claims.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

89 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, what were the most common reasons for applications being deemed ineligible in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

When claims are submitted to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS) and do not meet the eligibility criteria, a reason is recorded against the claim.

PATS assessors will query the Australian Health Practitioners Regulation Agency (AHPRA) website to determine the registration type of the specialist performing treatment.

The most common reasons for application being declined are claims not meeting the nearest specialist criteria and ineligible specialist criteria.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

90 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, how many appeals were processed in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Patient Assistance Transport Scheme (PATS) does not specifically record the number of appeals made, rather actions taken on an as needed basis.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

91 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, what was the highest number of claims received by an individual in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The highest number of claims received by an individual by the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme for the 2022-23 financial year is 37 claims.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

92 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, can you provide a breakdown of the number of payments by postcode in the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The number of payments for the 2022-23 financial year is measured by the PATS team and are considered as part of the assessment for further reforms to the program.

PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME

93 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). In relation to the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme, what is the rate of the overnight subsidy for the financial year of 2022-23?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Non-concession card holders are required to pay the first night's expenses in full but are eligible for a full subsidy for their second night of stay. Accommodation subsidies are provided at \$40 plus GST for a patient and an additional \$40 plus GST for an approved escort per night.

AMBULANCE STATION UPGRADES

94 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). Can you explain why an additional \$20 million has been allocated to the new Campbelltown, Mount Barker, Gawler and Victor Harbor ambulance stations?

1. What are the timelines for each project?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The additional funding was allocated to ensure that fit-for-purpose facilities could be built to accommodate the Malinauskas Labor government's commitment for new ambos.

Mount Barker, Gawler and Victor Harbor will now have rebuilt stations in separate locations that will be both futureproofed to accommodate additional crewing, and because they are more operationally suitable to respond to community demand and meet response times targets.

Timelines for each project have already been announced publicly.

AMBULANCE STATION UPGRADES

95 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What are the expected completion dates for the Marion, Elizabeth, Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Keith, Peterborough, Mallala, Goolwa, Wallaroo, Aldinga SA Ambulance Service stations that were announced for upgrades or partial rebuilds in the 2022-23 budget?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Station upgrades are being progressively completed. I look forward to keeping these communities informed as each project progresses.

SA HEALTH STAFF

96 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many nurses are expected to be recruited over the forward estimates?

1. What proportion will be due to activity growth, rather than increased staffing promised by the government?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Recruitment of nurses will be undertaken to fill existing vacancies and those that arise in the future.

This includes the election commitment to recruit an additional 300 nurses across the system.

SA HEALTH STAFF

97 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). How many nurses are expected to be recruited to meet the nurse-to-patient ratios to be legislated by this government?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Legislation to support the implementation of nurse and midwife ratio to patient ratios is currently being finalised.

SA HEALTH STAFF

98 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the status of the government's nurse-to-patient ratios?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Legislation to support the implementation of nurse and midwife to patient ratios is currently being finalised in collaboration with the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Foundation (SA Branch).

NURSE VACANCIES

99 Mrs HURN (Schubert) (12 September 2023). What is the current level of vacancies in relation to nurses across the state?

1. What is the breakdown of vacancies by local health network?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Local Health Networks are responsible for setting and monitoring the full-time equivalent (FTE) requirements for their respective network.

This includes the careful monitoring of vacancies and ensuring that these positions are filled in a timely manner.

REGIONAL HEALTH SERVICES

140 Mr TELFER (Flinders) (27 June 2024). What is the current off-site sessional rate at each Eyre and Far North Local Health Network (EFNLHN) health services centre, and what conditions are attached to that payment?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The current off-site sessional rate under the Rural GP Agreement is \$2,386. This is paid to an individual GP or a GP Practice for the provision of medical services for a 24-hour period. This rate applies where agreed between a GP Practice and EFNLHN.

The key conditions applied to an off-site sessional rate are:

- The GP is not required to be on-site at the hospital at all times but must be ready and available to attend the hospital and provide medical services to public patients as a priority.
- The GP can provide medical services to his/her own private patients at a private GP practice whilst in receipt of the off-site sessional payment.
- The GP/GP practice is not able to claim any other payment to EFNLHN for providing medical services within the specialty/scope of clinical practice for which that GP is engaged during the off-site sessional roster.

STREAKY BAY DISTRICT HOSPITAL

141 Mr TELFER (Flinders) (27 June 2024). What number of emergency and out-patient presentations occurred at Streaky Bay Hospital from 1 December 2023 to 1 June 2024?

1. What number utilised the South Australian Virtual Emergency Service (SAVES) and the South Australian Virtual Care Service (SAVCS) programs?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 1 December 2023 to 1 June 2024, there were 634 emergency department presentations and 376 outpatient presentations at Streaky Bay Hospital.

Of the 634 emergency department presentations, 69 utilised the South Australian Virtual Emergency Service (SAVES) and 4 utilised the South Australian Virtual Care Services (SAVCS).

REGIONAL LOCUM DOCTORS

142 Mr TELFER (Flinders) (27 June 2024). What is the current remuneration package for locums to service Eyre and Far North Local Health Network (EFNLHN) hospitals and what is the current off-site sessional rate paid to Streaky Bay Medical clinic doctors?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The expenditure for locums to service EFNLHN hospitals is circumstantial and can include variable costs including the shifts covered, flights and accommodation.

CEDUNA DISTRICT HOSPITAL

143 Mr TELFER (Flinders) (27 June 2024). With regard to Ceduna District Health Services, including the Ceduna District Hospital:

- (a) What was the operational expenditure for the 2022-23 financial year?
- (b) What is the projected budget for the 2023-24 financial year?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The operational expenditure for the Ceduna District Health Service is funded via the Eyre and Far North Local Health Network operating budget, which is contained within the 2023-24 state budget papers.

STREAKY BAY DISTRICT HOSPITAL

144 Mr TELFER (Flinders) (27 June 2024). With regards to the Streaky Bay Health Services, including the Streaky Bay District Hospital:

- (a) What is the operational expenditure for the 2022-23 financial year?
- (b) What is the projected budget for the 2023-24 financial year?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The operational expenditure for the Streaky Bay District Hospital is funded via the Eyre and Far North Local Health Network operating budget, which is contained within the 2023-24 state budget papers.

PAEDIATRIC COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (20 February 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

All 59 recommendations have been endorsed as completed by either the Paediatric Cochlear Independent Oversight Committee or the Health Chief Executive Council: Safety and Quality.

PAEDIATRIC COCHLEAR IMPLANT PROGRAM

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (20 February 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

As February 2025, 48 families have received the maximum ex-gratia payment of \$50,000 and 103 families have received \$5,000.

MENTAL HEALTH AND EMERGENCY SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 April 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

The Mental Health and Emergency Services Steering Committee meets quarterly, at a minimum. The most recent meeting was 18 March 2025.

The Royal Australian College of General Practitioners is not a signatory to the MOU and is not represented at the meetings. Information on the MOU between SA Health.

SA Ambulance Service, South Australia Police and the Royal Flying Doctor Service is available on the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist website.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (18 June 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

As at 18 June 2024, 627 patients had their elective surgery deferred as a result of the system-wide Code Yellow.

COUNTRY MENTAL HEALTH PATIENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (18 June 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

The Code Yellow arrangements did not proscribe or otherwise impact on the assessment or treatment of people with mental illness in regional settings or on their transport to Adelaide.

STRATHALBYN HEALTH SERVICES

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (19 June 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

Three million dollars remains allocated to the reactivation of Kalimna, which will deliver health services to Strathalbyn and its surrounding communities.

MENTAL HEALTH TRIAGE SERVICE

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (10 September 2024).

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised of the following:

At the time the OCP inspected the MHT, they noted a call abandonment rate of 33.19 per cent.

The number of abandoned calls has reduced by almost half in 2021 (44 per cent) to 12 per cent in 2024.

The MHT has continued to make improvements following OCP's inspection.

	2021	Mar 2024	Jul 2024	Aug 2024	Dec 2024
Abandonment Rate	44 per cent	33.19 per cent	20.44 per cent	18.02 per cent	12 per cent

Estimates Replies

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, there were 62 executive appointments made, across 13 agencies. There was a net decrease of 11 executive positions, taking into consideration resignations, abolishment of roles and terminations.

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$15,834,924 (excluding on costs).

Additionally, there are three statutory positions reporting to the minister, which are not included in executive appointment numbers:

- Chief Psychiatrist
- Mental Health Commissioner
- Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner

Individual executive total remuneration package values (TRPV) as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, there were 22 executive positions abolished, across five agencies.

The total annual employment cost for these positions is \$4,196,713 (excluding on costs).

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The total value of the termination payments was \$2,054,271, which excludes the value of accrued leave entitlements.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2022-24, information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors, including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

It is not possible to provide an estimate of the total cost for consultants and contractors in 2024-25.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The requested information is contained in the 2024-25 state budget papers.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2024-25 is detailed in table 1 below.

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch	FTE	\$
DHW	13.6	1,516,000
BHFLHN	3	315,000
CALHN	9.2	1,019,587
CEIH	1	125,000
EFNLHN	2	202,000
FUNLHN	2	180,000
LCLHN	1.8	210,000
NALHN	5	622,000
Preventive Health SA	3	370,000
RMCLHN	2	248,000
RSS	2	228,000
SA Ambulance Service	4.2	456,241
SALHN	6.5	744,317
WCHN	7.5	848,000
YNLHN	2	230,000

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Government Communications Advisory Committee Marketing Communications Reports are disclosed on the DPC website here:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In 2024-25, the overall budgeted expenditure for grants for each department and agency reporting to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is \$44,281,000.

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

It is not possible to delineate the management of remote work infrastructure from the overall budget for the management of other network infrastructure, digital tools, cybersecurity, and support services.

MENTAL HEALTH AND EMERGENCY SERVICES STEERING COMMITTEE

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Mental Health and Emergency Services MOU Steering Committee met on 19 March 2024 which was a regular meeting of the group.

The steering committee provides strategic and policy oversight of the MOU. Local Liaison Groups are convened by each local health network for the management and resolution of situations covered within the MOU.

COUNTRY MENTAL HEALTH PATIENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

There were no proscriptions on the assessment or treatment of people with mental illness in regional settings, or on their transport to Adelaide, during the system-wide Code Yellow.

CLARE HOSPITAL

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Clare Hospital CSSD Upgrade project is being funded from the Regional Asset Sustainment Program.

Additional funding has been allocated to supplement the existing budget, which has experienced a significant uplift in project delivery costs linked to a number of factors, including escalation of construction costs in regional areas.

The Malinauskas government has now allocated a total budget of \$7.3 million for the delivery of the Clare Hospital CSSD Upgrade project.

SA HEALTH COUNTRY CONNECT

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

State government employees are employed under a state enterprise agreement, the South Australian Public Sector Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement: Weekly Paid 2022, which is negotiated and registered under the state industrial relations system.

As such, the Fair Work Commission (FWC) decision does not directly apply to aged-care workers employed by the state government.

The South Australian Public Sector Wages Parity Enterprise Agreement: Weekly Paid 2022 is due for renegotiation in September 2024 and has an expiry date of 1 March 2025.

The FWC decision is noted and will form part of the discussions in the upcoming negotiations for a replacement state enterprise agreement.

ELECTIVE SURGERY

In reply to **the Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 31 May 2024 to 20 June 2024, there was:

- 141 postponements at Central Adelaide Local Health Network
- 112 postponements at Northern Adelaide Local Health Network
- 52 postponements at Southern Adelaide Local Health Network

There were no postponements at the Women's and Children's Hospital Network.

CODE YELLOW

In reply to **the Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The system-wide Code Yellow was called in response to unprecedented demand for services from the community and its duration reflected this demand.

LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK NOTIFICATIONS

In reply to **the Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The directive was given to the Chief Executive Officers of SALHN, CALHN and NALHN and was developed as an additional mechanism for the management of system demand and patient risk.

DRUG ADMINISTRATIONS

In reply to **the Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

During 2023-24, there were a total of 1,404 patient incidents reported by SA Health staff related to the administration of medication. 1,303, or 92.8%, of these incidents resulted in no harm or injury. None of these incidents resulted in death.

COVID-19 IN PUBLIC HOSPITALS

In reply to **the Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

It is difficult to determine precisely when somebody has contracted COVID. Considering this, it is not possible to quantify the number of patients who contracted COVID based on location.

Similarly, the number of patients who have died with COVID-19 in the hospital system cannot be verified as the diagnosis of COVID-19 may not have been the direct cause of their death. The total number of deaths with COVID-19 is publicly available on the SA Health website.

COVID-19 QUARANTINE

In reply to **the Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Patients presenting to SA Health hospitals with symptoms of an acute respiratory illness are subject to transmission-based precautions, which include isolating in a single room. This is just one of several strategies that are employed to reduce the risk of infection to staff or other patients.

URINARY TRACT INFECTION TREATMENT

In reply to **the Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Since 1 March 2024, over 304 community pharmacies have participated with more than 3,450 women accessing these services to date. This figure represents an estimated 62 per cent of registered community pharmacies including metropolitan, regional and rural pharmacies.

URINARY TRACT INFECTION TREATMENT

In reply to **the Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Since the introduction of the Community Pharmacy Urinary Tract Infection (UTI) Services Scheme on 1 March 2024, over 3,450 women aged 18 to 65 years have accessed UTI treatment services through community pharmacy.

Antibiotic treatment may be dispensed to women who meet certain clinical criteria assessed by the pharmacist, as per the clinical protocol developed for the scheme. People who fall outside the criteria or have other symptoms or risk factor may be referred to a general practitioner or other health professional as appropriate.

SUBSTANCE USE PRESENTATIONS

In reply to **Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 1 January 2024 to 31 May 2024, there have been a total of 4,077 emergency department (ED) presentations related to drugs and alcohol who arrived via ambulance across all local health networks (including regional LHNs). This accounts for 5.4 per cent of all ED presentations who arrived via ambulance.

Data is not currently available to determine specific drug and alcohol presentations with a transfer of care delay.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023, there were 33 executive appointments made, across four agencies. There was a net increase of seven executive positions, taking into consideration resignations, abolishment of roles and terminations.

The total annual employment cost for these appointments is \$8,503,262 gross (excluding on costs).

Individual executive total remuneration package values (TRPV) as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

From 1 July 2022 to 30 June 2023, there were 23 executive positions abolished, across four agencies.

The total annual employment cost for these abolished positions is \$4,844,042 gross (excluding on costs).

Individual executive total remuneration package values as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The total value of the termination payments was \$370,011.58 which excludes the value of accrued leave entitlements.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2022-23 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, is detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2022-24, information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The requested information is contained in the 2023-24 state budget papers.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2023-24 is detailed in table 1 below.

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch	FTE	\$
DHW	12.1	1,600,000
BHFLHN	3	309,000
CALHN	9.0	1,000,000
CEIH	1	123,000
DASSA	1	118,000
EFNLHN	1	86,000
FUNLHN	2	175,000
LCLHN	1.7	183,000
NALHN	4.6	561,000
Preventive Health SA	3.2	365,000
RMCLHN	2	221,000
RSS	2	223,000
SA Ambulance Service	6.6	688,000
SALHN	6.7	756,000
WCHN	7.5	816,000
YNLHN	2.25	226,000

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised

The Government Communications Advisory Committee Marketing Communications Reports are disclosed on the DPC website here:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

In 2023-24, the overall budgeted expenditure for grants for each department and agency reporting to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing was \$41,031,000.

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

It is not possible to delineate the management of remote work infrastructure from the overall budget for the management of other network infrastructure, digital tools, cyber security, and support services.

INCENTIVE PACKAGES

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Relocation reimbursements are funded by local health networks from within their operating budgets.

OVERSEAS RECRUITMENT CAMPAIGN

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Government Communications Advisory Committee Marketing Communications Reports are disclosed on the DPC website here:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

SA HEALTH VACANCIES

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The workforce information system is unable to capture this information.

NURSE RELOCATION REIMBURSEMENT

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As at 19 July 2023, 33 reimbursements were paid of which 23 were for overseas candidates and 10 were for candidates from within Australia.

TRANSFER OF CARE DATA

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The final full calendar year of the Labor Weatherill government was 2017 and reported 4,811 hours lost due to delayed transfer of care.

The final full calendar year of the former Marshall Liberal government was 2021 and reported 28,159 hours lost due to delayed transfer of care.

Therefore, the Marshall Liberal government oversaw an increase of 485 per cent in ambulance ramping and in spite of those numbers, were still issuing voluntary separation packages to frontline nurses while failing to invest in growing bed capacity.

TRANSFER OF CARE DATA

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Transfer of care is defined as handover from the SAAS ambulance officer to hospital clinical staff for ongoing clinical care and the SAAS ambulance officer and their equipment no longer being required.

Ramping is measured by the cumulative time lost in delays in transfer of care greater than 30 minutes for ambulance arrivals to metropolitan public hospitals.

This is consistent with the previous government.

Transfer of care is a tier one key performance indicator (KPI) for all metropolitan local health networks (LHNs).

HEALTH BUDGET

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The \$754 million being referenced is not the budget overspend amount for 2022-23, which includes the approved additional operating expenditure from original budget 2022-23.

GUMERACHA EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT

In reply to **Mrs HURN (Schubert)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The nurse-led clinic remains operational, with the model to be reviewed in partnership with the University of Adelaide.

MOUNT BARKER AMBULANCE STATION

In reply to **the Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The budget allocation for the rebuilt Mount Barker Ambulance Station is \$9.1 million, which is inclusive of the costs of land acquisition offset by the anticipated sale of the existing ambulance station site.

While the election commitment was to rebuild the Mount Barker Ambulance Station, it became apparent that the existing site was not large enough to fit a facility that could accommodate the new Mount Barker crewing.

The other important factor was catering for anticipated population growth and ensuring that the location of the station could best meet the needs of SA Ambulance Service to meet their response time targets. As a result, the decision was made to build a new fit-for-purpose ambulance station.

The additional budget will support the procurement of the new allotment and delivery of the essential project scope including site-works, engineering services connections and facility construction costs. The station will have space and facilities for six ambulance vehicles and two garaged light fleet vehicles, with room for potential future expansion if required.

BAROSSA HILLS FLEURIEU LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

In reply to **the Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Emergency departments at Mount Barker, Gawler and South Coast hospitals have been operating with limited physical capacity to manage the increasing numbers of presentations and level of complexity that has been experienced over the past twelve months. This has impacted on the ability to flow patients efficiently through the ED and subsequently on 'time spent in the ED'.

Capital redevelopments of these EDs are being undertaken. The new Mount Barker ED has opened, the new Gawler ED has opened. Construction of a new emergency department at South Coast is underway.

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

In reply to **the Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The independent review of the Retirement Villages Act 2016 made 60 recommendations to update legislation, policy and the Better Practice Guidelines.

The Office for Ageing Well has commenced work on the recommendations relating to changes to policy and the Better Practice Guides. These recommendations include the publication of a much broader range of retirement village information on the register and to have the register published online, with accessible and easily navigable functionality.

This work includes developing an online platform accessible via the Office for Ageing Well Retirement Villages website, which will initially include the existing register information. The online platform will have public facing search capability and an operator portal. Further work will continue to occur to include a broader range of information, which will be able to be gathered by the Registrar as a result of the legislative reforms.

The Office for Ageing Well have also been working on reviewing, updating and creating new content for the Better Practice Guidelines and information sheets, to support both residents and operators with commonly raised issues. These products will be available on the Office for Ageing Well Retirement Villages website ready for the commencement of the new legislation.

URGENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE CLINIC

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Urgent Mental Health Care Centre is a jointly funded state and commonwealth government project with the current agreement in place until 2025-26.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The total number of inpatient mental health beds is 506.

The total operating cost of local hospital network health services is publicly available in the annual budget papers.

SALISBURY SAFE HAVEN

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Salisbury Safe Haven is a partnership between the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and the Adelaide Primary Health Network. The total combined funding per annum to this pilot project is \$452,000 over an 18-month period.

MENTAL HEALTH VACANCIES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As at 30 June 2023, there were no vacancies within the Office of the Chief Psychiatrist.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

For 2022-23 the cost to SA Health for contracting of private mental health beds in the Adelaide Clinic was \$6.5 million. The Adelaide Clinic beds are contracted on a 'needs' basis.

URGENT MENTAL HEALTH CARE CLINIC

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The data received from the Urgent Mental Health Care Centre covers:

- guest numbers
- triage category numbers
- guest demographics
- referrals to other services or programs
- exit pathways
- service feedback
- incidents.

JAMES NASH HOUSE

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The independent review commissioned by the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network and its findings were released publicly in December 2023.

JAMES NASH HOUSE

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

As of 18 July 2023, the total FTE allocation for James Nash House is 152.04 FTE.

As of 18 July 2023, the actual vacancies for James Nash House were 8.8 FTE.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF PSYCHIATRIST

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The final review of Rural Mental Health Services in South Australia has been tabled in Parliament and of the 30 recommendations, at least 22 have already been implemented or are underway, with the majority of the remaining recommendations accepted or accepted in principle.

OFFICE OF THE CHIEF PSYCHIATRIST

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

WCHN has accepted in full four recommendations (recommendations 2 to 5) and partially accepted one recommendation (recommendation 1).

RETIREMENT VILLAGES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The Office for Ageing Well facilitated 13 information sessions on the Retirement Villages Miscellaneous Amendment Bill across both metropolitan and regional South Australia.

The regional information sessions were held in:

- Victor Harbor
- Berri
- Murray Bridge
- Nuriootpa
- Port Lincoln
- Kadina
- Mount Gambier

There are 26 villages in the Yorke Peninsula and Mid North areas, with the highest concentration on the peninsula. These villages were all invited to attend the information session held in Kadina.

REGISTERED NURSES IN AGED CARE

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Each of the LHN-run residential aged care services are either compliant with the 24/7 nursing requirement or have alternative arrangements in place.

GLENELG DRUG AND ALCOHOL REHABILITATION CENTRE

In reply to **Mr PATTERSON (Morphett)** (30 June 2023). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

The reference to Uniting Communities in the footnote of a small number of pages in the draft Service Agreement is an administrative error.

DASSA does not believe this administrative error has affected the integrity of the tendering process.