

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL**Tuesday, 1 November 2022**

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 14:17 and read prayers.

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

*Bills***APPROPRIATION BILL 2022***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**SUPERANNUATION FUNDS MANAGEMENT CORPORATION OF SOUTH AUSTRALIA
(INVESTMENT IN RUSSIAN ASSETS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**NATIONAL ELECTRICITY LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (CONSUMER DATA RIGHT)
AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SHOP TRADING HOURS (EXTENSION OF HOURS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

The PRESIDENT: 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 Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Reports, 2021-22—

Department of the Premier and Cabinet
Dhilba Guuranda-Innes National Park Co-Management Board
Dog and Cat Management Board
Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme
Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park Co-Management Board
Infrastructure SA
Office of the South Australian Productivity Commission
Police Superannuation
Premier's Delivery Unit
Report of the Auditor-General: Report 9 of 2022
South Australian Government Board and Committees Information—As at
30 June 2022
South Australian Parliamentary Superannuation Board
South Australian Superannuation Board

Southern Select Superannuation Corporation
 Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-Management Board
 Yumberra Conservation Park Co-Management Board

Regulations under Acts—

Radiation Protection and Control Act 2021—General

South Australian Law Reform Institute 'Autonomy and Safeguarding are not Mutually Inconsistent': A Review of the Operation of the Ageing and Adult Safeguarding Act 1995—September 2022

By the Attorney-General (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Reports, 2021-22—

Administration of the State Records Act 1997

Commissioner for Victims' Rights

Controlled Substance Act 1984—

Return of Authorisations issued under section 52C(1)

Legal Practitioner's Disciplinary Tribunal

Office of the Director of Public Prosecutions

Privacy Committee of South Australia

Summary Offences Act 1953—Return of Authorisations issued under section 83C

Ombudsman SA—Audit of compliance with the Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007—September 2022

By the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Return to Work Corporation of South Australia—Report, 2021-22

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. C.M. Scriven)—

Reports, 2021-22—

Adelaide Cemeteries Authority

Architectural Practice Board of South Australia

Dairy Authority of South Australia

Department for Trade and Investment

Forestry SA

State Planning Commission

Surveyors Board SA

West Beach Trust

Regulations under Acts—

Maritime Services (Access) Act 2000—General

Ports Access Regime and Price Determination Review: Stage one—Final Report—August 2022

Report of the Outcome of the Review of the 2013 Management Plan for the South Australian Commercial Marine Scalefish Fishery—September 2022

Ministerial Statement

NATIONAL ENERGY CRISIS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:24): I table a ministerial statement made by the Premier in another place.

Question Time

ENERGY SECURITY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Leader of the Government about energy security.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: Our community's safety and wellbeing is the most important purpose of any democratic parliament. Victoria's Premier, Daniel Andrews, has announced his government's intent to nationalise his state's energy generation and restrict gas development. South Australia's energy security relies heavily on the Victorian interconnector. When push comes to shove, there is significant risk that Daniel Andrews will disconnect that South Australian lifeline to keep the lights on in his own state.

My question to the Leader of the Government is: what guarantee will the Labor government give to our community to ensure that South Australians can keep their lights on, and will the government explain what immediate measures it has put in place to minimise the risks to energy security?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:33): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is an important question because the national energy crisis facing Australia carries risks to people right around Australia. It is worth noting that jurisdictions like Western Australia chose not to privatise their electricity assets, unlike the former Liberal government under the former Treasurer, the Hon. Rob Lucas, who, after going to an election and giving a guarantee of not privatising, decided to privatise our electricity assets.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Continue, Attorney.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It might be worse. Leave was granted to table a ministerial statement from the Premier in another place but as the question directly asked by the honourable member pertains to actions being taken in relation to the national energy crisis, it might be worth reading largely from what has just been tabled.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I am listening to the Attorney-General.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I understand that the opposition don't particularly care about this issue and are embarrassed and ashamed that it was their former government that sold off assets here, so I can understand the Hon. Michelle Lensink being embarrassed and ashamed. I could understand that, but I will give information because that is the respectful thing to do because the Hon. Jing Lee has asked.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The Premier has outlined:

The Commonwealth Budget delivered on 25 October forecasts that electricity prices will increase in the National Electricity Market by 20% by the end of this year and a further 30% next financial year—a potential cumulative increase of 56%.

In addition, Federal Treasury expects retail prices of gas to increase by 20% this year and a further 20% in 2023-24.

Price increases of this scale are completely unacceptable to the community and will have significant adverse impacts on households and businesses, worsening pressure on the cost-of-living crisis, reducing real disposable income and impacting economic growth.

As noted by the Commonwealth, the Australian Energy Market Operator and the Australian Energy Regulator, the illegal invasion of Ukraine—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —by Russia has caused a global gas supply crisis which has increased prices to extraordinary levels. Australia, including South Australia, is not immune to these price rises.

Electricity price rises have been exacerbated by a related global increase in coal prices and, in Australia, the increasing unreliability of ageing coal-fired power stations and problems with coal supply.

South Australia has a higher level of renewable generation and price rises here are expected to be lower than in the eastern states which rely on coal-fired power stations. However, while lower, the predicted rises are severe.

Accordingly, the Government has established a National Energy Crisis Committee of Cabinet which will be chaired by [the Premier].

The Cabinet Committee will be supported by a Taskforce which will help develop a response to the forecast electricity price increases with the aim of implementing measures that can reduce the scale of increase and mitigate the impact on the community.

The National Energy Crisis Taskforce will be co-chaired by the Minister for Energy and Mining...and the Chief Executive of the Department for Energy and Mining, with a membership including the Chief Executive of Hydrogen Power SA, Treasury and Finance, Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and other members as determined, with support from the Department for Energy and Mining and expert energy market consultants.

In addition, South Australia is working collaboratively with the Commonwealth, other states and territories and the national market bodies AER, AEMC and AEMO.

[This government] is pleased that the Commonwealth has reinvigorated the Energy Ministers process and welcomes the leadership of Energy Ministers by the Commonwealth Minister for Climate Change and Energy [the Hon.] Chris Bowen.

This is a national energy crisis and we welcome statements from the Commonwealth that Prime Minister Anthony Albanese, Treasurer Jim Chalmers, Minister for Resources Madeleine King, Mr Bowen and colleagues will consider all options in addressing the challenge of this crisis.

The Commonwealth has considerable regulatory powers and South Australia will welcome those powers being exercised in the pursuit of affordable, reliable and cleaner energy.

It is also important to dismiss the claims that renewable energy is the cause of the price increase.

The cause is the increase in the prices of coal and gas and the internationalisation of prices domestically despite Australia's bountiful supplies.

In the Quarterly Energy Dynamics report published last week by the Australian Energy Market Operator this trend is quite clear.

That report notes that in South Australia the average price of gas in the Third Quarter of 2021 was \$11.51 per gigajoule. In the same quarter this year it was \$27.29—that is, there has been a 137% increase.

We are, as a government, taking action. When you look at the price, as I said, of gas compared to that, let's say, for wind, the price change from negative \$41 in quarter 3 of 2021 to negative \$1 this year is clearly reducing overall price rather than stoking increases. As I said, any suggestion that renewable energies have played a part in increasing power prices isn't borne out by the facts.

The government is committed to assessing all possible options available at a state level to protect South Australia from the worst impacts of the national energy crisis. I thank the honourable member for her question but still reiterate it was a Liberal government that decided to sell off our electricity assets.

The PRESIDENT: Before you ask your supplementary question, I just make quite clear that I allowed the Attorney to read from a statement that had been tabled. I hadn't seen it. It was an important question and was obviously quite a generous answer. I would say, if it was asked by the government, I probably wouldn't have allowed you to read your ministerial statement. You have a supplementary question?

ENERGY SECURITY

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): Supplementary question arising from the answer: can the Leader of the Government indicate when the first meeting of the National Energy Crisis Committee of cabinet will be held, and whether a face-to-face briefing to the opposition and crossbench members will be done because this is such an important issue?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): I am sure it will be held as soon as it possibly can—

The Hon. J.S. Lee: No date? It's an important issue. There's no date?

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —and I will seek to see what the processes will be.

ENERGY SECURITY

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:40): Supplementary arising from the original answer: given the Leader of the Government's protestations about privatisation, is it this government's intention to nationalise South Australia's electricity assets?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:40): As the Premier has said, we are committed to assessing all possible options available at a state level to protect South Australia from the worst impacts of the national energy crisis. These are significant challenges being faced by people all around Australia. I am not going to start ruling things in or ruling things out—that's the whole point of getting experts to assess what the best options are.

BUILDING BETTER REGIONS FUND

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about the Building Better Regions Fund.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: In question time on 18 October, in responding to a question regarding round 6 of the Building Better Regions Fund, and the application for funding for the Mount Gambier and District Saleyards project, the minister said:

What I have done is advocate on a number of occasions to a number of different ministers—and my office has been in contact with those ministerial officers on a number of occasions—to impress upon them the importance of this program and how important it is for our local region in the South-East.

My questions to the minister are:

1. In light of the decision by the federal government to scrap the Building Better Regions Fund and cut the \$250 million allocated to round 6, will the minister now admit that she has been utterly ineffective as an advocate?

2. Will the minister also admit that she has failed the South-East community as a minister?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for her question. Her question of course is referring to the Building Better Regions Fund, and the one part of her question that was accurate was that the fund was discontinued in the federal budget last week. This is the Building Better Regions Fund of which the Australian National Audit Office had investigated the management. The National Audit Office had stated in their investigation that, 'Departmental advice on projects most worthy of support was routinely ignored by ministers.'

We know the previous federal Coalition government did not provide funding to the Mount Gambier saleyards application in BBRF round 5. We know that the Australian National Audit Office found that, in regard to BBRF, 179 funding decisions were not properly documented, and that there were 164 times when the then federal Coalition minister decided not to approve recommendations that were made by the department.

So I wonder whether the Mount Gambier and District Saleyards transformation project was among those 164 times that recommendations were made by the department but rejected by the then federal Coalition minister. If that was the case—and I guess we may not know unless FOIs can get into that detail—it is certainly the former Coalition federal government that failed. It is certainly those opposite here who failed to advocate to their federal colleagues at the time. It is clearly the opposition here that has been ineffective, both while they were in government and while their federal buddies were in government, while those same federal buddies were involved in ignoring recommendations from the department.

I am very pleased that the federal Labor government has announced a \$1 billion fund, or two funds, in terms of regions: the Growing Regions Program, which will deliver on the federal government's strategic priorities for regional Australia through an open and competitive grants process; and also the second grant funding for the Regional Precincts and Partnerships Program, which will provide a strategic nationally consistent mechanism for funding and coordinating projects that support the transformation of important locations across communities and regions, regional cities and rural Australia.

I am very pleased that the Malinauskas Labor government has recommitted the \$2.7 million that it had committed to the Grant district council Saleyards project, and I look forward to working with the Grant district council as they apply to these two new funds. I have been in contact with the council to restate the commitment of the Malinauskas Labor government to the Saleyards rejuvenation project, and I look forward to hopefully having some constructive support from those opposite, as well as our local community, which has been so keen to have this project proceed. I look forward to working constructively, if those opposite know the meaning of the phrase.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Lensink.

BUILDING BETTER REGIONS FUND

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:46): Given that the minister is such a great advocate of transparency, when is her government going to release the supporting documents that the Auditor-General has sent them?

The Hon. E.S. Bourke: How is that a supplementary?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Oh, covering up!

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: It's not a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Lensink, your next question, please.

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:46): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development regarding the federal budget.

Leave granted.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Lensink, please continue.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Minister for Infrastructure, Transport, Regional Development and Local Government in her federal budget media release outlining local community infrastructure projects in regional Australia said:

For South Australia there are projects including \$10 million towards the next stage of the City of Holdfast Bay's Jetty Road Masterplan and \$6 million for City of Marion upgrades.

My questions for the minister are:

1. What is the South Australian government's position regarding the inclusion of metropolitan Adelaide localities in regional programs?
2. As Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, does she advocate for localities to actually be in regional areas or does she find it acceptable that metropolitan Adelaide has been included?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo and the Leader of the Government, I would like to hear the answer in silence please.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for her question, but I do suggest that she direct a question about statements from a federal minister to a federal minister.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Lensink, you have a supplementary arising from the original answer?

FEDERAL BUDGET

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:48): I will try, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Have a crack.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Have a crack. Why then in opposition did she regularly ask me questions that related to a national disability insurance scheme?

The PRESIDENT: It is not a supplementary question.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Mr Ngo.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! Both sides of the chamber, I would like to hear the Hon. Mr Ngo.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN TRAINING AWARDS

The Hon. T.T. NGO (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister update the council on the Aboriginal South Australians who have been recognised in this year's SA Training Awards?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for his question and his interest in this area. I would be most pleased to update the council on Aboriginal South Australians and Aboriginal organisations that have been recognised in the training awards.

The South Australian Training Awards are an annual event run by the South Australian government. While the event itself falls within the portfolio responsibilities of my colleague the Minister for Education, Training and Skills, I was pleased to see some fantastic Aboriginal organisations and individuals recognised for their achievements.

Amongst this year's winners were the Regional Anangu Services Aboriginal Corporation (RASAC), the winner of the Small Employer of the Year. RASAC is owned and operated by Anangu, providing a range of services to thousands of people across the APY lands. It is the largest employer of local Anangu workers on the APY lands and a major contributor to local economies.

In particular, I am advised that this year's award recognises the work RASAC has undertaken to create a training culture within communities, encouraging people to take part in training opportunities where they may not have previously considered it relevant to them in the past. This has included a close partnership with TAFE SA who, I am advised, worked very closely with RASAC on designing appropriate and adapted programs for use on the APY lands.

Another deserving winner was the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Student of the Year, Angelina Dunnett. Angelina was provided an opportunity by RASAC to work with the community patrols program, supporting young people and helping to keep children safe. Through this role she was able to undertake a Certificate II and III in Community Services, after which she was promoted to zone coordinator for the patrol program. In addition, she now assists TAFE SA by interpreting training programs into the Pitjantjatjara language, and supports students to engage with training programs. In Angelina's own words:

I live and work in two worlds: Anangu way, and piranpa (white fella way). I'm proud that I'm developing my skills to find the balance to do both.

It is a real achievement to complete training on the APY lands. I want to show my people, my children and other young people that education is important, and we can do it.

Angelina is now a finalist in the national Australian Training Awards, with the finals to be held here in Adelaide on 18 November.

RASAC has also been listed as one of just three finalists in their category for the Australian Training Awards. Both of these awards and nominations reflect some of the important and innovative work being done on the APY lands by and for Aboriginal people.

Whether it's an individual working hard to learn new skills, and deliver for and within their community, or an Aboriginal business working to achieve positive social outcomes, there is much to be proud of with the work that happens on the APY lands and across remote Aboriginal communities in South Australia. I would like to congratulate Angelina and RASAC on being recognised in the South Australian awards, and wish them the best of luck in the upcoming national finals.

LIV GOLF TOURNAMENT

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:52): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question on the topic of sportswashing and the LIV Golf tournament to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, representing the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: LIV Golf has been dubbed by themselves as, 'golf as you have never seen it' but, by critics, as golf that sportswashes the human rights abuses they don't want you to see—or raise. The LIV Golf series is a large-scale effort to sportswash Saudi Arabia's human rights record and improve its global image.

The Public Investment Fund of Saudi Arabia is the majority shareholder of this controversial new tour. Saudi Crown Prince Muhammad Bin Salman is chairman of the Public Investment Fund. The Crown Prince now wants to realise his 'Vision 2030' plan of making the country more modern and less dependent on oil money.

Investments in sport play a key role in this plan, but human rights organisations have accused those in power in Saudi Arabia of sportswashing; that is, trying to use top level sporting events to distract from their human rights violations. The Crown Prince Bin Salman himself, for example, is suspected of being behind the murder of journalist Jamal Khashoggi.

Jamal Khashoggi was the US-based journalist and critic of Saudi Arabia's government who was murdered in 2018 after entering the Saudi consulate in Istanbul, where his body was then dismembered. Concerningly, when asked about Khashoggi, LIV boss Greg Norman said, 'Look, we've all made mistakes and you just want to learn by those mistakes and how you can correct them going forward.'

Further, the Public Investment Fund invested \$2 billion into Russian assets before the Kremlin's invasion of Ukraine, according to a report from the *Wall Street Journal*. Further, Saudi Arabia is on the list of countries importing cheap Russian oil, despite Western sanctions, and has continued to invest in top Russian energy companies.

As some members of the council may be aware, the Premier has welcomed the LIV Golf International Series potentially coming to Grange in South Australia in 2023, last month informing 7NEWS that he had 'not seen much evidence of the USPGA doing Australian golf and supporters any favours recently', and stating, 'I think it's about time golf had a bit of a shake-up,' and going on to state, 'I wish LIV Golf all the very best.'

Other countries and states have been far less welcoming of this tour, and most recently they were met with a frosty reception in Washington DC. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister recognise that hosting an event that has been accused of being a way for the Saudi Arabian Public Investment Fund to participate in sportswashing to distract from its human rights abuses might not be a good look for the state of South Australia?

2. When the Premier wishes them 'all the best', will those good wishes be matched with any public moneys or promotion and, if so, to what quantum?

3. Given the lengths this government has now recently gone to, as has the parliament, to divest from Russian assets, does it make any sense then for South Australia to be playing such a welcoming host to a tournament funded by a body that continues to fund those very same Russian assets?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her questions. I will refer them to my colleague in the other place and bring back a response.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY APPRENTICESHIPS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:56): My question is to the Attorney. What is the government doing to support apprenticeships so that they can complete their training and have ongoing sustainable work within the construction industry?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:56): I thank the honourable member for her question about apprenticeships in the construction industry. There are a number of ways that I know people have portfolio responsibilities, and I think it primarily falls within the Minister for Education, Training and Skills, the Hon. Blair Boyer, the member for Wright. I know the honourable member regularly talks to a number of stakeholders who are involved in the construction industry about training and apprenticeships. I am happy to liaise with the minister responsible and bring back a reply to this important question.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY APPRENTICESHIPS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:57): Supplementary: could the Attorney also confirm that the government can guarantee that the number of apprenticeships offered will continue and not be cut?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:57): I will pass that on. If it's private organisations or private training companies, I think it would be extraordinarily difficult for the government to make guarantees on their behalf, but I am happy to pass on the question.

EVOKE AG

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister please update the chamber on Evoke AG 2023?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:58): I thank the honourable member for his question about this exciting program. Evoke AG is the Asia-Pacific's premier agrifood tech event. Adelaide has won host city rights for the first time, with the event to be held on 21 and 22 February 2023 at the Adelaide Convention Centre.

Run by AgriFutures, Evoke AG endeavours to mature the innovation ecosystem for Australia, New Zealand and Asia-Pacific's burgeoning agrifood tech sector. It provides a platform to connect global change makers, thought leaders and start-ups with customers and investors to attract investment into innovation and to connect farmers and the supply chain with technology to help increase productivity and sustainability through face-to-face connections, collaboration, investment and, of course, agri-tech adoption.

Evoke AG considers how global agrifood and innovation and tech intersect to impact our food, farmers and the natural resources which sustain them. AgriFutures has recognised Adelaide as an epicentre of innovation in the agritech ecosystem and 'the logical next step for the Evoke AG journey'.

Approximately 1,500 delegates are expected to attend the event, which is primarily focused on connecting global change makers, thought leaders and startups with customers and investors to attract investment, as I said, into innovation. The program was launched on 27 October and it

highlighted more than 100 speakers from eight countries, who will lead conversations as agritech or agtech experts, from entrepreneurs, innovators and investors through to researchers and producers.

The conference theme is Down to Earth. The 'down to' part refers to bringing big ideas to reality and enhancing practical on-farm innovation. The 'earth' part represents farms, soil, water, production and productivity. The conference will provide a unique opportunity to showcase the South Australian agritech development ecosystem to attract developers and investors to established businesses in the state, while profiling the South Australian startup community to national and international investors. Also, it is connecting our primary producers with technology developers to create innovative solutions to production challenges.

The state government, through such agencies as PIRSA; Innovation, Industry and Science; Premier and Cabinet; Trade and Investment; and the offices of the Chief Entrepreneur and Chief Scientist, is supporting this conference and working with key industry stakeholders. In addition to the tech and innovation focus, Evoke AG will include a Festival of Food, including a producers' dinner, demonstrating the premium food and wine for which we, South Australia, have a global reputation.

Evoke AG 2023 provides significant opportunity for South Australia in hosting an anticipated world-class event and also for the opportunity for further investment in the state, increasing international attention to South Australia as a global innovation hub. I look forward to welcoming Evoke AG to South Australia in February next year.

EVOKE AG

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:01): Supplementary question: can the minister indicate to the chamber how much investment or funding has gone into the Evoke AG conference?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:01): I thank the member for her supplementary question. There has been a combination of support, including in-kind support. As I mentioned, that's through my own department of PIRSA, DIIS, DPC, DTI and the offices of the Chief Entrepreneur and the Chief Scientist.

EVOKE AG

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:02): Can the minister take on notice to bring back a breakdown of the contributions from those agencies that the minister has mentioned earlier in her answers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:02): If there is additional information, I will bring that back to the chamber.

POKER MACHINES

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:02): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney, representing the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs in another place, a question about poker machine reforms.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In Australian-first reforms, the Tasmanian Liberal government has announced gamblers in that state will be prevented from spending more than \$5,000 a year on poker machines, unless they apply to increase the limit and are eligible for doing so. The new scheme, where gamblers must use a cashless card that limits losses, will be implemented by the end of 2024, and will be mandatory, with default limits of \$100 a day and \$500 a month. The maximum of \$5,000 per year will be in place unless gamblers provide proof they have the financial means to spend more.

The initiative has been universally applauded by anti-gambling advocates, while it has been blasted by the state's hospitality association, which campaigned heavily in 2018 for the return of the Liberals after Labor vowed to remove poker machines altogether from pubs and clubs. Both major parties in Tasmania have clear agendas to reduce problem gambling in that state, despite the impact

on tax revenue. In New South Wales, the Premier is also vowing to reform the sector he describes as 'taxing on the misery of others'.

In South Australia, we have now seen record losses of \$831 million in the last financial year, or \$2.2 million a day. Despite the fact that note acceptors are now on 75 per cent of poker machines, those figures are on the rise. My questions to the minister are:

1. When and what is the state government doing in terms of problem gambling in this jurisdiction?
2. Will they show some sort of leadership and follow the lead of their interstate counterparts, similar to Tasmania and New South Wales, in terms of introducing meaningful, bona fide reforms aimed at tackling the scourge of poker machine gambling?
3. What precisely are they intending to do?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for her question, and her longstanding interest and advocacy in this area, and I will pass those questions on to the minister in another place and bring back a reply.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:04): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs on Aboriginal affairs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.G. WADE: On 5 August last year the final designs for the Aboriginal Art and Cultures Centre were released by the former Premier Steven Marshall. At that time the member for Lee in the other place, Stephen Mullighan, now the Treasurer, accused the member for Dunstan of being 'all talk and no action' on the centre, arguing the project was then two years late and \$50 million over budget. He said, and I quote: 'This was meant to start construction last year and South Australians would be right to wonder if it will ever be delivered.'

Yesterday, Premier Malinauskas announced that he has suspended work on the Centre for First Nations Cultures citing it was a further \$50 million over budget. My question to the minister is: given that the current Treasurer criticised the former Liberal government for being 'all talk and no action' when it acted to invest an additional \$50 million in the centre, why shouldn't the Aboriginal community see the current government as all talk and no action when it has stopped all work on the site and is not committing any further funding to the centre?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for his question. Certainly I have had quite a number of discussions soon after we came into government, before we came into government and since the announcement of the review of the Centre for First Nations Cultures at Lot Fourteen. Aboriginal people that I have spoken to and have made representations to me, that I have talked to since the announcement yesterday, are overwhelmingly positive for an announcement that looked to make sure that a centre that recognises and celebrates tens of thousands of years of the oldest living culture on this planet is done justice.

The Centre for First Nations Cultures was proposed, as the honourable member pointed out, by the former Marshall government to be delivered at Lot Fourteen near the corner of North Terrace and the Botanic Gardens. Upon coming to government, the government was advised that the \$200 million project capital will fall short to deliver a vision of a centre of international significance. I am advised experts from professional services teams led by Woods Bagot and architects Diller Scofidio + Renfro have advised that delivering the centre within the DIIS project budget would require a significant reduction in scope, which would deliver a centre only of local interest and standard.

Following this advice, the government has launched an urgent review to examine how to best deliver the cultural centre as a truly world-class cultural institution. As I said, my discussions with members of the Aboriginal community in South Australia over months and years in the past, and certainly over the last couple of days, have indicated a very, very strong support for taking action that

delivers something that is not just of local interest but is of a truly international standard that pays proper respect to the Aboriginal cultures of this state and of this country.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:08): Supplementary: when the minister says that delivering the project with the existing budget would mean that it would only be a local state-level standard facility, is he referring to the \$250 million original budget or the \$300 million with the additional \$50 million that was mentioned in the Premier's press release yesterday?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:08): I will double-check, but I am pretty sure it refers to not the \$250 million or \$300 million, but the budgeted \$200 million, which if my memory serves me correctly was comprised of \$115 million of state money and \$85 million of federal money from City Deal budgets. I will check to see if there is any further information, but I understand that the budget as it stood as of last week was \$200 million, comprising \$115 million of state money and \$85 million of federal money.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:09): Supplementary question: why have Bob Carr, Ken Wyatt and Carolyn Hewson been chosen to undertake the review, and how much are they being paid to do so?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't have information as to the exact terms or the payment to people conducting the review. It was a decision that was made by cabinet, to have three eminent Australians: Ken Wyatt, who became the first Aboriginal person to ever hold the Indigenous people's portfolio at a federal level; Bob Carr, a former foreign minister and very closely connected to the arts; and Carolyn Hewson who is well known in terms of business, and I think has been appointed to quite a number of boards—if my memory serves me correctly, InfrastructureSA and federal boards—to bring a range of views and understandings to make sure that we are truly delivering a world-class facility.

I will take the question on notice and if there are any projected figures, or as they become available, I will bring them back to the honourable member.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:10): Further supplementary: given building and construction costs are currently rising exponentially, what is the opportunity cost of the suspension of works?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for her question. As she points out, the cost of building things doesn't go down over time; it tends to go up over time. It wasn't tenable to build something that we know would be of local interest and significance when an ambition ought to be for something that's of international significance. The whole point of conducting a review is to look at how that will be done. The whole point of the review is to look at what the costs involved are and how to build something that is of true international significance.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:11): Supplementary: before the Premier made his public announcement yesterday, which stakeholders were actually advised beyond the Labor Party or the government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:11): I can take that on notice and see if there is information that can be brought back.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. S.G. WADE (15:11): Supplementary: could I seek clarity that an option coming out of the review will not be to abandon the project, that the Malinauskas government is committed to the delivery of this centre?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is a reasonable question. That is certainly what we are intending to do. The Premier has been quite clear that this review is about how you would make this a centre of international significance that does justice to First Nations history and culture.

CENTRE FOR FIRST NATIONS CULTURES

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (15:12): Supplementary: can the Attorney confirm that the project for the First Nations cultural centre will definitely go ahead?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:12): I think I have answered that in my last answer. The intention of the review is to look at how you deliver a truly international centre.

ABORIGINAL HEALTH WORKFORCE

The Hon. I. PNEVMATIKOS (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the importance of supporting the Aboriginal health workforce and the recent forum hosted by the Central Adelaide Local Health Network?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:13): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in the area. We know that in so many areas of policy and service delivery for Aboriginal people the best outcomes tend to come when Aboriginal people are involved in the design and the delivery of those services. We should be incredibly proud of the many talented Aboriginal health practitioners, nurses, doctors and allied health professionals working in our state's public health system, as well as those who are involved in designing these services and programs. I am pleased to see that the Central Adelaide Local Health Network recognises this also.

As the organisation that oversees the Royal Adelaide Hospital, The Queen Elizabeth Hospital, the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre, the Repat and Glenside services amongst others, it delivers both on Kaurna country and servicing Aboriginal people from nations all over this state and Australia. It was pleasing in my first week as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, after this year's state election, that I had the opportunity to speak at the launch of CALHN's Aboriginal Employment and Retention Strategy.

This strategy outlines priorities such as building stronger partnerships and relationships with Aboriginal communities, fostering culturally safe and racism-free workplaces, providing better inductions, training and support for Aboriginal staff, increasing employment opportunities for Aboriginal students and trainees, and much more.

Some 4 per cent of CALHN's population are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people. Statistics in the strategy highlight that Aboriginal people are over-represented in both emergency presentations and particularly in elective hospital admissions. By far, the largest principal diagnosis for the Aboriginal community using CALHN's services is kidney dialysis.

One of the important components of this strategy was the development of CALHN's Aboriginal Learning Health Network. It was a great pleasure to have the opportunity last week to speak at the inaugural forum for CALHN's Aboriginal Learning Health Network and to see the strategy in action helping to support CALHN's Aboriginal workforce. I am advised that more than 120 of the staff across CALHN are Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people, and I was pleased to meet many of them at the forum last week.

The day was facilitated by Haydyn Bromley from Bookabee Aboriginal consultancy, with a Kaurna welcome from Uncle Mickey O'Brien. Other guests throughout the day included board member Gavin Wanganeen and also Janine Mohamed, the CEO of the Lowitja Institute. Whether it

be in the public or private sector, there is still much work to do. Strategies like this that provide support for Aboriginal workers who deliver services to Aboriginal people are very, very welcome.

PREMIER'S DELIVERY UNIT

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:15): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the Attorney-General on the topic of the Premier's Delivery Unit.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Shortly after the March 2022 state election, the Malinauskas government announced the establishment of the Premier's Delivery Unit, with an annual budget of \$2 million. The purpose of the unit is to ensure the government is upholding their election commitments. When asked about the purpose of the unit in an estimates hearing on 20 June 2022, the Premier stated:

In terms of public accountability of the government, clearly we stand to be held to account on our election commitments...That is a good thing.

During the election, Labor announced a heritage policy document outlining their election pledge to:

...legislate to require proposed demolition of state heritage sites are subject to full public consultation and a public report from SA Heritage Council.

In February, the then Labor opposition supported my private member's bill to add the Adelaide Parklands to the state heritage list, and they reversed that position last sitting. My question to the Attorney-General therefore is: will the Premier's Delivery Unit provide a report on the status of the government's policy commitments on heritage and Parklands protection and, if so, will that report be tabled in the parliament?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his important question. As the name suggests, the Premier's Delivery Unit sits in the portfolio area of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, but I am very happy to take that question on notice as it pertains to the particular element of the operations of that unit and bring a reply back to the honourable member.

PREMIER'S DELIVERY UNIT

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:17): Supplementary question.

The PRESIDENT: I will listen to it.

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN: Will the Premier's Delivery Unit be tabling a list of all election commitments and a status update of them?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: I am in your hands, sir.

The PRESIDENT: You can answer it if you want.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: You people are amateurs, absolute amateurs.

The PRESIDENT: Order, the Hon. Mr Hunter! The Hon. Mr Hanson, your question.

JAPANESE ENCEPHALITIS

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the chamber on the vaccine for the Japanese encephalitis virus?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:18): I thank the member for this important question. Thousands of South Australians living and working in areas with greater risk of Japanese encephalitis virus (JEV) have had increased access to a free vaccine since mid-October under an expansion of the current program to better protect regional communities.

The expanded vaccine rollout targets people who live or work in a postcode within five kilometres of the Murray River, Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert areas ahead of the mosquito

season, which starts in the summer months. To be eligible, residents must be aged at least two months and spend at least four hours outdoors on most days. The same four-hour outdoors requirement also applies to workers.

More than 900 people in selected high-risk groups, including piggery workers, were vaccinated earlier this year through the first phase of the program. A total of 23,000 vaccines have been made available by the commonwealth and state governments as part of the second phase of the program. The vaccines initially are being distributed across eight SA Health pop-up clinics and seven GPs, with more sites to follow, including pharmacies, over the coming weeks, with the Malinauskas government committing \$1.84 million towards this stage of the rollout. A full list of vaccination sites can be found on the SA Health website at sahealth.sa.gov.au/jevaccine.

Of the nine confirmed cases of Japanese encephalitis in South Australia this year, the majority had visited the Murray River during their exposure period, and sadly there have been two deaths. A third consecutive La Niña weather event has resulted in conditions that present increased risks of mosquito-borne disease, including Japanese encephalitis for the 2022-23 season.

In response, SA Health's Fight the Bite Campaign, promoting the importance of personal protection and simple steps the public can take, is also being boosted. This coincides with other expanded campaigns to prevent exposure to the disease through mosquito surveillance and control, including the South Australian Arbovirus Surveillance Program, which usually runs from September to April but will now run until late winter next year. Also, we have the Sentinel Chicken Surveillance Program, which includes four additional sites, more frequent testing and the introduction of JEV testing of all sentinel flocks. Councils are being given extra training, equipment and support.

Japanese encephalitis causes a rare but potentially serious infection in humans that is transmitted through bites from infected Culex mosquitoes, which are commonly found in South Australia. Most people do not experience any illness. However, a small proportion will develop encephalitis, which can be fatal or cause long-term neurological damage. Symptoms include confusion, headaches, neck stiffness, tremors, drowsiness and seizures. More information on how to Fight the Bite can be found at sahealth.sa.gov.au/fightthebite.

I encourage eligible residents and workers, especially those around the Murray River, to take advantage of this free vaccine to help keep themselves safe. This virus can be deadly and we can all play a part in helping stop its spread. These vaccinations are important for our agriculture industry, people working outdoors and those in our regional communities so they can stay protected.

The PRESIDENT: Supplementary question, the Hon. Ms Franks.

JAPANESE ENCEPHALITIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:22): Could the minister please define what is 'four hours outdoors'? Does it include workplaces where mosquitoes are not able to be easily kept out, although they might not technically be outdoors?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:22): My understanding is that those who say that they are outdoors for four hours or more will be eligible for the vaccine. What we are really keen to do is make sure that the vaccine is available to those who are most at risk. In terms of the definition, I will certainly check with my colleague the Minister for Health whether any additional information is appropriate, but that is my understanding.

JAPANESE ENCEPHALITIS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:23): Supplementary: could the minister please provide the description of what a workplace is when it is outdoors? Would it include, for example, a plant nursery? Perhaps she might want to take industrial relations advice on that rather than just health advice, given it is a workplace safety interest.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:23): I thank the honourable member for her question. But I would point out that the requirement is that one must spend at least four hours outdoors on most days.

The Hon. T.A. Franks: That's why I've asked for a definition of what is outdoors?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I believe I have answered that question. As I said, I am happy to provide more information from the Minister for Health as required, but I think that is the relevant part rather than a definition of a workplace.

YOUTH OFFENDING

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN (15:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking questions of the Attorney-General regarding youth.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. CURRAN: On 24 September 2022 *The Advertiser* published an article titled 'Black, young and ruthless, the gang behind the high speed police chases'. The article was about a gang of youths aged between 12 and 15 who have been responsible for hundreds of crimes, including vehicle thefts, property damage, serious criminal trespass, assault, shop theft, possessing cannabis, robbery carrying offensive weapons, aggravated affray, stealing petrol and breaches of bail conditions.

Many of the gang members are in state care or under guardianship orders. In one case, a gang member aged 12 who lives in a Department for Child Protection care house in a northern suburb has had almost 300 infractions with police and was at the time of the article before the court on charges including breach of bail, illegal use of a motor vehicle, aggravated theft and aggravated robbery. He is also a suspect for a further 160 offences that include stealing petrol, assault, being unlawfully on premises, theft and carrying an offensive weapon. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What is being done to help reduce youth offending?
2. What rehabilitation, counselling and other support services are being provided to youth offenders?
3. Do you work with the Department for Child Protection to ensure that youth reoffending does not occur?
4. What is being done for young children who are identified as repeat offenders to ensure that they do not reoffend?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:25): I thank the honourable member for her questions and her interest in the safety of the community and issues to do with justice in South Australia. This touches on a whole range and a number of portfolios, as the honourable member has mentioned in the question, including the Department of Human Services, the Department for Child Protection and obviously the processes through the Youth Court in my department and the Attorney-General's department.

It is, I think, a prime responsibility of any government to do what they can to keep the community safe, and that is certainly something we are looking at as a government. We are looking at different ways, and investigating different ways, that there may be other sorts of interventions that may support families and young people who offend. Different therapeutic models are being looked at and investigated, and we are also looking at different ways that services can support families in total and also children who are under state care.

As I said, I think it is a reasonable expectation of the community that the government has a priority to keep the community safe, and that is why we are looking at, and will continue to look at, measures that will do that.

STUDENT SUPPORT SERVICES

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:27): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General, representing the Minister for Education, Training and Skills, on the department's student support services.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: The drift from parental rights with one's own child has gone too far. A publication from the Department for Education, Training and Skills titled 'Gender diverse and intersex children and young people support procedure' stipulates the process to be followed to support gender diverse and intersex minors. This document applies to all department staff in schools, preschools and care settings, family day care educators and respite care program care providers.

Pages 7 and 8 of this document refer specifically to parents who do not currently support their child's gender affirmation. This document states:

When parents make it clear they do not support their child's gender affirmation, the site leader must decide what is in the best interests of the child or young person.

The document also states:

If the site leader determines that supporting gender affirmation is in a child or young person's best interest, this procedure must be followed to make support arrangements for them.

I want to make clear that these are direct quotes from the document publicly available on the education department's website. It also notes that the same site leader is under the authority to determine if 'the child or young person has the capacity to make an informed decision to affirm their gender'. It lists three basic steps to determine this, without any reference to mental health history, social or cultural influences.

I have met multiple parents who have a child on this journey. They love their child, but they are distressed and feel excluded from investigating anything other than an affirmation pathway. My questions are:

1. What research supports the government to authorise a site leader to overrule a parent and make their own determination about the best pathway forward for a child or young person?
2. What expertise and training do the site leaders have that make them better positioned to overrule the parent or guardian?
3. How is it acceptable policy that the mitigating factors for determining an informed decision from a minor do not include mental health history?
4. What inquiries have been made about developing international best practice to adopt a wait-and-see approach with children, given recent developments in the UK, Finland, Sweden and France?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:29): I thank the honourable member for her questions and will refer them to the minister responsible in the other place and bring back a reply.

COMMISSIONER FOR EQUAL OPPORTUNITY ANNUAL REPORT

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:29): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question about equal opportunity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: In the 2021-22 annual report, the equal opportunity commissioner has called for a review into harassment in South Australia's hospitality industry. While a range of industry bodies have signalled they would be open to a review taking place, they are not prepared to fund such a review, particularly at a time when the hospitality industry is struggling with rising costs and labour shortages, and still recovering from the disruption of the COVID pandemic.

It is expected that a review into discrimination, abuse and sexual harassment in the hospitality industry would uncover significant under-reporting of such incidents, with young people and people from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds at most risk of being exploited or harassed. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Attorney-General read the 2021-22 annual report of the office of the equal opportunity commissioner?

2. Has the Attorney-General met with the commissioner to discuss the concerns raised in the annual report?

3. Does the Attorney-General agree that it is his responsibility, as Minister for Industrial Relations, to work with agencies to achieve fair, equitable and productive workplaces?

4. Will the government commit to such a review, recommended by the equal opportunity commissioner?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:31): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area. In relation to questions the honourable member asked about meeting with the equal opportunity commissioner to discuss issues raised in the annual report and other issues, I can inform the honourable member that I have regular meetings with the equal opportunity commissioner.

I haven't had a meeting since the report was tabled, but I have certainly read the report the honourable member refers to, and I pay tribute to the commissioner for the very important work she does in her role, as well as to commissioners who have gone before in their roles, particularly when it comes to looking at making workplaces safe and free from harassment.

I am aware that the commissioner is interested in various sectors in the community. In the past the commissioner has looked at workplace cultures, including a review of harassment in the parliamentary workplace. The commissioner has also looked at it in legal settings, and I know the commissioner has an interest in looking at a number of areas. I support the work of the commissioner, and if the commissioner requires extra funding for particular projects the commissioner is looking to undertake, that is something that is able to be discussed.

Bills

NEW WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 October 2022.)

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (15:33): The Greens welcomed the announcement of a new Women's and Children's Hospital last month. Indeed, the need for a replacement for the tired Women's and Children's Hospital has been apparent for many years and, in 2021, we saw the Marshall Liberal government announce plans for a new hospital next to the Royal Adelaide.

I do not want to engage in a debate about which proposal is better or which side of politics got it right and the differences between the Liberal and Labor proposals, but we do believe that a new hospital is desperately needed for South Australian women and children. However, it is important to note that the bill we have before us today is not about whether or not we have a hospital. Instead, it is about the location of that hospital and, in particular, the implications of that for heritage and our Parklands.

This bill vests specific power in the hands of the minister. It removes the state heritage protection value of the old police barracks, and it is our responsibility as legislators to consider the implications of this. South Australians should not have to choose between a new hospital or our iconic Parklands and heritage buildings.

On 27 September this year, the Hon. Peter Malinauskas, the Premier, was quoted in InDaily as saying, 'This is going to be a binary choice'—a choice between heritage on the one hand and health on the other. Well, we in the Greens reject that argument. It is not a binary choice. We can have both; it just takes imagination from government. The people of Adelaide and the people of our state do not have to choose between heritage and hospitals or parklands and hospitals; indeed, there are many cities around the world that preserve their heritage buildings and preserve their green space and still have world-class hospital facilities.

The problem here is that successive governments, both Labor and Liberal, have viewed the Parklands as free land. They view the Parklands as a land bank, and there are any number of meritorious proposals that could be advanced by governments of the day with respect to our public green space: hospitals, schools, universities and housing.

As the world's first public planned park, the Adelaide Parklands are an integral part of the design of the City of Adelaide. They are unique and they are enjoyed by all South Australians, but over time we have seen their inherent value being degraded—again, by both sides of politics. I am not simply criticising the Labor government here; I note, of course, that the Marshall Liberal government, despite promises made, had an abysmal record in that regard.

In the initial statements made about the hospital, Minister Picton has made it clear that there will be a net zero loss of Parklands. At least, that is the undertaking that the government has given, but the numbers do not appear to add up. In a statement released by Minister Picton on 19 October, he states that 30,000 square metres of inaccessible Parklands will be restored, yet meanwhile the hospital site and the blueprint that has been tabled demonstrate that there will be a footprint of 40,000 square metres. The car park would add another 13,000 square metres of loss. To make up that shortfall, we would need to see a commitment of another 23,000 square metres of Parklands to achieve the government's goal of a net zero loss of Parklands.

Labor's refusal to add the Adelaide Parklands to the State Heritage Register just two weeks ago is proof that they are wavering in their commitment, at best. Their statements around the future expansion of the hospital are further proof of this weak support for our public green space. Again, the Premier was quoted as saying at the time, 'By choosing to build on the barracks site, we leave room for future RAH expansion and we leave room for future Women's and Children's expansion.'

I note that the former Labor minister and Lord Mayoral candidate Jane Lomax-Smith has referred repeatedly to bracket creep; that is, governments taking over a portion of Parklands and then expanding their reach over time. I agree with the former Labor minister in that regard: it is concerning when we see governments expand their reach into our public green space. We do not want to set a precedent here that our Parklands can be swallowed up and seized every time there is a project of public merit—and there are lots of important projects that are worthy of support.

We also need to consider the implications of this bill for our heritage and the value of heritage listings. The whole purpose of heritage protection is that it is not meant to be held hostage by the government of the day. I have heard the Premier make comments in the media, where he has said, 'Oh, well, the old police barracks aren't exactly attractive. No-one goes there. It's not like it's a building on North Terrace.' That is beside the point.

It is not for members of parliament to make their assessments on what constitutes heritage values. We have an independent, peer-reviewed process. The power to do that is vested in the hands of the Heritage Council, and they are the body that should make those decisions, not the Premier, not individual members of parliament. The Department for Environment's own website describes a heritage place as follows:

A heritage place can be inspiring and intriguing and discovering the history of a place, especially if you're connected to it, will enrich your life. It's not just 'old' buildings that are heritage-listed, a place may be of value for reasons of history, social and cultural importance, design merit or rarity...it actually has to be a place that we want to keep because it tells our story and displays our uniqueness.

The criteria there is not, 'Oh, well, this is aesthetically pleasing,' or, 'The Premier thinks that this particular building is attractive.' That is not part of the criteria that the Heritage Council takes into consideration. Heritage protection provides benefits to our community. It tells our stories. It improves our tourism, and it gives our places meaning. Heritage is not about protecting pretty places. Heritage is about our history. The Thebarton Police Barracks are part of our history, and they have stood there for over 100 years.

I highlight for your benefit, Mr President, that Labor made commitments prior to the recent state election to add further protections to heritage laws through extensive public consultation. In their policy document announced during the election, they stated that a Malinauskas Labor government will legislate to require proposed demolition of state heritage sites are subject to full public consultation and a public report from the SA Heritage Council. This is not the standard that

they have applied to this bill. This is a case of Labor doing one thing before the election and now doing something very different when they find themselves on the government benches. Where is the public consultation?

The policy goes on to condemn the previous Liberal government for its actions on the Parklands, saying that the Marshall Liberal government showed its disrespect for Adelaide's heritage when it decided to rezone large parts of the Parklands. I agree with that, of course. But as I have said previously in this place, talk is cheap. It is easy to be critical of what the government is doing, but it is another thing entirely to actually put your money where your mouth is when you are in a position to make change. It is disappointing that the Labor Party have chosen not to take Parklands protection seriously now that they are in government.

The government is setting up a false choice here between heritage and a hospital. I want to make it very clear and to restate comments I have made previously that the Greens are not opposed to a new hospital, but we do have some concerns with elements of this bill. That is why we believe that the parliament should be given an opportunity to fully consider the implications of this bill through a parliamentary committee. I gave notice earlier of my intention to move for us to do that, to ensure that there is a select committee that could inquire into the implications of this bill for heritage protection and for our Parklands.

I also want to put on the public record correspondence from the Lord Mayor, Sandy Verschoor, that I received today. In the correspondence from the Lord Mayor, which was sent on behalf of the City of Adelaide, of which members will be aware I used to be a member, it stated that 'we respectfully request that final consideration of the Bill be delayed until such time as the impacts of the legislation are fully considered, tested and understood'.

Full consideration, I submit to you, Mr President, is vital if we are to ensure that we are not eroding heritage and our Parklands without considering the implications. To that end, I was concerned to note in the letter from the Lord Mayor that the advice of the Adelaide Park Lands Authority has not been sought in relation to this proposal.

It is very concerning that the authority has not been asked to have its say on the implications of this proposal. That is very concerning. I am also concerned about the speed with which this legislation is being advanced. I am concerned that it was only introduced into this place two weeks ago, or not even, and we now find ourselves in a position where significant reform with implications for heritage and Parklands is going to be advanced.

We will be moving a series of amendments at the committee stage to address some of the concerns that I have raised. Fundamental to the amendments that we are moving is a belief that we do not have to choose between heritage and a hospital, that we can do both. Indeed, the Greens amendments would allow us to do both. Some of our amendments relate to removing the sections of the bill that give the government the power to move police horses to other parts of the Parklands where they see fit, including their stables and infrastructure. We want to remove that part from the bill.

We want to maintain the heritage listing of the buildings that are implicated, which would ensure that the government would need to follow the standard heritage process. We are also wanting to ensure that there are no permanent fencings or barriers being built to close off the public green space, and we are also moving to ensure that the Parklands are not further impacted or, rather, we do not see the loss of the olive grove by having the car park being contained within the build of the hospital.

We believe that these are very sensible amendments. They would allow us to progress with building a hospital while also being sensitive to our Parklands and our heritage. With that, I conclude my second reading remarks, but I will obviously have more to say in the additional stages of the bill.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:46): I rise to speak on behalf of SA-Best on the New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill 2022. The bill is drafted broadly. It seeks to empower the relevant minister with powers—as has been highlighted—to delete those heritage items from the state register, relocate the police Mounted Operations Unit to another area of Parklands, and do all things

necessary to facilitate the construction of a new Women's and Children's Hospital on the site of the current Thebarton Police Barracks.

Despite the opposing views on this bill, there is consensus that the current Women's and Children's Hospital is outdated, dilapidated and in desperate need of replacement. As Chair of the Parliamentary Select Committee on Health Services, I for one—and I am sure other members can do the same—can categorically confirm that the evidence provided shows that this hospital is in dire need of replacement.

A mountain of work has been done in terms of the hospital build in South Australia, and that mountain of work—and evidence has been provided from nurses, from former consultants, from SASMOA, not to mention many, many concerned and upset parents of sick kids who have had harrowing experiences at the current Women's and Children's Hospital, both in relation to that hospital and in response to, with respect, the former government's proposal for a replacement hospital. That proposal squandered four years and \$53 million of taxpayers' money leaving us with what those experts described as a much less than satisfactory plan—and that is putting it nicely.

The location did not work, it was too small, it was not fit for purpose, and the design was a logistical nightmare. That is why we welcome the proposal behind this bill, and I will say for the record that the government did put us on notice about the time frame of this bill, and we have worked tirelessly to get this done, and to consult with the advocates that we have been working with for the new hospital, and not the government.

The many medical experts we have spoken to concur that this is the most ideal outcome. We put great weight on the opinions of healthcare experts. It is the opinion that I will put before politicians, the loud voices of those groups, every single day of the week. They know what is needed for a hospital to work well because they have committed their professional lives to working in hospitals and looking after our sick and injured. They have worked in one which does not and which has not for a very long time now worked well.

They are acutely aware of how important design is. They are acutely aware that efficiencies save lives, state-of-the-art equipment saves lives, proper resourcing saves lives. They are also acutely aware that our hospitals need to be an attractive place for medical professionals to work if we are to entice some of the world's brightest medical specialists to come to Adelaide to work and play once again.

When the competing interests of health and heritage became apparent, following the release of this proposal—and I think I referred to it as the elephant in the room when we last debated this issue—we knew exactly who we needed to consult with to help put things into clear and defined perspective for us. I will say Emeritus Professor Warren Jones AO proudly wears two hats with distinction, as many of us would know. He is the convenor of the Protect Our Heritage Alliance and co-founder of the Women and Children's Alliance, and is a tireless advocate for both heritage and health in this state. So when the government first announced the new site, Professor Jones summed up the debate simply and succinctly as this, and I quote:

There is a medical imperative to relocate the services of the Women's and Children's Hospital as close as possible to a major general hospital, the RAH.

There was no way that the previous Government's plan to try to utilise a very restricted triangular site was ever going to work.

Specialist clinicians have been warning about the gross inadequacies of this plan for over five years.

Despite this the Liberal Government proceeded with futile time and money-wasting plans for four years at a cost of \$53 million.

Considering all the options, there is no other adequate footprint for a new, enlarged hospital for the future other than the site on the north side of the railway line and extending into the Thebarton Barracks.

Arguments for building a freestanding WCH away from the RAH precinct are spurious, ignorant of the medical issues and contrary to modern standards of hospital care.

And so, the barracks have to go; end of story.

It is sad to have to sacrifice a State Heritage complex, but health and saving lives must trump heritage every time.

In more recent days, after more reflection and consideration, he offered this, and I quote:

The problems experienced at the Women's and Children's Hospital make it clear that a new hospital for the future of our women and children is an urgent need and should be the highest priority in resourcing and timely construction.

The present hospital, dating from 1879, is outmoded, and has increasing difficulty in delivering efficient and comprehensive health services.

As a freestanding hospital, isolated from the essential, acute and specialised services of a major general hospital, it is an anachronism in modern and safe hospital planning. Its replacement must, therefore, be located in the Royal Adelaide Hospital precinct on the site designated by the government.

Notwithstanding the unfortunate loss of the Thebarton Barracks, the chosen site is the only safe, workable and financially responsible option.

Although the new hospital will be largely self-contained, it needs proximity to the specialist staff and resources at the RAH.

It cannot be built on more distant sites proposed by some commentators.

The current WCH may not last the distance if the new build is not progressed with urgency and dedication.

As far as we are concerned, I think Emeritus Professor Jones has summed up the views of many in those comments. I remind members that if you can build a hotel at an oval, if you can tear down 16 Moreton Bay fig trees without the blink of an eyelid for an oval upgrade, if you can approve upgrades at Botanic High School on the Parklands without anyone batting an eyelid, then you can certainly look at improving the current amenities at Thebarton, creating more open public space and investing in our kids' wellbeing for decades to come.

I want to reflect on some of the views about the previous hospital and the political football that has become the new Women's and Children's Hospital build. I challenge anyone to suggest that it is anything other than—or has become anything other than a political football between the two major parties. Whose hospital is better?

We have heard evidence from many parties expressing apprehension about the new development that was the Liberal development and the ongoing impact on the existing Women's and Children's Hospital. As I said before, those concerns ranged from the actual location, the building site and footprint being too small, the layout of treatment areas and spaces and the lack of genuine consultation and engagement with medical staff.

I note some senior consultants at the Women's and Children's Hospital who have said things like, 'The evidence is clear,' that they do not know of one doctor who does not believe that the new site proposed by the former Liberal government was too small. In the current PICU at that hospital, there are 13 beds: the plan for the new build is for only 12. Paradoxically, Perth Children's Hospital went from 10 to 20 in their new build, yet there is a decrease in the future hospital that will need to serve the state's families and children for 20 to 30 years.

Another commentator suggested that the former government's process appeared to be nothing more than a sham process when it came to consulting with doctors, and another clinician labelled it as a box-ticking exercise. Another again thought that it was tokenistic in terms of the genuine consultation that was being undertaken with those experts in the know about what is needed in a new hospital design. Another noted the many errors that were made with the new hospital activity modelling. The new hospital again would be too small. The ED, paediatric and neonatal intensive care, theatres, medical day unit and inpatient beds would be inadequate. Departments were choosing not to sign off on their functional design briefs because of these reasons.

Another commented that they felt that it was a done deal and again that the former government was doing nothing other than paying lip service to the input of the medical profession. 'They know it is insufficient, and they have debated that now for six months,' is the comment of another medical professional, who said that the gross inadequacy of the grant is an indication of how little respect was given to those consultants during that process when it came to involving those medical professionals in the new hospital design.

They are the sorts of things that doctors at the Women's and Children's Hospital were saying about the former government's plan for a hospital. We know, of course, that both major parties went

to the election with yet another commitment for another hospital design in this state. SA-Best thinks that the new Women's and Children's Hospital design that is currently before us does make a lot of sense, and that is because we are guided by those very experts I have just quoted, people who have been working on this for years and people who have watched \$53 million of taxpayer funds being spent on a hospital design in this state to date.

There is no question that it will have a greater capacity to meet the needs of our state, with the capacity to grow as our population does. It will, according to the government plans and what we have seen, lead to the rejuvenation of a forgotten area of Parklands, which will open up public access and improve spaces that are currently closed off to them.

We appreciate the sentiment of the Greens and particularly the Hon. Robert Simms, who has spoken, and the push for a select committee of inquiry on this issue. I acknowledge that, on some issues on this front, the Hon. Robert Simms and I are never going to see eye to eye. This is certainly one of them, and I say that respectfully to the member. I will say that the committee that I referred to earlier has done a mountain of work on the Women's and Children's Hospital. It has heard from countless witnesses on the Women's and Children's Hospital design, and they are frustrated at the processes and barriers that have been put in place in terms of getting on with the job.

I will also say that there is nothing preventing that existing committee, which has done extraordinary work in terms of raising issues that both the former government and this government have been forced to address and bringing them into the public light, from continuing to do precisely the same in relation to this hospital build.

Of course there are other committees—the Public Works Committee, the ERD Committee, the Budget and Finance Committee—but I make the point that there is a health committee, which this parliament voted in, and we know that that committee has had a very huge focus on this. A huge part of its interim report was based on the Women's and Children's Hospital and the new Women's and Children's Hospital. So it is my view that there is no need to reinvent the wheel, not on this, and that those issues can be dealt with appropriately by that committee and we can look at those issues forensically.

It is my firm view also, and my colleagues' firm view, that it is time to take the politics out of this important and emotive subject. Let's not forget the past two elections—2018 and 2022, \$53 million later—had both major parties politicking and pontificating about the new Women's and Children's Hospital. A lot of 'my hospital is better than your hospital', 'co-located hospitals, unco-located hospitals'. I do not know if that is correct grammatically, but I apologise—

The Hon. J.M.A. Lensink interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: The Hon. Ms Lensink interjects about starting a hospital, but I did not see them do that. What I did see was a lot of criticism—a lot of criticism, which I have just outlined today—of what the former government proposed, and that is precisely the point. This is politicking between the two major parties about whose hospital is better. For our part this hospital is better, with respect to the honourable member.

The future hospital, as I said, was a major election issue for two elections for both major parties. I am pretty sure in terms of an inquiry into the hospital build, I do not recall a similar inquiry being initiated or proposed in relation to the former government's proposal for a hospital, despite us spending \$53 million of taxpayer funds over four years to get nowhere, to get absolutely nowhere with the hospital build.

As I said earlier, \$53 million has already been spent to get us to this point, and still a sod is yet to be turned. This should not be about political pointscoreing between the Labor Party and the Liberal Party; it needs to be about building a world-class hospital of which the entire state can be proud. Consultation on our part has been most thorough, it has gone on way longer than this bill has been before the parliament, and we have no intention of standing in the way of progress now that a workable proposal has been proposed.

I think the wait has been long enough; years and millions of dollars have already been wasted. There are a number of advocates who, on behalf of medicos, families and kids in SA, have worked tirelessly, advocating for a new hospital in this state. Emeritus Professor Jones, who I spoke

of earlier, and Associate Professor John Svigos, who are exceptional medical specialists—and gentlemen to boot, I might add—with more knowledge and experience than anyone I know, have managed to get the former government and this government to commit to a number of critical issues when it comes to the Women's and Children's Hospital, which would not have been possible without their campaigning.

Every step of the way their priority, unlike the major parties, has been on the best interests of both patients and medical professionals. That has been at the heart of the work they have done. The same can also be said of SASMOA, which has brought many of the issues of the Women's and Children's Hospital build to the fore. The same can be said of the mums and dads who have been willing to stick their necks out when presented with suboptimal plans.

The women and children of our state deserve a state-of-the-art, world-class hospital, a hospital that will help our once world-renowned Women's and Children's Hospital regain its mantle as one of the finest hospitals of its kind in the world. It is my sincere hope that this will become a reality, and we will be watching very closely every step of the way to ensure that this government remains committed to its undertakings.

As I just said, we will not be buying into the political pointscoring of the two major parties. You can call this the exception to the rule if you like, but we have been urged by the stakeholders, whom we have worked with now for over four years, to support this proposal for a new hospital and that is precisely what we intend to do.

It is absolutely my intention to keep the government to its word in terms of continuing to consult with those experts I have referred to in the medical profession as the project gets underway with respect to functional design issues and build issues—not something that usually happens with a new hospital—and keeping its commitments in relation to cardiac treatment and surgeries at the hospital.

I am going to finish today by quoting one of my, and our, constituents, who relies on the Women's and Children's Hospital for the care of her child and whose views reflect what many parents and families of kids in SA feel about the hospital:

It is my hope that by updating the built environment and the facilities, it might help to attract new talent and reframe and refurbish the mindset of some of the existing management at the Women's and Children's Hospital whose opinions and mindsets belong firmly in the same era as the current building.

With those words, I look forward to the next stages of the bill.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (16:06): The health and care of South Australian children is the most important consideration in this matter. I acknowledge that the spend has increased immensely and that there are heritage implications for the new plan. However, there are benefits to moving to a bigger site with better logistics access, increased onsite facilities and improved critical care service capabilities, which have convinced me that the extra spend is worthwhile for the future of our women and children.

I have been advised that the encroachment on undeveloped or green space Parklands footprint will be minimal to what already exists and, according to the maps provided by the planners, much will be improved compared to the gravel car parks currently in place. I have been assured that pedestrian and cycling access will be improved for city commuters and Adelaide High School students through the north-west corridor once the project is complete, and I understand South Australia Police have been guaranteed a new location for their mounted division within five kilometres of the CBD for continued quick response.

I would like to see this resolved swiftly by the chamber. South Australia must get on with building a new Women's and Children's Hospital, one that is of the highest standards, with ample capacity for projected growth. Clinicians consulted prefer this project. There are improved sterilisation facilities, improved catering facilities, improved pathology capabilities, improved pharmacological facilities, improved access for services and logistics, and the ability to contain all critical care services on one floor. These all add up to a better hospital experience and health outcomes for South Australians.

The part that has me cautious is the Malinauskas government's track record of blown-out budgets and blown-out time lines, and I can assure South Australian voters that I will be monitoring the progress of the new Women's and Children's Hospital closely, holding the government accountable for inaction or overspend. Children's wellbeing will always be my top priority. I want the best public health outcome for our constituents. Build the hospital and prove you can deliver it.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Curran, L.A.
 Lee, J.S.
 Wade, S.G.

Franks, T.A.
 Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

Girolamo, H.M.
 Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Martin, R.B.
 Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Ngo, T.T.

Game, S.L.
 Maher, K.J. (teller)
 Pnevmatikos, I.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.
 Pangallo, F.

Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.

Motion thus negatived.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:12): I rise to make some remarks in relation to this piece of legislation—which, I think it is fair to say, is unprecedented in the history of our parliament. In terms of the division we have just had, Labor's intention clearly is to jam this legislation through to silence community voices.

This legislation has been drafted very quickly, and we have some significant concerns, particularly in relation to the lack of transparency in some clauses. I have filed amendments that will certainly improve the processes, including to match those which are expected of other bodies. The government should at least be the model developer in any space, as it should be the model litigant, the model landlord, etc.

Firstly, remarks do need to be made about the history of the Women's and Children's Hospital. I note the comments of the Hon. Ms Bonaros, who said that it is 'one party playing football with another'. I think she does a disservice to my colleague the Hon. Mr Wade, the former Minister for Health, who is one of the most sincere people this parliament has seen. In his consultation as the then Minister for Health—and bearing in mind that we dealt with a pandemic for over two years—I do not think anyone can doubt that he undertook a deep and genuine consultation to try to rectify the fact that we continue not to have a rebuilt Women's and Children's Hospital, which we all support. I think that is a no-brainer.

Labor will continue to try to frame this as a binary debate about heritage versus a new Women's and Children's Hospital, and hope that in that process people forget about some of the details that are also important. There is no-one standing in the way of the redevelopment of the Women's and Children's Hospital, except for the fact that the Labor Party has chosen to kick this

project down the road. As my leader, the Hon. David Spiers, has described it today, 'Toddlers will be teenagers before this hospital is built.'

Just to recap on history, because it is important to place these facts on the record, building a new Women's and Children's Hospital was one of the top-priority infrastructure projects for the Marshall Liberal government.

Labor's record on the Women's and Children's Hospital is a litany of delays, cost blowouts, botched plans, false dawns and the like. Labor announced a new Women's and Children's Hospital in October 2013, which is now nine years ago, and they said it would open in 2023. They did nothing in those four years before abandoning the project in June 2017, which is five years ago. So they got the headline, did no work and had to abandon it in the lead-up to the 2018 election. They downgraded the project to a women's hospital only, leaving the children's hospital stranded indefinitely at the site in North Adelaide. The former Labor government wanted to split the hospital in two.

It was the Marshall Liberal team at the 2018 election that saved the hospital and the state from Labor's muddleheaded plan. Under the former Liberal government, construction was scheduled to start later in 2022—so, for those who are interested in having a hospital sooner rather than later, that was the plan—with a completion date of 2026-27 and a \$1.95 billion price tag. So we would be seeing shovels in the ground already. Our project went to Infrastructure SA, and thousands of hours of clinical engagement were conducted as part of the plan, so to say that nothing happened is just untrue.

However, as we know, Labor was elected this year, promising to deliver the hospital co-located with the Royal Adelaide but on the western Royal Adelaide site, the site that they announced nine years ago. The month after the election, Labor admitted that they did not have a plan by announcing a review led by a former senior public servant. After another six months of delay, Labor announced a further delay in the project and a cost blowout of more than \$1 billion. They have now scrapped that plan and gone back to the drawing board, announcing a \$3.2 billion hospital proposal that would only be delivered in 2032, at best—not this decade. This represents a delay of five years and a cost blowout of \$1.2 billion.

So far, Labor is yet to outline its sustainment plan for the current Women's and Children's Hospital in North Adelaide, which is hugely concerning because we cannot allow that to go to rack and ruin in the meantime. For those who lament the state of the current Women's and Children's Hospital, this should be a front-of-mind concern. The former government had invested \$80 million in sustainment works, based on moving to a new hospital in 2026-27. While we are supportive of a new Women's and Children's Hospital, we have serious concerns about the cost blowout, completion delay and Labor's ability to deliver this project. Not only that, there are significant concerns about how the new hospital will work.

It was Labor who oversaw the delivery of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital as well as the disastrous Transforming Health program. Since they have returned to government, ambulance ramping is at record levels. Put simply, Labor cannot be trusted on health.

The \$53 million that the honourable member referred to specifically relates to site remediation. We know that those works can be very expensive, so that explains the particular figure that she has been using.

We have been advised that the works for this current plan that Labor has are likely to commence in the second half of 2023, and we are not expecting the completion until at least 2032—and don't hold your breath. As I said, there are potentially hundreds of millions of dollars that will need to be expended on the current site in the meantime.

This legislation has been badged as a new Women's and Children's Hospital bill. It is actually a piece of planning legislation: there is not a single clause in there that actually relates to any health act. There are some clauses that obviously relate to the heritage places, to effectively cease the heritage listing of the Thebarton Police Barracks buildings, which will enable them to be demolished.

There have been well-ventilated concerns about the demolition of the Thebarton Police Barracks and its heritage listing. We also have concerns relating to the ministerial powers, which are

quite unprecedented and open-ended, and therefore we have drafted some amendments to redress those.

One of the government's key arguments for this legislation was that it would enable the process of building the new Women's and Children's Hospital to commence as soon as possible, thereby defraying the cost of potential future increases in cost of builds, but it has not provided any evidence to justify that. The former plans under the Marshall Liberal government would have seen a rebuild by 2026.

I have had a fair bit to do with Parklands and Parklands issues over the years, and I note the guidance of our forefathers when it comes to the Parklands: to build with care. One of the concepts that are often referred to are what is described as 'alienated parklands', so I do take the point that the barracks being a closed site can be seen as alienated and not available to the public.

We will ultimately be supporting this legislation, but we are very disappointed at the process under which this government has chosen to undertake this process, as I said, jamming this legislation through the parliament to try to avoid having to listen to those pesky community voices.

There are some fairly heavy-handed elements in this bill. Clause 10 is the clause relating to the relocation of the Mounted Operations Unit, known colloquially as the Police Greys. We think in particular that open-ended nature that the government is providing for this particular aspect needs to have greater transparency.

Clause 13 enables any changes to the Planning and Design Code and removes the barracks precincts from the Heritage Register. Clause 15 is very open-ended in enabling a regulation made under the act—or currently the bill—to modify, exclude any clause of any other act. In the briefing today, we were advised that the government would hope never to use that particular clause. I hope they are sincere in what they are saying.

In relation to the issue that we had with the Waite Gatehouse under the former Marshall Liberal government, we undertook to rebuild that beloved heritage asset and allocated funding to that. We are also seeking to include consultation with the state Heritage Council, which I think have been blindsided by this particular piece of legislation and the government's decision to do this. I note that they actually wrote to the Minister for the Environment. As my colleague the Hon. Rob Simms has outlined, the Hon. Dr Susan Close said one thing before the election and has said another thing after the election.

The South Australian Heritage Council wrote to the Hon. Dr Close on 13 October in relation to the Thebarton Police Barracks. They have provided the following—I will not read it in full, but they did refer to the commentary which exists in the South Australian Heritage Places Database:

Historically, the South Australian Police Force has been associated with the Thebarton Police Barracks since the barracks were constructed in 1917 to accommodate the South Australia Mounted Police, who moved from their premises located behind the South Australian Museum. The South Australian Mounted Police Cadre, established in 1838, is the oldest of its type in Australia, and with the possible exception of the Royal Irish Mounted Constabulary created by Robert Peel, is the oldest in the world. The changing use of the buildings on site illustrates the transition to motorised patrols, while retaining a patrol of Police Greys that supplement foot patrols and participate as honour guards at ceremonial functions.

The letter goes on to say:

There is a recent report prepared for the new Women's and Children's Hospital project which reviews the heritage values of the Thebarton Police Barracks and confirms its importance and status as a state heritage place. It is not a publicly available document, but it may be sourced from the Department of Health.

We have asked for that particular document in our briefing, and I believe the government has agreed to provide that. I think it is important that that is provided. One of our amendments is to relocate those buildings. Now we do not know what the heritage value is of each of those buildings, but if the government would seek to amend that particular amendment that I have filed on behalf of the Liberal Party, because they know better than we do—they have this report, which I am hoping they will make public—to advise which of those buildings has the capacity to be rebuilt. I think that is the least that the government can do to make a genuine attempt to try to preserve some of the heritage from this site, which in its unprecedented way it has decided will make way for the hospital.

The Hon. Mr Simms referred to a letter from the Lord Mayor Sandy Verschoor in which Adelaide City Council has expressed a range of concerns very eloquently. I think one might be accused of being cynical, but I think it is fair given that we are in the middle of caretaker mode for all of our councils, it is certainly interesting timing that the government has chosen to bring this bill on at this particular time when the council finds itself in a position where it is quite limited in what it is able to engage in.

We have also received correspondence from Community Alliance South Australia who have written on behalf of 35 member groups not to vote for the upcoming bill because of their concern about the heritage issues. I think it is fair to say that whoever is in government can find some of these groups challenging to deal with, but we respect that they have a right to express their views in the public domain, and they should be allowed to fully participate in these discussions, and for those reasons we are going to be supporting the motion of the Hon. Mr Simms to refer this matter to a committee.

In relation to consultation and those sorts of matters, I think it is important to outline what the State Planning Commission requires of any development or changes to codes or the like. We have had through the changes to the Planning Act, which is now known as the Planning Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 or the PDI Act, a community engagement charter. This document is quite a thorough document, and it provides obligations on anybody who engages in changing zoning and the like within our planning system. It says that the following principles must be taken into account in relation to the preparation:

- (a) members of the community should have reasonable, timely, meaningful and ongoing opportunities to gain access to information about proposals to introduce or change planning policies and to participate in relevant planning processes;
- (b) community engagement should be weighted towards engagement at an early stage and scaled back when dealing with settled or advanced policy;
- (c) information about planning issues should be in plain language, readily accessible and in a form that facilitates community participation;
- (d) participation methods should seek to foster and encourage constructive dialogue, discussion and debate in relation to the development of relevant policies and strategies;
- (e) participation methods should be appropriate having regard to the significance and likely impact of relevant policies and strategies; and
- (f) insofar as is reasonable, communities should be provided with reasons for decisions associated with the development of planning policy (including how community views have been taken into account). That is the standard that is set for every development in South Australia.

The way this legislation has been constructed does not meet that test, and therefore we have amendments that will seek to do that in a number of ways. I sincerely hope that we will receive support for those because they do not slow the process down at all. They provide for transparency, they add a process not a roadblock, and they will make the process much more consistent with all principles of good planning, and not provide the government with a sledgehammer to crack a walnut.

With those remarks, I indicate that we will ultimately support this legislation, but this is an unprecedented piece of legislation that gives the government broad powers in many instances to do whatever it likes without any reference back to the community.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (16:30): I thank honourable members for their contribution to what is an important bill which has generated significant community interest, and look forward to debate on clauses as they progress in the committee stage, and also addressing amendments that have been filed by both the Hon. Robert Simms and the Hon. Michelle Lensink.

Bill read a second time.

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (16:31): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable the new Women's and Children's Hospital Bill to be referred to a select committee.

The PRESIDENT: I have to put the question and there needs to be an absolute majority.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I understood I could speak at this point. Am I incorrect in that?

The PRESIDENT: There needs to be an absolute majority present. We have 11 and we need 12.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER: Mr President, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The PRESIDENT: The motion has been seconded. There being an absolute majority, I will put the question.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I actually have not had an opportunity to outline the rationale behind the proposal, Mr President.

The PRESIDENT: Okay. Speak to it, please.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just very briefly, this is not an intention to prevent the bill from progressing; rather, it is an intention to ensure that the heritage and the Parklands implications of this proposal are properly considered. This is a bill that has been dealt with quite hastily thus far, and I believe that the community would expect, when one is dealing with vitally important legislation such as this, that there is parliamentary oversight, and that is precisely what we are proposing in terms of the establishment of a select committee.

I note the earlier comments of the Hon. Connie Bonaros with respect to this proposal. I am disappointed to hear the honourable member state that she will not support an inquiry. I noted earlier that former Senator Rex Patrick, who was affiliated, I think, with the SA-Best party or the Centre Alliance party, has said that this is a departure from the parliamentary principles of Nick Xenophon. I worked with Nick Xenophon in the federal parliament, and I certainly would say that he would always support oversight and consideration of matters such as this. It is disappointing to see that there may not be support for a committee to examine these issues, but I will certainly test the proposal.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Curran, L.A.
 Lee, J.S.
 Wade, S.G.

Franks, T.A.
 Lensink, J.M.A.

Girolamo, H.M.
 Simms, R.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Martin, R.B.
 Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Ngo, T.T.

Game, S.L.
 Maher, K.J. (teller)
 Pnevmatikos, I.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.
 Pangallo, F.

Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.

Motion thus negatived.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I have some questions for the Attorney-General. In my second reading remarks I referenced correspondence from the honourable Lord Mayor of the City of Adelaide, Sandy Verschoor, regarding the failure of the government to consult with the Adelaide Park Lands Authority. Can the minister explain why the government has not sought the advice of the Adelaide Park Lands Authority in relation to this legislation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his question. My advice is that the government decided on the course of action that is contained in this bill rather than any other course of action that would necessitate consultation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Did the government ask the Park Lands Authority about the potential implications of the legislation they are proposing?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised they did not.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister provide a list of any organisation or body that has made representations on this legislation or this matter?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that we do not have a list of who has made representations, I would think, to either the department or the minister or the government more generally. People would have put in and represented their views and the views of their organisations, as often happens, but I do not have any consolidated list.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister advise whether the National Trust made any sort of submission?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that we are not aware of any submissions made at this point.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister advise on the views of the Heritage Council on this matter?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the Heritage Council's view is that they do not support the loss of heritage over the building subject in the area of the project.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Does the minister have any knowledge of proposed sites that have been considered for the new Mounted Operations Unit?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there are no proposed sites at this stage.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister explain then why the bill proposes such a large scope in terms of potential sites that can be acquired for use on the Parklands? Have other alternatives outside of the Parklands been considered?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that other alternatives outside the Parklands will be investigated and considered.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Which agency within government has been the lead agency for the development of this legislation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: What role has DEW played in relation to heritage and, secondly, what role has planning played?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that they have both been consulted and involved in the development of the legislation.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister advise when Health finalised its plans for submission to cabinet?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As the honourable member would well know, the internal cabinet workings and decisions are not matters that are publicly agitated.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That is not what I asked. I asked: when did Health finalise its plans?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As the honourable member would well know, having sat around a cabinet table, the internal workings, deliberations and time frames of cabinet are not something that is publicly agitated.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In my briefing, which I do thank the government for, I have been able to view the South Australian Heritage Council correspondence of 13 October on this matter. Will the government seek to make that correspondence public?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that it is not the usual practice for every bit of advice on every bill to be made public, but certainly I am happy to go away and find out if this one can be made public or if there is any reason for it not to be.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Then reading from it, I note that the 13 October correspondence from the Chair of the South Australian Heritage Council, Mr Keith Conlon, states on page 2:

Demolition of State Heritage Places has been extremely rare. No Government, as far as we are aware, has demolished a confirmed State Heritage Place in its entirety before, let alone a whole precinct. Heritage protection law has been upheld for more than four decades in this State.

Council is extremely concerned about the precedent this Government's decision sets for the future.

The new hospital site will also impact on the heritage values of the nationally heritage listed Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout and may lead to referral under the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

What preparations has the state government made for such a referral?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: There will be the commencing of discussions with the commonwealth in the coming weeks.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What previous state heritage places have been demolished in their entirety before in South Australia?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that heritage places have been demolished previously to make way for health infrastructure. I am advised such a building as the Repat is one example of that.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: One of the arguments that I think the Premier has used publicly in relation to rushing this legislation through is about inflation of future costs. Can the minister outline what the Premier was talking about?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that roughly every three months of delay costs the state \$25 million for this project.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister advise whether similar legislation was required for the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My initial advice is that legislation very similar to this was not required, but I can double-check that in due course and come back with a reply if that is not the case.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I just want to refer to two matters I raised during the second reading. They were around the input of clinicians in terms of consultation and also in relation to the cardiac treatment at the new Women's and Children's Hospital. Firstly, in relation to the cardiac treatment, the government's proposal includes futureproofing cardiac surgery. Can the Attorney confirm for the record that it is committed to a dedicated paediatric cardiac unit at the new Women's and Children's Hospital, with a view to surgeries in the future?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the design for the Women's and Children's Hospital as it stands provides the facilities that would enable a cardiac unit, should a government choose to establish that in the future.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In relation to consultation that I referred to earlier, can the Attorney confirm for the record that it is its intention to continue consultation with clinicians from the Women's and Children's Hospital in relation to the New Women's and Children's Hospital Bill?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is: absolutely.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What is the earliest that Heart Kids no longer have to travel interstate for cardiac surgery?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is as outlined in the previous answer, that it will depend on the possibility for a future government to do that in the facilities provided there.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In the year 2036 will children still have to travel interstate, if they are Heart Kids, to access their much-needed cardiac surgery?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I have previously said, that will depend on future decisions of the government. I am advised that this creates the facilities for the establishment of such a cardiac unit at this facility for a future government to make that decision.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Lensink-1]—

Page 2, line 4—After 'Hospital' insert 'Development'

This amendment adds the word 'development' to the title of the bill. As I stated in my second reading speech, the government has clearly tried to frame this debate as you are either for or against the new Women's and Children's Hospital. That is just bunkum: everybody supports a new Women's and Children's Hospital. It is a complete no-brainer.

The point does need to be made that the government is trying to avoid the issue that this is an unprecedented piece of legislation, and we think that adding the word 'development' more accurately reflects what this legislation is.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I can indicate that the government does not support this amendment. We do not think it adds any material value to the bill at all.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens support the amendment. We believe it makes the intention of the bill clearer.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In terms of the count of numbers, we will not be supporting the amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes	7
Noes.....	10
Majority	3

AYES

Curran, L.A.
Lee, J.S.
Wade, S.G.

Franks, T.A.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

Girolamo, H.M.
Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Hanson, J.E.
Martin, R.B.
Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
Hunter, I.K.
Ngo, T.T.

Game, S.L.
Maher, K.J. (teller)
Pnevmatikos, I.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.
Pangallo, F.

Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Simms-1]—

Page 3, line 22 [clause 5(a)]—After 'provision' insert 'but not including the excised area'

Amendment No 2 [Simms-1]—

Page 3, after line 26—Insert:

(2) In this section—

excised area means the land east of the eastern boundary of Gaol Road (being land shown on the plan in Schedule 1 as being part of the project site).

The amendments that I am moving would require the car park to be built within the footprint of the new hospital, rather than on the olive grove. We think that is an appropriate thing to do in terms of reducing the impact on the Parklands.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting this amendment. This amendment would excise a significant portion of land from the project site as defined in the bill. If the geographic boundaries of the project site were amended it would cause trouble for the project having its best chance of success. I am advised that the boundaries have been very carefully considered, so we will not be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We will not be supporting this amendment. The footprint is not such a concern in this particular legislation. Our biggest concerns are in relation to not having adequate provision for heritage reuse, for want of a better word, and also about some of the extraordinary powers that are in some of the clauses in this bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I want to answer a question the Hon. Tammy Franks asked on the last amendment in relation to the South Australian heritage committee submission. I have been advised that that submission is on the website of the South Australian heritage committee, so it is publicly available through the writer's website.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I have just a supplementary on that: is the health work that was done that is referred to in the South Australian Heritage Council's submission and response also made public?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is it is not public at this stage, but I am advised that there has been a commitment and an undertaking given to provide that report.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Can that report please be made available to the public today?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will certainly take advice on that. If that is possible, I will endeavour to see that that is done so.

The committee divided on the amendments:

Ayes	2
Noes	15
Majority	13

AYES

Franks, T.A.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.

Bourke, E.S.

Curran, L.A.

Game, S.L.

Girolamo, H.M.

Hanson, J.E.

Hunter, I.K.

Lee, J.S.

Lensink, J.M.A.

Maher, K.J. (teller)

Martin, R.B.

Ngo, T.T.

Pnevmatikos, I.

Scriven, C.M.

Wade, S.G.

Amendments thus negated; clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I note at subclause (3) the clause states that under this section—sorry, I probably need to read the whole subclause otherwise you cannot get the context:

- (3) Land that vests in the Minister under this section vests free from all dedications, encumbrances, estates and interests other than those indicated by the Minister in the plan or plans deposited under subsection (2).

Can the minister explain what this particular clause does and why it is necessary?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. I think it was in particular subclause (3) that the member was asking about. My advice is the reason it is needed free from encumbrances is to do with when plans are lodged with the general registry office to allow the project to go ahead as planned.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: What if, for want of a better word, things may be extinguished by this particular clause?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised an example of this might be a gas main under old Gaol Road that is lodged as an encumbrance on the title. That would then be extinguished and rerouted and relodged as a new encumbrance on the title. That is the sort of thing I am advised is an example.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Is this a fairly standard clause?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that this is standard practice in these types of developments.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Simms–1]—

Page 5, line 2 [clause 7(4)(a)]—After 'building' insert ', fencing or barrier'

This amendment would ensure that there are no permanent fencing or barriers erected on the support zones, that is, areas where there are no permanent buildings. This is consistent with the principles that the Greens have advocated over many years, and that is that we should not have closed or fenced off areas in our Parklands. These areas should be publicly accessible.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the government does not support this amendment. This amendment would have the effect, as we understand it, of prohibiting any fences to remain in place after the completion of the project. My advice is that could cause some safety concerns, for example, if there were fencing or barriers that may be required in the completion of works on Port Road and the building of new shared user path bridges. If this amendment were supported the government would hold concerns over safety measures that could be impacted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Liberal Party is not going to be supporting this amendment.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Lensink–1]—

Page 6, line 11 [clause 8(2)]—Delete 'All' and substitute:

If, following a public consultation process conducted in a manner determined by the State Planning Commission, the State Planning Commission determines that the project is consistent with the relevant principles of good planning set out in section 14 of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*, all

This relates to the matters that I broadly described as improving transparency. We have no desire to slow this process down, but we believe it is important that there is a level of consultation that is conducted in a manner which the community would expect. This particular amendment, rather than the government's model, which will mean that the development goes through potentially as a rubber stamp—and I note that while in our consultation the government did say that they intended to consult, that is not enshrined in legislation and yet for any major development or any other matter, as I outlined with the model principles, everybody else is expected to go by those rules.

We think that the government should consult in a model manner in relation to its own developments, particularly given that it is rushing this legislation through. This amendment just provides a bit of peace of mind to any affected parties, or anybody who has an interest in this, that the government should abide by its own principles of good planning, so this amendment will assist the government. We are trying to be helpful and save it from its own legislation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens support the amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting the amendment. The government intends, and in fact it will be necessary to engage in a level of consultation, particularly with clinicians, but this amendment would frustrate the very purpose of the act, namely, to consolidate the planning application process.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: For the record, we will not be supporting the amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
 Noes10
 Majority3

AYES

Curran, L.A.
 Lee, J.S.
 Wade, S.G.

Franks, T.A.
 Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

Girolamo, H.M.
 Simms, R.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Hanson, J.E.
 Martin, R.B.
 Scriven, C.M.

Bourke, E.S.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Ngo, T.T.

Game, S.L.
 Maher, K.J. (teller)
 Pnevmatikos, I.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.
 Pangallo, F.

Wortley, R.P.

Centofanti, N.J.

Amendment thus negated.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Simms-1]—

Page 6, line 14 [clause 8(2)]—After 'Act 2016' insert:

provided that the following conditions are complied with:

- (a) all buildings on the project site that form part of the State Heritage Place (under the *Heritage Places Act 1993*) known as the Thebarton Police Barracks Complex must be maintained within the development;
- (b) the development must not involve alterations to the buildings that could materially affect their heritage value (as determined by the State Planning Commission)

This amendment would ensure that the barracks heritage buildings would have to be preserved in any new build. In effect, it would ensure that the usual principles that apply in relation to heritage buildings are complied with. To outline my rationale, one of the main concerns that we have in the Greens about this proposal—and as I say, we are supportive, of course, of having this new Women's and Children's Hospital—is the precedent that this potentially sets for the destruction of our heritage buildings.

What we are suggesting is that the usual protections should apply. This would require the government to incorporate the building into their design. I know that the government will say that is not possible, but when one is spending over \$3 billion on a project such as this, then it seems appropriate that a building like this be incorporated. After all, this is not sending a man to the moon: it is preserving a heritage building. I would have thought that the government would have the resources to be able to make that happen, hence the purpose of this amendment.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will not disappoint the member; the government does say that this is not possible. The advice is that the effect of this amendment would be so heavily to restrict work on the project site that the new hospital as anticipated could not proceed on that site. I do acknowledge the sincerity with which the honourable member puts forward the amendment and his views on the heritage buildings on this project site; however, it is the government's view that this would so restrict what could possibly be done that what is proposed just could not go ahead.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I have a question on a further clause that is very much along the same lines. Between lines 10 and 15, at clause 10(5):

No compensation is payable by the Minister, the relevant Minister or the Crown in connection with the operation of this section.

What entities would be able to require compensation if this clause were not passed?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that in this clause, and where it appears elsewhere in the act, the identified body that may be entitled to compensation would likely be Adelaide City Council, particularly for utilising land to support the development.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In my briefing I asked a question about this and a clause yet to come, and now you are saying they are very much the same case. I was informed that there was some amount of 35□ per square metre per day that would come into question that would be payable to the council. Can you give me the basis of that charge of 35□ per square metre per day? Where does it sit, what does it apply to and why has it not simply been specific about that provision?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am informed that is a rate set by the Corporation of the City of Adelaide and, as the honourable member has outlined, a charge of 35□ per square metre per day would not be payable if this act passed.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Where is this amount set by the Corporation of Adelaide? Could you refer the council to the specific documents that you are requiring, and how is it 35□? For how long has it been 35□—where does this come from?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her questions. I do not have the specifics of what gives rise to the specifics of this amount per day, whether it is some sort of regulation that the council itself passes or whether it has legislative force, but I will find that out for the honourable member. But, my advice is that that is correct as the honourable member has outlined

that amount. The basis for which that is possibly charged or someone is liable for I will find out for the honourable member.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: So at 5, no compensation is payable by the minister, the relevant minister of the crown, in connection with the operation of this section here applies to the relocation of certain SA Police facilities? Why is it not then more precise about that amount of the 35□ per square metre per day and referring specifically and more directly to that provision, which seems to be what this is addressing?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that this is what this provision is aimed at. I do not have any advice that there are other things that this provision seeks to capture, but it is drafted in that manner because that was recommended, I assume, by parliamentary counsel to be drafted that way.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I will put the Hon. Mr Simms out of his misery and advise that we will not support his amendments. It is not very often that I agree with the Hon. Kyam Maher, but on this occasion we do, so that is the reason we will not be supporting his amendment.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can the minister outline what consultation there will be? We were advised quite clearly in the briefing that there is no legislative requirement for the government to consult on this bill whatsoever, which is of great concern, but I think the government ought to, for the record, outline its intention to consult, and I will be looking for some more fulsome response than some of the responses we have had to date.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there will be extensive consultation with clinicians about the design. My advice is that there is intended to be a consultation with the Office for Design and Architecture prior to lodgement with the State Planning Commission, and my advice is also that there is an intention to set up a community reference group to undertake community consultation about the design.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Is the minister able to indicate what level of consultation, particularly in relation to the community reference group, it would be comparable to? Was there this level of consultation on the new Royal Adelaide Hospital or Adelaide Botanic High or other projects of this scale?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice to the honourable member is yes, the intention is it would be comparable to the consultation that took place for projects of this sort of significance, such as the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I thank the minister for that answer. From what range of stakeholders will the community reference group be drawn?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that that is still to be developed and decided. It certainly will include consumers of health as well as other community groups and representatives to be involved, but that process is still underway.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Given the concern of a number of stakeholders that we have referred to in the debates this afternoon, can the minister advise what level of consultation any of those groups, such as the Adelaide Park Lands Association, Community Voice, the National Trust and the Adelaide City Council, will be engaged in?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that all the groups that were outlined will be consulted and consultation is underway with Adelaide City Council, but the groups that were specifically mentioned will be consulted in this process, I am advised.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Which agency will be the lead agency undertaking consultation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised the Department for Health and Wellbeing.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: So therefore, what is the role of the State Planning Commission in this process? I think, if I remember rightly from the briefing this morning, the State Planning

Commission also has some sort of role in terms of consultation. Will there be parallel processes between the State Planning Commission and SA Health? Are they done conjunctively? Are they done sequentially? Can the minister outline how this will transpire?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the groups the member outlined, and other groups, will be consulted prior to the development being lodged with the State Planning Commission.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Who by? SA Health or the State Planning Commission or both?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the Department for Health and Wellbeing will be consulting with those groups prior to the plan being lodged with the State Planning Commission.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Does the State Planning Commission therefore have a role in consultation, or does it just receive the referral from SA Health?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the State Planning Commission does not have a role in the consultation but has the role of receiving and assessing the plan that is lodged.

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In terms of the way the debate proceeds, I am just wondering if honourable members have any questions as this relates to the Mounted Operations Unit before we proceed to the amendments.

The CHAIR: Are there any contributions at clause 10 before we proceed to the Hon. Ms Lensink's amendment? No. The Hon. Ms Lensink, would you like to move your amendment?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Lensink-1]—

Page, 7, after line 4—Insert:

- (1a) Land does not vest in the relevant Minister by notice under subsection (1) unless—
- (a) the Minister has previously published a notice in the Gazette, and on a website determined by the Minister, specifying the land that is to vest under subsection (1); and
 - (b) the Minister has conducted public consultation in relation to the proposed use of the specified land by SA Police for the purposes of its Mounted Operations Unit; and
 - (c) the Minister has caused a report on the outcomes of the public consultation to be tabled in each House of Parliament.

Clause 10 has certainly been one of the more curious additions to this particular legislation and has caused a reasonable amount of consternation, because it really does provide open-ended capacity for the government to make decisions about this matter.

There is huge concern in the community about these particular clauses. Our concern, in all this, is not to hold up any of the process but to ensure there is a level of transparency that certainly does not exist in this legislation. I urge my crossbench colleagues to consider their approach to this very, very carefully. I think this is potentially one of the areas that has mystified many people in terms of why it has been included.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens are supportive of this amendment. I note that I have my own amendment in this regard, which is to actually to strike out the clause entirely, but we do support this amendment. In particular, I note the inclusion of consultation, which is a very important safeguard.

Many people in the community have been alarmed by the open-ended nature of the government's proposal here, and the power this vests in them to potentially move the police horses, stables and infrastructure into other areas of the Parklands. It does set a quite dangerous precedent

for Parklands protection going forward. We will be supporting the Liberal's amendment, but we will also move our own amendment to take that section out of the bill.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I rise to indicate that the government will not be supporting this amendment, nor the foreshadowed opposing of the clause by the Hon. Robert Simms. The relocation of the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit is an important component of this legislation and the project more broadly. As I said earlier on, the relocation of the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit will be actively considering all locations, not just any locations on the Parklands. The purpose of this bill is to be able to have this project being developed and progressed as quickly as possible, and we think that allowing for the relocation of the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit to somewhere else on the Parklands is an important component of that—if that is what is decided.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Is it the position of the Police Association that their preference is to relocate to Wayville or some other place?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that the advisers from the Department for Health and Wellbeing are not aware of the views of the Police Association, but it may well be that there are preferences that are expressed. As the honourable member said, places like the Wayville showgrounds or other places that are approximate to the city in other areas will be considered and may well be the future base of the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can I ask the minister to be a bit more specific about what kind of infrastructure would need to be built on the Parklands to accommodate these horses?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there are somewhere in the order of 32 horses that form part of it. The primary things that would need to be built would include paddocks and stables.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: There are 40 full-time equivalent staff, however. What is the intention for them?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that the full-time staff would need to be accommodated as they currently are, in the vicinity where the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit horses were accommodated.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister explain what footprint the stables would have on the Parklands?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: It is still a process to be determined about what that might look like in a different location from where it is now.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We did ask this question in the briefing this morning, but I would appreciate it if the minister could repeat it for the record. Where did this clause come from? Who asked for this clause?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that it was in the development of the bill, with all the aspects that may be needed in terms of this project getting underway and being developed in a timely manner. My advice is that this clause came about in the development of the bill.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My understanding of the site at Thebarton at the moment is that there are a number of operations that work interchangeably or that need to be co-located. Is there an explanation for why, through this clause, the Mounted Operations Unit is potentially going to be isolated from the rest of those operations?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her question. My advice is there are about 10 different functional units that are at the Thebarton barracks, including police dogs, armoury and as a mustering point. None of these need to be co-located with the SA Police Mounted Operations Unit going into the future.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes	7
Noes.....	10
Majority	3

AYES

Curran, L.A.	Franks, T.A.	Girolamo, H.M.
Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)	Simms, R.A.
Wade, S.G.		

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Game, S.L.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J. (teller)
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Pnevmatikos, I.
Scriven, C.M.		

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.	Wortley, R.P.	Centofanti, N.J.
Pangallo, F.		

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIR: The next indicated amendment is in the name of Hon. Ms Lensink, which I believe is consequential.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, Mr Chair, it is consequential.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Mr Simms, you are going to move that clause 10 be struck out.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yes.

The CHAIR: You are going to vote against it, but would you like to speak to that?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I will move that this clause be opposed.

The CHAIR: You do not need to move it, but you can put your case.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This is what I have been instructed, Mr Chair, so I am going on the advice I have received from the drafters. The reason for doing so is that the Liberals' proposal around consultation has been defeated which does give the government a blank cheque around how they approach this issue, so we would like to see this whole section removed from the bill. I encourage the Liberal opposition to have the strength of their convictions and to support our position on this.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I will just indicate we will be voting for the clause in the bill that we put forward in the bill.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I note the comments of the Hon. Mr Simms. We preferred our own amendment, and therefore the instructions from our party room were to vote for our clause, but sadly not for the Hon. Mr Simms'.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: For the record, we will be voting for the clause that is already in the bill.

The committee divided on the clause:

Ayes	15
Noes.....	2
Majority	13

AYES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Curran, L.A.
Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.	Hanson, J.E.
Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A.

Maher, K.J. (teller)
Pnevmatikos, I.

Martin, R.B.
Scriven, C.M.

Ngo, T.T.
Wade, S.G.

NOES

Franks, T.A.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

Clause thus passed.

Clause 11 to 12 passed.

Clause 13.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Lensink–1]—

Page 8, after line 18—Insert:

- (1a) The State Heritage Council must—
- (a) prepare a report making recommendations as to actions that should be taken to ameliorate the effect of the project on any State Heritage Place or State Heritage Area within the project site; and
 - (b) provide a copy of the report to the Minister.
- (1b) The Minister may cause copies of the report prepared under subsection (1a) to be tabled in each House of Parliament.

What this clause does is ensure that the State Heritage Council have a role within this matter, which I think is the least that this parliament can do given that we have this unprecedented situation where we are having state heritage places demolished for a project.

The State Heritage Council has already expressed a view as has been referred to. They produced a report for the month of October in which they lament the loss of the Thebarton Barracks, and they have also written to the Minister for the Environment outlining some ways in which the Thebarton Police Barracks can be continued to be understood into the future.

They are the pre-eminent body in this state which provides advice on heritage, and we think that they should have a formal process in this situation to enable them to ensure that the best capacity of the Thebarton Barracks is retained into the future, and therefore we think their advice should be sought. It does not in any way prevent the government from continuing to do what it wishes to, but it does ensure that the State Heritage Council has a role in terms of advice to government and to the parliament about how the elements of this site—both virtual and the built form—can be preserved into the future.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for bringing this amendment to this chamber, and say that the government understands and appreciates the reasons and motivations behind this amendment, however the government will not be supporting the amendment as in our view it is unnecessary. As the government has already indicated, and I am happy to place on the record here, the government intends to undertake a process with the State Heritage Council to appropriately capture the history of the site.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens are supportive of this amendment. Obviously we welcome the fact that the government is going to undertake such a process, but it is always better to have that set out in legislation in terms of setting a precedent for the future. Indeed, this is one of the elements that has been very concerning about this bill, is the potential precedent that is set in terms of how we deal with heritage listings going into the future.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I indicate for the record that we are satisfied with the response of the government in relation to this and will not be supporting the amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7

Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Curran, L.A.	Franks, T.A.	Girolamo, H.M.
Lee, J.S.	Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)	Simms, R.A.
Wade, S.G.		

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Game, S.L.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J. (teller)
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Pnevmatikos, I.
Scriven, C.M.		

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.	Wortley, R.P.	Centofanti, N.J.
Pangallo, F.		

Amendment thus negated.

The CHAIR: I have an amendment indicated in the name of the Hon. Mr Simms.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Simms-1]—

Page 8, lines 19 to 30 [clause 13(2) and (3)]—Delete subclauses (2) and (3)

The amendment that I am moving—members will be relieved to know, is my final amendment—would have the effect of maintaining the heritage listing of the buildings that are currently listed.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Mr Simms, I just need to clarify with the Hon. Ms Lensink: your second amendment at this clause is consequential?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes, that is my understanding.

The CHAIR: Thank you. The Hon. Mr Simms.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: As I was saying, my amendment would maintain the existing heritage listing of the buildings. Again, we have been concerned about the precedent that is established by removal of state heritage listing. Indeed, I note that this is the first time that we are potentially seeing governments bulldozing heritage listed buildings in this way.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I just indicate that the government will not be supporting the Hon. Mr Simms' amendment, for very similar reasons to, I think it was amendment No. 4 [Simms-1], in that it is argued that, in effect, this would make it impossible for the project to proceed.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: For the second time this evening, I will sully my reputation and agree with the Leader of the Government.

The CHAIR: We are going to split this amendment because the Hon. Ms Lensink has an amendment in between. The question I am going to put is that subclause (2), as proposed to be struck out, stand as printed.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Sorry, Chair, I need your guidance on my intention.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Mr Simms, you will vote no. We are only putting the question on subclause (2). You will vote no because the government will want subclause (2) to stay in the bill. The question is that subclause (2) stand as printed.

Question agreed to.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Lensink, you have an amendment that fits in between the two parts of the Hon. Mr Simms' amendment, so would you like to move your amendment?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Lensink–1]—

Page 8, after line 25—Insert:

- (2a) The Minister must ensure that any buildings comprised in the former mounted police barracks complex (being buildings that are removed from the South Australian Heritage Register under subsection (2)) that are dismantled are reconstructed at another suitable location.

This is the 'rebuild the barracks' amendment. I am assuming that the government will not support this amendment. Consistent with my previous remarks, we are flying blind in terms of the heritage assessment of these 10 structures at the site. The government knows which ones are in the best condition. We were advised in the briefing this morning that it was the view in the report that we are seeking to have publicised and get a copy of that none of the buildings would be suitable.

It is a bit difficult for the parliament and another reason why, quite frankly, this whole legislation rushed process is really unacceptable. If the government were minded to provide a bit of transparency about the condition of those buildings, that would be helpful. As I said, the former Marshall Liberal government undertook a process of rebuild for the Waite Gatehouse. If it is good enough for the Waite Gatehouse, it should be good enough for the barracks.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The government will not be supporting this amendment. My advice is that the buildings that are on the barracks site are in such a poor state that it is not practicable or feasible to dismantle and reassemble.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens will be supporting this amendment. Indeed, I think the principle that the Hon. Michelle Lensink has outlined is an important one. It was good enough for the Waite Gatehouse, so why not apply the same principle? I think the Labor Party, when they were in opposition, were very critical of the way in which the Waite Gatehouse matter was dealt with, and rightly so.

It would be appropriate, then, to apply that same principle with respect to this building. If the Attorney has been given that advice, I would ask that he make that available to the chamber because I think all members of parliament have a right to see that and, indeed, the broader community that will be concerned about what this means for heritage protection.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for his invitation. I do not have written advice or a copy of a written report. That is verbal advice I have received, but I am happy to go away after the conclusion of tonight's sitting and see what can be provided for the honourable member.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: When can that report be provided?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: As I said, I am happy to go away after we finish tonight and see what can be provided and provide whatever I can for the honourable member.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes6
 Noes.....9
 Majority3

AYES

Curran, L.A.	Franks, T.A.	Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)	Simms, R.A.	Wade, S.G.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Game, S.L.
-------------	--------------	------------

Hanson, J.E.
Martin, R.B.

Hunter, I.K.
Ngo, T.T.

Maher, K.J. (teller)
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Lee, J.S.
Wortley, R.P.

Pnevmatikos, I.
Centofanti, N.J.

Hood, D.G.E.
Pangallo, F.

Amendment thus negatived.

The CHAIR: We now come back to the Hon. Mr Simms' amendment. The question is that subclause (3), as proposed to be struck out, stand as printed. I am going to put it and, the Hon. Mr Simms, you and your supporters will be voting no.

Question agreed to; clause passed.

Clause 14.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I would like to revisit something I raised at clause 10. Clause 14 is a very simple clause. It states:

14—Certain fees etc not payable

No fees or charges are payable to The Corporation of the City of Adelaide in respect of the exercise of functions under this Act.

I have been told in briefings what this applies to, but I would like you to outline yet again, and then I will have a further question.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am advised that relates to a charge—the providence of wherever that charge originates from we will be finding out—of 35¢ per square metre, per day.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: In answer to my question at clause 10, with regard to the words, 'No compensation is payable by the Minister, the relevant Minister or the Crown in connection with the operation of this section,' what is the section that is referred to in that clause 10 and does it have any impact or relevance to clause 14?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I am sure the honourable member will let me know if I have misunderstood or have not answered the question properly, but my advice is the use of what we have previously discussed in clause 10 relates to clause 10 itself and what clause 10 proposes, whereas what is in clause 14 relates to the rest of the act. I think that is how I understood the question.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: So to make it very clear: the provisions in clause 10—the relocation of certain SA Police facilities which provide that no compensation is payable—only apply to clause 10, and the fees, etc. not payable applies to the entire act.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: Yes, that is my advice.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Thank you. What are the fees for?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My best advice is that it is understood that the fees would go into the general revenue for the council.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am asking because I actually do not understand from the briefings that I have had how these fees come about. I have been told that they are 35¢ per square metre per day, but it has not been explained what they are for, why they need to be deemed not payable, and why they were related as well to the lack of compensation under clause 10, which was a specific area and about the movement of those barracks.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I thank the honourable member for her questions, and they are indeed good questions. As I have said, we will go away and find out the historic basis for these. I suspect these have been something that have been around for a very, very long time and have some basis somewhere decades ago. But exactly what the basis for the fees is, and if they are applied for anything other than into the general revenue of council, I will also go away and find that out for the honourable member.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: My final question. If the Attorney could clarify whether there is any relation to EV—

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: EV?

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: —electric vehicle charging within this clause, that would be helpful.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: If this does not answer it, I am sure the honourable member will make it not the final question and ask me another one. There is intended to be electric vehicle charging capacity within the new hospital build. I do not know if that is what the honourable member was asking or if there was something else that needs answering.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Alright, this is the last question. I just want to know what the charge is for and why we are waiving the fees and why we are concerned that there will be compensation payable. I am actually happy that you have confined the compensation only to clause 10, because at least that does not apply to the entire act. That gives me small comfort, but some comfort.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: This is quite an extraordinarily broad and extensive power on behalf of the government. I would appreciate if the minister could make some comments about what he anticipates the usage of it might be.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: My advice is that there are no regulations that are currently intended or contemplated, that this provides for unforeseen circumstances but, as the honourable member is aware, regulations would be a disallowable instrument that both chambers could have a say in in the future.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (18:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (18:16): I thank all honourable members for their contributions, particularly the Greens for their support for all our amendments. I wish to reiterate that this has been a pretty appalling process. This bill has been rushed through the house, there are unanswered questions on a range of fronts and the response from the government on all of these is, 'Trust us, we're from the government, course we do the right thing.' That gives absolutely no comfort to those people in the community who have concerns about this bill.

I am disappointed, particularly with SA-Best, that they did not support our amendments, which would not have slowed down this legislation in any way. The next time they come wailing to us about transparency, well, you know, I will just claim hypocrisy.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (USE OF DEVICES IN VEHICLES) BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (18:19): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to incorporate the second reading explanation and the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

The Government is committed to reducing dangerous and high-risk driving behaviours, such as distraction, on South Australian roads.

Driver distraction is nationally recognised as a significant road safety risk and is one of the leading causes of fatalities and serious injury crashes on South Australian roads.

Between 2017-2021 (inclusive), 51 percent (247) of lives lost and 34 percent (1,330) of serious injury crashes listed inattention as a contributing factor.

This Bill amends the *Road Traffic Act 1961* to include an enabling provision that will allow for the use of mobile phone detection cameras.

This Bill also contains consequential amendments to the *Motor Vehicles Act 1959* as required to ensure consistency of definitions across both Acts.

Mobile phone detection will be able to occur through purpose built high-definition safety cameras at high-risk metropolitan sites. The cameras will target drivers illegally using a mobile phone whilst driving.

Mobile phone detection cameras have been implemented for enforcement purposes in New South Wales and Queensland and are currently being trialled for use in Victoria and the Australian Capital Territory.

These cameras will complement existing on road enforcement and road safety campaigns to reduce driver distraction by deterring drivers from illegally using their phones.

Introducing mobile phone detection cameras in South Australia is a positive road safety initiative aimed at reducing serious injuries and lives lost on South Australian Roads.

I commend this Bill to the House.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Motor Vehicles Act 1959*

3—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of *series of photographs* to clarify the meaning of that term for the purposes of the Act. A *series of photographs* includes a film, video or other continuous visual recording.

4—Amendment of Schedule 1—Evidence obtained by photographic detection device

This clause amends clause 4(a) of Schedule 1 of the principal Act to more clearly reflect the existing reference to a *series of photographs* in that clause.

Part 3—Amendment of *Road Traffic Act 1961*

5—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation

This clause amends section 5 of the principal Act by inserting a definition of *series of photographs* to clarify the meaning of that term for the purposes of the Act. A *series of photographs* includes a film, video or other continuous visual recording.

6—Amendment of section 79B—Provisions applying where certain offences are detected by photographic detection devices

This clause amends section 79B(10) of the principal Act to more clearly reflect the existing reference to a *series of photographs* in that subsection.

7—Insertion of section 175B

This clause inserts new section 175B into the principal Act.

175B—Evidence relating to use of devices in or on vehicles

This section empowers the making of regulations or rules to prescribe certain evidentiary provisions. The evidentiary provisions must relate to evidence obtained through the operation of certain photographic detection devices and must only facilitate proof of certain offences relating to the use of a device in or on a vehicle.

Both the photographic detection devices and the offences relating to the use of devices in or on a vehicle must be prescribed by regulation. The evidentiary provisions can include presumptions that have to be rebutted by the defendant. The power to make evidentiary provisions under this section does not derogate from any other power under the Act to prescribe evidentiary provisions.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. L.A. Curran.

**RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT REPEAL BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the House of Assembly and read a first time.

At 18:21 the council adjourned until Wednesday 2 November 2022 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***SILICOSIS**

113 The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (7 September 2022). Can the Minister for Health and Wellbeing advise:

1. What consultation has the state government undertaken with regard to silicosis?
2. Has representation been made by unions, interest groups or individuals to the state government concerning silicosis?
3. What action has the state government taken to address concerns in the construction industry with silicosis?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

SafeWork SA is the lead agency for consultation regarding silicosis, including with unions and other relevant groups.

However I can advise that in 2021, the commonwealth provided a final report for the National Dust Disease Taskforce (the taskforce) that examined the rise in silicosis cases among workers principally employed to manufacture and fit manufactured stone (eg benchtops). It was found that many young workers operating in poorly managed workplaces developed silicosis with catastrophic results (shortened life-expectancy and life-changing respiratory disease).

The South Australian Government also engaged with the taskforce and provided a list of proposed activities/actions underway to support the recommendations from the taskforce.

SA Health is also guided by the SA Strategy for Respirable Crystalline Silica Exposure Awareness and Reduction 2020, which identifies a plan to reduce workplace exposure to respirable silica.

Wellbeing SA is currently providing advice to the proposed National Occupational Respiratory Disease Registry through the Building Advisory Group, which was one of the key recommendations of the taskforce, in order to understand the prevalence of occupationally caused respiratory diseases and to help reduce further worker exposure.

As an interim measure to the implementation of this national registry, South Australia has designed and implemented the South Australian Silicosis Registry which became operational in April 2022 in four public hospitals across South Australia. The South Australian Silicosis Registry aims to understand the silicosis disease epidemiology in South Australia and identify occupational risk factors.

To date, no silicosis patients have been added to the South Australian Silicosis Registry, reflecting the rarity of the disease. The South Australian Silicosis Registry will be operational until the establishment of the National Occupational Respiratory Disease Registry.

In addition to occupational exposure, SA Health is addressing concern about community exposure to silica from quarries and mining activity with risk communication for these affected communities. SA Health is also working with the EPA and other government agencies to consider adequate protection limits for silica in dust. National leadership will be provided in setting these consistent environmental regulation limits in relation to respirable crystalline silica.

CREDIT RATING

156 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 September 2022). Can the Treasurer advise—how will the government continue to achieve AA+ credit rating?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Treasurer has advised:

The Malinauskas Labor government is committed to implementing its policies in a fiscally sustainable manner.

Credit ratings are reviewed on an ongoing basis, with a major review usually undertaken at least once every year following the release of the state budget.

International credit rating agencies S&P Global, Moody's and Fitch have all completed reviews of South Australia's credit rating following the release of the 2022-23 state budget.

South Australia has retained the second highest credit rating available from these agencies despite pressures from rising inflation, higher interest rates, and challenging global economic conditions.

South Australia is currently rated at AA+ by S&P Global, Aa1 by Moody's, and AA+ by Fitch. The credit releases issued by the rating agencies after the 202223 Budget included comments such as:

- 'South Australia's state budget 2022-23 (fiscal 2023 budget) incorporates the implementation of the new government's spending commitments which will be predominately funded through reprioritisation of expenditure and sustain operating surpluses, a credit positive.' (Moody's)
- 'Our ratings on South Australia are supported by the general strength and wealth of its economy, which has outperformed most of its international peers since the Covid-19 pandemic. The state also benefits from an extremely strong institutional framework and liquidity coverage. This is captured in the state's strong financial management.' (S&P Global)
- 'Importantly, the revenue outturn underpins our expectation that South Australia will achieve its target of a net operating surplus (total revenue minus total expenditures) from fiscal 2023, even in the face of expenditure pressures from rising inflation, higher interest rates and a more challenging global economic backdrop.' (Moody's)

The Malinauskas Labor government will continue to manage the state's finances in a prudent manner while delivering investments to support the economic growth of the state.

BETTING OPERATIONS TAX

161 The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (28 September 2022). Can the Treasurer advise:

1. Proceeds for the betting operations tax in a table on an annual basis since its inception, as well as the forward estimates.
2. Whether the betting operations tax is being reviewed and, if so, when will the review be completed? What are its terms of reference?
3. Whether, once finalised, the review will be made public?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Treasurer has advised:

1. The total taxation revenue received through the betting operations tax on an annual basis since its inception, as well as the forward estimates is outlined in the table below. The estimates from 2021-22 are consistent with forecasts contained in the 2022-23 budget. These will be updated as part of the 2021-22 final budget outcome and 2022-23 Mid-Year Budget Review, due for release later this year.

A proportion of the revenue raised through the betting operations tax is returned to the racing industry to support its operation. In addition, a legislated contribution from the revenue received is paid into the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund.

2017-18	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26
Outcome	Outcome	Outcome	Outcome	Est. Result	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate	Estimate
\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m	\$m
32.4	35.2	34.4	47.3	46.1	48.2	50.0	51.6	53.2

2. No review of the betting operations tax is being undertaken at this point in time.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (6 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

Following the state borders re-opening and the resultant impact of COVID-19, Forensic Science SA has seen a significant increase in deceased to FSSA, both coronial and non-coronial in nature. This increase in deceased numbers is beyond the current capacity of the FSSA facility and the backup facility has been activated. The backup facility is not at capacity and there is now sufficient storage space for current deceased numbers.

Naomi Kereru was appointed as a Coroner in April this year as a short-term measure to assist the State Coroner in dealing with management of workload in this jurisdiction. Then, in August this year, Coroner Kereru was reappointed as a Coroner for a further 12-month period, utilising the additional funding provided in the current budget.

Additional funding for the Coroner's Court for 2022-23 is \$976,000. The Coroner's Court budget is a subset of the overall budget of the Courts Administration Authority. Expenditure of that budget is a matter for the State Coroner and the Chief Magistrate. The total budget for the Coroner's Court for 2022-23 is \$4.673 million.

INDEPENDENT MEDICAL ADVISERS

In reply to **the Hon. S.G. WADE** (6 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

A selection committee exists to make recommendations to the minister for the purpose of appointing medical practitioners as independent medical advisers (IMA's) under section 118 of the Return to Work Act 2014.

That committee currently comprises two medical specialists, Professor Ted Mah and Dr Peter Jezukaitis, an employer representative Ms Kendall Crowe, and an employee representative Mr Donald Blairs.

In the most recent round of appointments in May 2022, the committee sought expressions of interest from medical practitioners for appointment as an IMA, including by inviting existing IMA's to reapply.

In areas of specialisation where no expressions of interest were received, the committee made targeted approaches to medical colleges and specialist medical practitioners involved in the workers compensation system, including personal letters from the committee chair Professor Mah.

Following this process one ophthalmologist was appointed as an IMA. No expressions of interest were received from neurologists and currently there is no neurologist appointed as an IMA.

I am advised that there have been infrequent instances where the South Australian Employment Tribunal (SAET) has been unable to refer a medical question to an IMA because there is no IMA with the required specialty.

However, section 35(1) of the South Australian Employment Tribunal Act 2014 allows SAET to 'refer any question arising in any proceedings for investigation and report by an expert in the relevant field'. This can be used for a medical question where there is no appointed IMA in the required field.

I will be consulting with the selection committee about what steps can be taken to attract specialist medical practitioners to nominate for appointment as IMAs to fill any gaps which may currently exist.

CONSTRUCTION, FORESTRY, MARITIME, MINING AND ENERGY UNION

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (6 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

Since becoming minister, I have had two specific meetings with representatives of the CFMMEU in Adelaide.

The first occasion was on 7 June 2022 regarding amendments to the Return to Work Act 2014. The second was on 30 June 2022 in relation to various industrial relations matters including industrial manslaughter and construction industry long service leave.

In addition, I had a personal coffee meeting with a family friend who is a CFMMEU forestry division official in Mount Gambier during a country cabinet visit.

In addition to those three meetings with representatives of the CFMMEU, I am advised that I have also met three times with Business SA, twice with the Australian Industry Group, and twice with the Master Builders Association.

As Minister for Industrial Relations, I have frequent meetings, both individually and in roundtable format, with industrial relations stakeholders representing many different viewpoints including unions and industry peak bodies.

I believe this is consistent with the public's expectations of the way the state's Minister for Industrial Relations conducts themselves.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (7 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

Following the State borders re-opening and the resultant impact of COVID-19, Forensic Science SA has seen a significant increase in deceased to FSSA, both coronial and non-coronial in nature. This increase in deceased numbers is beyond the current capacity of the FSSA facility and the backup facility has been activated. The backup facility is not at capacity and there is now sufficient storage space for current deceased numbers.

Naomi Kereru was appointed as a Coroner in April this year as a short-term measure to assist the State Coroner in dealing with management of workload in this jurisdiction. Then, in August this year, Coroner Kereru was reappointed as a Coroner for a further 12-month period, utilising the additional funding provided in the current budget.

Additional funding for the Coroner's Court for 2022-23 is \$976,000. The Coroner's Court budget is a subset of the overall budget of the Courts Administration Authority. Expenditure of that budget is a matter for the State Coroner and the Chief Magistrate. The total budget for the Coroner's Court for 2022-23 is \$4.673 million.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (7 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

Following the state borders re-opening and the resultant impact of COVID-19, Forensic Science SA has seen a significant increase in deceased to FSSA, both coronial and non-coronial in nature. This increase in deceased numbers is beyond the current capacity of the FSSA facility and the back-up facility has been activated. The backup facility is not at capacity and there is now sufficient storage space for current deceased numbers.

Naomi Kereru was appointed as a Coroner in April this year as a short-term measure to assist the State Coroner in dealing with management of workload in this jurisdiction. Then, in August this year, Coroner Kereru was reappointed as a Coroner for a further 12-month period, utilising the additional funding provided in the current budget.

Additional funding for the Coroner's Court for 2022-23 is \$976,000. The Coroner's Court budget is a subset of the overall budget of the Courts Administration Authority. Expenditure of that budget is a matter for the State Coroner and the Chief Magistrate. The total budget for the Coroner's Court for 2022-23 is \$4.673 million.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

In reply to **the Hon. S.G. WADE** (7 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

1. The Attorney-General's Department, in conjunction with South Australia Police, have engaged PricewaterhouseCoopers to facilitate the development of a final business case for a new forensic facility.
2. The CT scanner will continue to be housed in its current location, in a specifically designed and built room, until at least 2027.

POKER MACHINES

In reply to **the Hon. C. BONAROS** (8 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs has advised that:

1. As the member would be aware, in December 2018, the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner became the sole regulator for all gambling industries in South Australia following the abolition of the Independent Gambling Authority by the then state government.

The commissioner has since overseen an extensive review of all state-based gambling legislation, resulting in significant gambling reforms which took effect on 3 December 2020. These reforms provide increased protections for South Australians affected by gambling harm.

As part of an ongoing commitment to reduce harm caused by gambling, the commissioner is expected to shortly release a strategic plan which will set out clear direction and objectives around the regulation of the gambling industry in South Australia over the next three years.

The plan is expected to detail a clear path towards ensuring measures are in place to minimise the harmful impact of gambling in South Australia, while maintaining a gambling industry that is able to continue to operate in a responsible manner.

Complimenting the gambling strategic plan, a review of gambling industry staff training requirements has also been undertaken for the purpose of ensuring that training courses reflect contemporary harm-minimisation and responsible gambling expectations.

Key stakeholders, including industry peak bodies, gambling providers, gambling help services, registered training organisations (RTOs), the Office for Problem Gambling (OPG) and gambling researchers, were invited to contribute, with a number making extensive contributions to the review.

Further consultation with key stakeholders is expected to occur in the coming months, after which it is proposed that the gambling administration guidelines for staff training and relevant codes of practice will be updated. It is anticipated that the changes to course deliverables will result in an increase in early identification and engagement with patrons who may be suffering gambling harm.

Furthermore, the Gaming Machines Gambling Code of Practice (the code) has also recently been reviewed and follows the introduction of new codes of practice for wagering and lottery providers. The code was varied by the commissioner on 31 July 2022 and includes an extensive number of changes, including:

- references to 'problem gamblers' have been amended to refer to 'people displaying indicators of gambling harm', consistent with language used by gambling help services, the Office for Problem Gambling and training providers
- gambling advertising must now not include images or sounds suggestive of coins, banknotes or tickets being inserted or dispensed from gaming machines
- the prohibition on television advertising has been extended to 6am to 8:30am and 4pm to 7:30pm on any day
- spoken warning messages in gambling advertising must be at a speed that is clear and easily understood
- gambling advertising is now prohibited at cinemas when films rated G, PG, M or MA(15+) are showing
- gaming machine licensees must develop and implement effective policies and procedures that enable staff to identify people displaying indicators of gambling harm
- require that any printed consolidated barring list accessible to gaming staff must be printed in colour so as to ensure staff and licensees are able to accurately identify barred persons
-
- require that barred persons are not to be sent any direct marketing communications
- require licensees to take reasonable steps to assist staff experiencing difficulty with any form of gambling not just from gaming machines
- require that a prescribed responsible gambling message is displayed on automatic teller machines (ATMs) and cashable ticket redemption terminals (CRTs) while idle
- require that licensees must display the condensed warning message, national helpline number and website address at or near each coin machine or cashier area
- require licensees to offer to pay patrons winnings of \$500 or more by either cheque or EFT
- require that licensees must reinforce their commitment to providing gambling products in a responsible and safe environment in appropriate customer newsletters and other communications.

2. The proliferation of gambling advertising on radio, television and online cannot be ignored and while certainly this type of advertising is targeted at a cohort which generally accesses licensed online betting operators, some mass media advertising directed at people who play gaming machines does occur.

As the member would be aware, since November 2018, changes have progressively been made to the rules governing the way that online wagering services are provided to consumers. This work culminated in the development of the National Consumer Protection Framework (NCPF) which aims to help prevent and mitigate the risk of harm from interactive wagering.

Being an online form of gambling which occurs across state boundaries, the Commonwealth is driving this body of work which will ultimately be implemented by all states and territories to the extent that online wagering providers will have to use the same evidence-based messaging in their advertising, direct marketing, websites and other direct communications to their customers.

While this work is underway, the Australian Communications and Media Authority (ACMA) has rules in place which in particular governs gambling advertising during children's programs, live sport and when streamed over the internet.

Similarly, the proliferation of gambling advertising, and the risks of exposing vulnerable people and minors to gambling product advertising, has moved the Commissioner to refer the question of responsible gambling messaging to the South Australian Gambling Advisory Council (SAGAC), in particular, as it applies to gambling advertising around sporting venues, external advertising on licensed premises and restrictions on radio and television.

The Gambling Advisory Council is a dedicated group established under the Gambling Administration Act 2019 whose functions include advising the Commissioner on policies or proposals relating to the minimisation of harm caused by, and associated with, gambling.

Noting the work being undertaken as part of the NCPF, it is likely that the SAGAC will defer its findings until the evidence-based messaging requirements under the NCPF are finalised.

In the interim, the advertising requirements prescribed in the Gaming Machines Gambling Code of Practice shall continue to apply.

3. Since December 2018, the commissioner has overseen an extensive review of all state-based gambling legislation, resulting in a package of significant gambling reforms which took effect on 3 December 2020.

Noting this extensive review and the work currently being undertaken by the SAGAC, the government does not consider it appropriate, at this time, to establish a task force into gaming machines in SA.

4. In accordance with section 27E of the Gaming Machines Act 1992, the commissioner undertook an extensive review of the approved trading system for gaming machine entitlements and provided a report to the former Attorney-General. This report was tabled in both houses of parliament on 3 May 2022.

The report does not seek to provide recommendations, but rather provides the following four options:

- Maintain the status quo—no structural changes would be made to the approved trading system, however funding incentives for venues to surrender their licence and all entitlements could be considered.
- Modified application of the statutory objective—the forfeiture measures in the current rules would be suspended where the number of gaming machines in operation are less than the statutory objective in order to allow entitlements to be traded on the basis of supply and demand.
- Supplementary or sector-specific trading system—the current pricing methodology would be maintained but supplementary trading would allow unsuccessful participants to revise their offers and/or provide separate trading opportunities for the for-profit and not-for-profit sectors.
- Direct trading system—gaming machine operators may negotiate the sale of entitlements directly with prospective purchasers, however the commissioner has suggested that entitlements would need to be traded in blocks to allow for an accelerated rate of forfeiture.

The government remains committed to the objective of reducing the overall number of gaming machines in South Australia and continues to consider the options put forward by the commissioner.

COERCIVE CONTROL

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (28 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

1. The discussion paper was released by the Attorney-General's Department on 2 February 2021. Consultation closed on 1 April 2022. The government is considering the feedback obtained from that consultation.

2. The government has commenced targeted consultation on coercive control. The government will be continuing with public awareness raising and community consultation throughout 2022 and 2023.

RENTAL AFFORDABILITY

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (28 September 2022).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): I have been advised:

If a tenant or prospective tenant considers that they have been discriminated against on the basis of any one or more of the grounds set out in the Equal Opportunity Act 1983, they can lodge a complaint with the Office of the Commissioner for Equal Opportunity who will assess and, where applicable, conduct a conciliation process.

For discrimination on grounds outside of the Equal Opportunity Act, there are advocacy services such as RentRight, which is free and independent, and provide support when applying for a lease, and can assist prospective tenants with accessing legal and other services as required.