

LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Thursday, 26 June 2025

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:00 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.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers, giving of notices of motion and questions without notice to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

The PRESIDENT: I note the absolute majority.

Motion carried.

Bills

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 June 2025.)

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (11:02): I rise to make some remarks in relation to this piece of legislation, which I have to say at the outset that I think the President of the United States would be quite proud of. We have seen, in this term of this government, that the boys' club well and truly runs the Labor Party, and this bill was a bit of an escalation on the level of that pattern.

I have to confess that I do not know a lot about golf, but there are a lot of sports I do not know a lot about. I have never had any particular skill with hitting balls with any form of stick, whether they are metal or willow or any other form, and as a consequence I must confess that watching or attending events that involve anybody chasing or hitting balls or the like is not something that I participate in. I do appreciate, however, that others do, and as a Liberal I believe that 'whatever floats your boat' should be the approach that we take to things in general.

Obviously, the LIV Golf event is very popular and very well supported, and it is certainly one that we are supportive of, but it is not one for which we believe all laws should be cast aside to facilitate unfettered control over our Parklands. There is a conflict, I think, within this legislation which fails to respect what the Parklands represent to the people of South Australia. They are part of the green belt for people who live not just in the seat of Adelaide but in close proximity, whether they are in the seats of Dunstan, Unley, West Torrens or Badcoe. A whole range of other people use them for recreation purposes from time to time, so people will go in there because they are the parks for the people.

The guiding principle, when it comes to the Parklands, should be to build with care. I appreciate that we have a cultural boulevard, we have universities, we have hospitals—there are a whole range of things that take place in the Parklands—and we have built form. This particular approach to the Parklands, I think, takes too much away from the Parklands without respecting what they are. I also think that this debate should not be cast, as it has been by some, as a dispute between the City of Adelaide and the rest of South Australia, who get frustrated at times with the Adelaide City Council saying no to lots of things.

I certainly share the concern that the Adelaide City Council can get a little bit precious at times and see themselves as the custodians, when in a legislative sense they are custodians on behalf of us all for the Parklands. But they do understand the Parklands well because they are responsible for maintaining them, and they have a range of committees and legislation which have placed care under their control.

I do not know what Colonel Light would think about this particular proposal, being the one who actually established the Parklands. At some stage there was a proposal for Adelaide to have a second ring of parklands. It is clearly something that would have been beneficial in these days when we have a lot more density within Greater Adelaide. People appreciate having those open spaces where they can exercise or walk their dogs or play with their kids or do whatever it is they want to do.

I think there have been some disparaging remarks made about the John E Brown Park, where the Premier, and it might have been the minister as well, has talked about fill being there. I have not had the opportunity to go and have a look at that myself, but I understand there are walking tracks, and certainly a lot of trees there. Apart from the fill that Labor wants us to believe is so offensive there is a lot of other space in that park which will be potentially disenfranchised from people who currently use that, and I think that is a great shame.

This bill is a real doozy. As I have said, I have not had a lot of experience with hitting balls—not successfully where they are meant to go, anyway—in my lifetime, but I have had a lot of experience looking at bills. This bill is quite remarkable. In my view, it gives unfettered powers to the minister of the day and without any recourse to anyone. The minister has cited on many occasions, 'Well, no, we wouldn't be intending to do that,' but that is not actually contained in the body of the legislation.

Any reading of this bill will demonstrate that this really does hand over not just the golf course as it is and the John E Brown Park but potentially a whole range of other parts of the Parklands just based on the minister's opinion. I do not think that is acceptable to the people of South Australia. If this was a piece of private property, sure, go for it. One of my Liberal colleagues in the House of Assembly remarked that it reads like a contract. There are a lot of things that we do not know about what the golf course is going to look like: how much it is going to cost and the design—there are so many open questions about it.

The modern golf course, as I understand it from people who do know about these things, is quite elaborate and they cost a lot of money in terms of maintenance and upkeep, and there are certainly potential security issues going forward which I think the government has not been particularly transparent about. The very fact that it is Mr Greg Norman who will be designing the golf course—as I understand it, it did not actually go out to tender for any other people who might know how to make one. I think this bill is incompatible with the Parklands' purpose and as a unique place for South Australians. This bill really goes far too far.

I want to talk about some of the clauses in the bill which I think are quite invidious. What my amendments seek to do is to pull back on the unfettered nature of this bill and the huge amount of overreach that is contained in it. It actually has more overreach in it than the Women's and Children's Hospital Bill—and we could appreciate that. We talked about this before in this place in relation to the Thebarton barracks and what a complete shame it was that that had to be demolished to make way for the Women's and Children's Hospital, but people voted Labor so that is what you get with the Labor Party. They will take more and more Parklands, treat it like a land bank and get Emperor Malinauskas in there to do the big sell job.

I will talk about some of these clauses in a little bit more detail and why some of them are so offensive. This act overrides—apart from the Aboriginal Heritage Act—every other single act on our statute books. I have not seen that since the Olympic Dam indenture bill, which had the same effect, and I think we could all understand why that was: it was a piece of legislation that was designed to assist Olympic Dam to reach that next level, and there were very good reasons for the state to do that. But this is about a golf course, and the timing, too, is really quite offensive.

I am sure other members will speak—maybe the Hon. Rob Simms will speak on behalf of the city council, as he has been an elected member there and understands how they have been

treated—but I think the parliament has been treated with complete and utter contempt. We have been more than happy to work with the government on things of a nature where it could be demonstrated that haste was absolutely necessary: things of statewide and national significance like AUKUS—I do not think a golf course compares to AUKUS—and the Whyalla Steelworks, to rescue them. Again, they are of statewide national significance so, sure, we are prepared to drop everything and have a briefing and pass the bill through very, very quickly and do our best to give it due consideration. But this is a golf course.

I got a message from our manager in the other house, Mr Jack Batty, the member for Bragg, who said, 'There is some bill coming on'—this was on Tuesday morning, maybe at 10.30 or something. I think I got a call about the same time from the minister and probably cheekily said to him, 'What's your excuse this time?' I do not think a golf course is a reasonable excuse. LIV Golf finishes at Grange in 2026, and this is not due to start until 2028. For the life of me, I cannot understand why this has needed to be dealt with so quickly. Certainly, in the briefing with the minister that we had within two hours of first being told that there was a bill, he refused to rule out trying to get it through both houses. It was just bizarre: completely bizarre behaviour. This is a golf course—it is not AUKUS and it is not the Whyalla Steelworks—but we have to drop everything.

I think a lot of that has to do with the level of arrogance that we see from the boys' club that runs the government. They want to exercise their will over the parliament as well and make sure that everybody knows that they are running this town. That is just disgraceful. I think all South Australians should be very concerned that we have someone who is popular—he appeals to some—exercising his will over every other institution, because he can.

I am quite convinced that it was the government's full intention to ram this through last sitting week. I think they fully intended to do that, and we would have had minimal opportunity to provide any scrutiny of the bill at that time. To try to get a bill about a golf game through both houses of parliament within one week is extraordinary. We then had the Premier on the radio the next morning, Wednesday morning, saying, 'No, no, we never had that intention.' But the minister refused to rule that out, several times, in our briefing. I had also asked what the intention was and got no answer on that one.

We are all required to do our due diligence in this place too. This place is not just a plaything of the Labor Party, although I am sure they think that is the case. We are all elected to do our jobs and we would like to be able to do them. As I have said, for the steelworks or for AUKUS—yes, fair enough, there was rationale for those things, but not for a golf course.

I was talking about clause 4, which overrules every other act. I cannot see how that is necessary, so we have an amendment to address that one. Then we get to part 2 of the bill, which is the project site. At clause 5(1), as I have mentioned, it is not just the North Adelaide Golf Course and the John E Brown Park (Park 27A) and certain road reserve areas in the vicinity. Clause 5(1)(b) states that if, after the commencement of this section, the minister determines that it is necessary or desirable to include additional areas of land in the project site or to remove any areas of land from the project site, etc., then he can do that. In the clause beneath that, clause 5(2), the minister has to consult with the Adelaide City Council. Well, fair enough, but if they say no I am sure we know that they will be overridden in any case.

I go to clause 6, cancellation of leases and licences. We are not aware that there are many leases and licences but we have asked for a list. I have asked the government to actually provide that. We were promised one last week; we still have not received one as far as I am aware. But they are all cancelled, effectively, at the handover date.

Then we have preparations for the handover of the project site. Before designating a handover date, the minister must consult, but then Adelaide City Council has to hand it over and does not really have much discretion about that, and the onus is put on them.

Under 'Vesting and care, control etc of the project site', clause 8(6) states that any items of personal property remaining on the site after its vest are forfeited to the Crown, and there is no compensation and no effort made. Why is that? It is quite strange that this exists. Subclause (7) states that the Adelaide City Council still retains any liability, yet there is a clause further on in the bill which actually states that the state government has no liability for anything. It is all very one-way

in that the state government can exercise its right over this site and nobody else has any capacity to be considered.

In Part 3—Carrying out the project, we think the consultation with the city council that the clause talks about can be improved, so there is an amendment to that effect. Clause 10 of the bill explicitly states that the Aboriginal Heritage Act applies, which we support, but we also think that other acts should not be wholly excluded, which is why with our amendments we have that as a disallowable instrument, so at least the Legislative Review Committee and the parliament can have some oversight of that.

Clause 11 relates to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, so quite rightly the assessment place for any planning decision is the State Planning Commission. But clause 11(1) states that it is a deemed to satisfy proposal, which means that whatever is submitted must be approved by the State Planning Commission. I have spoken before about the role that SCAP plays, and I think it is a very useful process. We have seen, particularly through bodies that the commission consults with, such as the office of the government architect and ODASA, that a lot of proposals that have been submitted to SCAP can be improved.

The government thinks that there should just be a blanket approval given to whatever is submitted. It could be a whole range of things—it could be a Ferris wheel for all we know—and there will be nothing that anybody can do, including the Planning Commission, because it has to just rubberstamp it. It is not even a rubberstamped, it is just automatic. That, too, is quite extraordinary.

Clause 12 in relation to the project states that no other state laws apply. As I have said, we have an amendment to improve that particular clause. Clause 13 contains requirements relating to trees. This one has caused quite a lot of consternation. My understanding is that a huge number of trees will need to be removed from John E Brown Park for the driving range, but I will get to that in some of my questioning as well.

I think the minister has been on radio saying that one tree will be replaced with three new trees. Well, it also says there 'or seedlings'. Anybody who has grown seedlings, as I do in my own garden, knows how easy it is for some errant husband or garden bloke to accidentally whipper-snip your seedlings. They are very vulnerable and tiny and, while I appreciate that smaller plants have a better opportunity to form a strong root system, they do take time to grow. I think that is a bit of a joke, too, and we have some amendments, as I understand does the Hon. Mr Simms, so we will enjoy discussing those as we get to them.

The support zones are very much open slather. Support zones can be in place, again identified by the minister and placed in the *Gazette*. Once this bill goes through—I am assuming that it will go through; there is not much anyone can do about that—it will enable the minister to use all these different sites to apply for whatever purpose he likes, without any recourse. Again, we have the extinguishment of leases or licences by the minister in those zones.

Roads—this is going to be interesting. I also foreshadow, for the minister, that we have some concerns about permanent road closures. We have all heard, 'No, no, no; that's not going to happen', but the Hon. Mr Pangallo, who does know a lot about golf and who spoke to me about this quite recently, holds concerns that some of the roads—whether War Memorial Drive or Jeffcott Street—may indeed need to be permanently closed to accommodate this. It is interesting.

I did take a little drive around the golf course the other day, and it is fair to say that it is an area that fits in between the sort of jagged teeth around the hospital there; in some areas it is quite narrow and in others it is quite large. Mr Pangallo has made the point that some of these world-class professionals who play golf can hit a ball pretty hard and for a fairly long way, so whether this golf course land, as it is, is going to be able to accommodate the sort of golf course that allows for them to hit the ball as far as they would normally hit remains to be seen.

However, as part of that we do have very great concerns about road closures. The Calvary Hospital in North Adelaide, as we know, has palliative care and a range of other services there, radiology and pathology services. The parking is okay but it is not brilliant, and I think the services there may well be disadvantaged by this, particularly with the permanency of what we may have going forward. Clause 16 includes further comments in relation to the vesting of the project land:

The minister may, in order to implement leasing or such other arrangements...for any other purpose connected with the operation of this Act that the Minister thinks fit, by instrument in writing...

So here is your letter, this is what I am doing. The minister has decided to do all of these things to make sure that the project takes place.

Then we get to Part 4—Operation of golf course. The golf course is to continue to operate as a public golf course, and we would like that to continue. That is good, so thumbs up on that clause. It also provides, at subclause (2):

Nothing...prevents the erection of fencing or other barriers...where the Minister is satisfied...is necessary...for reasons of public safety...

Etc. We appreciate that. One of the things Mr Pangallo said to me is that, given the concerns a lot of people in our community have about LIV Golf itself and the Saudi regime, there is high potential for protests to be associated with this event and there may, therefore, be a higher requirement for these fences to be up.

We have also been told, in relation to the fences, that it is only going to be one week out of 52. We know, from experience with the car race in the eastern parklands, that there is a lot of infrastructure that is up well before and after the event, so I think we all have a right to be very sceptical about how long that piece of parklands is going to be alienated from the public for the purposes of setting up the event. That also reminds me that the LIV Golf contract is a contract, and so it is time limited. What will happen if the contract does not continue past 2032, or whatever the contract date is, and it never comes back?

The minister still has all of these powers. For that reason, some of my amendments will actually require him to come back to parliament. We say, 'Alright, we will agree to let you do these parts of it for now, but if you really want to continue to do this then you have to come back to the parliament.' I think that is fair and reasonable. Then we have the approved event support zones, which similarly provide unfettered control over those areas. All they need to do is be identified by the minister to enable any of those works, and there is no recourse to anyone.

If I go to Part 5—Miscellaneous, clause 26—Other actions to give effect to Act, this is very, very broad. I do not know why the government thinks it needed to cast this piece of legislation so broadly that just about anything is captured. As I said, one of my colleagues in the House of Assembly remarked that it does read like a contract, which if this was private land would be fair and reasonable, but this is Parklands. If it is required that the state government has to have so much control over what is public land then maybe that price is too high for this parliament.

I recognise that I probably do not have the numbers with me on this one, but I think that is a great shame. I would hope that all of my crossbench colleagues would consider that there are some compromises, which are through amendments that are before this bill. I think it is something that in the future the people of South Australia will be quite angry about. I think, on reflection, people will live to regret if they do not make a reasonable attempt to try to pull back some of the over-the-top clauses that are contained in this piece of legislation. As I said, it is more unfettered than the Women's and Children's Hospital legislation, and what is it for? It is for a golf course. I conclude my remarks on the bill and, if amendments are not made to this bill, we will not be supporting it.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The PRESIDENT: Just before I go to the Hon. Ms Franks, I acknowledge in the gallery Lord Mayor Dr Jane Lomax-Smith and Deputy Lord Mayor Mr Phillip Martin.

Bills

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (11:32): I rise to speak in firm opposition to the North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill 2025. The Adelaide Parklands are a special, unique and vitally important part of South Australia. They are a living and breathing history and are listed on the National Heritage List. To quote briefly from the National Heritage List website:

The Adelaide Park Lands and City Layout is widely regarded as a masterwork of urban design and signifies a turning point in the settlement of Australia. Adelaide was the first city...to be planned and developed, not as a penal settlement or military outpost, but as a place for free settlers.

Given this importance, it is deeply disappointing to see the Malinauskas government attempt yet another land grab, at the behest this time of a sporting tournament. Too often when a new development is in need and around the CBD, state governments have looked at the Parklands as supposed free land—and it is indeed free, but it is not their land. They feel they can snap it up and build upon it. It should not be a surprise that when LIV Golf came knocking at the state government's door wanting a new home for their event after Grange, the Premier was all too ready to point them in the direction of the North Adelaide Golf Course.

Possum Park (Park 1) in its entirety and a significant chunk of John E Brown Park (Park 27A) will be seized by the state under this bill should it pass. That will be to facilitate a multimillion-dollar redevelopment of the golf course. This no doubt puts numerous significant and mature trees directly in the line of bulldozers. Currently, this bill would require three new trees or seedlings for not less than three trees be planted for every tree removed during the project. Three seedlings is nowhere near enough to make up for the loss of significant mature trees. With some reports suggesting at least 600 trees being lost within Possum Park for this redevelopment, it is no wonder that so many are concerned about what that loss will mean for the Parklands—the people's Parklands.

Another concern for many in the community is the massive footprint of this project. This project is likely to include the expansion of buildings currently located in Possum Park, as well as new buildings, including, I believe, an indoor driving range. I fail to understand how an indoor driving range and a newly redeveloped multimillion-dollar golf course is supposed to be in keeping with Colonel Light's vision for the Parklands, or indeed the people of South Australia's expectations of the protection of our Parklands.

South Australians are rising up against this, and the amusing and very alliterative Possum Park Protection Platoon is on the case. They are planning the next stage in their battle to protect Park 1 of the Adelaide Parklands from the state government's chainsaws, which, as I say, are threatening hundreds of trees in what is a unique urban golf course forest currently.

Those hundreds of Parklands supporters came together on the steps of this state Parliament House on World Environment Day, 5 June. Why did they do so? Well, it is not just about a golf course. They have banded together to protect what is a very precious part of South Australia. The banners and posters at that particular rally had messages such as, 'Parks for people not FIFO millionaires'—I might add 'billionaires' actually—and 'Parks need life not LIV'. Another banner read, 'Pete, we need life not LIV'.

Further protesters on the day, including myself, raised some concerns other than simply the attack on the environment and the very public history of the Parklands that this embodies. We are told that LIV Golf is 'Golf, but louder'. I think that is a little bit of false advertising. Sure, there are DJs. Sure, it is a party. Sure, it is a piss-up. Do you know what LIV Golf is? It is golf, but bloodier. It sportswashes human rights abuses, and our Premier is inviting the 'great white shonk', Greg Norman, to amplify that sportswashing, all on the public dime and on public land.

They do not need our money. In fact, the LIV Golf series is offering the richest purse in pro golf history. Why? Because it is funded by the public investment fund of the Saudi government, a fund designed to sportswash their human rights abuses. Do not take my word for it. Take a look at the Human Rights Watch reports. They raise their alarm that the Saudi \$2 billion plus sovereign wealth fund is designed to sportswash that country's egregious human rights abuses and note that it is controlled by Saudi prince, prime minister and crown prince, Mohammed bin Salman.

The kingdom, of course, has the funds and has glamorous events, including the LIV Golf tournament. They are involved not just in sports, of course, but, as the Premier will point to, Live

Nation is connected with the LIV fund. But LIV Golf is one of the flagships, and here we are buying it hook, line and sinker and helping them wash the blood off their hands.

LIV Golf has been controversial, and rightly so, for its sportswashing, and I think it is important at this point in this debate to reflect on why. Jamal Khashoggi, a Saudi journalist, was murdered on 2 October 2018 inside the Saudi consulate in Istanbul, Turkey. He was lured there to obtain paperwork for his upcoming wedding. His fiancée waited outside for over five hours and he never returned. He was killed by a team of Saudi agents—I believe some 15 of them—flown over on both commercial and private jets at the order of the very man who controls the public investment fund, the Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman.

Khashoggi was a critic of the Saudi government, and Crown Prince Mohammed bin Salman saw his writings as a threat. A UN report concluded that Khashoggi was the victim of a premeditated extrajudicial killing for which the state of Saudi Arabia is responsible. At first they denied that he had never left the embassy. For five days his fiancée went to the media, and the government of Saudi Arabia claimed that he had left of his own volition.

We now know, particularly because the Turkish government actually bugged the embassy, that that was a lie by the Saudi Arabian government. Indeed, we know his last words were, 'I can't breathe', as they suffocated him and then, while he was alive, they dismembered his body. It is far more appropriate to call this the 'bone saw cup' than the LIV Golf tournament, and indeed many do and will continue to.

The motive of the Saudi Arabian government was to silence dissent. Greg Norman, the Chief Executive Officer of LIV Golf, who is indeed a millionaire doing the behest and the sportswashing work of billionaires, wrote this off as a 'mistake'. At a news conference, he was questioned about this issue specifically to do with his promotion of the LIV Golf tournament. Mr Norman, the 'great white shonk', to a question about whether he was concerned that LIV Golf was being financed by Saudi Arabia's Public Investment Fund, controlled by Mohammed bin Salman, stated:

From what I heard and what you guys reported, just take ownership of what it is. Take ownership no matter what it is. Look, we've all made mistakes, and you just want to learn from those mistakes and how you can correct them going forward.

That is a bit of a mistake. A mistake is an accident. A mistake is not premeditated: 15 people flown to another country, murder and dismemberment and disappearing—because his body has never been found—of a dissident. That is hardly a mistake. Not so many are as forgiving as Mr Norman. Perhaps money talks, even when you are a millionaire.

Freedom has a high price and far from this being a single mistake, Human Rights Watch and Amnesty International will show you that even today, while the LIV Golf tournament continues, the human rights abuses continue. Currently, the social media company formerly known as Twitter and now known as X is facing civil US lawsuits because they have cooperated with the Saudi Arabian government to not just silence but imprison and persecute those who make comments on what was Twitter and is now X. Indeed, freedom of speech has no place in the Saudi Arabian regime if it is critical of their government.

When you reflect upon this and how the world had a public outcry about Mr Khashoggi and how the world quite rightly condemns the execution of citizens of Saudi Arabia for public comment, it is no surprise that people in Saudi Arabia and the Public Investment Fund, and indeed the leadership of that nation, are willing to pay as much money as it takes to sportswash their way out of those human rights abuses to somehow cleanse their image. South Australia has become complicit in this.

It would surprise many South Australians to know that not only is this being done in a way where the South Australian government has come to the party, this 'golf but louder', to celebrate LIV Golf when no-one else in Australia wanted it, no other golf course was putting their hand up. Indeed, in Sydney and Victoria it was denied. The Victorian government certainly did not want a bar of it. The Royal Sydney Golf Club voted it down. Nobody wanted this event because they understood that it came with a price. Not only did it come with the price of sacrificing South Australia's reputation but of course we now know that South Australia is pouring tens of millions of dollars into this event. We are not being paid off; indeed, we have bought in to the human rights abuses.

It is gravely concerning that the state government has doubled down in its support of this event. Sure, the Adelaide LIV Golf tournament was successful. Do you know what? I might not be a golf player. I have played golf. I might not design golf courses, I might not put on tournaments, but I tell you what, with \$50 million I could probably get someone to do that pretty well without sacrificing our commitment to democracy and to human rights in this state. Indeed, anyone, I would think, could put on a pretty good party given the tens of millions of dollars that are being put up here for what are effectively millionaires' and billionaires' playthings.

There is no reason that we should be sacrificing our state's reputation as a place where women gained the right to stand for parliament and to serve in parliament, where we have a proud history of things like the secret ballot, where we can have debates and we know we will not end up dismembered in a body bag hidden somewhere for having a disagreement of opinion.

But what is really concerning to me about this bill is that hidden in it, as the Hon. Michelle Lensink has noted, are provisions that are intended to silence dissent. The Major Events Act will be employed for this. I believe back in the day—and the minister might correct me on this—the International Cricket Council were having a major event and they sought some protections from people running on the field and so on, and we had a few bills hurriedly passed through parliament. But for big events where people have not wanted there to be any disruptions, there are extreme provisions in the Major Events Act that stop what is called 'ambush marketing'.

My first question to the government is: will the government guarantee that none of the provisions that criminalise ambush marketing will be used to protect the reputation of LIV Golf? We celebrate diversity and dissent in this state and we have a proud democracy. I would hate to think that, as has happened in previous LIV Golf events down at Grange, anyone protesting and highlighting that this is indeed better framed as the 'bone saw cup' than the LIV Golf tournament might fall foul of the law or be subject to significant penalties under those ambush marketing provisions of that Major Events Act.

Further, I note that this event will be moved from Grange to the City of Adelaide, and I have to say, the people of Adelaide will not cop silencing of dissent and the sacrificing of our Parklands. They will continue to protest, and I know there is another one in just over a week's time about the range of land grabs currently being undertaken on our Parklands. But when they come with an extra serve of human rights abuses of them, I imagine many South Australians will simply not stomach that any longer.

While the Premier boasts an incredibly high popularity polling at the moment, and that would have no doubt come as somewhat of a wake-up call for the Liberal opposition, I suspect that this government is currently quite complacent. I say just look to history to see what can happen in the seat of Adelaide. This is an educated electorate. This is an engaged electorate. This is an electorate who is now watching what this government does. While now Premier Malinauskas came to power in the last election as a supposed husband, father and average footy player, perhaps he is turning out to be a disappointing Premier.

People's votes cannot be taken for granted. I note that there is a local community Independent in Keiran Snape putting his hand up for the seat of Adelaide. I was very happy to be down on the Parklands, indeed down at the North Adelaide Golf Course, on the weekend to help launch the campaign of Kieran Snape. There was a strong community there from right across the city. They are impassioned people, they are articulate people and they are determined people. They will not be taken for granted, and they will fight for their democracy. I note the words of Greg Mackie, cultural leader and former councillor of the City of Adelaide, in endorsing Kieran Snape on the weekend, who stated:

With four years' service on city council, and many more in the community, Kieran embodies the values that matter to greater Adelaide. Protecting and enhancing our priceless Parklands as a shared public asset demands an independent voice.

I could not agree more.

I thank those people who have so far not just turned out at those rallies but signed petitions and who have expressed their outrage at what is yet another bill being rammed through this parliament once the Malinauskas government has the numbers. I do not begrudge that in terms of

the numbers are the numbers of the parliament, but I think the people of South Australia are watching bill after bill be rammed through at an alarmingly quick rate. I echo the words of the Hon. Michelle Lensink that there has not been enough time to have proper public scrutiny on this bill that overrides every single act on our statutes currently other than the Aboriginal Heritage Act. I note that the Hon. Michelle Lensink noted that the only time she has seen that before was with the Olympic Dam indenture bill and then act.

I note there was another bill that during the Rau-Weatherill era sought to change our innovation laws and very sneakily tried to override every single law of the state other than the Aboriginal Heritage Act. When the public became aware of that particular bill, which stripped away all of our rights as the public currently enjoys them should something be declared an innovation or in an innovation precinct, the public outcry online saw over 10,000 signatures in hours and tens of thousands in days. That bill was quietly removed from debate. That was because the public were able to have their voice noted and heard.

When sneaky things are put into bills, it is the role of this particular council, the upper house, to hold it to scrutiny. I do urge the government to actually be more respectful of this place in terms of the timing of these debates. We have had this sitting on our *Notice Paper* for technically a week but what was, in essence, one day. In terms of the briefing that I received, I do thank the Premier and the Minister Bourke's office for the briefing that I received yesterday morning, but I note it was yesterday morning. I have had little time to consult with the public more broadly.

There is no Law Society feedback on this bill. Indeed, the expertise in the room from those such as counsel have not been able to be included in this debate, so I flag with the government there will be a lot of questions not just at clause 1 but as we go clause by clause through this bill. I remain opposed. I am not convinced that we need to be sacrificing our state's reputation and our precious Parklands for what is golf but bloodier. I think \$50 million, at the very least, could be spent on far better things than this Premier has chosen to spend it on through the passage of this bill today.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:54): I rise to speak on the North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill on behalf of the Greens and to indicate that I will be opposing this bill. My objections to the bill are twofold. I believe that this is wrong on both principle and on process. As has been noted by previous speakers, this bill is about securing a long-term future for LIV Golf in Adelaide. Indeed, when the government announced this redevelopment plan back in February, it made clear that this was part of a deal to keep LIV here until at least 2030.

As a matter of principle, the Greens have been clear that we do not support LIV Golf. That position is informed by the history of this enterprise and its links with the Saudi government which has a deplorable human rights record. Indeed, the previous speaker touched on some of this, but I think it is important to revisit some of the history because it is linked, of course, to this proposal.

In 2021, Greg Norman announced a new golf series to rival the PGA. This venture, which has come to be known as LIV Golf, was backed by the Public Investment Fund, the sovereign wealth fund of Saudi Arabia. The PIF is amongst the largest sovereign wealth funds in the world with estimated assets of over \$750 billion, and is controlled by Crown Prince Mohammed Bin Salman, the country's de facto ruler.

When LIV debuted back in 2022, its tournaments were the richest in golf history, I understand, with regular season events boasting purses of \$25 million, and LIV's prize money was on top of the appearance fees and signing guarantees that were provided to individual players. Documents obtained by *The New York Times* have shown that the Saudi officials know their golf foray may have limited financial payoff. *The Times* has reported that McKinsey and Company, who are consultants privately advising, told the wealth fund that a golf course could be earning revenues of at least \$1.4 billion a year by the end of the decade, or be losing hundreds of millions of dollars.

So why did the Saudi Public Investment Fund make this investment? Saudi Arabia, which has one of the worst human rights records of any nation in the world, is among the authoritarian states that have turned towards investing in sports to direct attention away from their tarnished reputation. This tactic, which the previous speaker acknowledged as well, is referred to as sportswashing. Sarath Ganji, the Director of the Autocracy and Global Sports Initiative explains that, and I quote:

Big governments, and big corporations included, use sports-related content and the media stories tied to sports, in order to alter the information that reached their target audiences. Saudi Arabia can use the media cycle of good sports stories in the United States to push out all those negative stories.

Saudi Arabia is consistently ranked among the worst of the worst in Freedom House's annual survey of political and civil rights and has many negative stories that it would want to drive out of the media. It is, indeed, one of the most prolific executioner's in the world, and 2024 saw a massive rise in the number of executions that were carried out.

The Berlin-based European Saudi Organisation for Human Rights tracked the executions of 345 people, up from 172 in 2023. It says that this equates to one execution every 25 hours. One execution every 25 hours, and the Malinauskas government is tarnishing our state's reputation by associating us with such blatant sportswashing.

Women and girls in Saudi Arabia remain subject to discrimination in law and in practice. The male guardianship system, for instance, was enshrined into law back in 2022, and this means that women must have a male legal guardian, and they cannot choose who this is.

Saudi Arabian authorities have arbitrarily detained Ethiopian migrants for up to 18 months in inhumane conditions, and tortured and ill-treated them before forcibly returning them to Ethiopia. They were held in overcrowded cells with inadequate access to food, water, sanitation and health care in two detention centres prior to their deportation, which has caused deaths.

Let's consider their record on LGBTI rights. LGBTIQ+ rights are not legally recognised or protected in Saudi Arabia, and these are even labelled as extremist ideas. The country's legal system prohibits LGBTI relationships, public displays of affection and gender expression, with severe societal stigma, discrimination and legal repercussions for LGBTI individuals, which includes imprisonment, fines or even the death penalty.

The Saudi and the UAE-led military coalition have committed serious human rights abuses in their military campaign against the Houthi armed group in Yemen. This has included unlawful air strikes that have killed and wounded thousands of civilians.

Protests and demonstrations are illegal in Saudi Arabia, and people who attempt to exercise their rights to freedom of expression, association and assembly are subject to arrest, prosecution and imprisonment. Indeed, many human rights activists who have been released from unfair imprisonment face further punishment including travel bans.

The Associated Press has written that the merger of the PGA Tour and LIV Golf has marked a turnaround for the authoritarian regime in Saudi Arabia, as the regime had been isolated for years over its human rights abuses. Although the wealth fund has insisted it was nothing more than an investor in LIV, a federal judge in the United States said she has concluded the fund was in fact 'the moving force behind the founding, funding, oversight and operation of LIV'.

Rather than simply wash away the human rights record of Saudi Arabia, the emergence of LIV Golf has instead put them under the microscope. Several groups have protested LIV's first US tournament in Oregon, including the families of 9/11 victims who wanted to highlight the Saudi government's alleged role in the terrorist attacks. US Senator Ron Wyden also criticised the event as Saudi sportswashing and stated that, 'No matter how much they cough up, they're not going to be able to wash away' their reputation.

Senator Wyden, who chairs the US Senate's finance committee, has since announced that he has opened up an investigation into the PGA Tour's planned merger with LIV Golf, stating that:

U.S. officials need to consider whether a deal will give the Saudi regime improper control or access to U.S. real estate.

Regarding the Saudi public investment fund's special tax treatment in the United States, Senator Wyden has said:

It's widely understood that the Saudis rip Americans off at the pump and funnel their oil profits into various efforts to launder the reputation of their violent authoritarian regime, but at a minimum, there's no good reason to help them along with a taxpayer subsidy.

LIV should not be getting special treatment in South Australia from the Malinauskas government—and they are being given special treatment by the government. The government is reaching a deal with Greg Norman designs and asking them to design this golf course, but LIV Golf will have the final say on whether this meets their demands and whether or not they indeed wish to commit to having LIV in Adelaide going forward.

I know the government will claim this is not about politics. They will say this is about sport and that sport should sit at arms-length. But we know, of course, that sport and politics are always linked. In recent years, there was a strong campaign against Qatar hosting the World Cup on the basis of its human rights record, and in the 1960s and 1970s South Africa was expelled from many international sporting federations, including the IOC, on the basis of their racist apartheid policies.

It is legitimate for parliament to discuss these links when considering this proposal, and the Greens urge the government to think again about this dirty association—this immoral association—with LIV Golf. This bill is also wrong on process. Back in February, when the government announced its plan to redevelop the golf course, the Greens asked some questions: what is the business case? What is the proposed plan for the site? What is the nature of any so-called backup legislation?

One of the most curious things about the announcement that came from the government at that time was that two crossbenchers stood with the Premier and said that they would support backup legislation. They gave a precommitment to support this legislation, sight unseen. We have asked, as members of the crossbench, to see that legislation. I have asked repeatedly in this chamber for the government to make it publicly available and to start public consultation, yet we did not see any legislation until last week.

We have also asked about the level of public access and we have asked how many trees will be lost. We asked all of these questions and they fell on deaf ears in the Malinauskas government. Lo and behold, you can imagine my surprise when last week an announcement was made and legislation passed through the other place at lightning speed, and now it has come before us today. Like other honourable members, I have been clamouring to get my head around the detail of this. I did not have a briefing from the government on the bill until yesterday morning. It is very difficult to deal with a bill of this complexity within such a short timeframe.

It is not just the members of parliament who the government is treating with contempt; it is treating the broader South Australian community with disdain. There has been woefully inadequate consultation on this bill. Rather than indicating that the bill was a fait accompli and passing it through the lower house last week, the government should have released it for public consultation months ago, when this idea was first put on the table.

Many people have asked me what this means for the Adelaide City Council. This bill takes away the council's oversight of parts of the Parklands in the designated area of the project site. While the bill does require some consultation with the city council while the project is being carried out, serious questions remain and, after all, discretion is given to the planning minister about the nature of this consultation. Will it be undertaken in good faith? Will it change the government's mind? What form will it take? Will this simply be a quick phone call to the Lord Mayor or maybe a post on Facebook, or something posted on the dead end that is YourSAy?

Early signs from the government are not encouraging. After all, the Premier chose to introduce this bill and ram it through the lower house while the Lord Mayor was overseas, and it is clear that this government is not interested in any dissent, especially from the City of Adelaide. It is very disappointing the way in which the Adelaide City Council has been treated.

As members will know, I have some history with the council, having been an elected member there myself. It is my observation that the council was attempting to negotiate with the government in good faith, and it seemed totally inappropriate to ride roughshod over the council and announce that they had the numbers in the parliament to get this done, rather than continuing to progress with those negotiations with the city council, which is in effect the custodian of the Parklands and has been paying for the upgrade of the North Adelaide Golf Course for many years.

The Adelaide Parklands Association rightly points out that no community consultation was undertaken before the bill was introduced into parliament, so how on earth can we trust the

government to do any meaningful consultation after this bill is passed? More broadly, I am very concerned about the broad powers that are being given to the government here and the lack of guardrails for the minister.

The first warning sign in this bill comes at clause 4(1), which states, 'This Act has effect despite any other Act or law of the State.' As noted by the Hon. Michelle Lensink, such a clause is always a good indicator that a bill requires careful scrutiny. It is worth remembering that, when we considered the bill that allowed the government to take over our Parklands for the Women's and Children's Hospital, a map was included at schedule 1 of the legislation to ensure the parliament considered the actual footprint in prospect before voting on any proposal. This time, however, the Malinauskas government is asking us to give them land on a platter; the bill allows for a map to be gazetted later. What has the government got to hide? Why is it not including the map in the legislation that we are considering today?

Parliament has been asked to consider this legislation when we have not even seen the plans. The usual checks and balances that exist within our planning system are being jettisoned. For instance, consider clause 5 of the bill. This makes it clear that the project site is much broader than the existing North Adelaide Golf Course or John E Brown Park. The minister can take in any other areas of the Parklands he considers necessary or desirable to do so.

Clause 11(2) makes it clear that any development proposal for the purposes of the project will be deemed to satisfy the development under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. In other words, any plan that is put forward by the government will get the green light, and the usual public consultation requirements simply will not apply. This, coming from a government that insists that it has a rules-based planning system. What a joke! When it came to standing up against the Walker Corporation taking over our plaza, the government said, 'Oh, we can't do anything, our hands are tied, we have a merit-based planning system,' yet when they want to fast-track a development, we know that they can step in, and that is precisely what they are doing in this instance.

As has been remarked today in correspondence received from Elbert Brooks of the North Adelaide Society, he warns that this bill makes the minister an omnipresent master of the Parklands, that the state government is taking over at its parliamentary and ministerial whim. It is a case of the government giving itself huge, sweeping powers over our public green space. The government really is being given a blank cheque here.

The golf course is being designed by private enterprise, Greg Norman Golf Course Design. As I indicated earlier, my understanding of the agreement with LIV Golf is that if LIV do not like the design they do not even have to honour the agreement to have the tournament here. What can we expect from this plan? Again, we have not seen it and we do not know what is in it, but if the history of Greg Norman Golf Course Design is anything to go by, accommodation could be a big component.

Indeed, luxury accommodation is a key feature of almost half of the golf courses designed by Greg Norman. Of the 104 golf courses designed by Norman across the globe—my office did some research on this—we found that 51 have some form of accommodation, nine have residential housing and 42 have hotels. Some of those hotels include a Trump International Golf Links and Hotel in Ireland—God forbid. There is also a Trump housing development as part of the Greg Norman designed golf course in Charlottesville in the US.

The government has baulked at the suggestion that hotels are even in contemplation here, and I raised this issue on ABC radio during the week. The minister indicated, and I quote from his remarks: 'These are just straw man amendments', he said, and that yes, of course he would rule this out. It is my hope that the government, then, will take some action on this.

I have been having some conversations with the government around this issue, and I have my own amendment, which will make it very clear that there would be no accommodation on the Parklands. I understand that the government may be developing an amendment as well to look at this question, and I hope they do that. It is very important that we shut down the potential for accommodation being part of this plan. We have had a long-term principle in South Australia that the Parklands are not for housing, they are not for hotels, not for penthouses or condos, and we need to make it very clear that privatisation of our public space should not stand.

The Malinauskas government, of course, seems to think that we should all just accept them at their word when it comes to this redevelopment; nothing to see here, it is just a redevelopment of a golf course, do not worry about it. Well, let us consider their record, let us consider the Labor Party's record. I do not look at what comes out of their mouths: I look at what they do with their feet, I look at how they vote.

When the Labor Party was in opposition they joined with the Greens in opposing a sports arena on the Parklands, and they were highly critical of the former Liberal government's plans for a development along the riverbank. Well, where has that commitment gone now they are in government? Now it seems they are enthused about a sporting facility of their own. In opposition they supported my private members' bill to finally add the Adelaide Parklands to the State Heritage Register. They supported it in opposition but, just a few months later when I reintroduced it into this chamber and brought it to a vote, the Labor Party opposed it. Why? We know why: it is because they had their sights set on the Parklands.

They were happy to say one thing in opposition and they did something very different once they found themselves back in government. That bill has passed the upper house, and it sits in the lower house waiting for the Labor Party to finally make it law.

They opposed my private members' bill to prevent the rezoning of the Parklands without approval of both houses of parliament; they swept in to demolish the Police Barracks and to seize the Parklands for the Women's and Children's Hospital; they are rolling out the red carpet for the Walker Corporation in their takeover of our public space on Festival Plaza—and all the while they were presenting themselves as warriors for the Parklands during the last state election campaign. This is Labor hypocrisy of the highest order. They are absolutely shameless. They have more front than John Martins.

This bill seeks to give this government yet another blank cheque over the Adelaide Parklands, and giving Labor more power over the Parklands is like giving Count Dracula the keys to the blood bank. They see the Parklands as a land bank, and they are going to continue to sink their teeth into them.

Let's also consider some of the infrastructure involved here. The bill states that the North Adelaide Golf Course must not have permanent fencing around the perimeter so that the public can still enjoy the public park. However, this does not apply where the minister determines that fencing or barriers are required for safety or security of property or otherwise for a good purpose. I understand, of course, that fencing may be required in certain situations relating to safety or protection of property; however, the phrase 'otherwise for a good purpose' is very broad. This could, of course, result in large parts of the golf course being permanently fenced off in the future, and so I will be moving amendments that remove this clause to ensure the minister cannot just set up permanent fencing on a whim.

I am also concerned about the lack of protections for the environment. During the declared period for the event, the provisions of the Environment Protection Act will not apply. This is concerning. Why does the government deem it necessary for that act to be overridden? We may inquire into that in the committee stage, and I am very keen to understand what scenarios the government is trying to address. I also have an amendment that will seek to insert the provisions of the Native Vegetation Act into this legislation to ensure that the government is not simply destroying some of our native flora and fauna.

As indicated earlier, I am not supportive of this bill. I do recognise, though, that it is very likely to pass the second reading stage on the basis of the precommitment that has been given by some of the crossbench. But the Greens will be moving a series of amendments, and I will talk you through those now.

My first amendments relate to clarifying the scope of the project. My amendment to clause 3 makes it clear that this project will not include any form of accommodation, including housing or hotels. My amendment to clause 9 further strengthens the consultation protocol in relation to the carrying out of the project by removing the minister's prerogative to consult only on the matters that they see fit, and so any protocol with the council would need to be agreed on mutually agreed terms, rather than the minister just consulting as they like.

My amendment at clause 13 imposes a greater obligation on the minister in relation to significant trees, ensuring that the minister must use their best endeavours to ensure that regulated trees are not removed in carrying out the project. Under my amendment, significant trees can only be removed if the minister determines that the carrying out of the project would be significantly impaired if trees were not removed.

Additionally, under my amendments, the minister would be required to ensure that for every regulated tree removed, no less than three new trees—saplings of at least one metre in height or mature trees—are planted. That is an important point, because simply chopping down trees and throwing a few seeds in the ground is not going to address the loss of trees. It takes a long time for trees to reach appropriate maturation, and so this amendment tries to address that.

My amendment at clause 18 would remove the provision that gives the minister the power to erect fencing or barriers when they are satisfied it is necessary or desirable. My amendment at clause 22 would make it clear the minister can only erect temporary fencing with the approval of the council. My amendment to clause 19 limits the duration of any special event, and this is an important point as well. The existing provision gives the minister broad powers to undertake works that they see fit, temporarily close roads, and circumvent a range of existing laws.

I do not think it is fair to the residents and ratepayers of the City of Adelaide in particular but, more broadly, people in the city who rely on those roads and who might be significantly inconvenienced, that this level of imposition on the public amenity could continue for months and months and months on end. My amendment makes it clear that the minister can only do that for a maximum of three months in any 12-month period, and I think that is reasonable.

I also note the amendments that the Hon. Michelle Lensink has filed on behalf of the opposition. She has spoken about those. I believe that those amendments are complementary to the Greens' amendments and they do, I think, curtail some of the significant powers that are being vested in the hands of the minister, so I indicate that I will be supporting those amendments. I, in particular, support the idea that the act should contain objects that explicitly set out directions for the redevelopment of the site. When we are talking about public land that belongs to all South Australians, we should have maximum transparency around what is involved.

The Greens will be opposing this Labor land grab, and I urge other members to do the same, but if this bill progresses to the committee stage, I urge members of the crossbench in particular to have an open mind to amendments and to listen to the arguments put forward in the hope that we might be able to strengthen some of the protections for our environment, and to support or create greater transparency.

Might I also say, just in closing, that I do think this will be a big issue heading into the next state election. I imagine Lucy Hood MP in the other place will not be very happy to see the Parklands back on the agenda in this way heading into the state election. We in the Greens will be working hard to remind voters of Labor's record, of the fact that they say one thing in opposition but when they are in government—when it really counts—they do not follow through, they do not deliver and they capitulate to developers. It is inappropriate, and the Greens will be calling it out. I will certainly be asking a lot of questions at committee stage about this bill, and I urge members to vote against this draconian legislation.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (12:20): I rise to speak on the North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill 2025. This bill is presented by the government as an exciting opportunity to elevate a much-loved public asset into a premier destination for international events while delivering long-term benefits to our city and community. Many stakeholders and businesses from our hospitality and tourism sectors, which both contribute to and benefit from the success of events such as this, have expressed support for LIV Golf.

LIV Golf Adelaide has delivered substantial economic returns: nearly \$65 million in 2023, over \$71 million in 2024 and a record \$81.46 million in 2025. Whether one likes golf or not, the most recent event attracted more than 100,000 attendees, 41 per cent of whom travelled interstate, and generated over 86,000 visitor nights. These figures contributed to some of the highest hotel occupancy rates ever recorded in Adelaide. Tourism and hotel industry peak bodies have reminded us that these are not just statistics. They reflect real and growing opportunities for local businesses,

workers and the broader community. They demonstrate the potential for Adelaide to thrive as a destination for world-class events.

The case for investment is compelling. However, my consideration of this bill is not without qualification or reservation. While I acknowledge the potential economic, recreational and reputational benefits of this redevelopment, I remain concerned about the breadth of the powers conferred by the bill and the precedent it may set for future projects involving public land.

The government has made clear its intention to deliver a championship-standard golf course in time for LIV Golf 2028. The urgency of this timeline has been outlined. There is the need to allow for construction, turf establishment and event preparation. They are all legitimate reasons; however, at the same time it is essential that this momentum is matched by transparency and accountability, to ensure the project delivers on its promises for all South Australians.

The bill in its current form grants the minister extensive powers. These provisions raise legitimate concerns about ministerial overreach. It is the role of this chamber to scrutinise legislation in detail to ensure that what we support here in this place serves the best interests of South Australians, not only today but for generations to come. It is important to acknowledge that the Adelaide City Council has been the steward of the North Adelaide Golf Course for over a century. For over 100 years, the council has invested in the course, supported its staff and maintained the site, at considerable cost to ratepayers. They deserve to be recognised for their work.

I note from the government's briefing that the project remains in the early design phase and that the absence of a defined map in the legislation is intended to preserve flexibility. As many honourable members have already mentioned in their speeches, it would have been handy to have a map clearly define the whole area for the development. While this may be practical from a project management perspective, it reinforces the need for transparency and ongoing consultation as the project evolves.

I also note the government's stated commitment to maintaining the course as a public facility, retaining existing staff and ensuring that Adelaide City Council is not burdened with event-related costs, such as traffic management. These are welcome assurances and provisions. I trust that these provisions will be honoured in spirit as well as in writing and true answers provided by the minister in this place.

In anticipation of the committee stage, I signal and foreshadow the following matters for the minister's consideration and response: will the government commit to ongoing consultation with Adelaide City Council throughout the project life cycle, including during the construction phase? How would this consultation work in practice? Can the minister reaffirm the assurance that full-time staff will be retained regardless of who operates the site? Can the government provide assurances that additional costs, such as traffic management and road closures, will not be shifted to Adelaide City Council during event mode? Can the minister provide detail on how the commitment to planting more trees than are removed will be implemented and monitored? How would the principle of maintaining the golf course as a public facility be upheld in practice?

The government has indicated a willingness to work with the council on a future operating model and clause 16 of the bill provides a mechanism for leasing arrangements post construction. This is a constructive approach and I encourage the minister to formalise his collaboration as early as practicable. While this bill focuses on the redevelopment of the golf course, it also represents the opportunity to enhance and value public space for future generations. It reflects our capacity to deliver projects and strengthen community amenity, foster collaboration across levels of government, and create lasting social and economic benefits for South Australians.

I note, as other members have noted, that this bill is likely to pass. I want to work with the government to ensure that I am in a position to support the bill, but that I do so with a clear conscience having raised concerns that, I believe, warrant further scrutiny. This bill is about more than a golf course; it is about how we can govern shared spaces and it is about the balance of power between state and local government. I look forward to the committee stage, when these matters can be explored in detail and the proposed amendments considered on their merits. I commend the bill.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (12:27): Before I go to the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Club, I just want to go briefly through the history of LIV Golf in South Australia. LIV Golf has provided a platform to showcase South Australia and deliver significant economic benefits to South Australia. Adelaide has hosted the Australian fixture at the Grange Golf Club since the first event in 2023, which attracted over 77,000 attendees, including 43,000 international visitors from 37 countries. Attendance in 2024 increased to more than 94,000 and then in 2025 to a record 102,000 attendees.

The state has secured the extension of the LIV Golf agreement for a period to 2031. The North Adelaide Golf Course will be the exclusive home of LIV Golf in Australia. The redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course is necessary to provide the required facilities and amenities to accommodate year-round use for the public, world-best tournaments and tourism to South Australia.

Our National Heritage Listed Parklands have had a golf links since the late 19th century. As part of the evolution of the precinct, the North Adelaide Golf Course was developed in the early 20th century and it is the most centrally located golf course complex in any Australian capital city. The redevelopment will create one of the world's best public golf courses for year-round use for all South Australians, no matter who you are or your background. This will remain a public golf course in public hands.

The existing North Adelaide Golf Course is currently comprised of two 18-hole courses on approximately 75 hectares of Parklands, together with one par 3 course. The current golf course does not contain a dedicated driving range facility or the amenities and infrastructure for the development of the sport at the scale required. The legislation will ensure the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course can go ahead as soon as possible to host the LIV Golf tournament in 2028.

The legislation commits to a positive duty to consult with council on the development and to resolve the future ownership and operating structure of the North Adelaide Golf Course. The redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course will be constructed on what is defined in the bill as the project site. The project site will include the area currently operating as the North Adelaide Golf Course, as well as the intention to include Park 27A, also known as John E Brown Park.

The use of Park 27A will see the transformation of an underutilised area of the Parklands to provide more useable space and reduce the impact on trees. The legislation has outlined requirements that for every tree removed, no less than three new trees or seedlings must be planted within the project site or support zones.

Under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course will be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed to satisfy. The approach will ensure that planning controls will still remain and building rules consent will be required, mandating the quality, safety and integrity of any facilities constructed. The application of the Aboriginal Heritage Act 1988 is not affected by the legislation.

Legislation establishes safeguards and limitations on various components of the site and its surroundings. To avoid environmental impact, it defines the project site support zones, which will be utilised to facilitate construction but with clear limits about what can occur in these zones. This is a project that will facilitate the redevelopment of the North Adelaide Golf Course to be a world-class facility which will support world-class events. The golf course will remain as a public golf course for anyone and everyone to enjoy.

The issue of accommodation has been raised by the Hon. Mr Simms. I must say the first time I have heard about accommodation on this was from Mr Simms. I was actually gobsmacked when LIV Golf first came to Adelaide about how many people I knew that I did not even know played golf were so keen to get a ticket to go to watch the tournament. Personally, I am not a golfer—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: —I have not had time in my life to actually learn to play golf.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Mr President, will you please—

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: I have never had time to actually learn to play golf, and I have the same problem as the Hon. Ms Lensink: I have trouble having the head of the club hit the ball to make sure I get a decent drive. But the amount of enthusiasm in this state for people who live in this state was actually staggering.

At the moment, there is a golf course on this area of Parklands. After the redevelopment, there will be a golf course on this redeveloped land. What is going to go with it, I am not sure, but I must say if I do learn to play golf and I do join the 18-hole golf class, I would hope there is a cafe at hole 3 and I would hope there is another cafe at hole 9 so I can actually enjoy a nice lunch, because I must say that the Parklands are a beautiful place in this state and they are to be cherished, but there has to be things on it for people to enjoy the Parklands.

We have the Adelaide 500 and that is fenced off and it does cause some inconvenience, but it is a world-class event and when it is all unpacked it is a beautiful Parklands. I think the Hon. Mr Simms, with his objections, is a little bit excited about the recent polls, which says that the Greens may win two spots, so it is in Mr Simms' interest to actually create straw people to—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: Surely not!

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY: Absolutely! So it does fail to actually inspire me, some of the debate. I wish Mr Simms the best of luck in the next election, but the reality is the people of South Australia want a LIV Golf course, a world-class golf course, in South Australia. I am looking forward to it. As long as all the required provisions, the development approvals and so on, are accommodated, I think we should all be cherishing the thought.

All my life South Australia has been known as a regional town. It has always been referred to as a regional town, but Labor governments have worked hard to ensure that we provide world-class events with world-class facilities to allow international tourists, national tourists and our own local people here to actually enjoy the great things that this state has to offer. I commend the bill, and I look forward to the committee stage so we can once again hear the Hon. Robert Simms and his accommodation theories.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (12:35): I rise also to speak on the North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill 2025. At the outset, the first thing I would like to address is the issue of the Adelaide City Council. In so doing, I would like to thank the Lord Mayor and council for their work to date on this issue and the role that she has played in particular, and council will continue to play into the future, when it comes to this issue.

I say that genuinely because, as I have said publicly now many times, that was always my preferred option in terms of dealing with LIV Golf in the city. When I signalled my support for LIV Golf, I said just that. I know that a lot of work has gone into this at the local council level, and I do understand their disappointment that a bill is now being introduced into this place. So I say that very genuinely.

I did come out pretty strongly and say that I support LIV Golf progressing in South Australia, hopefully being here beyond 2031 as well. I am also a realist, and I can see the clock ticking and the need for certainty. I think it is all well and good to talk about what this place is doing, but we also need to take into account the fact that council has been working on this issue now for some time, and the issues confronting council are not council issues. They are not issues or hurdles or roadblocks or anything like that that the council processes have put in place. They are legislative issues. It is not a hold-up by council that has been responsible for us getting to this point. Rather, effectively it has required this timely process which makes it difficult to meet deadlines.

The Hon. Michelle Lensink says, 'Why the rush?' and I accept that question. I think the short answer is if, as some of us have done, you support this, then there is a clock ticking and we are running out of time. I do not accept that this bill would have been rammed through last week, because it is simply not accurate. I was privy to the discussions that took place last week certainly with me, and it was made crystal clear to me that this bill would be introduced, as it was—everybody found

out about the bill being introduced—that it would sit on the *Notice Paper*, as bills normally do, and we would get to this week. So I do not accept there was any proposal or that the Premier or the minister responsible had the support last week to introduce this bill and ram it through this place. That is simply incorrect and inaccurate.

The reality is that we are heading into the winter break. If this project is to get off the ground, based on the timelines being set, the foundation does need to be laid. In order to do that, the government, I accept, cannot afford to have to go through some of those same processes that council would be going through if council was dealing with this issue, because that is where we were prior to this bill being introduced. I guess that is the very essence of the bill that is before us.

I have heard everything there is to hear about this bill, and why I came out and supported it, and I do not back away from the comments I made. I did say that the benefit this brings to SA is unprecedented, and we are the absolute envy of Australia at the moment, and we can build on that. But the bottom line is that I think you either support LIV Golf, you support the proposal of LIV Golf coming to the city, or you oppose it. That applies regardless of whether it is council undertaking that process or it is government undertaking that process.

The concerns around the trees—and I say this respectfully as well—are going to apply regardless of whether it is council undertaking the process or it is government undertaking the process. It is going to apply whether it is a council memorandum of understanding that is entered into or work that is being undertaken by the government. That has not changed. That has not changed at all, and that still has to happen. The question is: which process will it happen under?

As I understand it, delays have been, to a large extent, caused by the painstaking efforts that I understand have been from all those involved—including council—who have been engaged in those discussions about what you can and cannot do on our Parklands, given the legislative parameters that are in place and, in particular, around the issue of trees.

The design that we are all talking about—where is that design? We all want to see the design, but it is a bit of a circular problem. The bill makes it clear that we cannot go beyond the footprint in this bill. That is very clear in the bill. It does not even mean that you are necessarily going to use all of the footprint in the bill, but you cannot go outside that footprint. A good example of the sorts of issues that council would have been confronted with and we are confronted with, and the reason why we are putting the legislation before the design in this respect, and why we have not seen the final design, is that we do not know what we can and cannot do on that footprint because of those steps that we have to go through.

Park 27A is a perfect example of that. That has been identified as one of the areas that will form part of this proposal. At the moment you cannot use Park 27A as a golf course, so when it comes to that certainty that we have heard spoken of time and time again in this debate, it is a bit difficult to say, 'We will use Park 27A' when we know currently in law you cannot. That is addressed in the bill, as are a number of other issues that impact the design phase of this work that cannot be finalised because there are other implications.

That makes sense to me, and when I ask, 'Can I see the designs too? How are the designs progressing?' I understand that there are things there that mean that if anything was put in front of us and it is a design, it may not look anything like that because there are other issues that need to be overcome. I am just not as convinced as others are that this can be pulled off in the absence of legislation, and one of the main reasons for that is timing. It would be timing if it was local council and it will be timing if it is this parliament.

I absolutely understand and accept that there are people here, and watching, who are either deeply disappointed in—and I accept that—or supportive of this proposal. The voices have not been lost on me in speaking on this bill today. It is one of those areas where we try to balance things because, by the same token, the response—evidenced by the popularity of LIV Golf and the number of attendances that the Hon. Jing Lee referred to increasing from 94,000 to 102,000—also speaks to the broader community support for LIV Golf in South Australia. I guess that is the perspective that I have tried to balance in coming to this.

However, I have said to the Premier at the outset, 'There are going to be hurdles here and there are going to be concerns. How are they going to be addressed?' I also said publicly that when I was having those discussions at both levels, I raised certain issues—I will go through them when we get to them, such as public accessibility, public ownership, fencing, council consultation and the issue of fees that would have to be paid—which would have to be addressed.

Of course, as I said in the press conference when I spoke on this issue, I did engage in those discussions and said, unlike the apparent blank check that some would like to say I wrote, that these sorts of issues would need to be addressed before I would consider supporting a proposal. That is part and parcel of what we do in here. But on some issues we have very different political, ideological and philosophical positions. On issues like this, I know I always do not agree with some of my crossbench colleagues, and we see these sorts of discussions happening every time that occurs.

Obviously, one of the first things that I asked myself when I had my very first conversation about this was, 'What does the city offer? What are they getting here that they are not getting elsewhere?' I thank the Hon. Russell Wortley for his contribution just a few moments ago, because I think he actually highlighted a few of them. We do love showcasing our Parklands in myriad ways. There is a golf course in the city now; there will be a world-class golf course in the city in the future if this bill passes. It is an opportunity to showcase and experience everything that South Australia has to offer.

Whether you like LIV Golf and like the idea of LIV Golf in the city or not, it is on a growing trajectory. I said a few months ago and I will say again now that I do think the Premier took a risk when he initially entered into that contract for LIV Golf in Adelaide. I think the fact that he had Victoria lurking at LIV Golf, trying to snatch it from South Australia when those discussions were taking place about an extension, shows that that risk paid off. I stand by that today; I think it did. The fact that we have over 100,000 people attending the event, and that figure is increasing, shows that it did. The fact that we have generated over \$87 million of economic activity shows that it did. It was a measured risk taken by the Premier, and it paid off. People were supportive.

We love using our Parklands as part of that showcasing of South Australia. We have events in our Parklands: we have WOMAD, we have car races, we have equestrian events, we have the Fringe, we have the Garden of Unearthly Delights. All of these things—many of them world-class and world-leading in terms of their attendance and turnouts and success—take place on our Parklands. They all have the same sorts of issues that we are confronted with when we talk about a golf course.

They all require fencing at some point to ensure that there is a parameter around the event. We do that every time we have an event in our Parklands, regardless of whether it is golf, it is WOMAD, it is the car race or it is the Fringe. That already takes place now. That would still continue to take place if it was council undertaking this process and not the government, so nothing there has changed.

I am not as convinced as are others in relation to some of the points that have been made. I have certainly taken the time to raise my concerns. I have certainly taken the time to speak to the individuals I have been speaking to for some time now, because I did not say, 'Yes, I support LIV Golf. Go your hardest and do whatever you want.' I said, 'Yes, I support LIV Golf, but I want to see what that's going to look like.'

Working through that process, you can see all the sorts of things that you will have to get to, but the two things that have been clear to me is that this is not just about, first, LIV Golf because, as others have said, LIV Golf is not a guarantee. We have LIV Golf until 2031, but certainty around LIV Golf puts us in a much stronger position if we want to extend LIV Golf beyond 2031. I think South Australians in the main would like to see South Australia hold on to LIV Golf beyond 2031, which is where the question of certainty comes in and certainty is impacted by delays in design.

This is why I say that these are all interconnected issues that have to be considered here. But, it is not just LIV Golf—you are right—and, if we do not get it beyond 2031, have we just built a golf course for a few years at which we will not continue to have an event? The obvious answer is no. There are other tournaments we can be attracting to that golf course, and it is a publicly owned

golf course, so regardless of whether we have LIV Golf here beyond 2031, the public of South Australia will have a world-class golf course in the city.

That brings with it economic benefit to the state, as does every other golf course. There is already a golf course in the city. It is just being brought to a standard that means that we will be able to attract those sorts of events in the future, events that we cannot necessarily attract today. No-one is suggesting by any stretch—and I think this was canvassed at the time—that Grange was not a great course. The turnout itself shows that it is a great event and a great course, but it comes with its limitations. It comes with the limitations in terms of where it is in proximity to the city, to hotels, to restaurants, pubs, clubs and the rest of it.

All these issues are taken into account. Does it make sense to upgrade the golf course in the city? My answer was that, when you measure the pros and the cons, yes it does. In saying yes it does, then we have to look at all the things that need to be done. We know that council has been looking to upgrade that golf course for a number of years now. Funding has been an issue around that, so here we have a proposal by the government for a publicly funded, publicly owned, publicly accessible golf course. It is not that we are taking away the golf course, it is not that we are building a new golf course that does not exist. It is a golf course that is already in the city.

As for the process, I know it is very easy for anyone to stare at me. Later this afternoon I will be getting up to speak about process in this place, and we set those standards. I said at the outset, and I will say it again: I do not accept that there was any proposal to ram this bill through last week, because I was not privy to any discussion that involved that—certainly not my support for any discussion that involved that, nor was it suggested to me. The discussions I had were very clear about the timeline for this proposal. They could do whatever they liked in the lower house in terms of its introduction, but there is a process where a bill sits here and we go through debate.

I was not happy with the pace of the bills we dealt with last week that went through this place, but I am also a realist in terms of how we deal with these things based on where we sit on issues. In this instance, I have said that I support this bill being introduced and dealing with it this week. That is no different to any other bill that gets introduced that we deal with in those timeframes.

We do not always agree on issues in principle, we do not agree on them philosophically, and we do not agree on them ideologically. That is just fact. Whether we have this debate today or we have it in two months' time, the only thing that will happen if this debate happens in two months' time is that it will set back the certainty that anyone who is supportive of this proposal and who wants to see this go ahead is seeking to achieve. I know everyone is watching, and it is not just the people in the chamber today. There are people everywhere watching this debate, because that certainty is key in terms of this proposal.

I might just end by saying that I do not make those decisions lightly. I do not like upsetting sectors of our community any more than anyone else in here does but always, always, I think we take the time to measure the pros and cons of any proposal. I agree that the Parklands are home to so many world-class events that make them even more beautiful and more accessible by South Australians, by interstaters and by international visitors: events like WOMAD, the Fringe, the Garden of Unearthly Delights, the motorsport race.

It does not matter whether you are a fan of those events or not; others are, and they are enjoying the Parklands. It might be the only time they actually come to the Parklands, and they are coming because they enjoy that event. Outside of that they might not be that interested in visiting the Parklands, but it brings people in and that showcases South Australia, and that generates economic activity—and that is something I support.

I understand that not everyone sits on the same page when it comes to LIV Golf, but that does not mean others do not enjoy it and they do not support it and they do not want to see this go ahead. For me, this decision is based around providing the certainty that is needed—and the certainty is needed, from the design phase onwards—to meet the 28 deadline, the 31 deadline. It is also needed to show our commitment to this issue so that we can secure this event—and other events, other tournaments—beyond 2031.

They may not have liked it when it first came to Australia, but they sure as hell like it now. I think there would be a few states that would happily put up their hands to try to snare it from South Australia if they could. We have that benefit here, and we have seen what it is doing for our state. I have said I would back that, and I would like that certainty, that everyone watching this is seeking, in order for us to be able to move ahead in a timely fashion. That is what I am supporting, and it is on that basis that I have indicated to the government that I support this bill.

Mr President, I apologise, I will get to this when we deal with amendments. We have talked, and I will talk, about differential rates, because we have talked about public accessibility, public ownership, but also ensuring that we have something in the bill that points to that, which I am happy to talk to when we get to the amendment stage.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (12:58): I rise to address the government's North Adelaide Public Golf Course Bill 2025, and indicate that I will definitely be supporting this bill. That support goes beyond the event. As has already been said, it is about recognising that this is a very time-sensitive matter. South Australians are going to miss out if we do not get on with the job, and that means decreased economic prosperity for the state, particularly the city area, as well as the average Australian potentially missing out on having a world-class, publicly legislated golf course.

This bill will allow South Australians to get on with business, the business of creating another drawcard for our state. It aims to create a world-class golf course in South Australia to sit alongside other wealth generators that support family businesses and jobs and make our state a more attractive place to live, visit and invest in. The government's bill will do this by turning an existing golf course into a world-class golf course, and it will not cost the Adelaide City Council.

In supporting this bill, I am making an outcome-driven decision supported by the opening line of this act, which is particularly succinct and to the point. This legislation will, and I quote, 'facilitate the development of a new North Adelaide Golf Course, to provide for its ongoing use as a championship golf course...and for other purposes'.

Key elements of this bill include ensuring ongoing consultation between the responsible minister and the Adelaide City Council, including agreement on a consultation protocol, and a requirement for every tree removed as part of this project to be replaced with three trees situated or planted within the project site and support zones. The bill also ensures that the North Adelaide Golf Course remains a public facility during and after this upgrade.

South Australians will have protections to guard against any substantial increases to paying fees for locals, increases that might exclude some members of the public from using the course. The bill also forbids the erection of any permanent fencing that would exclude the public from the course. The course will be rebuilt to international standards for LIV Golfers, but it will also be for everyday hackers, for children and young people new to the sport and its many health and wellbeing benefits, and for everyone in between.

This bill essentially enables South Australians to use a world-class facility year-round, except for those few days when the professionals arrive in Adelaide and bring with them the spotlight of world sport. LIV has been a runaway hit for South Australia since arriving in 2023, with 77,000 people attending that first year, 94,000 in 2024 and 102,000 earlier this year. The 2024 event generated over 79,000 visitor nights. By anyone's definition, that is an enormous shot in the arm to the local economy, and we know that LIV Golf will be with us now until at least 2031.

The local event will remain at Grange Golf Course until 2027 before it is planned to be relocated to North Adelaide from 2028 onwards. The new site is an outstanding setting to further grow the event and showcase much of our state to the rest of the world. Figures show golf tourism is especially lucrative to the respective location in question, with golfers typically spending more money during their visits than non-golfers. Increasing these revenues year in, year out will ultimately boost the South Australian economy and allow the government to start repaying some of our ballooning debt.

Golf is undergoing a resurgence. We have seen the fifth consecutive year of membership growth across the nation, plus increases in playing numbers, including junior boys and junior girls. Golf is a healthy outdoor activity associated with wellbeing and fitness, not to mention the person-to-

person social interaction. This popularity trend is a welcome development given all the data and reports that outline how damaging our obsession with screen time can be.

But what does the bill mean for Adelaide City Council? Given its geography, its composition and its existing service responsibilities, the Adelaide City Council lacks the ratepayer base to fund upgrades of this nature. This bill clears the path for the state government to provide those upgrades by effectively allowing it to invest on behalf of the council.

Some have queried the swiftness of this bill's creation and passage, and suggested brakes need to be applied, and contend the bill should have been returned to members for additional scrutiny before being introduced, and that Adelaide City Council should have been further consulted on it. However, given the council's track record, and the fact that the project has a deadline of 2028, this bill's passage needs to be swift and sensible. If we allow this bill to be bogged down in unnecessary changes, the timeline will be impossible to meet. We might still be talking what ifs in 2028 when the golfers should be teeing off at the redeveloped North Adelaide facility.

If we had allowed the Adelaide Oval redevelopment to be sidetracked, delayed, railroaded and ultimately scuttled, think of what would have been lost to the city and state. It is also worth noting that the Property Council supports this redevelopment, which will enhance the Parklands for golfers and non-golfers, and it will improve public spaces, including movement in and out of the city. The Parklands are not just for a small group of people. They are to be enjoyed by all, and this development will help that happen. With those words, I indicate my support for the bill.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (13:03): I am mindful that we have ticked over into break time, so I am just going to make this very quick. I would like to thank the honourable members who have spoken on this bill: the Hon. Michelle Lensink, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Jing Lee, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Rob Simms and the Hon. Russell Wortley. As we are already aware, the committee stage will hopefully be picking up later today where we will be able to continue these discussions about the significance of having a public golf course invested in in our city.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes15
Noes.....2
Majority13

AYES

Bonaros, C.
El Dannawi, M.
Hanson, J.E.
Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Game, S.L.
Hood, B.R.
Lee, J.S.
Scriven, C.M.

Centofanti, N.J.
Girolamo, H.M.
Hood, D.G.E.
Lensink, J.M.A.
Wortley, R.P.

NOES

Franks, T.A.

Simms, R.A. (teller)

Second reading thus carried; bill read a second time.

Sitting suspended from 13:08 to 14:15.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Report of the Auditor-General—Report 5 of 2025: Agency audit reports
[Ordered to be published]

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

2024 Vailo Adelaide 500 Event Summary
2025 Ministerial Staff Report prepared pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009

By the Minister for Special Minister of State (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Regulations under Acts—
Electoral Act 1985—Miscellaneous

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

Minister Bettison's Overseas Travel Report from 21 April to 28 April 2025 prepared
pursuant to the Public Sector Act 2009

By the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. E.S. Bourke)—

Fees under Act—
Education and Children's Services Act 2019

ANSWERS TABLED

The PRESIDENT: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

Question Time

FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding the South Australian forensic centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The 2024-25 budget revealed that the South Australian forensic centre will be delivered more than \$13 million over budget. When asked during estimates about that fact, the Attorney said the reason for the blowout was that, and I quote, 'The original budget of \$348.9 million excluded land-related costs.' So my questions to the Attorney are:

1. When did the government become aware that land would be needed to be purchased for the project?
2. What was the government's original plan for where the new forensic centre would be built?
3. Why did the government at no point in the last three budgets account for land acquisition requirements for the project?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:20): I thank the honourable member for her question. I think it was yesterday morning on ABC radio, this was thoroughly traversed. I assume the honourable member might have been listening to Matt and Dave instead and didn't hear what happened on the radio yesterday.

The forensic centre—about \$350 million was put in I think two budgets ago to build a new state-of-the-art forensic centre in South Australia. It is somewhat astounding that those opposite would seek to criticise the allocation of a significant amount of money for a new facility because it stands in contrast to the policy that the Liberal Party had to do nothing about it. In all their time in government, they didn't allocate anything—nothing in a budget for a new centre.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: We have allocated in excess of a third of a billion dollars for a new forensic centre so that a purpose-built centre matches the level and the standard of the expertise that we have in the scientists who are world regarded. Off the top of my head, it was about \$348 million that was allocated a couple of budgets ago. We have been doing work refining the scope and exactly what's needed and, importantly, where the facility might go.

My advice is it had been hoped there might be land that the state government already owned that would be suitable for the centre to be built on. My advice is, having not been able to find suitable land, we are in the process of looking for private sector land for it to be built on. Those opposite—I don't know if they think land is for free everywhere, but not having found suitable land that's already owned by the state, we are now in the process of looking for land that is suitable for this purpose-built centre from the private market and that will require extra funding. It is about \$13 million that has been additionally put into the budget for the land that we haven't been able to source from the land we already own.

FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): Supplementary: when did the Attorney become aware that suitable land would need to be purchased?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:23): This has been a process that has been going, off the top of my head, for about two years, and that has been an iterative process looking for suitable land to be used. Certainly, over the course of this year, it had been established that there wasn't land that we already owned that it could be built on and that is reflected in this year's budget paper that we have made an allocation to purchase land from the private sector.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries on the topic of financial assistance for commercial fishermen affected by the algal bloom.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The opposition has been contacted by commercial fishers, who continue to struggle as a result of prolonged and severe algal blooms that have significantly impacted their ability to earn a living. While some weather changes have brought modest relief in isolated areas, in many regions the issue persists. One fisher described the situation, and I quote:

There is a \$1500 grant to help financially with algal bloom. I know fishermen that have applied with no success as they want to know everything and you almost need a tax accountant to fill the form out which would cost lots of money itself. I thought government help should be easy, not this hard, as our businesses go under. I'd also say that there is huge concern not only about today but also about the unknown future that the government has no concern about.

My questions to the minister are:

1. Is the minister aware of concerns raised about the complexity of the application process, and will she commit to simplifying access to financial support for affected fishers?
2. What is the department doing to actively monitor the ongoing impacts of algal blooms on commercial fishing operations across different regions of our state?
3. Will the government consider expanding eligibility for industry fee relief by introducing clear, criteria-based guidelines rather than relying solely on, as the minister has stated previously in this chamber, a case-by-case basis?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. First of

all, in regard to what the member claims is complexity, I would encourage anyone who would like assistance with applying for these sorts of grants to do so through the Family and Business Mentors, who are also able to direct them to additional assistance that might be available, obviously depending on their circumstance. That applies to whether they are fishers, farmers or anyone else who is eligible for that type of assistance.

I certainly am happy to raise it with Rural Business Support, because I haven't had feedback that the \$1,500 grants are difficult to access. I think I might have heard the same fisher on radio yesterday morning—it may have been the same person—and that is the first time that I have heard that sort of feedback about the applications for those grants. What I have heard is that it's quite straightforward.

Initially—and I don't think this would have applied to the fisher applying for it, because to my knowledge no fisher has applied until fairly recently—the thought was that the applications would go through the usual process of a full financial counselling assistance program. Back then, we got some feedback, particularly, if I recall correctly, from GPSA (Grain Producers SA) that—or it may have been Livestock SA, but I think it was Grain Producers SA—that wasn't necessarily the most appropriate approach for all farmers and, therefore, there was the alternative option of speaking to a business support officer at RBS and stating what the impact of the drought had been on you and your business and providing evidence that you have, for example, overdue bills or something like that. So my understanding is that the process has been simple for the majority of people, but certainly I am happy to raise that with Rural Business Support if that is a concern.

In terms of monitoring the algal bloom, I have spoken before about that process. We have talked about the fact that this is the largest algal bloom seen before in South Australia and that the expectation was that wild weather and a decrease in sea temperatures brought about by rain would assist. In terms of the updates to that, the last update I think was six days ago, so there should be a further update, remembering the updates are on the DEW website and, I think, possibly on the PIRSA website as well, either today or tomorrow.

The analysis involves both water sampling and satellite imagery. Where there is cloud cover, satellite imagery will be negatively affected, so some of that information will still continue to come through. Obviously, we all hope that the algal bloom will disperse sooner rather than later. Some of the early indications that I had in briefings that I have had have been that some of it has moved but not necessarily dispersed as we would have hoped.

My office has received a number of requests from marine scalefish licence holders and one from the association requesting fee relief due to fishing conditions reported to be related to the harmful algal bloom. Over the past weeks, my office has been working with the association and the department to devise an appropriate process to gather information detailing the impacted fishers, the extent of the impact they have suffered, and then that can guide whether there is some appropriate assistance that can be provided.

Both associations will now gather information to provide to PIRSA regarding their members who have been impacted and the extent of those impacts. Obviously, the information would need to be verified and targeted if there is assistance. I think it is also important to mention that marine scalefishers across the sector are impacted to varying degrees by the harmful algal bloom: some are reporting significant impacts and some none. That is why a one-size-fits-all approach is not appropriate in this instance.

I do find it quite remarkable that the Leader of the Opposition in this place doesn't want the approach to be flexible. She is saying, 'We have to have clear guidelines and not on a case-by-case basis.' She is saying that she doesn't want it to be flexible. I think, when we are looking at what the impacts have been and whether assistance is appropriate and for whom, of course it needs to be flexible. It needs to be based on the information because, as I said, different people are affected in different ways.

SOUTH COAST ALGAL BLOOM

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: how long will the investigation in regard to fee relief take, and when will the association be given an answer as to whether fee relief will, in fact, be granted to its members?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:30): At the moment I am waiting for the associations to bring back to PIRSA the information that I outlined.

BIOSECURITY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about biosecurity.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: When asked in estimates about whether the government had a current state biosecurity strategy, the minister answered, and I quote:

My advice is that there are currently multiple policies in regard to biosecurity...We also have a number of documents in regard to our compliance with national protocols and national plans.

My question to the minister is: can the minister confirm whether South Australia currently has an endorsed whole-of-government state biosecurity strategy in place and, if not, why has the government only just begun to develop one now despite the escalating biosecurity risks and the passage of the Biosecurity Act some months ago?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her question. I do understand the shadow minister in this place has had a few tough weeks, being mocked on radio last week for her infamous interview and being forced to issue an apology for that performance where she said she was a bit tired. It had been a big week and so she was a bit tired. I understand why she would be—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —clutching at straws. What I think is unfortunate, though, and, indeed, very disappointing is that the shadow minister continues to undermine confidence in biosecurity in this state.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Undermines the confidence of biosecurity in this state.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The Department of Primary Industries and Regions (PIRSA) released a refreshed version of the state biosecurity policy in June, so within the past 12 months. The policy serves as a statement articulating the approach of the South Australian government's role in biosecurity while the state biosecurity strategy is being developed. The policy provides narrative on the government's intent, and it details the objectives and principles in the implementation of strategies and plans for South Australia.

The policy has been updated to reflect the current operating environment and the landscape of biosecurity within the state. As the honourable member may be keen to understand, it is available on the PIRSA website. It is publicly available. In fact, I have a copy here, Mr President, if the honourable member would like to avail herself of it—but, as we know, she doesn't actually like facts, she just likes a few cheap headlines or at least the attempts to do so.

It is concerning that the shadow minister is again seeking to undermine confidence in the state government's response to biosecurity. She can moan and whinge and be terribly tired as much as she likes, but the constant feedback I get is that those opposite, the shadow minister in particular, is particularly irresponsible in terms of her approach to biosecurity, which should always be bipartisan. That is the feedback I get and I think perhaps the shadow minister should reflect on that.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! The Hon. Ms Girolamo!

BIOSECURITY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): Supplementary: why, then, has industry asked the state government for an overarching biosecurity strategy?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:34): I thank the honourable member for her supplementary question. She may not be aware that there is now a national biosecurity strategy, which will guide the development of state and territory-based biosecurity strategies. If she just doesn't bother to find out what is happening on a national level, she is the only one who can answer to that.

TEA TREE GULLY CFS

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Will the minister inform the council about the recent Tea Tree Gully CFS anniversary?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:35): I thank the member for her question. It is lovely to see you back in the chamber. The year 2025 marks a milestone year for the Tea Tree Gully community as we are proudly able to celebrate 90 years of service, courage and commitment from the local CFS. Across those nine decades, we celebrated three significant anniversaries that highlight the depth and history of this extraordinary brigade.

The first was the 70th anniversary of the opening of the station on Haines Road and the formal registration of the Tea Tree Gully brigade with the South Australian emergency services on 25 June 1955. The second was the 80th anniversary of the first eight members officially registered with the emergency services on 1 February 1945. The third, looking back even further, was the 90th anniversary of the pivotal meeting held by the District Council of Tea Tree Gully on 11 December 1935, where community members first gathered to organise a response to local fire risks. That gathering led to the formation of the Fire Fighting Association and the appointment of the district's first fire control officer.

This year is not only a moment of reflection, it is also a celebration of the people who continue this legacy. Current members of the brigade collectively hold over 850 years of service. That speaks volumes about the dedication, experience and enduring commitment of this community.

A special mention to Captain Rob Sandford for his leadership, and heartfelt congratulations to Jim Sandford, who was recognised in the King's Birthday Honours this year. This is an extraordinary effort because his brother, Rob, was also recognised years earlier for the same award: two brothers holding incredible service and recognised by the King's Birthday Honours. Thank you to Jim for his tireless effort and decades of service—almost 60 years.

Of course, the future of the brigade is in good hands too. The CFS cadets were a proud part of the celebrations. Their energy and enthusiasm were infectious. We heard from cadet Harry, who summed it up perfectly when he was asked what he loved most about the CFS cadets: it was quite simply 'community'. We wouldn't talk about the cadets without mentioning their CFS mum, Carol Frawley. Her care and mentorship for the cadets—including Ethan, Aidan, Zoe, Lachlan, Imogen, another Ethan, and Harry—is inspiring.

Looking ahead, we are building on this legacy of excellence. I am proud to acknowledge the recent state budget announcement of \$5.8 million in new funding to support structural firefighting training—a critical investment in volunteer safety and capability. This is thanks to the strong advocacy

of the CFS Volunteer Association, particularly Jeff Clark and Sonia St Alban, who worked tirelessly to ensure volunteers' voices were heard. Their efforts have helped deliver this training support for volunteers, which they deserve.

At the heart of this brigade, and across the CFS, our volunteers are our most valuable resource. Their local knowledge, passion and professionalism make them the world-class unit that they are.

ADELAIDE FESTIVALS

The Hon. J.S. LEE (14:39): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the minister representing the Minister for Arts about festival funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: On 12 June 2025, ABC news reported that two longstanding Adelaide festivals, the Cabaret Fringe Festival and the Beer & BBQ Festival, have been forced to shut down due to financial pressures. These festivals have played a vital role in enriching South Australia's winter cultural calendar and supporting local creative industries. Despite their cultural and economic contributions, they have struggled to access consistent government support. The 2025-26 state budget allocates less funding to the CreateSA grants program than the estimated actuals for the previous financial year.

The outgoing CEO of Festival City Adelaide, Justyna Jochym, spoke at the SA Festival and Event Industry Policy Summit and highlighted that the biggest problem for the industry was a false dichotomy that the events and festivals were treated differently. As quoted by InDaily, Justyna said 'the consequences of this divide run deep and maintains a narrative that some formats are economic liabilities, while others are economic engines'. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why has the government allowed two well-established and community-driven festivals to collapse without providing targeted support?
2. What action will the government take to ensure the festivals, which are not classified as major events but are still culturally and economically significant, can access sustainable funding in future budgets?
3. Given that the government's own statement outlines its commitment to supporting a vibrant and inclusive arts sector, how does it reconcile with a budget that appears to leave many community-driven festivals unfunded?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:41): I thank the honourable member for her question and I will see what the minister from the other place can bring back.

WAGE EQUITY

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:41): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Industrial Relations on the topic of same job, same pay.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: This morning I met with Elizabeth and Erin, two working women on the frontline of our healthcare system. Elizabeth works at the Lyell McEwin Hospital, where she cooks meals and serves patients lying sick in their hospital beds. Elizabeth explained to me that, in addition to feeding the sick, she is often the only person many patients get to speak to in a whole day as she does her rounds. I also met Erin. Erin works in aged care in Barmera, looking after the elderly. She drove to Adelaide to share her story with me about chronic understaffing in the Riverland. They can't find enough aged-care staff because the wages are too low.

These two working women are literally caring for the sick and the elderly and they can't make ends meet because they are paid 20 per cent less than their interstate workmates doing the same job. My questions to the Minister for Industrial Relations are:

1. Does the minister think Elizabeth and Erin are worth less than their interstate workmates doing the same job?

2. Does the Labor government support the principle of same job, same pay and, if so, will they commit to paying South Australian healthcare workers the same as their workmates employed interstate and federally?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:42): I thank the honourable member for his questions, and I congratulate him on meeting workers who are absolutely critical to keeping South Australians healthy, safe and ticking over. I, too, have had the privilege today of meeting a number of workers from right around South Australia, right across the metropolitan area, and people who work in aged-care hospitals in Ceduna, Mount Gambier, Whyalla, Port Lincoln and Murray Bridge, who I was fortunate to discuss matters with today.

I absolutely agree with the honourable member that many of these workers, who do things like sterilise instruments that then operate on people, are, as the honourable member said, sometimes the only person a person living with a disability or in an aged-care setting talk to during the day. These workers are not just simply working in those areas; they in a critical way keep South Australians healthy, keep South Australians safe and look after many in South Australia. The honourable member is right: some of these workers are among the very lowest paid in South Australia.

I wish to acknowledge the union that represents many of these workers, the United Workers Union, with whom I have had a very long association, as have a number of my colleagues, including the Hon. Mira El Dannawi, who has had a very long association working with and in industries that the United Workers Union represents. We are absolutely committed to real wage increases for these workers.

We have had a number of very productive negotiations with the union that represents these workers, and I am very pleased to say that in a number of areas we found many points of agreement, including very substantial wage increases to bring people up to federal levels, particularly in the disability and aged-care areas. We are not quite there yet, but I am confident that with the goodwill that is being shown, and the recognition of the work that many of these people do for other South Australians, we will come to an agreement that we will see real wage increases for some of the lowest paid South Australians.

HEALTHCARE SECTOR WORKERS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:45): Supplementary: does the minister share the view of the Premier that workers who are demanding fair pay are belligerent, and will he be supporting the campaign of the United Workers Union for these workers to get fair pay?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:45): Certainly, I think that some of the very lowest paid South Australian workers working in some of the most critical areas in our state, working for some of the people who have the most complex needs in our state, do deserve real wage increases that recognise the work they do. That is what we are working on with the union to find an outcome.

HEALTHCARE SECTOR WORKERS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:45): Supplementary: what steps is the minister taking to address the clear link between low public sector wages, the growing recruitment and retention crisis, and the increase in agency privatisation by stealth, in effect?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is something that has been raised not just today, when I had the privilege of meeting with many of these workers, but at other times when I have met with workers in these industries in their workplaces, in my office, in the Deputy Premier's office, to discuss issues. That certainly has been raised.

That is one of the reasons, although not the primary reason. The primary reason is to make sure that people who are working in these roles receive real wage increases, properly paid. It does

have the benefit, as well, of making that work more attractive. Better pay will attract more workers, recognising that it is a very tight labour market and there are many areas that are finding it difficult to attract workers right across the economy and in industries in South Australia at the moment.

HEALTHCARE SECTOR WORKERS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:46): Supplementary: does the minister agree that paying workers fairly is a far more cost effective and sustainable solution than relying on expensive short-term external labour?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:46): That is exactly what we are looking to do to make sure there are real wage increases. As I said, I am pleased at some of the progress that we have made towards that today.

HEALTHCARE SECTOR WORKERS

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:47): Final supplementary: does the minister agree that workers' claims for an immediate, fair and just pay rise of 20 per cent, followed by 5 per cent per year for each of the following two years is reasonable, especially given their vital work and the impact this work has on improving the ramping crisis? After all, that was a key pledge of the Labor Party at the last election.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:47): I thank the honourable member for the invitation to essentially negotiate with him in the Legislative Council today in terms of headline wage increases. The member will be disappointed that I do not intend to enter into those negotiations right now, but we will continue those negotiations with the union that represents the workers. I must say that the honourable member has many, many skills, but I suspect the union and their leadership are probably just a little more experienced at those sorts of negotiations, so I will leave that to them.

HEALTHCARE SECTOR WORKERS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing questions to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector about union action.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: The opposition spoke recently to a lady who regularly travels 170 kilometres each way to and from public hospitals for neurology appointments on a pathway to a multiple sclerosis diagnosis. Sometimes her hands do not work, sometimes her throat does not work well. Her husband's farm income has dried up with the drought, and her two children have regular extracurricular activities before and after school.

Today, her stress levels were elevated due to her being unsure if her appointments will or will not go ahead during the proposed doctors strike. After so much family preparation and planning to make these important appointments happen, she is concerned the four of them will drive up to Adelaide only to have to turn around again. My question to the Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector are:

1. Can the minister guarantee that scheduled appointments will go ahead when people like this lady travel to Adelaide during proposed strike action?
2. To that end, what guarantees can the government give any patient, local or regional, that their appointments will go ahead?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:49): I thank the honourable member for her question, and that is in relation to action that is being taken by doctors in our public health system who are represented by SASMOA, the association that is effectively the doctors' union. I think I commented yesterday, when asked in the media about planned industrial action, that it would be preferable if that union's leadership was able to rule out any effect on patient safety for action that

they are taking. It is not up to me as the industrial relations minister; that is something that is in the hands of the union that represents doctors.

I think it has been publicly ventilated that there is a claim from the doctors' union for a 30 per cent pay rise over three years. I think the Premier, the Treasurer and others have said that is not going to happen. That sort of pay increase, particularly for senior doctors, some who earn many, many hundreds of thousands of dollars a year, would equate to pay rises—just pay rises over three years—of some hundreds of thousands, \$300,000 or \$400,000 for some of the best paid doctors. When you think about that sort of pay rise and the number of hospital orderlies that could employ, or the number of disability care workers or aged-care workers that could be employed from a pay rise over three years—just a pay rise, not base pay—of \$300,000 or \$400,000, I think most South Australians would say that is not a valuable way for the state government to spend its money.

I would very much hope that the union that represents doctors is able to, if they are taking the action, do it in such a way that does not compromise public safety because a 30 per cent pay rise over three years for senior doctors, many of whom are already the best paid in the whole of the country, is not something we are able to contemplate.

HEALTHCARE SECTOR WORKERS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary: what engagement has the minister had with the union to ensure that medical services are not impacted during any planned strikes?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:51): I thank the honourable member for her question. I know that officials from the state government, from the Industrial Relations and Policy branch of state government, from the health sector and a number of ministers regularly engage with unions on a whole range of matters.

BYARD, EMERITUS PROFESSOR R.W.

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:51): My question is to the Attorney-General. Will the Attorney-General inform the council about South Australian Professor Roger William Byard's recognition in the 2025 King's Birthday Honours?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:52): I would be most happy to do so. It is with some pride that we can celebrate the appointment of Professor Roger William Byard as a Companion of the Order of Australia in the 2025 King's Birthday Honours. This achievement is one of the highest civilian accolades that can be bestowed in Australia and was bestowed in recognition of his service to medicine, forensic pathology, tertiary education and the broader community.

It also, I must add, is an additional set of letters for what is already a formidable set of letters for Dr Professor Byard AC PSM PhD, MD, DSc, FAHMS, BMedSci, MB, BS, MMedSci-paed, FCAP, FRCPC, FRCPath, FRCPA, FFFLM, FFSc, FRSN, FFPMI. So a couple of more letters to add to the many, many letters this distinguished professor already has.

Professor Byard's career has crossed the globe over four decades, during which he has made significant contributions to forensic pathology and public health. He qualified in medicine in Australia in 1978 from the University of Tasmania, became a fellow of the College of Pathologists across the world and was registered as an expert with the International Criminal Court in The Hague in 2009. I recall having met Professor Byard when awarding him the Justice Ted Mullighan Outstanding Case Award at the Forensic Science Awards in 2023 for his work in the Jasmeen Kaur murder case. His pathological findings demonstrated the manner of the death in this case, after which the accused pleaded guilty.

Along with contributing to just outcomes in matters like this, Professor Byard has also played a crucial role in some of the most challenging forensic science investigations of our time. He was integral to identifying victims in the Bali bombings in 2002, and the Boxing Day tsunami in 2004,

providing closure to grieving families. His experience has also extended to international efforts, including the investigation of the 1995 Serbian massacre in Bosnia.

Although this brief synopsis of his outstanding career does read like an index of some of the worst examples of human suffering, the professor's work has also undertaken some groundbreaking work to preserve human life at its earliest stages. His pioneering research into sudden infant death syndrome has been instrumental in advancing our understanding of this tragic phenomenon, leading to improved prevention strategies and saving countless young lives.

As an academic, Professor Byard has been a pillar of the University of Adelaide, holding the George Richard Marks Chair of Pathology from 2006 to 2023. His dedication to education has shaped the minds of countless medical students and professionals, fostering a new generation of forensic experts. I would like to extend my warmest congratulations to Professor Byard on this extraordinary honour. His unwavering commitment to science, to education and to humanity exemplifies the very best of South Australia.

DISABILITY SUPPORT WORKERS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:55): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General, in his capacity as Minister for Industrial Relations, a question about disability sector support workers.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Disability support officers employed by DHS have been earning less than the federal award minimum wage rate of pay, despite the state government receiving federal funding for wages at higher rates of pay through the NDIS. A certificate III qualified disability services officer today earns \$222.50 less than the equivalent lowest paid worker.

Hundreds of members of the United Workers Union, which has already been referenced, have provided responses to a survey outlining how persistent low wages and the cost-of-living crisis are currently affecting them. It paints a dire picture, where South Australian public servants are unable to afford even the most basic necessities on their current wage.

In DHS, there has been a 20 per cent reduction in full-time equivalent staffing levels as workers leave the sector, with 19 per cent of new disability support officers recruited between 1 July 2023 and 2 December 2024 already having resigned. My questions to the minister are:

1. How does the minister justify the government retaining more than 20 per cent of the federal funding it receives by the NDIS specifically for disability services officers' wages and not passing this on to workers supporting some of the most complex people living with disabilities in our state?
2. What commitment is the government making to address this and back pay those workers since the disparity emerged?
3. When did the disparity emerge?
4. Does the minister acknowledge that even with the 20 per cent issue being addressed those workers will still remain amongst the lowest paid workers in the nation?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:57): I thank the member for her question. I don't have the date of that federal wage case in the federal system for the federal award. They are, of course, different systems, federal and state industrial relations systems. However—and I think it was mentioned in the function that was held during the lunch break today in the Balcony Room—one thing that we have committed to at this stage in the negotiations that we are up to, should we come to an agreement, is remedying that, to make sure that in the state public system we are looking to pay the wages in the future that are reflected in the federal system. Although they are different systems, that is something we are looking to remedy in this round of enterprise bargaining.

DISABILITY SUPPORT WORKERS

The Hon. C. BONAROS (14:58): Supplementary question: does remedying that issue include back paying of the 20 per cent?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (14:58): Once again, similar to the Hon. Robert Simms, I very much appreciate the invitation to have the Hon. Connie Bonaros act as a bargaining agent for some of our workers in South Australia, but I am afraid I am going to leave it to those within the union who are doing the negotiating.

ADELAIDE BEACH MANAGEMENT REVIEW

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:59): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General, as the representative of the government, regarding the Adelaide Beach Management Review and sand.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: On Tuesday 24 June, despite a forecast high tide and storms with both strong wind warnings and rain, DEW continued to cart at least 15 trucks of quarried sand to the Henley Sailing Club beach ramp. One of the comments on the Save West Beach Sand's Facebook page states that 'a significant amount got washed away in the tide last night, straight into the water'. I understand this is disputed by the government. According to InDaily media, the department says that 'crews reached their target of 200,000 cubic metres for this financial year'. My questions for the Attorney are:

1. Was there a rush to dump 15 trucks of sand that day, knowing that it was a high tide and storm, purely to meet an end of financial year target?
2. Will the government admit that its handling of the Adelaide Beach Management Review has been purely political to keep the Deputy Premier's constituents happy, regardless of outcomes further south along the coastline?
3. When is this government actually going to fix metropolitan beaches and ensure equity of sand across the metro beaches?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:00): I thank the honourable member for her question. The day-to-day management of sand on our beaches is something that DEW does and the relevant minister has responsibility for. Certainly, the program looking at the northern cells between the West Beach-Henley Beach area, up to the Largs area, is something that I have been delegated to look at for the government's response for a long-term solution. We had a commitment to a proper, thorough scientific investigation of what the solutions might be.

I do not have full answers in relation to the day-to-day management at West Beach. I do know that there is, I understand—and the honourable member made reference to it—something like 200,000 cubic metres of quarry sand being delivered to West Beach in the 2024-25 financial year, which I believe is the largest amount that has ever been replenished there in one year. There is a program that DEW has to replenish sand, but we are also looking at what will or may need to be done in relation to mass nourishment of sand and annual sand recycling.

ADELAIDE BEACH MANAGEMENT REVIEW

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:01): Supplementary: for the questions that the minister says he does not have answers, will he agree to take those on notice? Who are members of parliament supposed to question, given they can't question the environment minister and this minister refuses to answer anything in detail?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:02): I said I don't have responsibility for the day-to-day management of sand, but having had some information in front of me I was able to answer the questions for the honourable member.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

ADELAIDE BEACH MANAGEMENT REVIEW

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (15:02): Supplementary: will the minister come back to confirm whether or not \$14 million worth of quarry sand was wasted by DEW that day?

The PRESIDENT: I think we did talk about sand mining; it is close enough.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:03): I am happy to answer this because it actually does raise a good point and we now know it is the whole of the South Australian Liberal Party who are effectively climate change deniers, whose state council voted against—

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Point of order: the Leader of the Government is verballing me.

The PRESIDENT: Look, I think we have had enough.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: And you know my views on this because they are publicly available—very publicly available.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I want to keep moving.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister speak to the chamber about her visit to Black Rock and Laura yesterday to speak to farmers about the impact of drought in their regional communities?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:04): I thank the honourable member for his question. As I mention regularly in this chamber, agriculture is vital to our state's economy, and our farmers and regional communities are currently in need of support due to the drought gripping most of the state.

Primary producers in South Australia are facing extreme challenges, with one of the worst production seasons in many years, as drought conditions combine with other compounding issues, such as frost, biosecurity outbreaks, and market fluctuations. That is why the state government announced its over \$73 million package in drought support in April this year, with wideranging support measures to address various areas in need, which built on the package announced in November 2024.

As I have also mentioned many times in this chamber, this government's drought support is based on advice from well-respected industry groups as well as farmers on the ground, who I have been meeting with for many, many months since the middle of last year. Yesterday, I went to Black Rock and then to Laura. I am very grateful to the farmers who generously took time out of their busy schedules yesterday to meet with me.

At Black Rock Ag I met with Jim, Gaye, Tom and Sam who, despite their own struggles at the moment with the impacts of drought, invited me into their home and talked with me over lunch prepared by Gaye. The generosity of this family speaks to the spirit of the farming communities. From Black Rock I headed to Laura and met with Andrew and Graham. I had open discussions with all the farmers that I met with yesterday about the drought, about the government support and the impact on farmers and the communities. Andrew at Laura Hills Farm was also a recipient of some donated fodder in the recent Rapid Relief Team charity hay run in Jamestown, which was supported by the state government through the transport subsidy as part of the \$73 million drought support package.

Following the meeting at Laura, I headed to Watervale for the Clare Valley Wine inaugural members and sponsors mixer event. At this event, it was good to connect and have more conversations about drought and its impact, this time on the wine industry. There were also a number of farmers, people within other agricultural sectors present as well.

Across these conversations throughout the day and evening, it was good to hear about different people in different industries utilising the state government's support package in various different ways, including through use of the On-farm Drought Infrastructure Rebate Scheme, which has received over 2,600 applications now. It was also fantastic to hear, earlier in the week, from Myponga farmer Ash Pacitti that his application for the rebate, which he was using for a new hay shed, was a quick and straightforward process, approved within 17 days.

This government's drought support is flexible and responsive to feedback. As the drought continues, I will continue to meet directly with farmers as well as with industry bodies and engage with them to receive advice so that the support package is tailored appropriately.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:07): Supplementary: within that support, when will the state government provide no and low concessional loans given RIC loans are 5.81 per cent and variable and not feasible for many farmers?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:07): Did I mention RIC loans?

The PRESIDENT: I don't think so.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti: You mentioned support. Your whole thing was about drought support, Clare. Are you kidding me?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: You know I have answered the question already.

SEX EDUCATION

The Hon. S.L. GAME (15:07): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, representing the education minister, regarding visual resources used for sexual education classes in South Australian schools.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: A book titled *Sex: Safe and Fun—Support Person's Guide* is on the teacher catalogue for SHINE SA, which is one of only three approved sex education providers for Australian public schools that choose to source classes externally. The book has not been classified by the Australian Classification Board and it contains what a South Australian based classifier has described as a 'clear instruction of paedophilia'.

Presently, not all visual resources used for teaching health, sex and relationship classes are required to be officially classified. My questions to the Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, representing the education minister, are:

1. Does the government agree that all visual resources should be officially classified before being made available to use for teaching health, sex and relationship classes in South Australia, and will the government commit to investigating why this is not happening?
2. Does the government accept that there is a current risk to South Australian schoolchildren being sexualised by the education system and acknowledge the widespread parental concern on this matter?
3. Does the government agree that is in fact parents, and not schools or government, who are in charge of the moral and ethical teaching of children?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:09): I thank the member for her question. I am happy to refer that and see what the minister can bring back.

FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation prior to asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding the South Australian forensic centre.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: As has been referenced in previous questions today, the 2024-25 budget revealed that the South Australian forensic centre will be delivered three years later than forecast, in June 2031. I acknowledge that the Attorney-General spoke on ABC radio regarding this yesterday, although when asked during estimates, the Attorney said the reason for the delay was that 'the revised project completion date will more closely align with the proposed lease period of the existing facilities'. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Was the lease expiry date of the Divett Place facility known when the project was first budgeted?
2. Has the government received advice from Forensic Science SA about the risks associated with extended use of the current Divett Place facility specifically around issues that could compromise the accuracy, timeliness or integrity of forensic analysis?
3. Can the Attorney provide assurances to the people of South Australia that the facility will be ready by June 2031?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:10): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will reiterate again that there is a stark policy difference between the Labor government and the former Liberal government and now Liberal opposition in relation to this matter. The Forensic Science Centre in Adelaide does remarkable work. Its scientists are world-recognised. In fact, in a question I had earlier today I talked about one of the world-renowned scientists from Forensic Science SA who received a King's Birthday Honours this year.

We have come to government and made the decision that the scientists who work there deserve a new, purpose-built Forensic Science Centre to do the important work they do. Those opposite had a policy. Their policy was to do nothing—to do nothing at all about it. So there is a very, very different—

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: A stark difference.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: —a stark difference in terms of our attitudes towards this. We will build, and we have budgeted to build, a new, purpose-built Forensic Science Centre. The Liberal Party and the Liberal opposition have a policy to do nothing, as was reflected from their four years in government.

In relation to the building of a new Forensic Science Centre, it is important to get this right. The honourable member in his—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: The honourable member reflected in his question the importance of making sure that it is a fit-for-purpose Forensic Science Centre. We have seen issues raised around the world and in other states—I think Queensland is an example of that—where contamination of samples has occurred, which has caused significant problems. The science centre, where it is, has proven to help the world-class scientists operate efficiently and effectively, but we recognise it does need a new, purpose-built centre rather than the current premises at Divett Place that I have visited a couple of times. That is what we are doing.

In terms of making sure we get it right, we won't apologise for making sure that the design phase that it's now in is done thoroughly to make sure, as best we can, we don't see some of the problems we have seen in other places around the world.

In relation to, I think, the very first part of the question the honourable member asked about reasons that it's 2031 rather than 2028, yes, a factor, I am advised, is lease arrangements, but that is just one of the factors. Also included are making sure we get it right on what is a very, very individualised project. There are no other of these sorts of things in South Australia, and they are very unique and very one-off projects to build.

FORENSIC SCIENCE CENTRE

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:13): Supplementary: can the Attorney-General advise the chamber whether the lease expiry date for the Divett Place facility was known when the project was first budgeted, given that this will now be delivered three years late?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:13): I don't have details, but I am happy to go away and look for them. But I do know a lot of leases are structured in terms of options for leasing. I think, and I am happy to go away and check, that the lease is managed by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport as many government leases are, but I am happy to go away and check on those.

HAWKE HOUSE

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (15:14): My question to the Leader of the Government is: will the government join me in congratulating South Australian design architects Mulloway Studio on its nomination for a national architecture award for their work on the Hawke House in Bordertown?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector, Special Minister of State) (15:15): I am happy to answer that as Leader of the Government but also as Minister for Industrial Relations because, of course, Robert James Lee Hawke, former Prime Minister, was also head of the trade union movement in Australia, one of the movement's great leaders before he entered politics.

I am aware that Bob Hawke's childhood home—the home of the 23rd Prime Minister of Australia—is in Bordertown. I have had the opportunity a number of times, when travelling through Bordertown, to stop by that home. It is an important historic part of South Australia. Aside from being a Labor legend, a trade union legend and this country's third longest serving Prime Minister, Bob Hawke is the only Australian Prime Minister to have been born in South Australia.

Hawke House is Bob Hawke's childhood home and is now a fantastic accommodation venue and tourist attraction in the Upper South-East town of Bordertown. The house itself was constructed in 1885 as a bank office and manager's residence before being bought by the Congregational Church. Bob Hawke's father was Bordertown's Congregational minister between 1928 and 1935, and it was during the family's time there that Bob was born in 1929.

The Hawke family left the house in 1935 and over the years it went through a number of changes in use and ownership until it was acquired in 2021 by the Tatiara District Council, with support from the commonwealth government. The house has undergone a three-quarters of a million dollar renovation and is now open as visitor accommodation, providing a unique tourist experience for those visiting Bordertown. Who wouldn't want to stay in the house that Bob Hawke lived in in his youngest years?

The extensive renovations were designed by South Australian design architects Mulloway Studio. The project emphasised preserving the unique and historic features of the home while also ensuring that it was fit for modern use, including features such as wheelchair accessibility. The house now features snippets of Bob Hawke's story, including wallpaper as well as artefacts scattered throughout the home.

South Australians should be rightly proud of not only this attraction but the recognition that the project is receiving. I am advised that Anthony Coupe and his team at Mulloway are nominees for this year's Australian Institute of Architects national Architecture Awards, and I am sure that members will join me in wishing best hopes for Mulloway Studio in this weekend's awards, and encouraging all those visiting Bordertown to take a look at this unique attraction. If you need somewhere to stay in that area, do yourself a favour and stay in Bob Hawke's house.

GIRLS AND WOMEN PARTICIPATION IN SPORTS

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Will the minister inform the council about the Malinauskas government's efforts to increase girls' and women's participation in sport?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:18): I thank the honourable member for her question about supporting women's participation in sport, a goal this government is proud to lead with a vision, action and meaningful investments. Following the inspiring achievements of the Matildas during the 2023 World Cup, the Malinauskas Labor government committed \$18 million over three years to create a lasting legacy for women and girls in sport.

From grassroots change rooms to elite pathways, the Power of Her—Infrastructure and Participation Program is now driving change across our state. This year, we have stepped up again with more than \$9.1 million being made available in this round, the biggest round yet to support clubs and organisations that are removing barriers and making sport more inclusive, safe and empowering for South Australian women and girls.

Through this initiative we are not just investing in infrastructure, we are also investing in equity in participation and in changing the sporting culture. Our focus is clear: to ensure that every woman and girl in South Australia has the opportunity to lead, thrive and stay engaged in the sports they love.

In recent rounds we have seen how impactful this program can be. In Port Pirie, for example, the netball association used its \$200,000 grant to resurface 12 netball courts. This upgrade has enabled over 600 players and volunteers to participate all year round, from juniors right through to adults. It is growing team numbers, boosting community pride and helping girls feel valued and included.

We know that this is an incredibly powerful program that has helped so many people within our community. We look forward to the momentum continuing, particularly with this new round and where it can take not only our girls but our women in their sport.

Bills

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: To save time, I might ask a lot of my questions during the clause 1 stage, if that is agreeable to you. My first question relates to the status of the plan for the redevelopment. Can the minister advise: what is the status of this plan, has it been shared with the government and has it been shared with LIV Golf?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the member for his question. I am advised that the plans are currently under development.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Has the minister seen any project scope for the plans? What guidance has the government provided to Greg Norman Golf Course Design to inform the development of the plan?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: My understanding is that it is being developed at this point in time by Greg Norman Golf Course Design, and once those designs are available we will be able to work through them.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Has the government provided Greg Norman Golf Course Design with any guidelines to inform the development of this plan? Have such guidelines been developed in consultation with LIV Golf, the city council or any other players?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As you may be able to appreciate, we are not golf course designers, that is why we are engaging the Greg Norman Design Group to come up with what a world championship golf course would look like.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: So the government has not provided any guidance to Greg Norman Golf Course Design in terms of what they are considering here—it is literally, 'Here's your budget, go for gold, do whatever you like, there's no parameters around that'?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As a government we are working with what our expectations would be, as we have highlighted with this bill that is before us today, with trees being preserved as much as possible, but we are working through what a world championship golf course is required to be.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Has that information been provided to the brief that has been provided to Greg Norman designs? For instance, has the government said they want to retain trees? Have they talked about limiting impact on Parklands, and the like? I am trying to get to the bottom of exactly what guidance has been provided to Greg Norman designs. I find it hard to believe that the government would just say, 'Do whatever you want.'

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: You can appreciate—and I think this has been mentioned a few times in the other chamber as well—those design processes are being slowed down in some ways to make sure that there are opportunities to preserve as many trees as possible, and that has been one of our key focuses here as well, taking the time to get this right. The Greg Norman Golf Course Design team and the state government have been working together to come up with what that could look like.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greg Norman design team has been advised of the government's desire to preserve trees and green space? What other brief has been provided to Greg Norman Golf Course Design? The minister advised a moment ago that this is still being worked through, but then she indicated that the government is working in collaboration with Greg Norman Golf Course Design. So what is in and what is out of the brief?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised there are a number of things that we would like to focus on, and a lot of it is captured in the bill that is before us today. Aboriginal heritage is obviously a primary concern, and I have been advised that it is something we want to focus on. Public amenity is another and, as we highlighted earlier, it is really about the environment, with the trees and making sure that vegetation can be preserved as much as possible.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am a little bit confused here, because earlier on in my questioning, in response to my questions, the minister indicated that a brief had not been provided. Now it sounds like there has been a brief provided. Can the minister clarify whether the brief is simply what is within the legislation or is there other criteria that has been provided to Greg Norman design, and how did the government arrive at that criteria? What is in and what is out?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have been advised, we have a contract with them and they are to provide a range of services, a number of which we have already outlined not only in this bill but today as well. That is what we will be working through to try to achieve.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Will the minister make that contract publicly available so that members of parliament can see what is part of this contract with Greg Norman design and LIV Golf, given we are being asked to vote on this legislation today and we have not actually seen the plans?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised it is confidential. If we were to share the contract there would be confidential parts within the contract, so it is unable to be shared.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Does that contract involve a business plan? Bearing in mind that I asked the minister in this place, and I moved a motion, for the production of documents calling on the government to make the business case available. I was advised at the time that there was no such business case. Is it now the case that there is a business case as part of the contract?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the honourable member for his question. As I have said earlier, there is a lot to work through here and we continue to work through this. The bill before us today has made clear some of those provisions we are wanting to put in place, and we are working through what this new development could look like. At the end of the day, the importance of this is that we are building a golf course in place of a golf course. It is going to be an incredible facility that not only can be used at competition level but also as a public facility in South Australia, and it is one we are proud to be investing in.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I appreciate that there is a lot to work through, but at the same time we are being asked to make a decision on this today. Can the minister reveal whether or not there

are any financial obligations being placed on the state government as part of this contractual arrangement? Whether there is any minimum return that is being expected to LIV Golf as part of this contractual arrangement? Precisely what brief has been provided to Greg Norman design? The minister has said that some of this information is commercial-in-confidence, but can she provide the parliament with an update on the core elements that inform this contractual arrangement, given we are being asked to support the legislation that enables this?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have highlighted, there is quite an amount to work through but, at the end of the day, what we are talking about here is not just about a commercial golf course. This is about a public golf course as well. What we are enabling ourselves to do here is invest in an open space and do something that I think is being able to back in a really popular sport like golf. It is not just about the competition; this is also about how many South Australians will be able to benefit, and also how many interstate people will be able to benefit from this incredible investment as well. It is an investment in our open space. It is investment in sport and participation. It is also an investment in our Parklands.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just so I am clear, there is a contractual arrangement with the various players. We will not get an opportunity to see it. There is, obviously, a brief that has been provided to inform the plan, yet we will not get an opportunity to see it. Given this information is not being shared with the parliament, why on earth are we being asked to vote on this today?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have been advised, this bill is not about a contract with any organisation like LIV Golf, as you may be suggesting. It is really about enabling us to get on with investing in the North Adelaide Golf Course, which is a public golf course. Yes, it will be available for tournaments like LIV, but also available for many other public-facing opportunities, and also other competitions that may arise as well because of this investment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Does the contract give LIV Golf the power to pull out of any arrangement with the state government if they are not happy with the design?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I just advised earlier, it is my understanding that this particular bill before us today is not about a contract with any particular organisation. This bill before us today is about an investment in the North Adelaide public golf course, and what we are here to discuss is how are we investing in this site and the parameters around that investment.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Can I ask the minister just in relation to the contract, which follows a similar line of questioning to the Hon. Mr Simms: if the bill is not passed in the form that the government has tabled it, what is the understanding of the status of that contract? Is the contract dependent on this parliament passing the bill in the form the government has put it to the parliament?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As has been made very public, we are hoping to have this incredible event at the North Adelaide Golf Course by 2028, and this bill before us today enables us to achieve such an outcome, to be able to deliver on that commitment that we would have LIV Golf be able to participate at the North Adelaide Golf Course in 2028.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I thank the honourable minister for her answer, but she did not actually answer my question, which was: to what extent is the contract dependent on the bill passing pretty much in the entirety of the form in which it has been tabled?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I just highlighted in my previous answer, I am advised that, to be able to have the certainty that this event can go ahead in 2028, we need the provisions within this bill to ensure that we can get the course ready in time. As we know, this is not just about the incredible opportunity that will come about with these investments for the public but also the economic opportunities that will come about because of investments, of bringing LIV Golf not only to South Australia but then will be able to be also brought to the city.

We know that this event, year in and year out that it has been held in South Australia, has continued to grow, and the economic record of this being provided is just over \$81 million from the last event that was held here at the start of this year. We do not want to risk any of the opportunities that come with this event through not having the opportunity to progress with these required changes in North Adelaide. We want to get on and get it done so that we can make sure that we can bring

this economic opportunity to South Australia and also the opportunities that come with us investing in open space like North Adelaide Golf Course.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I thank the minister for that answer, but—and we have heard quite repeatedly about the need for the timeliness—can she list what aspects require the hasty delivery of this legislation, which will otherwise hold up the delivery of the golf course on time for 2028?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I can appreciate that these developments take time. I do not know how to build a golf course, but they take a substantial amount of time, and if we do not get onto this now we do put at risk the opportunity of holding this in 2028, because of the amount of work that is required to be achieved. The requirement of this bill before us today is to enable us to get on and do just that, to start to get everything in place to bring this up to a world championship level, so that we can continue to make not only the opportunity to bring many people to our state who may have not been here before but the economic opportunities that follow with that as well. That is why we need to get this bill before the parliament and through the parliament, so that we can get on with making sure that we can secure this event.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just on this issue of the contract, does the contract contain one or more schedules that specify what is to be delivered, by whom and by when? Are there sections of the contract that the minister could release publicly that are not commercial-in-confidence?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that there are confidentiality provisions within that contract that do prevent it from being released, but we are not really here to debate the contract; we are here to debate a bill that is enabling us to invest in the North Adelaide Golf Course, which is a public golf course, one that is there. Yes, it will help with this event, but it will help with us also investing in a public space that supports people's participation in golf.

We know that golf has become incredibly popular, and one of the key reasons for its popularity and its growth has been LIV Golf being here in South Australia. This is really about us being able to invest in sports participation, as well as enabling us to attract an event like LIV Golf to come here and enabling us to invest in a space that has not been invested in enough for some time.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: The minister has mentioned 2028 on multiple occasions. What discussions have occurred about LIV Golf for 2027? If Grange members vote against hosting in 2027, what is the government's contingency plan for LIV Golf in 2027?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am not really sure how that is relevant to this particular bill before us today.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (The Hon. I.K. Hunter): Order!

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The bill before us today is enabling us to do something quite unique, and that is to be able to invest in a public golf course. That is a good thing for us to be doing. It is enabling us to not only invest in open space, invest in being able to attract an event like LIV Golf, but also increase participation through having a public golf course that is available to South Australians.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Is there a chance that the golf course will be finished by 2027, because what is going to happen if Grange's members vote against hosting in 2027? What is the backup plan and are there any contingencies, or will there be the ability for this golf course to be finished by 2027 in order to host LIV Golf in 2027?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I said earlier, to be able to achieve a world championship golf course, as we are suggesting, this is required, hence we are trying to get this bill through parliament. This is because it will take some time to be able to get the golf course to the standard that is required. I have been advised that it is not anticipated it will be ready in 2027 and this is where we need this to be able to give the time to be able to get this golf course ready and get it through the parliament and that is why we are doing this today.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: What provisions or contingency planning is in place if no venue is secured for 2027, and what conversations have been had with Grange Golf Club in regard to their position on hosting in 2027?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the member for her question. Maybe I missed the section in the bill that refers to where every tournament of LIV Golf will be held. I am happy for her to organise a meeting—

The Hon. H.M. Girolamo interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (The Hon. I.K. Hunter): Order! This is not question time, it is the committee stage.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: —with the South Australian Tourism Commission where we can discuss further about where our LIV Golf events will be. As we highlighted previously, and I think as many people have highlighted, LIV Golf is a particularly popular event and one that has grown year in, year out. It is one that we know is well attended and it has been great to see not only our dedicated golfers go but young people as well. We are seeing participation in golf become a trend in the community, where we are seeing more people take it up than before.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Will LIV Golf concerts, including DJ sets, go ahead at the North Adelaide Golf Course in future years? Given the proximity to Calvary Hospital, how will the government manage noise and community impacts if concerts are held at North Adelaide?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that we are not envisaging those concerts to be held on the North Adelaide Golf Course and that is something we look forward to working through.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I have some questions about the so-called backup legislation, which is now 'the' legislation. In the media there was some discussion around backup legislation. When was the bill that we are dealing with today first made available to some members of the crossbench and when was it made available to the minister?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As the member would be very well aware, we do not discuss what we talk about in cabinet within the parliament. For any other questions in regard to members of the crossbench, you are welcome to ask those questions of them.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Why did the government not release the bill for public consultation, as is the usual practice?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I think I have answered this in a number of different ways, but I will repeat those words. I guess there is a need, with the amount of work that is required, to get this underway as quickly as possible. We have found that we have to be able to get on with it and getting this bill into the parliament and through the parliament is enabling us to do just that.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just to return to this issue of the secret contract, the bill before us provides for the minister to take over the Parklands for a championship course. Is the minister telling the chamber that there is no contract or heads of agreement with LIV Golf, or there is an arrangement and she just will not share with us what the heads of agreement are?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: When I was referencing the contract earlier—just in case there was confusion—it was in regard to the Greg Norman Golf Course Design; that is what I was referencing before.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: So there is no contract with LIV Golf; is that what the minister is saying?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that the South Australian Tourism Commission would likely have a contract with LIV Golf.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister confirm whether or not LIV Golf has a contract with the South Australian Tourism Commission, and is that contingent on the legislation being delivered in its current form and them being satisfied with any redevelopment plan?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that the South Australian Tourism Commission does have a contract with LIV Golf.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister advise what the nature of that contract is—to the point that the Hon. Michelle Lensink touched on earlier? Is it the case that an element of the contract relates to the legislation that is before us today and this legislation being passed in its current form? Does the contract also deal with LIV Golf's satisfaction with any golf course redevelopment plan?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that the contract does require LIV Golf to be held in North Adelaide in 2028.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I asked a question in the second reading about ambush marketing, and I will explain it further. Ambush marketing is a provision under the Major Events Act and this legislation anticipates that the Major Events Act will be activated for these events. Ambush marketing entails that a person must not participate in ambush marketing in relation to a major event to which that section of the Major Events Act is declared to apply, with a maximum penalty in the case of a body corporate of some \$250,000, or, in the case of a natural person, some \$50,000. So these are quite significant penalties.

The reason I raise it is because while I think the legislation is anticipating somebody trying to pretend to be the event and making money out of the event in that way, my concern is for reasonable political discourse. As I outlined in my second reading speech and alluded to, there may be people who have protest signs, for example, or perhaps T-shirts that might say 'LIV Golf' and instead of 'LIV Golf: Golf But Louder', it might say 'LIV Golf: Golf But Bloodier', using the logo. Will that be subject to these ambush marketing provisions, or will the government guarantee people the freedom of political communication?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that this bill is not proposing to change any of the requirements of the Major Events Act.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I am not asking for the government to change the Major Events Act here and now. What I am saying is: given the controversy around the human rights abuses associated with the Public Investment Fund, will the government guarantee, in relation to those parts of the Major Events Act, that—not ticket scalping, for example, and not other provisions that allow them to shut down roads and the like but those ambush marketing provisions that could, in fact, penalise what would otherwise be lawful political communication appropriating the LIV Golf branding and language—the government will not clamp down on democracy like they do currently under the Saudi Arabian regime?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As per my previous answer, I have been advised that we are not proposing to alter any part of the Major Events Act in regard to this event.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Did the proposal for Greg Norman designs to undertake this work go through the standard government procurement process?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that we utilised established government procurement processes to achieve the outcome.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just to circle back to the confidential contract, can the minister advise precisely what is confidential in terms of the brief required for the design being sought by Greg Norman designs? Also, why is the timing confidential? Surely she can advise us on those things.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that the entire contract has confidentiality provisions attached to it, but as I have said earlier, the aim here is to be able to provide a golf course at championship level by 2028.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: So the minister is seriously advising that the contract in its entirety is subject to confidentiality arrangements?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that is correct.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Will payments to Greg Norman's company be required to be disclosed in the annual report?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Considering the confidentiality of those provisions, I would have to take that on notice.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: How many other companies were invited to tender for the design or redevelopment work of North Adelaide Golf Course?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised there is a direct contact with the Greg Norman Golf Course Design team and that others have also been engaged to support that process.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Who else has been engaged at this stage?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that there are different services that we can call upon to be able to provide support to the development of this significant investment. One would be through architectural heritage, Aboriginal heritage and urban planning and engagement. They will help with that engagement process.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the minister confirm whether the area of Beaumont Road is going to be included within the prescribed area and, if so, whether key stakeholders have been advised of this?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I understand that within the bill the minister has the opportunity to prescribe the project and where it will be located, so it is not up to myself to be able to rule in or rule out where that would be.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: So there has been no suggestion made to key stakeholder groups that Beaumont Road might be in contemplation?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: That is something I am happy to take further on notice for the member.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: One of the provisions in the bill, and I believe it is at clause 13, relates to nuisance complaints. Activities that are carried out as part of a designated event are not subject to the usual nuisance requirements. What does that mean for residents who might live opposite should they wish to make noise complaints?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: In regard to this bill, it is about making sure that this event can be successful and can be achieved and be able to provide those opportunities for our state to be able to hold events, but also to be able to invest in this site, which is a dedicated public golf course. The provisions that are within this bill enable us to achieve an outcome that will enable us to hold not only LIV Golf with the requirements of the fund that goes with LIV Golf but also regarding what those investments look like for a public golf course.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: But why is the government seeking to override the provisions of the Environment Protection Act during the declared period of events? What precisely does it contemplate for the Parklands?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that this simply mirrors other legislation in regard to major events and it has similar wording to those.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: What is the estimated annual cost to maintain the golf course once redeveloped?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I am sure the honourable member can appreciate, once we have the designs available to us, we will also be able to have more of an understanding of what those future maintenance costs would be.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: I certainly do appreciate that, but I would also appreciate, given the significant amount of taxpayer funds that are being invested, knowing if there is a business case or something where you have done some sort of forecasting on the amounts that would be both expended on an annual basis but also the expected income that is likely to come through as well from memberships and other forms of income.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As we have highlighted a number of times, I think the modelling we can base this on at the moment is the fact that this has been an event that has continued to grow, in regard to the economic income from this event. We know that it has been an incredible opportunity for our state to be able to benefit from an event like LIV Golf and also other events that we have been able to bring to South Australia like Gather Round.

We know that these are not just about people being able to go along to sport; they are about getting people into our hotel rooms and our restaurants and also seeing how busy our airport becomes over that period as well. This provides an economic opportunity for our state, which is why we find this is an important public space to be investing in.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: So, to confirm, there is no business case or modelling on what is likely to be occurring once the North Adelaide Golf Course is up and running. Given this, how confident are you about how much taxpayers will be required to contribute on an ongoing basis for operations of the golf course, and has this been factored into the forward estimates?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As previously stated, I am advised that once we have a clearer understanding of what the design will look like we will also have an understanding of what those ongoing maintenance costs will be. But just to highlight again, in 2025 the event delivered over \$81 million to the South Australian economy, I am advised, which was up 14 per cent from the previous year. That is a significant economic boost for our state.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: I appreciate that, and I believe the Premier has also said that for 51 weeks of the year it is going to be operating as a normal golf course. So what planning has been done on that front to fully understand what the cost or potential burden on taxpayers will be in regard to the costs of running the golf course?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The government makes significant investments in our public spaces. If I was to look at those investments over the years in our Parklands from this government, we have seen investments in the Marshmallow Park Playspace and into the wetlands in Victoria Park. Governments have continued to make investments in our Parklands because we know, as you have rightly pointed out, these are public spaces. This again is enabling us to invest in a public space—one that we can have more utilisation of.

This brings me to the John E Brown Park, which I have taken the time to go and look at before coming into this chamber to debate this bill. I have to say, I was very shocked at what I saw. It is not an overstatement to say that it is underutilised; it is incredibly underutilised. There are tyres, there are irrigation systems piled up in a heap, there is dirt piled and it is not a nice site.

I live in the city and I love the city and its Parklands, but when you walk past a Parkland like John E Brown you know that this could be far better than what it is at the moment. I think this is an incredible investment to be making so that we can bring it up to a standard that is reflective of other parklands in our community, particularly in the Adelaide region.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: In regard to the ongoing cost of running the North Adelaide Golf Course, has any amount or allocation been included in the forward estimates for the operations of the North Adelaide Golf Course? Yes or no?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have previously stated, the designs of this golf course are ongoing and underway. Once we have an understanding of what those designs look like, we will be able to have an understanding of what the ongoing maintenance looks like. As I have advised the chamber already, the investment opportunities that come with this event—which is a once-off event for the year, but other opportunities will then come about because we are bringing this up to a world championship level golf course—will bring other opportunities for our state at an economic level but also at a sports participation as well. More people can be active and out in a public space that can be more utilised.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I have some general questions. The Hon. Heidi Girolamo asked about Calvary North Adelaide Hospital. Have they been formally consulted in any way and can the minister, the government, guarantee that there will be no loss of car parking in that part of North Adelaide?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that it comes down to that design phase as well. Once we have an understanding of what the golf course can look like, it provides an opportunity to do consultation at that point.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: In a similar vein, I ask about road closures. Which roads does the government anticipate will need to be closed temporarily during tournaments or whatever they are called—championships?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that, like most construction programs, they will have a better understanding once the design is available to them as to what would be required.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: My question is about permanent road closures. Can the minister rule out the need for any permanent road closures in North Adelaide or the Parklands, such as Memorial Drive, as a result of the new golf course?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that there is no desire to close any of the major roads.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: But can the minister, just for the record, rule it out or not?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that we would not be closing any of the major roads.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I have listened with interest to the discussion around the business case and the design, of course, and I spoke in my second reading about the fact that we are dealing with the legislation in advance of the design, for the reasons that have already been outlined. For clarity though, I think it is important—and I am asking the minister this question—when the government is in a position to share the design plans, can we anticipate it will also be in the position, as it has stated previously, to share the business case or at least those elements of the business case that are not subject to the confidentiality restrictions that she has spoken of, as the government has previously indicated?

I refer specifically to the order of production of documents that was moved in this place and the advice provided to members during that debate, noting that the government did indicate that it would do so at that point in time.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I appreciate the member's question, and I am sure other members can appreciate that it is not just up to one individual in a chamber to determine what the government's decisions will be, and that is why it would be a matter for us to work through what would be available.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: On that score, when that plan is concluded, will the minister commit to conducting public consultation around that, or will the only consultation be with LIV Golf?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have said before, this event in itself speaks for how successful it is. We have an event that has generated over \$81 million in economic benefit for our state in just one year. That is an incredible success; it is a 14 per cent increase on the previous year. That in itself demonstrates the success of this event.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am not sure if the minister missed my question. What I was asking about was consultation on any draft plan. Once the plan is developed by Greg Normal design, will that be put out for public consultation so that members of the community can have their say on how public money is being spent?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am sure, as a government, we look forward to sharing those designs with the public when they are available. As we have said before, there is a lot of excitement around this event, and when they are able to be made available to the public I am sure we will be very excited to share them.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

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

Amendment No 1 [Lensink-1]—

Page 3, lines 10 to 12 [clause 3, definitions of *approved event* and *approved event support zone*]—Delete the definitions of *approved event* and *approved event support zone*

This brings forward provisions in the bill to this point, essentially for the purpose of taking part 4 out. One of the amendments that is further down in the pack removes part 4, which starts at clause 17, so these two set that up, if you like. The purpose behind it is that we would like the government to come back to parliament rather than doing this blanket 'everything happens now and nobody shall ever have any say on this forever more'. Essentially, this requires the government to come back to the parliament to do further work down the track rather than doing it all at the same time.

I will speak to amendment No. 2 at the same time, because it is consequential on amendment No. 1. The new 3A(1)(c) is new, and just reinforces what we very firmly believe: that the heritage and amenity values of the Parklands must be borne in mind by the new North Adelaide Golf Course. Therefore, that would be something critical to the design that none of us have any idea about.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I indicate my support for the amendments. Might I say I think the exchange we have had during the clause 1 discussion demonstrates why these amendments are so valuable because there is a secret contract here, there is a secret plan. None of this information is being shared, and so I think setting out very clearly what the expectations are within the legislation, as the honourable member does through her amendment, is very important.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: It will not surprise honourable members that we will be opposing this amendment, and amendments that have been put forward by the opposition. We understand that to be able to hold an event, as I guess we have outlined today, you do need to have the ability to get on and get this achieved, and a world-class championship golf course needs to be able to stage championship tournaments and events. These provisions are required to facilitate the success of that event.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Simms, R.A.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.
Pangallo, F.

Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.

Amendment thus negated.

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

Amendment No 1 [Simms–1]—

Page 3, line 20 [clause 3, definition of *project*]—After 'course and' insert ', subject to subsection (2)',

This amendment involves after the words 'course and' inserting 'subject to subsection (2)', and the subsequent amendment that I will move deals with that. It might be useful if I talk to both of them now, just to save time. The second, more substantial, amendment relates to preventing any development of accommodation on the Parklands. I understand the government will be moving their

own amendment in that regard. I do welcome the government taking this issue up. I understand that their amendment, however, will constrain that restriction just to the project site, whereas my amendment will make it clear that there can be no hotels or accommodation on the Parklands more broadly.

What I am worried about is, given the broad nature of what has been proposed here by the government, that there is the potential for some sort of hotel or accommodation complex to sit opposite any development, so the issue is much broader than simply the proposed project site. I urge members to support my amendment, but if that is not successful I will support the government's amendment on the basis that at least that narrows the scope of the project somewhat.

I think there is a cause for alarm here when one looks at the history of Greg Norman designs and the fact that almost half of those have had an accommodation component. Also, we have no publicly available business case and we do not know what is within the contract or whether indeed there may be a need to change the scope of the project if the financial circumstances change. I think it is important for us to put as clear guidelines around this as possible. I should indicate also that I have been consulting with the Adelaide City Council in relation to this and the other amendments that I am moving.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the member for the amendment that he has put forward. As we have indicated, we will not be supporting this particular amendment. We have taken on feedback and will be putting our own amendment forward in this space, because the bill before us today is about this particular site and that is what our amendment is doing, narrowing it down to this particular site in regard to hotels. It is, as our amendment is highlighting, not at all our intention to be doing that, I have been advised. I think that builds on our commitment as a government to really be investing in our Parklands.

I know that as a government we have committed to returning a lot of the Parklands, which is something we have been very proud to do. In 2011, under the former Labor government, I have been advised, the SA Water depot site at Thebarton saw around 5.5 hectares of land being returned to the Parklands. The O-Bahn tunnel, I believe, saw over 1,500 square metres of Parklands being returned.

I also know that recently we were able to invest and put money back into the Helen Mayo Park. We have declared and restored this particular site, which is a great outcome in comparison to the \$662 million basketball stadium planned by the former government. I have also been advised that once the new aquatic centre is open, the existing Adelaide Aquatic Centre, which has been demolished, will result in 1,000 square metres returning to the Parklands.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I do not know if now is the time to make a joke, but I was waiting for the part of this amendment that actually talks about modular housing perhaps being allowed in the Parklands. But perhaps it is not the time, Mr Chair. I, in principle, when I saw this amendment, was completely open to it. It was one of the discussions that I had when I saw the amendments with the mover, but also with the government.

I accept the intent in principle, and certainly the discussions actually go beyond just the accommodation. I think there was some talk about Red Ochre at some point as well, whether existing businesses would be impacted by this and whether there would be any move to have other sorts of permanent businesses on the Parklands, and certainly none of that was in the equation. Accommodation was not in the equation, and that was ruled out with me.

I think the purpose of the amendment, though, is to really bring it back to the scope of the bill. So it is not that I do not support what the Hon. Rob Simms is doing, I do support that, but I also support the government's intention to bring it back to the scope of the bill because that is what we are actually debating, as I think the honourable member would acknowledge. On that basis, I support in principle what the Hon. Robert Simms is doing via the government amendment.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am just going to put the Liberal Party's position on the record. Certainly, when the Hon. Rob Simms raised this as a potential issue it was that of course we ought to be scared about what may or may not happen as a consequence of this open-ended legislation, so I congratulate the Hon. Mr Simms on bringing this amendment forward. I do agree with the

contribution of the Hon. Connie Bonaros in that I believe that it does need to be contained to the scope of this bill and it would probably be hypocritical of someone from my party to say that hotels should never be built in the Parklands, given—

The Hon. R.A. Simms: It wouldn't stop you if you were on the Labor side.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: No, they are far worse than we are, you know that, everyone knows that, they do too—the hotel that sits within Adelaide Oval. So, for that reason, we will be supporting the government's amendment, but I do congratulate the Hon. Rob Simms on highlighting this potential issue because if he had not then this still would be very open-ended.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for that. It is just a question of clarification. It is my assumption that, in order to achieve what they are wanting to achieve through their amendment, the government will support my amendment around 'subject to subsection (2)' and then they will have their own subsection (2). So I will still move amendment No. 1 [Simms-1] and that would be supported, I assume, and then the point of difference becomes amendment No. 2 [Simms-1]; is that correct?

The CHAIR: Our advice is that really we should be supporting this first amendment.

Amendment carried.

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

Amendment No 2 [Simms-1]—

Page 3, after line 23—After its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

- (2) The definition of the *project* in subsection (1) does not extend to the development of any accommodation (whether in the form of a hotel or other temporary accommodation facilities or in the form of housing for ongoing occupation) and nothing in this Act—
 - (a) authorises or permits the development of any such accommodation in the Adelaide Parklands; or
 - (b) has the effect of causing such development to be taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed-to-satisfy development for the purposes of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*; or
 - (c) in any way alters any prohibitions, restrictions or requirements applying under the other laws of the State in connection with such a development.

The CHAIR: The minister will move her amendment. I will put yours first, the Hon. Mr Simms. I suspect we will be voting no to that and yes to the minister's amendment, if that is the will of the chamber, of course. I am not directing things here. Minister, you need to move your amendment.

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

Amendment No 1 [EmergCorr-1]—

Page 3, after line 23—After its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

- (2) The definition of the *project* in subsection (1) does not extend to the development of any accommodation (whether in the form of a hotel or other temporary accommodation facilities or in the form of housing for ongoing occupation) and nothing in this Act—
 - (a) authorises or permits the development of any such accommodation on the project site; or
 - (b) has the effect of causing such development to be taken to be classified by the Planning and Design Code as deemed-to-satisfy development for the purposes of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

This refocuses this to this particular site. As I have highlighted already, this is going to be a world-class golf course right here in South Australia, and a public golf course at that. The accommodation is not contemplated as part of this bill and the government has no intention of building accommodation on the North Adelaide Golf Course; therefore, the government will move an amendment, which is amendment No. 1 in my name, to define that the project and the project site does not extend to the development of accommodation.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I was just going to indicate that I do not oppose the Simms amendment, but the government amendment is much better.

The Hon. R.A. Simms' amendment negatived; the Hon. E.S. Bourke's amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

The CHAIR: There is an amendment in the name of the Hon. Ms Lensink to insert new clause 3A.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That is consequential, so I will not be moving it.

Clause 4 passed.

Clause 5.

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

Amendment No 3 [Lensink-1]—

Page 4, lines 12 to 20 [clause 5(1)(b) and (2)]—Delete clause 5(1)(b) and (2)

The clauses that this amendment seeks to remove are really just this open-ended nature of the government to be able to grab any other land because it is not just the North Adelaide Golf Course and the John E Brown Park and road reserve area, which would be fair and reasonable. Paragraph (b) that I am seeking to delete enables the government basically to decide at any point that it needs to requisition any piece of land that it sees fit. What we would prefer is that the government come back to the parliament if it wants to change the footprint of the project. We would urge everybody to support this amendment No. 3 in my name.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I thank the member for putting an amendment forward, but, as has been indicated, we will not be supporting this amendment or other amendments being put forward by the opposition. The project is in its early phases and while this assessment and surveys are underway, it is deemed necessary and desirable to include additional areas of land or to remove any areas of land from areas already stated, which comprises the existing golf course.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I am just hoping that the minister can elaborate on that a little further, or indeed the mover, because there is a level of consultation that would also be required in relation to that. Again, given the design phase and the business case and everything that is being discussed today, there are steps here that may mean a bit is in and a bit is out, or whatever the case may be, but there are other obligations in terms of consultation that have to be undertaken if that is the case. Can the minister just clarify how that would work?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As is stated in the provisions:

The Minister must not include additional areas of land in the project site under subsection (1)(b) unless the Minister has undertaken consultation [and that could include] (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit) with the Adelaide City Council and any other entity the Minister thinks fit.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: By extension—and I am going to use the Aboriginal Heritage Act as an example—perhaps there may be something that we do not know about a particular area that becomes apparent and it is therefore not ideal. That process will enable the government to consult with the relevant entities that they need to consult with and revisit the planning phase, or whatever the correct terminology is, to ensure that we do not capture anything that we do not want to be capturing.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: Yes. As it says here, consultation is undertaken as the minister sees fit with the Adelaide City Council and other entities, so that really does broaden the opportunities for that consultation process.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I will be supporting this amendment. I think if we are relying on the government to consult, that is a pretty dangerous approach, if one considers the way in which they have consulted with the parliament and indeed the key players on this matter.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 6.

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

Amendment No 4 [Lensink-1]—

Page 4, after line 26—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) A person whose lease or licence is cancelled under any provision of this Act is entitled to be paid reasonable compensation by the Minister for any loss or damage incurred as a result of the cancellation.
- (1b) The regulations may make provision in relation to the manner in which claims for compensation under subsection (1a) must be made or determined.

I will put a question to the minister which I did ask in my second reading speech, but I do not expect her to trawl through all of our second reading speeches to pick these up. My understanding is that there might be one leaseholder who is impacted by this. The minister, as is his wont, said he would take that on notice and get back to us, and of course he has not, but I would be interested to know if there are any other leases there. What amendment No. 4 does is provide a fairly limited compensation scheme for anybody who is cancelled, because I think it is unreasonable for the government just to cancel licences without any consideration for those who may be impacted.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that clause 9 requires a minister to consult with the Adelaide City Council on any matters council would like to be consulted on, which would include any lease or licences that could be cancelled. The minister can then determine an appropriate consultation protocol to assess those licences and leases.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Amendment No. 5 is consequential, so I will not be moving that one.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

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

Amendment No 6 [Lensink-1]—

Page 4, line 32 [clause 7(1)]—Delete 'consultation (in such manner as the Minister thinks fit)' and substitute 'reasonable consultation'

I indicate that I will be dividing on this because I think it tightens up the wording a bit to ensure that there is a level of reasonable consultation with the council on this matter, rather than just consultation. We have heard constantly from the government that of course they are reasonable, and of course they are going to consult and all those sorts of things, but we know how they tend to operate when the keys are handed over holus-bolus. This just provides a level of protection for the council in terms of consultation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I support the honourable member's amendment. I do think the consultation in general has been lacking in this regard. It seems to be a return to the announce-and-defend policy of the Rann Labor government. I think giving some more guidance around what this consultation might look like makes sense.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As we have suggested, we are opposing this particular amendment. The minister, as I am advised, is required to consult with the council in relation to handover and requires flexibility to determine the manner in order to ensure no delay can arise from the handover consultation and process.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Noting that the mover has indicated that she will be dividing on this amendment potentially, I indicate that I will not be supporting the amendment. I do, though, think it is important to note the positive obligation that exists in here to consult with local council on this issue and on all these issues. Indeed, it is a requirement not only for positive obligation but also for council, in effect, to nominate the sorts of issues that it wishes to be consulted on.

The point I am going to make is that I appreciate the intent of the amendment in terms of reasonableness, but I also accept that the council is actually going to be in a position to provide those

arguments. They will have to provide that, and they will have to do that in the manner that is worked out between the relevant minister and the council. Again, I point to the fact that there are positive obligations in this bill to actually consult with council.

I guess the concern is the timeframes when we start introducing notions around what reasonable is and otherwise, and how long that may take, so for the purposes of that I will not be supporting this particular one but point again to the fact that there are positive obligations that exist in here to ensure that there are levels of consultation with local council on the issues they deem necessary, and the issues in relation to handover.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Simms, R.A.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.
Pangallo, F.

Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.

Amendment thus negated.

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

Amendment No 7 [Lensink-1]—

Page 5, lines 6 and 7 [clause 7(3)(c)]—Delete '(on such terms as may be specified by the Minister) of any personal property the Minister thinks necessary or desirable' and substitute:

of any personal property the Minister thinks is necessary

This is in relation to the confiscation of personal property. This is one of many clauses in this bill that do seem to provide a level of discretion solely with the minister, so we are just trying to make it a little bit more reasonable.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I will be supporting the amendment. As I indicated earlier, I want to put some guardrails around the minister and the way in which they exercise their discretion.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I have highlighted, we will not be supporting this particular amendment. I am advised that the minister is required to consult with the council in relation to the handover and requires flexibility to determine the terms of the handover of any personal property to ensure the project can progress as required and in a timely manner, or to ensure the ongoing care, control and management of the project site or flexibility of the project site, either during the project delivery or after the project completion. I understand that this particular clause, clause 9 and clause 16 all require consultation with the council.

Amendment negated.

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

Amendment No 8 [Lensink-1]—

Page 5, lines 10 to 13 [clause 7(4)]—Delete subclause (4)

This is to delete subclause (4), which puts an obligation on the council if it fails to comply with the direction of the minister. We would prefer that the minister would work more collaboratively with the council rather than them just be subject to unilateral direction.

Amendment negated.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am advised that my amendment No. 9 [Lensink-1] is consequential, so I will not be moving it.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Amendments Nos 10, 11 and 12 are all consequential to my amendment No. 3, so I will not be moving them. I move:

Amendment No 13 [Lensink-1]—

Page 5, lines 38 to 40 [clause 8(6)]—Delete subclause (6)

This is to delete subclause (6) of clause 8, which relates to vesting and care. This relates to 'items of personal property remaining on the project site are vested with the minister and forfeited to the Crown', which I think is unreasonable. I encourage members to support this amendment.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We will be opposing this amendment, noting that amendments Nos 6, 7, 8 and 9 were also opposed for similar reasons. While fixtures—things that are fixed to the land—ordinarily pass with the land, this subclause deals primarily with those things that are not fixtures, so that they are either removed from the land or passed to the minister with the land.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 9.

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

Amendment No 14 [Lensink-1]—

Page 6, line 5 [clause 9(1)(a)]—Delete 'an opportunity' and substitute 'a reasonable opportunity'

This again is in relation to the open-ended nature of powers for the minister. We are seeking to delete the level of discretion that is provided to the minister alone.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We oppose this amendment. I am advised that the minister must consult with the council and must ensure council is given an opportunity to outline matters for consultation.

Amendment negated.

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

Amendment No 3 [Simms-1]—

Page 6, line 9 [clause 9(1)(b)]—Delete '(containing such requirements as the Minister thinks fit)'

This amendment deletes the phrase '(containing such requirements as the Minister thinks fit)'. That provision sets out a requirement for the government and the council to develop a consultation protocol, but it gives the minister the opportunity to have the final say on what requirements are part of any such agreement. My amendment simply takes that out on the basis that that should be agreed between the council and the minister. It should not just be the case that the minister determines the nature of the consultation.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I indicated previously, we oppose this amendment. As mentioned in my previous statements, I am advised the minister must consult with council and must ensure council is given an opportunity to outline matters for consultation, but the requirements of that consultation will be at the minister's discretion.

Amendment negated.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Lensink, you will not move your amendment as it is the same as the Hon. Mr Simms'?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11.

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

Amendment No 16 [Lensink-1]—

Page 6, lines 20 to 31 [clause 11(1) and (2)]—Delete subclauses (1) and (2) and substitute:

- (1) The *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* applies in relation to development proposed to be undertaken, for the purposes of the project, on the project site or the support zones subject to subsection (3).

This is an important one from my point of view, so we will again be dividing on it. It relates to the application of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. It is taken to be classified as deemed to satisfy for the purposes of the Planning and Design Code. We are seeking to delete subclauses (1) and (2) and substitute it with (1), which is in my amendment. I do not think that SCAP should be a rubberstamp for any application; I think SCAP should have the opportunity to consider—and this is probably going to be quite a unique application, a unique decision for that body.

There are other bodies and organisations that SCAP could consult with and come back with some fairly useful recommendations, which might have to be considered by the proponents. It is important that what is good for the goose is good for the gander: if everybody else in the private sector has to go through the SCAP process, the government should abide by its own rules, and therefore I urge members to support this amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I indicate that I will be supporting this amendment. It is a very important issue that the honourable member has identified, and I thank her for that. One of the things that really concerns me about this bill is the fact that the usual checks and balances do not apply. The fact that anything that is presented could be deemed suitable is totally inappropriate. It makes a mockery of the arguments that this government has made on multiple occasions now that we have a rules-based planning system.

It is very concerning, when one considers the advice that was provided by the minister during the clause 1 discussion, where there is a secret contract, we do not know what is in the contract, we do not know what brief has been provided to LIV Golf, we do not know what brief has been provided to Greg Norman designs. The way this reads is that whatever they put forward will get the green light. A lot of people should be outraged by the lack of safeguards that the government has put into this bill.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: As I indicated earlier, we are opposing this amendment. I am advised they are deemed to satisfy development in the streamlined planning pathway under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 and the associated (General) Regulations 2017, and are required on this project to ensure it can progress in the required timeframes.

In terms of the process and the timeframes, the DTS application is lodged with the relevant authority. The authority has five days to determine that it is a properly made application, and then a further five days to assess the proposal. Once a decision has been issued, including any conditions imposed by the relevant authority, the application must obtain building consent, which varies depending on the building classifications, and then development approval, another five business days.

I am further advised regarding assessment requirements that (General) Regulations Schedule 8 set out the mandatory information to be lodged as part of the application. This includes plans drawn to scale, reports and technical information that must be provided.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Simms, R.A.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.
Pangallo, F.

Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

New clause 11A.

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

Amendment No 1 [Simms-2]—

Page 6, after line 35—Insert:

11A—Application of *Native Vegetation Act 1991* etc

The *Native Vegetation Act 1991* (or an Act that replaces that Act) applies in relation to any clearance of native vegetation (within the meaning of the *Native Vegetation Act 1991*) occurring in the course of the carrying out of the project on the project site or the support zones.

This is to ensure that there is some respect for native vegetation in the way in which this project is carried out.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We will be opposing this amendment. I am advised that the Native Vegetation Act 1991 does not currently apply to the Adelaide Parklands. In fact, the NVA does not apply to the vast majority of metropolitan Adelaide. This is a result of s4 of the NVA and the regulation 4A of schedule 1A of the Native Vegetation Regulations 2017. In this way, the proposed amendment seeks to expand the application of the NVA over and above the status quo.

If the NVA were to apply to the project, I am advised that, subject to certain limitation exemptions, the state would be unable to clear native vegetation, which would include some of the vegetation, without the consent of the Native Vegetation Council under the NVA. Not only is this impractical, it also is inconsistent with the project timelines and the streamline project assessment process provided in this bill.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We also will not be supporting this amendment. I am not sure what native vegetation actually exists within the Parklands. I would have thought that most of it has been cleared over the years, with the exception of maybe some of the reeds in the river.

The Hon. I.K. Hunter: There is some grasslands on the East Parklands.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: That is right. The former environment minister reminds us about grasslands with the butterflies. Anyway, I will not distract myself. The Native Vegetation Act does not really apply in the metropolitan area, so I do not think it should be applicable here.

New clause negated.

Clause 12.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: My next amendment is consequential. I will not be proceeding with that.

Clause passed.

Clause 13.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Mr Simms, you have an amendment, which competes with the Hon. Ms Lensink's amendment, but yours is filed first, so would you like to move yours?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Yes, I will actually, because, with no disrespect to the honourable member, I think mine provides a bit more protection for some of the trees, so I will deal with mine first. I move:

Amendment No 4 [Simms-1]—

Page 7, lines 7 to 10—Delete clause 13 and substitute:

13—Requirements relating to trees

- (1) The Minister must use the Minister's best endeavours to ensure that regulated trees are not removed in carrying out the project.
- (2) No significant tree may be removed in carrying out the project unless the Minister has determined, by instrument in writing, that the carrying out of the project would be significantly impaired if the tree were not removed.
- (3) The Minister must—
 - (a) ensure that for every regulated tree that is removed in the course of undertaking the project, not less than 3 new trees (being saplings not less than 1 metre in height or mature trees) are planted within the project site and support zones; and
 - (b) ensure that for every other tree (not being a regulated tree) that is removed in the course of undertaking the project, not less than 3 new trees (which may be seedlings) are planted within the project site and support zones.
- (4) In this section *regulated tree* and *significant tree* have the same meaning as in the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

This really beefs up the obligations on the government in terms of protecting trees. It would insert a new clause, which would require the minister to use the minister's best endeavours to ensure that regulated trees are not removed in carrying out the project. It would require that no significant tree be removed in carrying out the project, unless the minister has determined by instrument in writing that the carrying out of the project would be significantly impaired if the tree was not removed. Whilst a lot of other elements of the bill we are dealing with actually give the minister a huge amount of discretion, this makes it clear that the minister must take some particular action with respect to protecting trees.

The minister would, under this amendment, ensure that for every regulated tree that is removed in the course of undertaking the project, not less than three new trees, being saplings not less than one metre in height, or mature trees, are planted within the project site and support zones. They would also be required to ensure that for every other tree (not being a regulated tree) that is removed in the course of undertaking the project, not less than three new trees are planted within the project site and support zones.

This is a key issue that was raised with me by the Adelaide City Council and, indeed, I note that organisations like the Conservation Council have flagged this before. When we are talking about tree removal, it is not enough to simply say we are going to put some seeds down. You need to have trees that are a certain level of maturity in terms of being able to protect those ecosystems, so that

is the purpose behind this amendment. I am not sure what the nature of the secret deal between the government and LIV Golf is, whether or not this is an amendment they can consider, but I would encourage them to support this protection of our significant and regulated trees, and I indicate that I will be calling a division.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Lensink, do you want to move your amendment?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: As well? Or could I just speak to this one? Are we dealing with them separately?

The CHAIR: Do you want to move your amendment?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am happy to wait and see what happens with Mr Simms' amendment.

The CHAIR: The first question is that clause 13 stand as printed, so if you are supporting the government you vote yes, which will mean that both of your amendments will not be able to be inserted.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am happy to support Mr Simms' amendment.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 14.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I am advised that amendment No. 19 [Lensink-1] is consequential to a previous amendment, so I will not be moving it.

Clause passed.

Clause 15 passed.

Clause 16.

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

Amendment No 5 [Simms-1]—

Page 9, lines 6 and 7 [clause 16(1)]—Delete 'or for any other purpose connected with the operation of this Act that the Minister thinks fit'

This amendment basically narrows down some of the discretion of the minister. As I have indicated previously, I am concerned that the minister is being given quite wideranging powers under this legislation. This deletes the phrase 'or any other purpose connected with the operation of this Act that the Minister thinks fit'.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: The Liberal Party supports this amendment.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We oppose this amendment. I am advised that the proposed deletion would have the effect of limiting the government's flexibility to make provisions in relation to the land or interests, including the ability for the government to deal with parties other than the council, as may be required to ensure the successful operation of the golf course.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clause 17.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Ms Lensink, you are going to indicate that you are going to oppose clauses 17 to 25?

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Mr Chairman, this is consequential, so I will not be moving it.

Clause passed.

Clause 18.

The CHAIR: At clause 18, there are amendments in the name of the Hon. Ms Bonaros and the Hon. Mr Simms. The Hon. Ms Bonaros, your amendment was filed first.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros–1]—

Page 10, after line 7—After subclause (1) insert:

- (1a) The Minister must ensure that a differential price structure applies in respect of access to the public golf course such that persons who are able to produce evidence (of a kind determined by the Minister) establishing that they are resident in the State will be entitled to pay a lesser fee for that access than persons who are not able to produce such evidence.

The amendment really goes to the heart of a public golf course being owned by the people of South Australia and the accessibility to that. Of course, there has been lots of discussion about the possibility of getting to the end of this process and local South Australians not being able to afford to play golf at the golf course. That is certainly not the intent and I think the amendment reaffirms the discussions that have taken place about ensuring that there is a differential price structure that applies so that locals have access to that.

I have to say that I agree to the extent that the Premier has said—and I have had these discussions with him and others—that when you build a world-class golf club obviously the prices can be inflated in terms of playing there. I have asked the question about what it costs to play at some of these world-class golf courses. I think playing a round of golf at North Adelaide Golf Club now is in the order of \$35 or \$40-odd. You would expect that, when we are talking about differential pricing structures, that price may increase slightly from that but not considerably from that. By comparison, if you are playing at a world-class golf course you are looking at fees that could be in excess of \$400, for instance, and we have golf courses here that, if you are not a member, they are the sorts of fees that would apply.

I have been very clear with the government that, on the basis this is a public golf course that we want to ensure accessibility to, we would want to keep those prices at around what they are now for locals in South Australia playing golf. That is what this amendment seeks to do to the extent that we are able to do so in legislation and I suppose that is the other important point: it would be very difficult in legislation to provide some sort of methodology that would actually apply and it would be very peculiar and probably not stack up anyway even if we did try it. So, to the extent that we are able to do so, that is what this amendment seeks to address.

I agree though that, in principle, people love to visit golf courses where they can play a world-class golf course and if it is others who are visiting here from interstate or overseas then we could be able to charge them more to play at that golf course, given they are having accessibility to a South Australian owned asset that is providing that sort of prestige and whatnot.

The idea really is to ensure a differential price structure for South Australians compared to those interstate and overseas visitors who may be wanting to come to South Australia to take advantage of that same golf course. Even then, based on the discussions that I have had with people in the golfing know, it would be anticipated that, if you are coming to South Australia for the weekend and you are enjoying the South Australian experience as a whole, it is still going to be something that is affordable, even for those visitors who come over here from interstate and overseas, and at the same time it continues to contribute to the rest of the economic viability of the state by those people staying in hotels, eating at restaurants, visiting bars and the rest of it and the list goes on and on.

Really, though, the intent is to ensure that there is that price differentiation so that locals are not footing the bill but also that they have accessibility to a South Australian owned asset and that we can still market it in such a way that is attractive and alluring to those people who wish to visit from interstate and overseas without removing the ability to visit by locals in South Australia. I hope that makes sense to everybody. It is on that basis that I move this amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just a question, and maybe this is something for the government: how will this work in practice? It is one thing for us to legislate to say that there will be a differential rate, but will people, when they travel to the golf course, be required to turn up with some sort of identification document to demonstrate that they are a resident of South Australia? How precisely will that be policed?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: To the extent that I can—and perhaps I will be corrected by the government—I think there are a couple of things here. You have private golf courses already at the moment and they would work on an identification basis. So if you are a member, you present your membership, which clearly states where you are from and whatnot, and you get either a member fee or a non-member fee to play.

I would envisage the same sort of thing would apply here, except we are not basing it on membership, we are basing it on residence. So you present your driver's licence. You are a South Australian resident, so these are the fees that apply. If you are from Hong Kong or New South Wales, then there is a different fee that would apply. That is my very broad understanding, but I think we need to get into that a little bit further as we nut this out.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Is that something that is within the contract between either LIV Golf or Greg Norman designs?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am advised that this particular amendment would have no impact on the LIV Golf contract. This is about access to a public golf course. I guess, as it mentions in the mover's amendment, you would need to produce evidence of a kind determined by the minister. So it gives the ability for the minister to determine what that evidence would be.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just more broadly, I guess the other point is that it is going to apply to all those other times when it is not being used for LIV Golf or any other event that is being held at the course. So it is outside of that, in the normal golf playing times, that this would apply.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: Just for the record, yes, we are supportive of this amendment.

Amendment carried.

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

Amendment No 6 [Simms–1]—

Page 10, lines 8 to 11 [clause 18(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

This amendment is a deletion of subclause (2); that is the subclause that notes:

Nothing [here] prevents the erection of fencing or other barriers in relation to particular areas forming part of the North Adelaide Golf Course where the Minister is satisfied that the erection of the fencing or barrier is necessary or desirable for reasons of public safety, the security of any property or otherwise for a good purpose.

I am concerned, once again, that the minister is being given way too much power here and that this could result in fencing being erected at whim.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I do have a couple of questions for the minister in relation to this. One of the discussions that I had, certainly with the government, prior to this bill was the issue of fencing. I am a bit perplexed as to how this is different to other events that we have. There is no suggestion that there is going to be any permanent fencing and there cannot be permanent fencing when you have a public asset that is owned by the South Australian people, and we have just gone through this process of how people are going to use this.

How is that different to your WOMADs or your car events or everything else that does require a level of fencing? There is always an installation phase when we have to set things up, and then the event phase, and then a post-event phase when we are taking things down. It does not make sense to me that we would not have or do not require—and it is on that basis that I had these discussions with government—fencing during that process.

I just want to go back, though. I am hoping the minister can answer that question, but I also want to put to the minister once again—and it does go to this to some extent, for the Hon. Rob Simms' benefit—I asked a question earlier about the planning and design and also the business case. One of the points I made I am hoping the minister might be able to elaborate on a little further. Given we do not have them now, given that we have already had one production of documents order and that we are now having this debate, can the minister confirm that when we do have that planning and design release it will be accompanied by, to the extent that they are not commercial-in-confidence, those documents around the business case, because I think all these things are relevant?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I might just speak to the amendment first and then address the honourable member's last comments after that. We are opposing the deletion that has been put forward here. I am advised the amendment would have the effect of limiting the government's ability to provide provisions like netting or other safety devices where a safety in design or other risk assessments may be determined or required.

In regard to the release of documents, I understand there has been a lot of interest in this in the chamber, and I appreciate that. That is why I am advised that the government would be pleased to release key elements of this business case work which is currently being developed to provide the public with this important information. There may be elements that are not appropriate to be released publicly, given it may release information that provides the state with a competitive advantage.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: In terms of informing consideration of this amendment, I think the key point here is that clause 18(1)(b) makes clear that 'the area of land comprising the North Adelaide Golf Course must not have permanent fencing around its perimeter'. But then the issue with subclause (2) is it gives the minister the power to erect fencing in circumstances where the minister believes it is 'necessary or desirable for reasons of public safety, the security of any property or otherwise for a good purpose'.

My concern is that that section negates the previous prohibition on permanent fencing, and that is the point of difference. Temporary fencing is one thing. Indeed, we do sometimes see temporary fencing around events that occur in the Parklands, but giving the minister the power to erect permanent fencing for something they might consider to be of a good public purpose does alarm me. I would encourage people to consider the record of the Malinauskas government when it comes to the Parklands in considering how they may well approach such sweeping powers.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I am pleased to advise I have received advice that there will be no permanent fencing. As I mentioned earlier, there may be times when safety devices are required, such as that netting that I mentioned earlier.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: For the record, we will not be supporting this amendment due to concerns that for safety this may be required.

Amendment negated; clause as amended passed.

Clause 19.

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

Amendment No 7 [Simms-1]—

Page 10, after line 25—After its present contents (now to be designated as subclause (1)) insert:

- (2) The Minister cannot specify a declared period for an event under subsection (1)(b) that would result in declared periods for events exceeding a total of 3 months in any 12 month period.

This is a really important amendment. It makes clear that the minister cannot specify a declared period for an event under subsection (1)(b) that would result in declared periods for events exceeding a total of three months in any 12-month period.

One of the issues in relation to declared periods within the legislation is that it allows the minister to circumvent a range of other laws. Indeed, it circumvents environmental laws and it circumvents council laws. It can give the government power to initiate road closures and the like. My concern is that that is a potentially huge inconvenience for residents and, indeed, people who may use the city. What I am seeking to do is put a limit on the period of time when those powers can be activated. What I am suggesting is that it be for no more than three months within any 12-month period.

Again, I do not know what the nature of this secret contract is. It may be that part of the secret arrangement that has been reached with LIV Golf is that it needs to operate for a certain period of time—I do not know; that information has been concealed from the public—but I do think it is very reasonable to put some limits on this so that we do not see these powers being used for inordinate amounts of time during the year.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We oppose this amendment. As I am advised, this proposed amendment could have the effect of limiting the opportunity to stage other national and international championship golf tournaments, not only the annual LIV Golf event. This would also include the time for smaller declared events and the time before any event required for preparation, and the time after any event required prior to resumption, all of which unduly limits the golf course.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We will be supporting this amendment. It is interesting to hear in the course of debate that the government has views that there may well be other things taking place. It would be nice if they were transparent about these things beforehand. We have constantly heard that we can expect that the North Adelaide Golf Course will continue to be open to the public for 51 weeks of 52 in every year. I think it is unreasonable not to provide some level of information publicly about what might take place. I think this amendment holds the government to account.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I discussed this particular provision at length with the government to get my head around it in terms of the timeframe. One of the key issues that was raised was that it is just not about LIV Golf. I note what the Hon. Michelle Lensink has just said, but we have discussed throughout this debate the potential for other golfing events as well. There may very well be other golfing events, so there is that element of it, but the other one is how long it takes to set this up and, if there is a hard and fast rule that it is three months and it takes longer to set up, to have and then to take down whatever is around that, then that is going to be an issue.

There may also be an issue where you potentially have something smaller. I do not know. These are theories but you might have something at the end of LIV Golf that carries it over slightly into something else, into another golf tournament, and then you would again go over that three-month period. It is problematic from that perspective. If I am to understand what the mover is trying to do, it is to ensure that we are prioritising this for outside of those tournaments for public use, as we have discussed.

I am concerned that that hard and fast rule around three months actually might prohibit us from being able to do things because what if it goes over? What if we need longer to set up and take down after it? I do not know how long it takes to set up and take down but it may not be three months from beginning to end, and then we would have some other issues, unintended issues on our hands to deal with.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes7
Noes.....10
Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Simms, R.A. (teller)

Franks, T.A.
Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.
Pangallo, F.

Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.

Amendment thus negated; clause passed.

Clauses 20 and 21 passed.

Clause 22.

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

Amendment No 8 [Simms-1]—

Page 12, after line 17—Insert:

- (2a) However, the Minister may only take action under subsection (1) or (2) with the written concurrence of the Adelaide City Council.

This proposes that after clause 22 on page 12 we insert a new subclause (2a). It currently reads that where the minister is satisfied that it is reasonably necessary or desirable for, or incidental to, for the purposes or functions under this act, to fence off or cordon off part of the land, they may do so. My new insertion makes clear that the minister may only take this action under subsection (1) or (2) with the written concurrence of the Adelaide City Council. I do not think that is much to ask in terms of just adding another layer of consultation. I await the government's response with bated breath.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I advise the member that we will not be supporting this amendment. As I am advised, this amendment would have the effect of providing council with a veto power on the matter, affecting an event and the event's proceedings. This amendment would have an impact on the government's capacity to run events.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: I think, reluctantly, we would not support this particular amendment as well.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clauses 23 and 24 passed.

Clause 25.

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

Amendment No 9 [Simms-1]—

Page 13, after line 5—Insert:

Note—

This section does not however apply in relation to the development of any form of accommodation—see section 3(2)

This amendment is just inserting a note: 'This section does not however apply in relation to the development of any form of accommodation'. We have had some discussion around this. It seems fairly uncontroversial. Now that the government is saying that accommodation will not be part of the development site, I am hoping they will support that inclusion of a note.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We will not support this amendment, is my understanding, as we have dealt with this in amendment No. 2.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Before we move on, could the government elaborate on that? What harm does this amendment do? What is the concern with that inclusion?

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: I have been advised that this has been dealt with earlier in the bill in regard to the accommodation, and it does not seem like the appropriate spot to be putting this as it has been dealt with previously in the bill.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

New clause 25A.

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

Amendment No 10 [Simms-1]—

Page 13, after line 5—Insert:

25A—On-going requirements relating to trees

- (1) The Minister must use the Minister's best endeavours to ensure that regulated trees are not removed in carrying out development or works under section 25.
- (2) No significant tree may be removed in carrying out development or works under section 25 unless the Minister has determined, by instrument in writing, that the conduct of approved events at the North Adelaide Golf Course would be significantly impaired if the tree were not removed.
- (3) The Minister must—
 - (a) ensure that for every regulated tree that is removed in carrying out development or works under section 25 not less than 3 new trees (being saplings not less than 1 metre in height or mature trees) are planted within the project site and any approved event support zones; and
 - (b) ensure that for every other tree (not being a regulated tree) that is removed in carrying out development or works under section 25, not less than 3 new trees (which may be seedlings) are planted within the project site and any approved event support zones.
- (4) In this section *regulated tree* and *significant tree* have the same meaning as in the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*.

This relates to some ongoing requirements regarding trees. I spoke at length previously around the need to beef up some of the protection of our significant trees and regulated trees, so this imposes similar obligations on the minister.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: We are opposing this amendment. I am advised that it is not practical to have an ongoing requirement of this magnitude relating to trees in the operation of the golf course. The landscaping and tree planting will be established on completion of the project in accordance with clause 13, which design will have given consideration to the operational requirements for the operation of the golf course, including the LIV Golf Adelaide tournament.

The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK: We are supportive of this amendment because people of Adelaide love their trees, particularly mature trees. I think there are huge concerns in relation to the chainsaws that will be in operation once this bill goes through. This goes some way to providing some protection and acknowledgement that the green space in that part of the Parklands is incredibly important.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes7
 Noes.....10
 Majority3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.
 Hood, B.R.
 Simms, R.A. (teller)

Franks, T.A.
 Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
 Lensink, J.M.A.

NOES

Bonaros, C.
 Game, S.L.
 Lee, J.S.
 Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
 Hanson, J.E.
 Maher, K.J.

El Dannawi, M.
 Hunter, I.K.
 Scriven, C.M.

PAIRS

Henderson, L.A.
 Pangallo, F.

Martin, R.B.
 Ngo, T.T.

New clause thus negated.

Clause 26.

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

Amendment No 21 [Lensink-1]—

Page 13, lines 7 to 25—Delete clause 26 and substitute:

26—Other actions etc necessary to give effect to Act

The Minister responsible for the administration of the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016* will, at the request of the Minister under this Act, make any alterations to the Planning and Design Code under that Act, or any other instruments under that Act, that are, in the opinion of the Minister, necessary to give effect to this Act or as a result of the project (and any requirements of that Act relating to the making of such alterations do not apply).

Once again, this is about the open-ended nature of this piece of legislation. There are a couple of phrases I will quote from this particular clause. Subclause (1) provides that, at the request of the minister, any entity must 'make any alterations to an instrument' etc. At subclause (2) the language is fairly consistent. It provides:

An entity responsible for the grant of any consent, approval, authorisation [etc.] must, at the request of the minister, grant any statutory authorisation that is, in the opinion of the minister, necessary or desirable to give effect to this act

It is just the sort of open slather we have seen that is consistent with this bill. My amendment trims the wings, if you like, and there needs to be another level of oversight to be applied. I might add, too, that this amendment mirrors provisions that were placed into the Women's and Children's Hospital legislation that passed through, so if it is good enough for a children's hospital, I cannot see why it is not good enough for a golf course.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I agree, and I will be supporting the amendment.

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE: The government opposes this amendment. I am advised the provisions in clause 26 are required to extend more broadly than only the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 to ensure other instruments reflect the status of the project site under this bill. There is a requirement for other statutory permissions to be granted in a streamlined fashion and without delay.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clauses (27 to 31) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (Minister for Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Autism, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (17:50): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The council divided on the third reading:

Ayes10
Noes.....7
Majority3

AYES

Bonaros, C.
Game, S.L.
Lee, J.S.
Wortley, R.P.

Bourke, E.S. (teller)
Hanson, J.E.
Maher, K.J.

El Dannawi, M.
Hunter, I.K.
Scriven, C.M.

NOES

Centofanti, N.J.
Hood, B.R.
Simms, R.A.

Franks, T.A.
Hood, D.G.E.

Girolamo, H.M.
Lensink, J.M.A. (teller)

PAIRS

Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.

Henderson, L.A.
Pangallo, F.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

*Motions***PASSENGER TRANSPORT ACT**

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:54): I move:

That the regulations under the Passenger Transport Act 1994 concerning transit barring orders, made on 8 May 2025 and laid on the table of this council on 13 May 2025, be disallowed.

The purpose of this motion is to disallow the Passenger Transport (Transit Barring Orders) Amendment Regulations 2025. I am bringing this to a vote today because, as we know, we are about to go on winter break, and in this instance we have an early commencement certificate which has been issued and these amendments come into effect on 1 July.

That has implications, particularly if, after 1 July, or later down the track, there is any challenge to these regulations on a number of grounds and we end up with different cohorts of people falling into different baskets, which we often do when regulations are challenged, and we have people who have been charged with offences which, when you make changes, no longer apply after the changes have been reversed.

Can I just say for the record that I have tried to approach this issue with the government in a collegial way in order to resolve this issue, an issue which has been the subject of, sadly I think, information in the public arena, particularly on radio, which I said I found appalling and which did not even touch on the issue of what we were talking about.

In fact, the only thing that I could see from the radio segments that I tuned into was—I said it there and I will say it now—a political stitch-up over what the government dubs as being tough on crime, completely in the absence of anything to do with process and the process that happened at the Legislative Review Committee, completely in the absence of all the evidence that has been provided to that committee and, importantly, completely undermining the process of that committee in terms of the minister going and speaking publicly about deliberations that were done at a committee meeting.

Mr President, you should be concerned about that and our Clerks should be concerned about that, because we know that there are rules that apply in relation to what happens in those meetings. When you have a minister who sees fit to go and tell the deliberations that happen in a committee meeting on radio—bearing in mind that he only told half the story, the half that suited his argument, and not the full story—that is a breach of the practices and protocols in this place.

It did occur. It occurred last week on radio and it was milked to the nth degree, sadly. I found it appalling and completely dismissive of the fact that that committee that we are talking about is not just made up of Liberals and a person from the crossbench; that committee is made up of Liberals, it is made up of Labor and it is made up of a crossbench member.

If we wanted to play the way that the minister played, we could have very well gone on radio and given the same sorts of accounts that he gave about what his members did on that committee and about what his ministers have said about these regulations in those private reports, which are not meant to make their way into the public but are there for the scrutiny purposes that exist within that committee. We could have done that, and in fact I told people to go and read between the lines

about what those ministers may have said about this, given the level of angst that these regulations have caused.

This has nothing to do with being tough on crime. Let me point that out first. It has absolutely nothing to do with being tough on crime. The regulations that we are introducing, that will come into effect on 1 July with an early commencement certificate, which means we cannot do anything about them unless we deal with them today, include changes that may very well end up being challenged. There are certainly concerns that have been raised in relation to their validity and the powers that have been exercised in making them, and certainly in relation to overreach by the government.

This is not a bill like the bill we just debated. This is a set of regulations and regulations have a purpose. In this instance, there have been very serious concerns raised not by us as members but by stakeholders, including the Legal Services Commission, the ALRM and the Law Society, about overreach by the minister.

In addition to the overreach by the minister, concerns have also been raised about the disproportionate impact it is going to have on certain cohorts within our community. There is an increase in the maximum period of barring orders from three months to six months for a first order and from six months to 12 months for a second order. There is the introduction of new penalties for breaching an order. There is the introduction of a provision allowing a recipient to apply to the court for the lifting of a barring order but not before three months have passed, so we are going to apply the penalty today and you can do nothing about it for three months.

There are concerns around the fact that we are dealing with charges and not convictions in the application of these barring orders. You can be barred without being convicted of an offence and this marks a significant and punitive shift in public transport law in South Australia and it is for that reason that it should not be dealt with by regulation. That is what the experts are saying and that is what anyone who knows legislation would be saying as well. It is an attempt by the government to slip far-reaching changes through regulation without proper consultation, scrutiny or debate.

We have just had a bill that has been the subject of all those things, but we went through a process in here. When the government deems that it is okay to just make these new laws that are punitive in nature that carry criminal penalties and we will just slip them through in some regulations, there is something seriously wrong with our lawmaking practices.

The regulations lower the bar for discretionary orders. They lengthen their effect and they expand who can issue them, including now authorised officers. It does not even need to be the police anymore, it can be an authorised officer. They may be departmental staff with no legal training, no procedural safeguards and no requirement to follow evidentiary standards. It is an extraordinary transfer of power, potentially into the hands of, depending on who we get, unqualified and inexperienced individuals.

These are not minor administrative matters. These are substantive changes to law, creating a quasi criminal prohibition scheme that ought to be considered in this place, like we just did with the North Adelaide Parklands. As a member of that committee, I have had the benefit of considering the detailed submissions on those regulations and I will in a moment seek leave, for the benefit of other members, to table at least two of the submissions so we know what we are getting into with these regulations when they come into effect on 1 July, the first from the Aboriginal rights commissioner and the second from the Legal Services Commission. They have raised serious legal, ethical and practical concerns. They have warned that the regime is heavy-handed, poorly targeted and disproportionate and that it takes risks punishing innocent, vulnerable people, not protecting the community from genuine threats.

I remind honourable members that everything the minister has said that he is doing, he can already do. It is the additional layers over and above what he can do. If you want to target thugs, delinquents and unruly kids on buses, trains and trams, you can already do that, and guess what? You can already slap them with a barring order. You can already do all those things. We are moving above and beyond that now so that we can show we are tough on crime. We are doing that in the absence—

The PRESIDENT: Are you moving those two submissions?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes, I am. I am seeking leave—

The PRESIDENT: Are they submissions to the committee?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: They have been made publicly available. They have been circulated outside of the committee.

The PRESIDENT: I think what we will do, the Hon. Ms Bonaros, is that when you have made your contribution and we have heard the other contributions, will you have a chat to the Clerks, because when you sum up you may seek leave to submit those submissions to have them included if we deem that is appropriate. You can do that when you conclude your remarks.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yes, I will do that, and I note for the benefit of the Clerks that these submissions have been circulated now extensively to members of parliament and to ministers and stakeholders in relation to the issues they have canvassed, so they are not limited. They are publicly available documents.

These regulations will impact, as I said, the most vulnerable members of our community, people experiencing homelessness, people with disability, mental illness, people fleeing from domestic violence households, people with drug or alcohol dependency, and, of course, Aboriginal South Australians, particularly in regional areas.

These are people who often solely rely on public transport to get to work, to get to medical appointments, to get to some of those court appointments that they would have to deal with as a result of their interactions with the criminal justice system, or to see their children. The assumption that these people can walk or drive or catch a cab is not a daily reality for these individuals we are talking about in the main.

The assumption that they do not deserve to be on public transport is, in my view, deeply offensive. Are we really prepared to tell these South Australians that they are going to be banned in this manner, not under the current regime that exists but in this manner, for three, six or 12 months, or even indefinitely, based on a suspicion—not a conviction; based on a suspicion—with no avenue of appeal for at least three months and no power for a court to intervene, even if the order is wrongly made?

It is a huge concern that even if the order is wrongly made, you cannot do anything about it before you can finally get yourself before a judge. That is months down the track. Lord only knows what you are going to have to deal with and how you are going to have to go about your daily living between the time of the suspicion and the time that you can finally make it before a magistrate. There is no safety valve in the scheme and, as the experts have said, it is a blunt instrument.

I am going to give you a real example, based on real-world concerns that have been raised in evidence. Imagine a person with a cognitive disability who becomes visibly distressed and agitated on a train. They have not committed an offence. They have not been charged or convicted of anything, but a probationary constable or an untrained approved person misunderstands their behaviour and issues a three-month ban.

That person then cannot make it before a court to show that they had a cognitive disability, which resulted in their behaviour, for three months, but in that time they cannot catch any public transport. They lose their access to their psychologist appointments, to their GP appointments, to their court-mandated programs, to their work or their study. They are not a threat to public safety; they are simply falling through the cracks of a system designed without safeguards because we want to be tough on crime.

Take the example of a domestic violence victim caught in a public confrontation with their abuser. A hasty decision-maker sees something from a distance, it is disorderly, and they issue a barring order on both parties, and all of a sudden that person trying to flee from their perpetrator is also banned for the next three months from catching public transport. The victim is banned; the abuser walks away.

These are not hypothetical concerns; they are real risks raised by frontline legal services. I draw the council's attention also to correspondence that I received yesterday and I will seek to table that letter from the equal opportunity commissioner. I will read from that letter. The commissioner

highlights serious concerns about the disproportionate impact these changes will have on disadvantaged and marginalised groups, particularly those already facing systemic barriers to transport and justice.

Let us also not forget the purpose of the Passenger Transport Act, under which these regulations are made. The act's objects include the promotion of access to essential services, especially for the transport disadvantaged, and the promotion of social justice. These regulations are a direct contradiction of these objectives.

This is not called lawmaking; this is regulation used as a workaround to avoid accountability, and it will have very human consequences. So today I say to the government—and, as I do with all issues that are discussed in that committee, when there is an issue, we try to raise it in a collegial manner behind the scenes and get it addressed. In this instance, we have been met by the stubbornness of the minister responsible, who does not want to budge, does not give a damn about what everyone is saying about his regulations. He does not care what the concerns are because he is tough on crime and the rest of us are apparently soft on crime.

As I said on radio, I would be asking the Attorney-General and the Minister for Human Services what they have to say about these regulations and, indeed, the Minister for Child Protection, whose kids will also be captured under these changes and, I bet you, if you went and asked them, they would have a very different take on it. They would have a very different take because they know that overwhelmingly it is their cohort of constituents and people they are responsible for who are going to be impacted by these regulations.

So we can allow this to fly today, but mark my words: post 1 July, at some point, one of these scenarios will occur and we will find ourselves in a mess, and the people who will have to clean up that mess are, indeed, the Attorney-General, the Minister for Human Services and the Minister for Child Protection—not the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport but the other three ministers, who deal with these things on a daily basis and who understand, not because they have told me but because of everything their portfolios are supposed to enshrine, the impacts that this will have disproportionately on the people who fall under their watch.

If the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport wants to push ahead, then he can do so at his own peril. I hope somebody challenges these regulations. I hope that at some point he is asked to defend how we can use regulations to give these sorts of powers to authorised officers and others. The minister does not need these powers; he has ministerial power now. For the record, those trams, buses and trains he is talking about do not belong to him. They belong to the public of South Australia, not to the minister responsible for this.

He can be as tough as he likes on crime and wanting to stop any unruly behaviour—and there is lots of it. Nobody who is speaking on this issue is saying for a moment that that does not occur and does not need to be addressed, but address it through the appropriate channels. This is not the appropriate channel for these changes to be made.

I am extremely concerned about the overreach. It points to the broader problem that we have in this place—and I note the time, so I will wrap up—that the Legislative Review Committee confronts on a daily basis, of the majority of lawmaking in this state taking place via regulation and the extent to which we overreach in terms of the powers that we try to implement through regulations. I think I have said enough. I have moved that these regulations be disallowed.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (18:12): I rise as the lead speaker for the opposition on this motion. From the outset, I preface that we do not support this disallowance motion. Our position is that these new regulations are flawed, but as it is impossible to disallow only the flawed aspects, we do not support the disallowance as it would reject the entire regulation.

The Leader of the Opposition has been on the record that we do believe that we need some stronger laws around the people who do the wrong thing on public transport so that passengers are protected from those who would assault people and use physical and verbal violence against people. But what we do not stand for as an opposition is the minister running roughshod over parliamentary process, conflating parliamentary process and weaponising it in a political manner.

He passes on clips of the Leader of the Opposition and his stated position on calling for stronger laws on public transport, lines that up with what are commonly described as holding motions given in the Legislative Council and the House of Assembly by the Legislative Review Committee—which is usual parliamentary process—and then whips that up to divert attention from him and his government as he goes into estimates with DEM and DIT, smiling with glee the whole time.

It is utterly ridiculous that we are even here talking about this because of the behaviour of a minister of the Crown. We have our Clerks here and you yourself, Mr President, ensuring what the honourable member who spoke previously can table from a parliamentary committee, yet the minister jumps on radio and just decides to tee off on members of the opposition who sit on the Legislative Review Committee, very carefully omitting the fact that there are two members of his own party who sit on that Legislative Review Committee. I have seen the *Hansard* and the comments from the member for Elizabeth, who has moved a holding motion of his own for the Legislative Review Committee in the House of Assembly. Somehow that was missed out on FIVEaa.

It is dumbfounding. Well, actually, no, it is not, because I actually tip my hat to the member for West Torrens. He is a master at this. He has been here a very long time—many would say too long—but he is a master at it. He is just so good, so slick in weaponising things that he knows he should not be weaponising. It is absolutely ridiculous that he would behave this way, but he is doing it anyway.

As the Hon. Connie Bonaros said, there has been significant consultation that has come in to these regulations. There are very pointy bits on it that the government really should be knocking off. We have heard from the Law Society, the Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement and the Legal Services Commission that there are some serious concerns. It does not take too much imagination, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros said, to see how some of these things could really catch people out.

They are sweeping powers, inflexible powers in some respects, with these regulations. We do urge the government to attend to what could be unintended consequences of these regulations, particularly the risk of lifetime public transport bans for vulnerable South Australians. We urge the government to address these flaws. We urge them to update these regulations promptly, and we urge them to undertake a broad public awareness campaign so people do understand the serious new consequences attached to these offences.

Again, the opposition wants to see stronger laws to ensure that those who do the wrong thing on public transport are held to account, but the government cannot run roughshod over parliamentary process, and the government surely cannot weaponise it for their own political purposes, spin it up in the media, light the fuse and then run away. That is exactly what Tom Koutsantonis has done here.

The Hon. Connie Bonaros is right. We keep getting told that we cannot know what happens in cabinet, of course, and we actually cannot know what happens in a lot of things with this government, but I would like to know what the Minister for Child Protection and Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence thinks of this, what the Attorney-General thinks of this, because, again, the Hon. Connie Bonaros is right that they will be the ones who will have to deal with the aftermath of these regulations. We urge the government to look at them, consider the flaws that may exist there, update those regulations promptly and then bring them back.

As I said at the outset, the opposition will be opposing the disallowance motion because we cannot chuck out the entire regs. Some of them we agree with, but there are bumps on a fair bit of it, and the government needs to do a bit more work.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (18:18): I rise today to speak on this motion. Whilst we will not be supporting the Hon. Connie Bonaros' disallowance motion, as the Hon. Ben Hood has pointed out as lead speaker, I would like to speak about the vital role of parliamentary scrutiny, particularly when it comes to regulations; that is, subordinate legislation or regulations that can have a profound impact on people's daily lives in the same vein as legislation but are often introduced without the same level of debate, without the same level of transparency and without the same level of consultation that primary legislation receives.

One of the tools that is available to us as members of parliament is the notice of motion to disallow a regulation. This is not a political stunt, nor is it an act of blind opposition, and it should never be treated as such. I think those who seek to do so should be absolutely ashamed of themselves, because, let me be clear, notices of motion, as we all know in this place, are a routine and important mechanism that allows this chamber, and the other place, to examine and to scrutinise the implications of executive decisions.

Make no mistake, calling for a regulation to be scrutinised is not the same as opposing its intent. In fact, it is often driven by a desire to see the intent carried out in a way that is fair and lawful. In the case of these regulations concerning public transport bans, concerns have been raised, not about the need for community safety—we all want safer public places—but about the breadth and the nature of the specific powers being granted. The regulations allow for indefinite bans. As my honourable colleagues have pointed out, these indefinite bans from public transport will potentially be issued by non-police officials and before a person has been convicted of a crime.

This is not, as the Hon. Connie Bonaros pointed out, about being soft on crime. This is about ensuring that innocent people are not unfairly punished due to administrative errors, mistaken identity or overreach. Notices of motion to disallow are a responsible way for parliament to say, 'Let's take a closer look.' They are about due diligence. They are about transparency, they are about due process and they are about getting the balance right between authority and accountability.

As members of this chamber, it is not only our right but our responsibility to interrogate executive powers. We do not rubberstamp legislation and nor should we. We question it, we examine it, we listen to the debate and we challenge when appropriate. That is the cornerstone of a healthy democracy.

So I say again: putting forward a notice of motion to disallow is not an attack on public safety. It is an assertion of parliamentary responsibility because laws, which are passed in haste without consultation or scrutiny, are laws most prone to error. The people of South Australia deserve laws that protect them with fairness, with transparency and with accountability. What they do not deserve are members of parliament, such as Tom Koutsantonis, who deliberately misuse the disallowance process to stoke fear and confusion in the community, and do so in a manner that is not even entirely accurate.

As we all know in this place, the Legislative Review Committee is also government controlled, with the Labor majority that ultimately determines the direction of its inquiries, its deliberations and its recommendations.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: And witnesses—its witnesses.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Exactly. While the minister was quick to reveal on commercial radio the committee's deliberations concerning Liberal members, he notably avoided, nor was he questioned about, the views and contributions of his own Labor colleagues on the very same topic. In fact, recorded in *Hansard* the Labor member for Elizabeth, Mr Lee Odenwalder, acknowledged the seriousness of the concerns raised by witnesses stating, and I quote, 'I would like to thank you all for coming in. You make some pretty compelling points, I have to say.' He then went on to concede, 'There are so many questions.'

This chamber exists to serve the people, not to scare them. The disallowance mechanism is a tool of accountability, not a political weapon. It is designed to prompt thoughtful review and to ensure regulations are workable, are proportionate and are just. When members use that process to sensationalise, to mislead or to suggest that scrutiny equals sabotage, they do a disservice to the democratic institutions that we are entrusted to uphold. Worse still, they erode public trust and confidence in the very system designed to protect them.

South Australians expect their representatives to be responsible, not reckless, to test the detail, not inflame the headlines, because good governance is not about who can shout the loudest, it is about who can think the clearest, act with integrity and legislate in the public interest.

The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (18:25): The Malinauskas Labor government has recently unveiled a series of measures and investments to improve safety and security on our public transport network,

including the establishment of a new security task force to combat antisocial and violent behaviour as part of a \$9.6 million state budget initiative.

In addition, the government recently announced the introduction of nation-leading powers to crack down on criminal and antisocial behaviour on public transport, including indefinite bans for passengers. The measures to come into effect from next month give the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport new authority to ban passengers indefinitely from public transport if they have been charged with offences involving violent acts. Currently, only South Australia Police can ban people from travelling on public transport, and SAPOL does not have the power to issue indefinite bans.

These include sexual and indecent assault, carrying weapons, and psychological or physical abuse that may occur on board services or while waiting at stations or bus stops. The maximum court penalty for breaching a transit barring order will also be strengthened under these changes, increasing from \$2,500 to \$7,000 as the state government takes a hard line approach to protect passengers, drivers and public transport workers. In that you have the whole reason for doing this: we want to protect the users of our public transport system and the people who work for South Australians running those public transport systems.

As I said, I am grateful that the Liberal Party has come on board and flip-flopped on their previous position of opposing these provisions. I have to say very briefly that it is incredible that Liberal Party members in this place come in here complaining about Minister Koutsantonis deliberately talking about these disallowance motions and making a political statement about them when they were doing it themselves on radio all week.

What was the Leader of the Opposition in this place doing on radio all week? She was opposing this while her leader was out doing other interviews saying, 'We support them and we want them to go further.' This really demonstrates a total division inside the Liberal Party in this state. Vincent Tarzia, the Leader of the Opposition, on one side saying, 'This should go further,' Liberals up here saying, 'No, we're not going to support it,' run by Alex Antic in this state, overturning all the Liberal Party policy that has been in place for years.

They are soft on people going after our drivers, they are soft on people who are abusing our passengers who only want to get on with their private business and use public transport in safety. I am very glad that they have reconsidered their position. The Hon. Nicola Centofanti, I think, is very cute when she says, 'We don't want this to be politicised', when she was doing the very same thing herself. Methinks, Mr President, she protesteth too much.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Bonaros, you might be mindful of the time.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (18:28): Yes, I am mindful of the time. I am not going to go on. I am going to say that I have spoken to the Clerk in relation to the letters. Can I urge all honourable members to go to the Legislative Review Committee and access the submissions that are available. Can I particularly urge the government and the minister responsible to go and read the submissions that have been made available.

I do not believe the Hon. Ian Hunter believes a word of anything he just said, and can I seek leave to table the letter from the equal opportunity commissioner, and just for the minister and the Attorney-General's benefit—who has just joined us—the equal opportunity commissioner ends her correspondence by saying:

In the event, if these regulations are commenced as proposed, it is crucial that members of the public are made aware of their rights under the act and their ability to lodge a complaint with my office if they believe they have been discriminated against.

I would just reinforce that advice. Shame! I seek leave to table this letter.

Leave granted.

Motion negatived.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (DEFENCES—INTOXICATION) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill without any amendment.

NORTH ADELAIDE PUBLIC GOLF COURSE BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the amendments made by the Legislative Council without any amendment.

At 18:31 the council adjourned until Tuesday 19 August 2025 at 14:15.

*Answers to Questions***ADELAIDE DESALINATION PLANT**

In reply to **the Hon. S.L. GAME** (14 May 2025).

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

All of the chemicals permitted to be used in the Adelaide Desalination Plant are already publicly available on the Environment Protection Authority's (EPA) website.

All marine desalination plants operated by SA Water are licensed by the EPA and must comply with strict environmental standards, including the management of any chemicals used in the desalination process.

SA Water regularly monitors and evaluates the environmental performance of these plants, as part of standard operational requirements to meet licence conditions.