

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 28 September 2022

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 10:30.

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Bills

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (TARGETS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 July 2022.)

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (10:32): I take the opportunity here to speak in parliament today about the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction (Targets) Amendment Bill 2022, which has been introduced by the Leader of the Opposition and aims to update the emissions reduction and renewable electricity targets in the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007. This is aimed to be commensurate with global efforts to help reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to limit the worst effects of climate change.

Of course, South Australia is the driest state in the world's driest inhabited continent, so at our heart climate and rainfall have been an ever-present challenge to South Australia in terms of its growth, both economically and socially. South Australia certainly has a vital interest in the success of global efforts to avoid the worst effects of climate change. Consequently, addressing it was a priority of the previous Liberal government and remains a priority to those on this side of the house because we do acknowledge the risks and also the challenges and opportunities that climate change poses.

At the same time, it is very apparent that South Australia is not the only jurisdiction that is facing these challenges, but South Australia is well equipped to respond to both the challenges and opportunities of climate change, more so than many other Australian states or nearly all other places in the world.

As previously mentioned by the leader, these amendments will serve to legislate provisions in line with the former Liberal government's greenhouse gas emissions reductions and renewable energy generation targets, as well as those encapsulated within the state's Climate Change Action Plan 2021-2025. In summary, these policy targets are as follows:

- net zero emissions by 2050;
- reducing net emissions by more than 50 per cent (from 2005 levels) by 2030; and
- achieving 100 per cent net renewable energy generation by 2030.

Enshrining these greenhouse gas emission reduction and renewable energy generation targets within the legislation will serve to demonstrate that, as a state, South Australia is committed to its goal of reducing greenhouse gas emissions, and will also send a strong message both to South Australian people and to the business community. At the same time, we do not see from those opposite their plan. Is it to do the same? They have resorted to what I would say are empty gestures and virtue signalling, such as declaring a climate emergency, whilst at the same time making massive cuts to the Department for Environment and Water. That just puts it in perspective.

From a global perspective, if we look at the most recent IPCC assessment reports, one of those is the Mitigation of Climate Change report. That demonstrates what is going on from a global perspective, what the growth of greenhouse gases is. If we look at 1990 levels, there were 38,000 megatons of CO₂ equivalents. By 2005, this had grown to 47,000 megatons and increased further by 2019 to 59,000 megatons. Breaking this down into regions, it shows that eastern Asia made up 27 per cent of those emissions; North America, 12 per cent; and Europe, 8 per cent. In comparison, Australia's emissions in 2005 were 625 megatons and by 2019 had decreased to 530 megatons.

South Australia's contribution to the 2005 levels was 36 megatons and decreased to 24 megatons in 2019. Comparing that with the 59,000 megatons of global emissions, it does put in perspective the role that we play and also the effect of South Australia's emissions. However, what is also important is mitigation action. We can do our bit as well, but we need to acknowledge that it is going to require a global effort to reduce emissions, as I said, by comparing our emissions of 24 megatons with the worldwide emissions of 59,000 megatons.

It is a complex problem and it is a global problem. We have many developing nations having to lift large populations—in the hundreds of millions or the billions for some countries—out of poverty, and at this stage their energy sources are primarily tied to coal. This has been one of the key reasons for the resulting increase in global emissions. While it is important that we do our bit in South Australia to mitigate emissions, it really is imperative that South Australia puts in place adaption measures to plan for changes that will occur because of climate change—factors well outside what South Australia does and more in line with what the world is doing.

Recognising that we needed to have practical action, the former Liberal government's approach to adaption was very practical. We worked to drive action on the ground and in communities as well because it is important that they can see and experience what is going on and therefore become a part of it. Some of the practical action taken on greenhouse gas emissions reduction by the former Liberal government, and also the promotion of renewable energy generation, was characterised by an acknowledgement of the risks and challenges that climate change poses, a commitment to reduce our emissions, as I said before, and, importantly, a desire to adapt and pursue climate change-related opportunities, which included engaging with business and the market.

This amendment bill seeks to amend the current targets in the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 by replacing them with a target of net zero emissions by 2050. Additionally, a new interim target that relates to the previous Liberal government's policy target, which was to reduce net greenhouse gas emissions by more than 50 per cent from 2005 levels by 2030, is also included. At present, the two existing legislative renewable energy targets are to increase renewable electricity use and generation by at least 20 per cent by 2014, and these were achieved by 2011. These are looking to be replaced by a new target reflecting our renewable energy ambition, which is to achieve 100 per cent net renewable electricity generation by 2030.

In December 2020, the former Liberal government released its Climate Change Action Plan. It was developed with input from renowned climate change expert Professor Ross Garnaut. South Australia has already reduced its net greenhouse gas emissions by 33 per cent from 2005 levels, based on that 2019 data, and at the same time, whilst those emissions have gone down, gross state product has grown by 26 per cent. It is important to understand, as I said, that we can still continue to grow our economy and grow society at the same time.

The figures also show that South Australia is on track to reach net 100 per cent of our electricity demand from renewable energy by 2030. In so doing, this meant that the former Liberal government then set a goal of reducing emissions by 50 per cent by 2030. Professor Garnaut has previously stated that a 50 per cent reduction in emissions by 2030 is within reach, but it will require major contributions from economic sectors, such as low-emissions manufacturing and mining, renewable electricity and hydrogen, and transport, and also options for carbon abatement, such as storing it inland or in the sea, in what is known as blue carbon farming.

By continuing this momentum, the state really is on track to achieve a level of renewable energy by 2050 that is five times more than the current demand. This is based on a number of projects that have been initiated. Under the former Liberal government, a number of projects related

to reducing greenhouse gas emissions and promoting renewable solutions also occurred. One such project is in the area of hydrogen. There are massive opportunities from being able to use the abundant solar and wind resources this state has to convert water via electrolysis into hydrogen.

We have invested in a number of hydrogen-related projects. One of those, of course, is the Port Bonython hydrogen hub, which is in conjunction with the federal government. It will be a truly global project. It has international companies from Japan and Canada involved as well, coming together to be global market players in this industry and to accelerate further the already good work being done here. In summary, in the time that is remaining, this bill is about updating targets to be more in line with where we want to take the state and where it is going at present.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (10:42): I also rise to speak on the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction (Targets) Amendment Bill. I commend the Leader of the Opposition for bringing this bill before the house because I think it once again demonstrates that it is those of us on this side of the house who are serious about taking real action on this issue and are serious about maximising the economic benefits that the energy transition will present for South Australia.

This bill brings the emissions reduction targets, as well as the renewable energy targets in the 2007 act, in line and up to date with global efforts to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to limit the worst effects of climate change. The changes that are proposed by this bill enshrine into legislation targets that the previous Liberal government put in place and reflect the state's climate action plan.

There are three broad targets that are going to be updated by this bill: firstly, a target to reach net zero by 2050; secondly, an interim target to reduce net emissions by more than 50 per cent by 2030; and, thirdly, to achieve 100 per cent net renewables by 2030, a target that I am very pleased to say we are well on track to meet.

What this bill does is legislate our ambitious targets that are consistent with the Paris Agreement, consistent with the climate change goal to limit warming by below 2°, and preferably 1.5°, and consistent with targets set by the Australian government and their commitment to net zero by 2050. I was very pleased and very proud to have been part of that Australian delegation that committed to net zero at the COP26 climate conference in Glasgow just last year.

Targets are all well and good, but they are totally meaningless if they are not backed up by a plan to meet them, if they are not accompanied by real action. That is exactly what the previous Liberal government put in place. In December 2019, the previous government released its Climate Smart South Australia policy framework, and that set out its ambition to reach a goal of net zero emissions by 2050.

About a year later, in December 2020, the previous Liberal government released what was the most powerful vision for climate action in this state that any South Australian government has ever put forward. As the member for Morphett has pointed out, it was developed in conjunction with and with the advice of climate change expert Professor Ross Garnaut. That action plan had real action. It had 68 actions across seven focus areas, including energy transformation; the economy; agriculture, landscapes and habitats; low-emissions transport; built and urban environments; resilient communities; and government leading by example.

I mentioned that it was developed in conjunction with Ross Garnaut. The professor released his own report in September 2020, which began with a dire warning for South Australians. It pointed out the challenges that we face on this issue. He said: 'South Australia stands out in a vulnerable world for its vulnerability to climate change.' Importantly, and encouragingly, Professor Garnaut also noted the immense opportunity that the energy transition can bring to South Australia.

It is very important that we realise that economic growth is not inconsistent, is not at odds with emissions reduction. Indeed, Australia has already reduced its emissions by more than 20 per cent since 2005, and in that same time period our economy has grown by 45 per cent. In South Australia, similarly, we have reduced our emissions by 33 per cent on 2005 levels, and what have we seen over that same time period? Our gross state product grew by 26 per cent.

I noted in my own maiden speech just a few weeks ago that this is an issue that concerns economics and concerns energy security just as much as it is an environmental issue. Just as the

world has always looked to Australia to power it with coal and with gas, it is going to start to look to Australia—it is starting to look to Australia—to power it again, but with clean energy. I say: why should South Australia not be at the forefront of what will be an emerging and growing industry for our future? The good news is that Professor Ross Garnaut in his report said that this state is perfectly placed to do just that. He said, notwithstanding the challenges that he also outlined:

...South Australia is better equipped to respond to the challenges and opportunities of climate change than any other Australian state and nearly all of the world's sub-national jurisdictions.

That is very encouraging, but we need to embrace these opportunities, and that is exactly what the previous Liberal government set about doing. We increased renewables. In just 15 years, South Australia's energy system has grown from being 1 per cent renewables to over 60 per cent, so we are well on our way to achieving the target that this bill is setting out to legislate; in fact, we are ranked second only to Denmark for annual variable renewable energy that we generate.

We invested in hydrogen projects. We had an electric vehicle action plan that accelerated the uptake of electric vehicles. We set about creating a regulatory framework to support large-scale carbon capture. We did other things, like reducing food waste—we had a comprehensive strategy to halve the amount of food waste by 2025—as well as implementing innovations in other waste management areas and in the circular economy, for which we now have a shadow minister.

All this work that was undertaken by the previous Liberal government can be harnessed to develop new export industries and to develop new advanced manufacturing industries based on what we have here in South Australia, which is a clean energy advantage. It has been acknowledged by Professor Ross Garnaut, it was acknowledged by the previous Liberal government and it should be acknowledged by this house through this bill.

That is what this is all about for me: it is about embracing the benefits that South Australia can reap from the energy transition. I will tell you what it is not about. It is not about protests, it is not about ideology or the ideologues and it is certainly not about declaring a climate emergency. Declarations of emergencies, like what we have seen from those opposite, when they are backed up by no emergency action, are simply virtue signalling at its very worst. In fact, not only did we see a declaration of emergency from those opposite without any action to address that emergency but we saw the exact opposite: we saw cuts to the environment budget.

We cannot resort to virtue signalling; we need to resort to action. That is what we have seen from the previous Liberal government. We need to implement an action-based plan that will drive not only serious environmental outcomes but also, importantly, serious economic outcomes. Legislating these targets, which is what this bill seeks to do, will send a strong signal to South Australians, and indeed, to people across the country and across the world, that this state is serious about this issue. It is serious about achieving environmental outcomes and, importantly, it is serious about unlocking the economic potential that the energy transition is going to present to South Australia. That is why I will be very pleased to support this bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

ELECTORAL (TELEPHONE VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 June 2022.)

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (10:52): I rise today to add my support to a bill that was introduced to this parliament earlier in the year, the Electoral (Telephone Voting) Amendment Bill 2022. The Electoral Commission of South Australia (ECSA) published an election report into the 2018 state election. As members of this place would be aware, the former Liberal government introduced the Electoral (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill and the Electoral (Electronic Documents and Other Matters) Amendment Bill of 2021 into this place in the former parliament.

While this particular bill is based on some of the recommendations that were made in the report provided by ECSA and on the consequent consultation that occurred in regard to the bills that

came after that, it is important to note that it is very much a standalone bill to bring forward the reform, specifically in regard to assisted telephone voting in South Australia.

The amendments proposed in the bill amend sections 84A, 84B and 84C of the Electoral Act, which currently provide for electronically assisted voting for sight-impaired electors. It is intended that electors with a range of disabilities and electors living overseas will be able to cast their ballot using telephone-assisted voting. The amendments set out in the act provide a new definition of 'prescribed voter', and provide for the class of voters and the methods of assisted voting to be prescribed by regulation.

In essence, the proposed bill will enable the state to provide voting services that are more consistent with options available in other jurisdictions in Australia, and also, importantly, meet community expectations. The bill inserts a new division in part 9, which is 5B—Telephone voting for certain electors. The bill also expands the options for telephone voting, as previously discussed, which are currently available for sight-impaired voters. The class of voters who can access telephone voting and the method of telephone voting are designated in the bill and can and may further be prescribed in regulations, as has been mentioned.

One of the important things to remember as part of this reform is that it is not just in regard to the ability to franchise a group of people in our community who have for far too long have not had their preferred method of voting, but it also deals with the issue that has reared its head in the last couple of years in regard to slow postal services and supply chains, which will better enable those who are overseas, and very much citizens of South Australia, to participate in the relevant elections, as they should rightfully be able to.

Telephone voting has been available in federal elections for electors who are blind or who have low vision and electors working in Antarctica. The 'Report of the inquiry on the future conduct of elections operating during times of emergency situations', which was completed by the Joint Standing Committee on Electoral Matters of the Australian parliament, recommended expanding telephone voting to elderly Australians and those living with a disability, who are vulnerable in a pandemic, and those directed to quarantine or self-isolate.

Again, as this parliament is well aware, we do not know what may occur in the future. For the Queensland 2020 local government elections and the general election, telephone voting was expanded to include electors who had been directed to quarantine or self-isolate. The volume of voters who elected to use telephone voting during that process rose by 390 per cent.

I just want to take the time to express my frustration—and I think the frustration of the vision community—that this sensible reform, which enfranchises a group of members of our community, has not been progressed. That fault lies at the feet of everybody within this parliament. It lies at the feet of the government, it lies at the feet of the opposition, and it lies at the feet of the crossbench. We as a collective, this parliament as a whole, were not able to progress these reforms in the previous parliament, and that is an indictment of our process to this point.

This is a standalone bill. It simply deals with the issue at hand and nothing more. I have certainly had incredible and strong advocacy put to me by the vision community. In particular, I would like to raise the name of Mr Peter Greco, who undertakes a radio program each and every week with Vision Australia Radio, his Leisure Link program on 5RPH community radio. This issue is raised with me each and every time I speak with him and each and every time I have discussions with the broader vision community.

This community has been disenfranchised for too long. Would having passed this bill prior to this point have allowed the vision community to participate in the council elections later this year through their preferred method? We will, of course, never know. It is time for this bill to pass. It is time for the government and the opposition to come together to provide the preferred method of voting for the vision community of South Australia and that time is well and truly now.

If this parliament is serious about making our processes available and inclusive to our whole society, this bill must pass. As you can tell, I am reasonably passionate about this. I do want to see this reform progressed. I do want to see these options provided to the vision community and also

those other groups that may well be able to benefit from telephone voting in South Australia. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Motions

STATE ELECTRICITY NETWORK

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:03): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 28 September 2022 marks six years since the statewide blackout in which almost all South Australia lost power during a period when local power prices soared to amongst the highest in the world;
- (b) commends the Marshall Liberal government for increasing the reliability of South Australia's power network and accelerating South Australia's achievement of net-100 per cent renewables while reducing the average household electricity bill by \$421 a year; and
- (c) urges the Malinauskas Labor government, despite Labor's previous opposition to the project, to ensure the high-capacity interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales is completed on schedule to provide a further cut to power prices while incentivising the introduction of more renewable energy.

Today is 28 September: six years ago to the day, on 28 September 2016, South Australia was plunged into a statewide blackout under the former Labor government, causing chaos and putting lives at risk. The state lost power, and it was certainly a dark day for South Australia, affecting South Australians just as they were about to finish work or come home from school.

It really hit home just how much modern society depends on reliable electricity. With all the traffic lights out, commuters returning home had to rely on police officers to direct traffic, causing massive delays. It was the first time such a blackout had occurred on a statewide level in Australia.

The impact on business was significant as well. According to Business SA, Labor's statewide blackout cost the state about \$350 million. Some examples of this include that BHP's Olympic Dam mine was unable to operate from more than two weeks after the blackout, costing it \$1 million a day, while another major South Australian company, Adelaide Brighton Cement, lost power for 36 hours during the statewide blackout, with an estimated loss of \$9 million.

Over and above this massive statewide blackout, either side of it there were also other continued forced blackouts for a number of periods during that time. Businesses and households started looking to buy backup diesel generators as they lost faith in reliable electricity. An example of this is the South Australian company Ferguson Australia, which is involved with seafood, lobsters. It has been affected by trade issues recently, but before that it had to depend on reliable electricity.

It had live lobsters in water tanks that needed to be filtered and the water continually running. Without electricity, that filtration system no longer works and the lack of oxygen causes the lobsters to become stressed and eventually die. Having to resort to backup batteries and backup diesel generators were suboptimal conditions for a business to operate in, and the impact was such that the business lost faith in reliable electricity.

Between 2014 and 2018, during the term of the former Labor government, seven million customer hours were lost from households as well as from businesses. What was happening during this time? Renewable energy was replacing traditional generators that were fuelled either by coal or gas. One such generator, the Northern power station at Port Augusta, closed in May 2016, just four months before the statewide blackout.

The loss of traditional generation led to declining system strength and network stability in terms of both frequency and voltage. Unfortunately, the former Labor government was not focused on these important areas to ensure the right settings and controls were in place on renewable energy and renewables in this state.

At the same time as the system strength issues, the closure of the Northern power station saw wholesale spot prices jump extraordinarily high—up over 100 per cent. Of course, this flowed

onto customers and they saw an increase in their bills of between \$200 and \$250. Overall, between June 2016 through to June 2018—this was the last time that the current energy minister was also energy minister—according to ESCOSA, the average residential household's electricity prices skyrocketed by \$477. Businesses also were not immune to this and saw their bills rise by \$1,075. Overall, South Australia's electricity prices soared to amongst the highest in the world while, at the same time, the former Labor government failed to make sure that we had secure generation in South Australia.

If we are to undergo an orderly transition to renewables, it is certainly important that it is done so that it generates not only clean electricity but, importantly, electricity that is affordable and reliable. To do those three in conjunction, if you go too far in one direction with one, invariably one of the others fails. In this case, we saw reliability and affordability go through the roof. We need to take this opportunity in South Australia because we have 69 per cent of the nation's solar and wind resources, quality wind resources, and they can be leveraged, but it really does need to be done in an orderly manner.

Certainly one of the key ways to do that, to continue to grow renewable energy, is to make sure that there is grid stability. Recognising this, the former Liberal government put in place four key pillars to ensure that that grid was stable. One of those was to roll out the Home Battery Scheme for households. This saw the world's largest per capita take-up of smart home batteries, with South Australia leading the nation in percentage terms.

Not only does this help householders themselves but at times when energy is at its highest—in the morning when people are getting ready for work and school or when people are coming home and turning on appliances—and when there are electricity peaks, home batteries can reduce the overall peak demand which then means that the prices that all South Australians pay are reduced.

The scheme itself was targeted at 40,000 home batteries of seven kilowatt hours each, producing overall 280 megawatts. That was the target: to have 280 megawatts of renewable energy storage into the system to stabilise that grid. As the scheme rolled out, the take-up saw the average battery per household at around 11 kilowatts. As it was going through, 18,000 households took it up. That saw 200 megawatts of renewable energy capacity stored in batteries. That continued on as a successful program but, unfortunately, it has been cut by this government, again calling into question their understanding of the need for grid stability.

Another area we concentrated on was, as I said, to get grid-scale storage as well. A grid-scale storage fund, again, tried to get batteries at grid scale so that not only do you have renewable energy but you also have dispatchable energy. Again, these are focused on those peak times. This has seen significant battery expansion in terms of storage capacity into the South Australian market. The Hornsdale battery has been increased by 50 per cent and we have also seen batteries come online at Gould Creek, Lake Bonney and Dalrymple.

Another area to help stabilise the grid was in terms of demand management, having voluntary demand management. Instead of people all putting on their appliances when everyone else was—say, at 6 o'clock at night—those that maybe do not need to go on at that time, like hot-water services and pool pumps, if they can be managed in the middle of the day when there is a lot of excess renewable energy then not only does that help keep prices down, it helps to reduce load on the system.

The most important measure that the former Liberal government looked to, and has successfully been able to introduce, was the interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales. That provides 800 megawatts of capacity between the two states. It has a twofold purpose: it allows us to export excess renewable energy when South Australia has an excess of renewable energy from our abundant wind and solar resources and, equally, when there is a wind drought or it is overcast, to be able import that energy from another source. At the moment, we have the interconnector to Victoria and this adds on another one to New South Wales. That redundancy is really important, so grid stability is also making sure that the system is resilient.

Equally important as well now is that we are getting into periods when we have negative demand and produce more electricity because of the massive rooftop solar we have here. It is over one gigawatt of rooftop solar and it is growing at about 200 megawatts per year. This interconnector

will allow that distributed energy to be exported as well. It provides another avenue out which then in turn perversely allows you to continue to increase that amount of renewable distributed energy on rooftops as well.

I should say that the interconnector is also encouraging massive investment in grid-scale generation. One such project, Goyder South, wants to introduce 1,200 megawatts of wind energy, 600 megawatts of solar, 900 megawatts of battery capacity, and Neoen have said that two-thirds of this, or \$2 billion of that investment, relies on being able to export that electricity to New South Wales. The managing director said that Project EnergyConnect is vital to unlocking the full potential of Neoen's multigigawatt Goyder Renewables Zone.

It was very interesting to see the current energy minister and the Premier announcing the next stage of this project only a few weeks ago. It was fantastic to see the commencement of construction in January this year at that site and, again, at that stage the Managing Director of Neoen said that it would have been impossible for Project EnergyConnect to get the Goyder South project off the line without that interconnector. That just really shows that not only is it helping South Australian households but it will help grid-scale generation as well.

Importantly, AEMO have also highlighted the importance of this interconnector. They have called it a no regrets decision in their integrated service plan back in 2020. Interestingly enough, two years later—every two years they bring out these service plans—again, they have emphasised how important interconnection is to this orderly transition. They have now started calling these sorts of interconnectors transmission lines of national significance and, certainly, that is what this interconnector is to South Australia.

This orderly transition has, at the same time as producing increases in renewable energy generation, increased reliability in South Australia. In fact, in the four years there were no customer hours lost from forced load shedding compared with seven million customer hours under the previous Labor government. Additionally, this has had massive downward pressure on electricity prices in South Australia with prices dropping by \$421, which is fantastic for South Australian households. Unfortunately, this looks like reversing as we go forward.

We have just seen the latest ESCOSA report come out and it shows that prices have unfortunately gone up by \$218. This is at the same time that the Labor government has cut programs that were helping with the stability, helping with the reliability, helping bring down prices for South Australians. That is of great concern to us. We cannot see any immediate plan in action at the moment and emphasise the need to concentrate on measures such as these mentioned here, such as the interconnector to ensure grid stability and making sure households experience low electricity prices.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I recognise the presence in the gallery of representatives from Grandparents for Grandchildren, guests of the member for Reynell and the member for Badcoe. Welcome to parliament.

Motions

STATE ELECTRICITY NETWORK

Debate resumed.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (11:18): I move to make the following amendments to the motion:

In paragraph (a) delete the words 'during a period when local power prices soared to amongst the highest in the world', and insert in lieu thereof 'when an extraordinary storm struck the state'.

Delete paragraph (b) and insert new paragraph (b) 'condemns the Marshall Liberal government for reducing the reliability of South Australia's power network by leasing the publicly owned generators to the private sector, abrogating its responsibility to encourage investment in, and efficient use of, generation capacity and failing to meet the Liberal Party election commitment of reducing average household power prices by \$302 a year'.

Delete paragraph (c) and insert new paragraph (c) 'urges the Malinauskas Labor government to continue its good work to improve provision of reliable, affordable and cleaner energy to South Australians'.

Can I thank the member for Morphett for moving this motion, because it gives the house time to revisit the events of 2016 and the myths and misinformation that were created around that episode in the state's history. It also gives the house time to reflect on how those opposite sat on the government benches for four years and failed to act to meet their election promises and failed to ensure there was investment in an efficient use of energy generation in South Australia. Accordingly, I have moved amendments to the motion proposed by the member for Morphett.

My fellow members will have more to say about the events of 28 September 2016, but can I just highlight that the motion proposed by the member for Morphett is yet another disgraceful attempt by the Liberal Party to spread disinformation. Who can forget how it took a Labor Premier to stand next to the then federal energy minister, Josh Frydenberg, and call out the shameful attitude of the Liberal Party to South Australia over an event caused by an extraordinary storm? The Liberal Party blamed renewable energy when the storm tore down three power transmission lines, precipitating a series of events involving the transmission system, wind farms, the Victorian interconnector and fossil fuel powered generators.

In paragraph (b) of the member for Morphett's motion, it is claimed that under the Liberals the average household electricity bill reduced by \$421 a year. During the 2018 election campaign, one of the key promises made by the Liberal Party was that average electricity prices would fall by \$302 a year. That promise was repeated time and time again. Of course, we should recall that earlier media conference when the then Liberal leader, Steven Marshall, was embarrassed by having to admit that most of the projected production was already in train rather than through any action planned by the Liberals.

Let's look at what that promise actually was. In its document called 'Liberal energy solution', on page 9 the Liberals said, and I quote, 'an average South Australian household's power bill fall by \$302, compared to the latest (2016-17) prices'. What were the average prices in 2016-17? The benchmark is estimated every year for the state by the Essential Services Commission of SA, which surveys all available retail market offers. The commission's 2016-17 energy retail offers comparison report said that the average was \$1,976 a year. What was the ESCOSA estimate for the last full financial year (2020-21) of the Liberal government? It was \$1,941.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morphett is called to order.

Ms HOOD: What was it in 2021-22, a financial year in which the Liberals were in government for roughly three-quarters of the time? It was \$2,041. No matter how you look at it, the Liberal Party failed dismally in meeting its election promise. At absolute best, prices fell by \$35, not even close to the promised \$302. Then, prices were on an upward trend by the time the Liberals were defeated by the people of South Australia to an increase of \$65. Of course, the Liberals have form when failing to meet election promises. Let's think: GlobeLink, a tram right-hand turn, no privatisation agenda. The list goes on and on.

Ms Stinson: School zones.

Ms HOOD: School zones. The member for Morphett is echoing claims made by the former Premier and former energy minister of a \$421 fall in prices. Those claims are based on taking a different starting point from the one made in writing by the Liberal Party and an arbitrary end point, made under special instruction outside the ESCOSA annual reporting pattern. There is a term for behaviour like that, and it is called shifting the goalposts. It was not just one set of goalposts; the Liberals decided to move the goalposts at both ends of the ground. They must take the public for fools. Fortunately, the Australian Labor Party treats the public with respect. We do not shift the goalposts and we deliver on the promises we make.

Let us think about what actions the respective side of politics has taken to strengthen the electricity system. In the final years of the previous Labor government, measures included:

- leading changes to requirements on synchronous generation;

- investing in state-owned generators, which would fill the crucial capacity gap to meet extreme peak demand; and
- underpinning investment in the big battery at Jamestown, which I was proud to attend the night it was switched on.

It is important to note on that last point that the former Liberal Prime Minister, Scott Morrison, mocked our big battery, likening it to a big banana. That is the same former Liberal Prime Minister who, when he was Treasurer, carried a lump of coal into federal parliament and told us we should all be afraid. He would have been better carrying in a Dyson because that is a much more accurate description of the renewable energy policy on that side of the house—a vacuum!

With leadership like that, it is no surprise as to what the South Australian Liberal Party did when they were in government. They brought in new rules so household solar could be switched off remotely, denying households the ability to earn feed-in tariffs from exporting their solar energy, privatised our state-owned generators and broke their promise to reduce power prices by \$302.

The big battery in Jamestown has saved consumers tens of millions of dollars in the reduced cost of system support services. Derided by those who never understood its purpose, the battery is now a model, copied around Australia and globally as an essential service for electricity grids. The two sets of generators bought by the previous Labor government likewise did what they were intended to do. For example, on 24 January 2019, when hot temperature records were broken in many regions of South Australia, the Australian Energy Market Operator ordered that the government-owned generators fire up.

Despite electricity demand peaking close to records as households cranked up their air conditioners, there were no blackouts in South Australia due to the lack of electricity supply. In fact, SA had excess generation and helped minimise load shedding, that is, localised rolling blackouts like Victoria. So what did the Liberal Party do? They sold off control of the generators to the private sector through long-term leases, losing that safety net in the system. Shame!

In the latest forecast by AEMO, South Australia faces a potential reliability gap in the summer of 2023-24, a gap that is almost exactly the size of the capacity of the generators, which are no longer under government control. In paragraph (c) of the motion, the member for Morphett claims that Labor opposed construction of the high-capacity interconnector to New South Wales. As so often is the case with the Liberal Party, the claim is hollow. Where are the quotes from the Premier or from the Minister for Energy and Mining where they said they oppose the interconnector? Such quotes do not exist because they were never said.

What was correctly pointed out was that Project EnergyConnect will result in thermal generators in South Australia closing down earlier than they would have without the interconnector. That risk—and it is a risk—was actually part of the business case in which the proponents advocated for the interconnector in its investment test with the Australian Energy Regulator. Now with the timetable for Project EnergyConnect slipping, according to AEMO, the potential reliability gaps have increased.

In contrast, rather than pinning our hopes on the aging coal-fired power stations in New South Wales, which are breaking down and likely to close down earlier than expected, the Malinauskas Labor government is strengthening our capacity here at home in South Australia. The \$593 million Hydrogen Jobs Plan will firm up cheap renewable energy projects, and the CSIRO has reported that renewable energy is the cheapest form of new generation.

To make renewable energy projects even more attractive to investors, the government's hydrogen generation plant will enable proponents to offer firm contracts of clean green energy, with hydrogen filling in any gaps during still dark nights. That hydrogen will be manufactured from renewable energy at times when it is plentiful. This will restore value to solar generation. The Malinauskas Labor government wants South Australians to be in control of South Australia's future. We will not abrogate our responsibility: we will show leadership as we have in the past, and we will deliver reliable, affordable and cleaner green energy.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:28): I rise to support the motion as presented by the shadow minister, the member for Morphett, and to oppose the proposed amendments that have just now

been circulated and spoken to by the member for Adelaide. I am glad that the member for Adelaide raises the issue of the generators, the so-called emergency diesel generators that were acquired in the dying days of the last Labor government, because it is true to say—and one might draw the connection—that the Labor government we saw through the 1980s and into the early 1990s finished with the collapse of the state's finances.

The previous Labor government—and there can be no doubting—finished with the collapse of confidence in the state's electricity supply. There are connections that can be drawn from one era to the other, but the collapse in confidence that resulted from those years of energy policy mismanagement by the previous Labor government cannot be seen to be repeated now that Labor finds itself back in power.

One of the important things about this debate is that over the course of the last generation, as South Australians moved from what was the Playford era base load generation model—where we were all used to reliable energy generation for an extended period of time, to the extent that the average South Australian would not have really turned their mind to electricity or even prices terribly much—we saw the introduction of the new era of renewable energy generation, something that South Australia is so naturally suited to and strong in.

As we see—and it is only one example but a key example, and I recommend it to everybody, Ross Garnaut's text on the matter—*Super-Power* offers the manual to confidence that South Australians ought to have in the energy space. The point to be made in all of this is that when it comes to electricity policy, management and delivery, it is management and good policy that are at the core of achieving success.

I am really not interested in dwelling on rhetoric surrounding why South Australians ended up with the extraordinary unreliability that they undoubtably did in the lead-up to 2018, nor am I interested in rhetoric around why they were paying so much more for electricity than they ought to have been as the result of that mismanagement.

What is clear is that residents in my local area in the Hills, and they were not alone—we experienced storms extended in 2016, the spring storms of 2016 through to the Christmas storms, which led to all sorts of difficulty—had come to the point where the smart money around the barbecue was identifying which generator you had been able to secure so that you could secure reliable power for your home, your toilets and, if you were running a small business, to keep your freezer running while the ever more unreliable energy grid was failing on an ever more frequent basis in this state.

We had come to a point by certainly late 2017, over the course of that year commencing with the infamous statewide blackout, where South Australians had moved to a mindset in which grid electricity was expensive and unreliable to the point where you needed to fend for yourself, particularly if you did not have mains water and particularly if you were trying to keep produce cool. We were left in a situation where the whole thing was vulnerable to politicisation in a way we had not seen for many generations prior. It was an extraordinary state of affairs that led to the situation we found ourselves in at the end of 2017.

Into this space came Labor, with rhetoric from the previous Minister for Energy that, 'Right, we are going to go it alone in South Australia. We are going to island ourselves from the rest of the grid so as to protect our interests, and we are going to spend a whole lot of money on so-called hybrid electricity generation,' essentially diesel generators. You can just picture the convoy of tankers rolling through to fuel these things.

That rhetoric was somehow going to tell South Australians that if they stuck with Weatherill Labor and the then energy minister (who finds himself back in the role), they were going to have island South Australia, they were going to have these diesel generators and they were going to move even further away from a rational approach to energy. That is against the background of not just the statewide blackout on 28 September 2016 but continued and ever more unreliable and expensive power over the period that followed.

By the way, to this may I say that if one wants to talk about moving the goalposts look at the scoreboard. How many blackouts occurred in the lead-up to the March 2018 election, and how many

blackouts occurred over the summers that followed under the good stewardship of the former minister Dan van Holst Pellekaan? The answer is none.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Where is he? Didn't he get rewarded? Well, take your hat off and thank him. He's right here.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has the call.

Mr TEAGUE: As the Treasurer has observed at least recently, it is the case that Minister Dan van Holst Pellekaan is no longer in this place. It is not for any failure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —of record in this space. Zero blackouts, high reliability and reduced costs are his legacy. I pay tribute to him, as all members here should.

When we dwell on this matter just for a moment, because I am glad the member for Adelaide has raised the matter of these generators, the new government in 2018 considered the matter of what to do about these diesel generators and commissioned a thoroughgoing inquiry into them, the result of which was a damning finding that the cost of the acquisition of these generators—which had not been used by late 2018. They had not been used. As Daniel Wills, the then state political editor for *The Advertiser* newspaper, reported in October 2018—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —the power shock was that \$610 million was to be spent based on dubious, if any, evidence of any efficacy. Not only that, but a straw man was set up by these folks opposite to somehow create this notion that the rational leasing out of these generators to the private sector, who could put them to use, was somehow privatising them contrary to interest.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has the call. The member for West Torrens is called to order. The Treasurer is called to order. The member for Chaffey is called to order.

Mr TEAGUE: All I will say at this point is: look at the scoreboard. Look at the record—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Rhetorically and ideologically bankrupt.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —of the former Marshall Liberal government in this space: costs were down, reliability was up and the good management of South Australia's strong renewable capacity was there for all to see.

So I do ask South Australians: keep up your interest in our state's greatest strengths in this space, keep up your interest in ensuring that South Australia is leading the way on renewable energy, keep up your holding of this government to account on completing the interconnector to New South Wales, notwithstanding whatever form of mealy-mouthed commitment or otherwise to it that we have heard.

Make sure it happens, folks, because we know that ensuring reliability and ensuring lower prices means having a rational approach to energy in this state. It does not mean playing politics, it does not mean islanding South Australia, it does not mean acquiring assets simply for the purposes of creating a political narrative. What it means is day-to-day good management.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who wants to island South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens!

Mr TEAGUE: I will be the first to join in supporting a rational approach, but I endorse very much the words of the motion in its original form and I commend that to the house.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (11:38): I thank the member for Morphett for raising this motion. It gives the house time to revisit the events of 2016 and the myths and misinformation that were created around that episode in the state's history.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

Mr FULBROOK: Member for Chaffey, I sat in silence while your side spoke. I think you could afford me the same courtesy.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Playford will not respond to interjections. The member for Chaffey is called to order.

Mr FULBROOK: It also gives the house time to reflect on how those to the right of me failed in their responsibility to strengthen the electricity system. With this in mind, I speak in support of the amendments to the motion.

Continuing our walk down memory lane, let us again revisit the night of 28 September 2016. In doing so, we must not rely on uninformed or malicious speculation from commentators who are scientifically illiterate and oppose renewable energy. Instead, let's focus on the official apolitical investigations conducted by public agencies. The first of these was by the Australian Energy Market Operator, the body that runs the grid in the National Electricity Market. This is what AEMO said happened, and I quote:

On Wednesday, 28 September 2016, tornadoes with wind speeds in the range of 190-260 km/h occurred in areas of South Australia. Two tornadoes almost simultaneously damaged a single circuit 275 kilovolt (kV) transmission line and a double circuit 275 kV transmission line, some 170 km apart.

The damage to these three transmission lines caused them to trip, and a sequence of faults in quick succession resulted in six voltage dips on the SA grid over a two-minute period at around 4.16 pm.

As the number of faults on the transmission network grew, nine wind farms in the mid-north of SA exhibited a sustained reduction in power as a protection feature activated. For eight of these wind farms, the protection settings of their wind turbines allowed them to withstand a pre-set number of voltage dips within a two-minute period. Activation of this protection feature resulted in a significant sustained power reduction for these wind farms. A sustained generation reduction of 456 megawatts (MW) occurred over a period of less than seven seconds.

The reduction in wind farm output caused a significant increase in imported power flowing through the Heywood Interconnector. Approximately 700 milliseconds (ms) after the reduction of output from the last of the wind farms, the flow on the Victoria-SA Heywood Interconnector reached such a level that it activated a special protection scheme that tripped the interconnector offline.

The SA power system then became separated...from the rest of the NEM. Without any substantial load shedding following the system separation, the remaining generation was much less than the connected load and unable to maintain the islanded system frequency. As a result, all supply to the SA region was lost at 4.18 pm...AEMO's analysis shows that following system separation, frequency collapse and the consequent Black System was inevitable.

So AEMO identified a cascade of events, an extraordinary storm striking the state in more than one place at the same time. The storm caused physical damage to three transmission lines. This led to the lines tripping off, which led to the voltage problems, which led to wind farms tripping off, and then the Heywood Interconnector to Victoria overloaded and tripped. The disturbance in the grid then led to the remaining generation, including gas-fired power stations in Adelaide, to trip off.

Clearly, there was no singular event but a series of events starting with the storm. Without the storm, there would have been no blackout. In all subsequent events, after the storm blew over the transmission towers, the equipment performed according to how it was set up. Whether it was a wind farm, an interconnector or a fossil fuel generator, the equipment tripped off to protect itself.

Having lived in the Northern Territory, I feel it is important to consider the magnitude of this storm compared with the tropical cyclones experienced up north. This is how the Bureau of Meteorology described it, and I quote:

One of the most significant severe thunderstorm outbreaks in recent decades...Multiple supercell thunderstorms produced damaging to destructive wind gusts, including at least seven tornadoes, very large hailstones and locally intense rainfall.

The bureau goes on to talk about 'explosive' and 'extreme' conditions. This was not some regular South Australian thunderstorm; this was something very different—the sort of extreme weather that experts warn will be the consequence of climate change, even if they are wary of attributing an individual event to the change.

Of course, the Bureau of Meteorology did issue warnings about severe winds on that fateful day. In turn, AEMO was in discussions with South Australia's electricity transmission provider, ElectraNet, about the looming storm. ElectraNet had field crews on stand-by and rescheduled work to put as much of a buffer into the system as they could. AEMO said the following of their discussions:

No issues were raised by ElectraNet about abnormal risks to the transmission network. Across the National Electricity Market, the transmission system has had a history of successfully withstanding storms, with maximum gust wind speeds of 120 to 140 km/h without major incidents. The lack of any advice from ElectraNet of additional risks to its transmission network under these forecast conditions was not inconsistent with the historical performance of the grid.

But the storm was outside historical expectations, with wind gusts of up to 260 km/h. After the event, many commentators sought to blame renewable energy, specifically wind farms, for the blackout, even though they, like every other piece of equipment in the chain, performed as they were set up to do. I am not saying this to escape the fact that there was no issue on how they were set up and whether these settings had been properly ratified according to the rules.

The Australian Energy Regulator, the body which enforces the rules, took the view they were not and successfully argued the case in the Federal Court. The wind farm owners accepted this was a serious transgression and agreed to pay substantial fines. But what is of particular interest in the four Federal Court cases was a formal allegation by the Australian Energy Regulator that the wind farms were a contributing cause of the black system event and blackout throughout the South Australian region. In court, the regulator dropped the allegation. I say again: no storm, no blackout.

My colleague has outlined that the Liberal Party failed on many fronts in the electricity sector during their term in office. They failed to meet their election promise. They failed to ensure the prospects of increased generation capacity were fulfilled. They failed to retain in state government control the generation capacity that has and can make a crucial difference in keeping the lights on. The Liberal Party was all talk, but no real action.

In contrast, the Malinauskas government is getting on with the job of sorting out the mess and delivering reliable, affordable and cleaner energy to South Australians. I commend the actions of this government and the proposed revisions to this house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:47): During the election campaign, someone decided to tape then opposition leader Peter Malinauskas, who is now the Premier, regarding remarks he made on power prices. He said very clearly that politicians in state parliament, politicians in federal parliament and politicians in general who get up and make bold claims about electricity prices are setting themselves up to fail.

A clear example of that is the previous Marshall Liberal government, which made a stupid and irresponsible promise they could never keep, which was to reduce power prices by \$302 from the 2016-17 ESCOSA average. They set a benchmark to it. They could not meet it. They tried to meet different time lines to try to show that they could meet it. They even used their ministerial powers to instruct ESCOSA to come up with different ways of measuring annual electricity prices to try to escalate the amount of money that people had saved. It was a fool's paradise. It did not work, and no-one believed them because they saw the experience in their own bills.

Mr Teague: No-one believes you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I note my learned friend, the energy expert, who is the shadow minister for child protection and attorney-general, having a view on electricity prices. Perhaps, the hard cold reality is that at no moment during the last four years of his government were power prices lower than they were under the previous Weatherill government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He shakes his head because he does not know.

Mr Teague: How many blackouts?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Blackouts, not prices?

Mr Teague: Yes, prices, too.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Prices, too?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Do you assert that prices were higher under the Weatherill government than they were under the Marshall government? Do you assert that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange across the chamber will cease.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, you don't. Cowardly as always.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Politicians making promises about power prices is just silly. One of the reasons that I also want to point out to the house is that, after the 2016 state blackout, we released an energy plan, an energy plan that was comprehensive, to try to stabilise the grid. Why were we having to stabilise a grid that we did not own? Because it had been privatised, and the people who had privatised our grid were then trying to blame the people who were managing it for their lack of investment. Think of that.

At the time, the shadow treasurer and the Treasurer was the same person who sold these assets yet attempted to assign blame to another party. Then, when we were putting in backup diesel generation, it was to be converted to gas-fired generation. That was the subject of the Livesey report. The previous government then outsourced our generation, and to this day half our generation was not operational for the entire time of the previous government's time in office. It was lost to us, just lost to us.

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, the member asserts they were never used—false. They were used. So another thing he has told parliament that is not accurate is that they were not used: they were used. Of course they were used. When it comes to energy policy, partisanship will poison this debate every single time. What has happened now is the Hornsdale Power Reserve—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Despite the right-wing opposition, who are trying to yell out obscenities against renewable energy, the truth is the Hornsdale Power Reserve is now the blueprint for every piece of investment around Australia and globally. We were mocked for grid-scale generation to be stored, mocked by members opposite. They mocked us. They cheered when the former Prime Minister said it was nothing more than a tourist attraction, like the Big Banana. Now, it is standard practice.

I pose this question to the house: of the 2017 energy plan that was designed to stabilise the system, what part did the incoming Marshall government repeal? What part did they repeal? None—not one. It was implemented in full—in full. But the member for Heysen, who only scraped in here at the last election after a Labor candidate who had campaigned for a maximum of 28 days pushed him to preferences, now is trying to tell us somehow that he is a genius on energy. Perhaps he should look to the log in his own eye before he criticises the speck in ours.

I have to say, this motion moved by the member for Morphett is purely partisan. All it attempts to do is self-congratulation, rather than actually reflect on why it is he is now the opposition spokesperson for energy rather than the Minister for Energy. It is motions like this of self-congratulation that do you no good—absolutely no good. Perhaps it would be better to review your energy policies and say, 'What went wrong?' But they cannot do that.

They are beyond self-reflection because, if you read this motion, the last four years were all honey and light. Everything was perfect. Power prices were the cheapest they had ever been—not

true. Project EnergyConnect, the project that the previous government hung all their aspirations on, is all about connecting us to a jurisdiction that has on average higher wholesale power prices than we do. That is their claim to fame. It was going to cost less than \$2 billion. It is now costing over \$2 billion and, of course, it is delayed again.

I have a letter here sent to the Master Butchers Co-operative by then energy minister Dan van Holst Pellekaan. It was sent on 25 May 2021. It was a question by Mr Jamie Higgins, who was the chief executive officer. He was asking, 'I am on the gas spot market for our enterprise. We are a cooperative, and we want to make sure that we are doing the right thing by our members. Should we remain on the spot market, or should we hedge our gas contracts?' The response from the minister was that Project EnergyConnect would fix all of that. Why? Because Project EnergyConnect is designed to close all gas thermal generation in South Australia, which will create a surplus in gas in South Australia, which will mean there is more gas available.

Of course, Project EnergyConnect is delayed. The time frame for building EnergyConnect has been delayed, but the time frame for closing those gas-fired generators remains on schedule. So now we are facing a shortage of generation, and where we turn to our backup generation they are already in the market. We have no backup generation. We have none. The state has no reserve, which is why, yet again, we have to come to the election promising to build new generation, another 200 megawatts, this time on completely renewable energy, and of course that will be owned by the people of South Australia and operated in the interest of the people of South Australia. But the risk of course is that if we lose an election the members opposite will return to form and sell that as well.

Every time we build up our energy system, they sell it—Torrens Island, 1,200 megawatts, new generation. I remember when Northern closed, the screams of outrage by members opposite that Northern was closing. If it was so important to members opposite, why did they sell it? There is silence opposite. The man sitting behind us looks down at the members opposite with contempt—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —contempt! There is a reason you are a habitual one-term government—because the best and brightest do not join the state Liberal Party. Why would you? Look at who you are sitting next to. Why would you join this lot?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They go to Canberra or they go to the private sector. These people could not run a Wokinabox, let alone the energy system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have to say, the faux outrage by—

Mr Teague: Faux outrage?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Faux outrage. You are not really angry. You can't be really angry.

Mr Teague: My electors had to buy generators because of that.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You need a personality to be angry. You don't have any.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Teague: My electors couldn't have their toilet because of you.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Oh, they couldn't have their toilet because of me.

Mr Teague: If you don't have mains water under Labor, you don't have a toilet that functions.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is just extraordinary. It is extraordinary, the way members opposite make their arguments in this parliament. It is extraordinary. It is unprofessional, and there is a reason—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —the members opposite are sitting in the opposition benches again, booted out again.

Mr Teague: Do not engage in personal abuse.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, you have been booted out again and you cannot—

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, if you wish to raise a point of order, raise it. Otherwise, I draw your attention to 141.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All you do is sit here and interject in a disorderly way because you cannot make an argument because you do not know what it is you are talking about, and that is why you are sitting on the opposition benches again. That is where you will remain because you cannot make a cohesive argument.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for Chaffey well knows the standing orders. If he wishes to raise a point of order with the Chair, he has the power to do so.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens! The Treasurer has the call.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (11:57): It might help those opposite if we have perhaps a more comprehensive re-examination of the history of the electricity networks here in South Australia.

Mr Teague: Absolutely. I am waiting for an extension of time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Heysen is keen to listen. He said, 'Absolutely.' So let's start, shall we? Let's start in 1997—that recently—when his acolytes in the South Australian Liberal movement, and I use the term 'Liberal movement' pejoratively, guaranteed the community, 'We will never, ever sell ETSA.' Those were the words, and then what happened? They managed to squeak back into government after enjoying a majority, not a totality but a majority, of 27 seats in this place.

They managed to squeak back into government after one term of government—sound familiar?—and what do they do? They sell ETSA, allegedly to pay down state debt. What were they doing when they were paying down state debt? The mastermind of the 2022 Liberal election campaign, Rob Lucas, while he was telling South Australians he was selling ETSA to pay down debt, was running up budget deficits and increasing the state's debt at the same time. Genius, right? But that is who has been leading them for 40 years in South Australia: Rob Lucas.

So they sell ETSA and there is a three-year price guarantee from the year 2000 for three years until January 2003 as part of the sale terms because we were promised as a state, under the privatisation, that power prices would fall as a result of privatisation. What happened in January 2003? Retail prices—not wholesale—went up 30 per cent after the price guarantee ended after three years: a 30 per cent increase.

Do not take my word for it, go down to the basement of the parliamentary library and pull out the front page of *The Advertiser* because that is where it was reported. You want to talk about

Advertiser reportage? Go down and do your research. You do not even understand the history of the issue you are debating.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If you want to know how rhetorically and intellectually bankrupt those opposite are, you only have to look at the *Notice Paper* and the ensuing debate that we have had here this morning. There was backslapping from the member for Morphett and the new member for Bragg about how great the South Australian Liberal Party is on climate change action and how they embrace renewables, how they are the party for the future when it comes to renewable energy and climate change action, and then fast-forward the tape 25 minutes and here they are rehashing the same old blame game about the statewide blackout for—that is right—being a race too quickly to renewables.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: This is just extraordinary.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: If you even fast-forward the tape from 2003—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey well knows the standing orders. If he wishes to raise a matter, he can do so.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is a reflection on your rhetorical and intellectual incompetence and bankruptcy—that is what it is, member for Chaffey. That is what the reflection is: it is the mirror that we are holding up to you for your debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is the contrast we have had.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen and the member for West Torrens will cease their exchange.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We have had them embracing renewals and then blaming renewals in the space of 80 minutes. This is the modern South Australian Liberal Party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —writ large in this state. Then, when we finally see the fruits of the state Liberal's privatisation of our electricity networks—

Mr Teague: Don't mislead the house.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —20 years of underinvestment, 20 years of price hikes, 20 years of vulnerability, and we get the coup de grâce that they are complaining about: a statewide blackout from a network, which, in private hands, in Chinese-controlled hands, has not kept up to date and falls into disrepair—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The first time we have a serious storm—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —out in the Far North, we have a statewide blackout, what do they say? 'It was the fault of a Labor government trying to modernise and reinvest public resources into an electricity network.'

Mr Whetstone: Hydrogen will fix it!

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: When we rolled out the member for West Torrens' energy plan to make our electricity network more robust, more resilient and, God forbid for those opposite, actually bring some prices down for the benefit of consumers, what do they do? Again, led by Rob Lucas, now that they had got back into government, they privatised that state's investment—they privatise it. They cannot help themselves.

Mr Teague: You are on the same Kool Aid.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Heysen says, 'There wasn't a privatisation; it was just a very long-term lease.' Are you joking? You may as well walk out and catch a tram or a train and say, 'Well, these are publicly provided services. They are not privatised; it's just a very, very long lease. Don't listen to what the Treasurer says about ETSA being privatised. It's just a very, very long lease.'

Mr Teague interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is just extraordinary—

Mr Teague: It was a disastrous decision.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, come to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —that they would come in here and have the gall to put this matter on the *Notice Paper* and try to prosecute their bona fides about managing electricity networks. I remember very well the debate in this chamber straight after the statewide blackout. Those opposite, including the member for Chaffey, were criticising the former Weatherill government for not paying an aging coal-fired power station \$90 million of taxpayers' money to stay open.

Mr Whetstone: That is not true.

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That was the direct criticism. Do not take my word for it; look at the *Hansard*. They cancelled question time to make that very point. They had an urgent debate. They cancelled question time to make that very point. Ninety million dollars to pay to keep that coal-fired generator going, even though it could have been closed at a whim with a month's notice.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

Mr Whetstone: Little boy.

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just remarkable. The member for Chaffey says, 'Stop the personal attacks,' and then he interjects across the chamber calling me a little boy. This is the typical behaviour that we have got used to from the member for Chaffey. This is just extraordinary. Talk about the contrast between the complaints about standards of behaviour in this debate and then the personal attacks from the member for Chaffey!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey will come to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is just the same as the intellectual bankruptcy of what we have seen this morning, where they start calling themselves climate change champions and at the same time criticise this state's global leadership in renewable energy.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The truth is those opposite have no credibility on managing energy networks here in South Australia. Not only do they have absolutely no credibility, not only does the member for Heysen come in here, following the member for Morphett, claiming responsibility for delivering the member for West Torrens' energy security plan—that is how intellectually bankrupt those opposite are—not only do they come in here and say that it is actually the benefits of their labour, the fruits of their labour, that we had low energy prices because of renewable energy here in South Australia and because of new measures to enhance energy security, not only do they try to claim credit for that but they attack us for continuing to take policies to the community to enhance security.

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Heysen says that we were hell-bent on islanding South Australia. Maybe he has not been to Victoria, but between our state and that state there is a very large interconnector.

Mr Whetstone: Two.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It remains. Two, the member for Chaffey says. Well, you should sit next to the member for Heysen and whisper to him—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer will not respond to interjections and the members for Heysen and Chaffey will come to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —like the member for Schubert does to the Leader of the Opposition. He says, 'Oh, we were going it alone.' No-one has a policy in South Australia, except perhaps the member for Heysen, to get rid of the Heywood interconnector. He says 'island South Australia'. We have never been an island under the national electricity network.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Heysen, you well know the standing orders.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Heysen says, 'You try talking to my constituents who couldn't flush their toilets.' I would ask the member for Heysen—in fact, I would invite him to reflect. He is a member of the Liberal Party, he is a member of the Liberal movement, he has signed up to this, presumably because during his adult years he saw the performance and the behaviour of the South Australian Liberal Party, their management and privatisation of our energy networks and said, 'I want a bit of that. I will seek preselection so that I can continue this legacy for the people of South Australia.'

That is the member for Heysen's record. That is the record of those opposite and that is why the member for Morphett and his motion have no credibility in this place whatsoever.

The SPEAKER: Members, it is a spirited debate and there is rhetorical flourish on both sides in order to maintain an open forum. I have been drawing members' attention to the standing orders, and I continue to draw members' attention to standing orders 141: the 'House does not permit quarrels', and 142, 'No noise or interruption allowed in debate'.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:08): We will close debate, Mr Speaker.

The house divided on the amendment:

Ayes23

Noes.....10

Majority13

AYES

Andrews, S.E.

Brown, M.E.

Cook, N.F.

Hood, L.P. (teller)

Koutsantonis, A.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Savvas, O.M.

Thompson, E.L.

Boyer, B.I.

Champion, N.D.

Fulbrook, J.P.

Hughes, E.J.

Michaels, A.

Pearce, R.K.

Stinson, J.M.

Wortley, D.J.

Brock, G.G.

Close, S.E.

Hildyard, K.A.

Hutchesson, C.L.

Mullighan, S.C.

Piccolo, A.

Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B. (teller)

Gardner, J.A.W.

Patterson, S.J.R.

Whetstone, T.J.

Batty, J.A.

Hurn, A.M.

Teague, J.B.

Cowdrey, M.J.

McBride, P.N.

Telfer, S.J.

PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.

Speirs, D.J.

Clancy, N.P.

Tarzia, V.A.

Marshall, S.S.

Picton, C.J.

Pederick, A.S.

Bignell, L.W.K.

Pisoni, D.G.

Malinauskas, P.B.

Amendment thus carried.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the motion as amended be agreed to. There is a point of order from the member for Morphett.

Mr PATTERSON: A closing statement, to close debate?

The SPEAKER: Debate has closed; the member for Adelaide has closed debate. If you have a point of order I will hear you on the point of order, but certainly the member for Adelaide closed debate. Member for Morphett, do you have a point of order?

Mr PATTERSON: No.

The house divided on the motion as amended:

Ayes23

Noes.....11

Majority12

AYES

Andrews, S.E.

Brown, M.E.

Cook, N.F.

Hood, L.P. (teller)

Koutsantonis, A.

Odenwalder, L.K.

Savvas, O.M.

Thompson, E.L.

Boyer, B.I.

Champion, N.D.

Fulbrook, J.P.

Hughes, E.J.

Michaels, A.

Pearce, R.K.

Stinson, J.M.

Wortley, D.J.

Brock, G.G.

Close, S.E.

Hildyard, K.A.

Hutchesson, C.L.

Mullighan, S.C.

Piccolo, A.

Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B. (teller)
Gardner, J.A.W.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Telfer, S.J.

Batty, J.A.
Hurn, A.M.
Pratt, P.K.
Whetstone, T.J.

Cowdrey, M.J.
McBride, P.N.
Teague, J.B.

PAIRS

Bettison, Z.L.
Pederick, A.S.
Clancy, N.P.
Speirs, D.J.

Pisoni, D.G.
Picton, C.J.
Marshall, S.S.

Bignell, L.W.K.
Tarzia, V.A.
Malinauskas, P.B.

Motion as amended thus carried.

NATIONAL FAMILY BUSINESS DAY

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (12:18): I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises National Family Business Day on 19 September 2022;
- (b) notes the significant contribution made by family businesses to the South Australian economy and the South Australian community; and
- (c) recognises National Family Business Day as a time to acknowledge the significant role family businesses play, accounting for up to 70 per cent of Australian businesses and employing around half of Australia's workforce.

I rise to speak on this incredibly important motion which recognises that 19 September is National Family Business Day. The role that family businesses play in our community is incredibly significant. They employ 55 per cent of Australia's workforce and represent up to 70 per cent of Australian businesses. Some of these are well-known household names like Beerenberg and Coopers and Haigh's, but I also want to take a moment to acknowledge the family businesses that are household names in local communities, those nestled in our neighbourhoods who are the heartbeat of our cities and towns, who form the identity of our suburbs and who constantly give back to their local area.

They are the family businesses that offer so much more than a product or a service. They are the businesses that keep our communities alive, like Liam and Jo West at my local butcher. I also want to mention Matt and Monique Pallister at Sideways; the Schinellas family at Schinellas Market; Franz and Barbara Knoll and their sons at Barossa Fine Foods; Maria and Athena Aslineedis from Parthenon Boutique; Jimmy, Scotty, Mick and Aaron at Muratti Cakes; Anita and Maria at Cibo Prospect; Helen and Jason at Indy Love; Aaron and One from Sunny's Shop and Rosemont Hall, which will soon be rebuilt; Harsh and Sneha from Coffylosophy; Danny and Leila from Biga Café; and John and George from John and George's Barbers. There are just too many to mention, but these are just some of the incredible family businesses in my local community.

I know from listening to local business owners in my community that running a small or family business is not without challenges, persistence and hard work, in particular given the extraordinary challenges of the last two years during the COVID-19 pandemic. As a government it is so important that we ensure that we are checking in on these businesses—

Members interjecting:

Ms HOOD: —and offering our support. Recently, I had the pleasure of taking our Minister for Small and Family Business to visit iconic main streets within the Adelaide electorate—

Members interjecting:

Ms HOOD: —such as Prospect Road and Hutt Street, to talk to local family businesses. I want to thank the minister for her support of these businesses in my electorate.

I also want to give a shout-out to a particular family business in my community, Cafe Komodo off Prospect Road run by Andrew and Bronwyn Taylor. You will not just find Andrew and Bronwyn at the cafe working hard but you will often find them out and about in their mobile coffee caravan at community events, at Roosters' games and at so many other community functions. They are huge supporters of local sport—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Adelaide, can you just take a seat. Member for Chaffey, I have let a few comments go. The next time you comment out of place you will be leaving the chamber.

Ms HOOD: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. They are huge supporters of local sport, as well as local artists and the live music scene. Along with the Minister for Family and Small Business, who is also the arts minister, I was proud to visit Cafe Komodo recently to deliver the good news that they had received a \$5,000 Venue Improvement Grant to continue supporting emerging and established live music artists.

I also want to commend the minister not just for those grants but also for recently establishing the Office for Small and Family Business, where there is a development of strategy and extensive statewide engagement. I also look forward to the minister launching the Women in Business Program. I commend this important motion to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:22): I would like to support this motion. I think it is a very important motion. As a former business owner and proprietor, I have seen only too well the importance of not only what family businesses mean to South Australia and to the nation but what they also mean to communities and the contribution they make in terms driving an economy and also employing people and supporting particularly regional communities when it comes to the buoyancy of those smaller communities in particular.

There are many small businesses here in South Australia—too many to name—but I do think it gives me the opportunity not only to speak about family businesses but also to speak about how government has been able to play a role in giving them some level of support over many decades, if not further. The 40 per cent of South Australia's workforce that is employed by family businesses is a \$40 billion annual economy. They make significant contributions not only to the economy but also particularly to the sustainability of communities, whether it is a metropolitan community or a regional community.

I will pay tribute to some South Australian businesses in a little while, but I want to acknowledge the former Marshall Liberal government and some of the benefits it introduced to support some of those small family businesses. We saw the tax threshold rise from \$600,000 to \$1.5 million in terms of wages, and we saw 3,200 businesses across the state become exempt from payroll tax. We have saved businesses over \$44,000 a year and provided relief to a further 400 businesses with the reduction in their payroll tax liability. From 2018, the former Liberal government provided more than \$500 million of payroll tax relief on top of a range of those COVID-19 relief measures.

The pandemic brought challenges for many businesses and you did not have to be isolated whether you were a family business or a publicly controlled business. What it did was test the mettle and what we have seen is that a majority of those family businesses have come out the other side of the COVID pandemic.

In relation to that payroll tax, we saw exemptions for commonwealth JobKeeper payments, we saw waivers of payroll tax from April 2020 for 14 months, we saw a six-month waiver of payroll tax from January 2021 and up to a nine-month deferral of payroll tax due from April to December 2020. They are some of the initiatives that the former government put in place to support businesses through an unprecedented level of challenge.

What I do want to touch on is some of the South Australian iconic businesses, whether they are South Australian or whether they are quarantined to some of the smaller regional communities. If we look at some of the big businesses in South Australia, we look at the Detmold Group. The Detmold family, through packaging paper products and the PPE products that have come about through the pandemic, has seen their family business really shine.

We have seen the Beerenberg family, the Paech family—Anthony, Sally and Carol—which has been going for 100 years. Anthony, Sally and Carol are not 100 years old, but the Beerenberg name has been going for 100 years with over 100 products. We look at some of the Angove Family Winemakers, a great Riverland tradition, formed in 1910. They are fifth generation: Ted was a pioneer in the wine industry, developing bag in the box or the cask as we now call it, and then was succeeded by John and now Victoria and Richard. Today, their headquarters is not only in the Riverland but also at McLaren Vale with their famous cellar door.

We also have to remember that Angove Family Winemakers are associated with St Agnes brandy. It is a famous distillation facility in the Riverland and it has won many world awards, as well as being leading organic grape growers. Of course, Nippy's is an iconic family tradition in the Riverland right around South Australia. The Knispel family, Alic and Lyla, were the pioneers and then Jeff and Tina and now Ben have succeeded that family model.

They were established in the thirties, packing citrus into the thirties. They progressed through the war and they were once leaders at the East End Market selling citrus. Alic was known as the 'orange king' and then later came into Adelaide, squeezing juice at the kitchen table. As we now know, it adorns many of our freezers in some of those retail shops. I was speaking to Jeff this morning and he tells me that their business model has been quite diversified. He is still paying between \$13 million and \$14 million in wages annually and, sadly, the public holiday to commemorate Queen Elizabeth II cost that small business \$60,000.

They are great community supporters, just like the Mitolo group in the Riverland and at Virginia. Bruno and Angela were the pioneers of the Mitolo group, succeeded by Frank and John and their families, growing potatoes, onions, olives, wine grapes, and they have that famous cellar door at McLaren Vale, Little Wolf Osteria. That business employs over 1,500 South Australians and is a significant employer. Parilla Premium Potatoes, another great family tradition by the Pye family, are large broadacre horticulture growers: potatoes, onions, carrots, particularly broadacre and livestock to further vertically integrate that business model.

Both the Mitolos and Parilla are reinventing the common potato. We now look at different potatoes for different reasons and low-carb products, and they are now exporting globally. We look around the Riverland to the Moularadellis family, Kingston Estates, one of the great wine producers and winemakers in South Australia. Bill is the managing director of Kingston Estates, and they are selling bulk wine to the world.

We have to remember that the bulk wine product is an essential part of the wine industry and an essential part of the engine room in the wine industry here in South Australia. I was having a chat with Bill recently, and he said it is about how do we actually get 20 of the larger wine companies in Australia to increase their exports by 30 per cent. That is the challenge.

Again, I had the opportunity this morning to speak to the CEO of Food SA, Catherine Sayer. She is doing an outstanding job for those family-related businesses, those food businesses here in South Australia. We talked about the Food SA Hall of Fame recipients. If we look around South Australia, there are some great names. We have the Crotti family, Maurice and David, of the famous San Remo brand. I am sure all of us have had a plate of San Remo pasta at some stage, and I am sure we have all had a green frog cake too. They are also the proud owners of Balfours, who are doing a great job.

The Kotses family, Angelo and Mary, are the managing directors of Bickford's. That is a great success story here in South Australia. They continue to go from strength to strength with diversity in their business model, now not only building accommodation and providing cellar-door experiences but putting great beverage products into the marketplace that are second to none.

We think of Thomas Foods. Darren and Chris Thomas are great South Australians. They are passionate South Australians who employ a significant workforce through their abattoirs, livestock and now new business ventures. It really is a credit to them.

Alister and Simon are doing a great job at Haigh's. When we think chocolate, we think Haigh's, and it is a great institution. There is the Macro Group of companies where Ray Borda and his family are doing an outstanding job with meat products and leather products nowadays. We look

at Coopers Brewery—Tim, Glenn and their families—one of the great traditions of South Australia. At Drakes Supermarkets, Roger and John-Paul are doing a really good job with succession planning. I have talked about Nippy's, I have talked about Mitolo's, but there is also the Menz family. Phil, Grantley and Richard are doing an outstanding job.

At Barossa Fine Foods, we cannot forget Franz, Barbara and the four boys. They are all doing a very good job putting some of the finest smallgoods on our plates. Of course, Maggie Beer has now become a publicly listed company, and both Maggie and Colin were great pioneers in the food space. Of course, Almondco is another great Riverland success story. It is very much a family-backed business in South Australia. I cannot express how important family businesses are, not only to South Australia's economy but to the institution of providing food and services to the world.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (12:32): I want to thank the member for Adelaide for bringing this motion to the house in support of National Family Business Day on 19 September. I also want to thank the member for Chaffey for his support of this motion as well.

We did celebrate National Family Business Day on the 19th here in Parliament House. I had the pleasure of hosting Family Business Australia for a luncheon with a number of their members, which was a fantastic opportunity to recognise the invaluable contribution family businesses make to the South Australian economy.

I was raised in a family business myself. My dad was a cabinet-maker, and we all grew up sandpapering doors on weekends and school holidays. My mother worked in the business as well. I then had the pleasure of starting my own small business, a law firm, which has turned into a family business in the last couple of years, so I know the joys and challenges of running a family business. It is a real pleasure to be the Minister for Small and Family Business. From everything I have researched, I am the first family business minister in South Australia, which I am very proud of.

A number of the household names that we know, which many members have just mentioned, were represented here on 19th for National Family Business Day. We had representatives from Ahrens and Gerard McCabe. We had Ken Hall from Ken Hall Plumbers. We also had a representative from the McBride family, so I want to thank the member for MacKillop for that attendance from one of his representatives. It is a fantastic South-East family business.

It is just as important, though, to recognise the names we do not necessarily know. Obviously, we have some great, very well-known South Australian family businesses, but there are a number of small family businesses that we do not necessarily know the names of—the accountants, the architects, the lawyers, the cafes. The member for Adelaide took me down to her electorate to visit a number of businesses, as she mentioned, many of which are family businesses. They keep the South Australian economy alive.

In particular, I want to acknowledge the work that Family Business Australia does in supporting South Australian family businesses. I acknowledge Brett Miller, the State Regional Director, and Diana Thoeny, who is the State Manager for FBA, for facilitating that luncheon that we had here at Parliament House last Monday. I was very proud at that function to be able to share with everyone the work we have been doing as a government to demonstrate our commitment to the business community.

We know small and family businesses are the backbone of the South Australian economy. They make up almost 98 per cent of all businesses in South Australia and contribute \$40 billion to our economy. They are also a critical employer in South Australia. But it is not just about the economics, and some of the stories we have already touched on this morning demonstrate that. Family businesses make an incredible contribution to our communities. We cannot measure that necessarily in a dollar figure, but we all know that family businesses will jump up and help out when their community is in need, and I thank them for that.

We know that the last couple of years have been pretty tough for family businesses, particularly in certain sectors. It is not that easy right now with skill shortages and inflation cost pressures. We are hearing that loud and clear through the engagement we are undertaking at the moment.

I am really pleased that the first thing we did upon first coming to government was the Support Small Business campaign. We launched that within three months of coming in, and that featured a number of South Australian family-owned businesses, with a real message to support local and buy local, and that was fantastic campaign that feeds into us bringing back Brand SA as well, which will be a huge support for family businesses in South Australia to help market South Australian businesses, not only within the state but interstate and overseas. Some of the names we have already mentioned—Haigh's, Beerenberg—are on a national and international scale, so it is great to bring that back to support them.

The member for Adelaide also mentioned the See It Live program, supporting hospitality businesses and bringing back the live music industry. We went to Cafe Komodo to celebrate their success in a venue improvement grant, which was fantastic. We also, I am very pleased to say, have opened an Office for Small and Family Business. It is really going to be a central port of call in the state government to support small and family businesses, and I am really pleased that we opened that on 16 August. We are doing a really extensive consultation phase. As with any business, to work out the right business model you ask your customers, and that is what we are doing: we are asking our small and family business community what they want to see from that Office for Small and Family Business.

The round tables have been a huge success so far. We are doing 20 overall in metro and regional, and we are doing industry sectors as well. There is one at Port Lincoln today, which I was due to be at; unfortunately, I cannot be because of the rescheduling of the dates. I have been at almost all of them, they have gone really well, and we have had over 1,000 businesses respond to our online survey, which has been a huge success in only a matter of weeks.

I encourage any family business or small business listening in—and they probably are not because they do not have the time—to go online to business.sa.gov.au and complete that survey, to really help us shape that Office for Small and Family Business to be able to provide the right supports that they need. I know from my background that a number of supports would be useful coming from the state government in terms of building capabilities within small businesses, whether it be financial literacy or networking.

A lot of the round tables are picking up on the need for mentoring for business owners as well, so we will feed that through and come up with a statewide strategy early next year and set the tone for what that office will do, which I hope will be very useful for the business community in South Australia. We are also using that office to implement the Women in Business program. As a female business owner, I know the challenges that that particular segment has, and so we are wanting to build capability for female-owned businesses and female business owners to support them in starting and growing their businesses successfully in South Australia.

With that, I again want to commend the member for Adelaide for this wonderful motion. I want to wish every family business in South Australia a happy National Family Business Day for last week, and we continue to celebrate our family businesses throughout the state.

Motion carried.

NATIONAL POLICE REMEMBRANCE DAY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:40): I rise to move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 29 September is National Police Remembrance Day;
- (b) acknowledges that this day honours the memory of police men and women who have given their lives in the service of the community; and
- (c) appreciates the ongoing dedication of sworn and non-sworn SAPOL members across the city, suburbs and regions of South Australia and their significant contribution to keeping South Australians safe during the COVID-19 pandemic, and at all other times.

Tomorrow, Thursday 29 September, marks National Police Remembrance Day, and I will be attending the Police Academy at Taperoo to observe the significance of what National Police

Remembrance Day means to our police force and our police community. They come together to reflect on the memory of our police officers who have made the ultimate sacrifice in their service.

As a state and as a nation we pause to honour those who keep us safe every day. It is also an important time to remember police officers who have lost their lives through illness or other circumstances and to grieve with the families of our fallen officers. This day was first held in 1989, and it is one of the most important days in the policing calendar. It is recognised across Australia, New Zealand, Papua New Guinea, Samoa and the Solomon Islands.

South Australia's police force was established on 28 April 1838, and it is one of the oldest centrally controlled police services in the world. Throughout the history of South Australia Police, 61 officers have lost their lives in the line of active duty. Over that time, we have seen South Australia Police providing a range of policing services 24 hours a day, seven days a week. There are 5,000 active sworn in members across the state, including cadets in training and the PSOs.

In 2001, the National Police Memorial was established in Canberra to pay tribute to Australian police officers who have been killed on duty or who have died as a result of their duty. I would also like to acknowledge the dedication of our officers to their work and to the community, particularly in the Riverland and Mallee. I hold their efforts in exceptionally high regard. We know that in regional areas such as Chaffey, police are part of a very small community, so they work closely with one another to reduce crime through programs such as Neighbourhood Watch.

In the lead-up to the National Police Remembrance Day I would like to acknowledge the recent anniversaries of South Australian officers Motor Traffic Constable Jerry George Preston and Sergeant Martin Henry Harnath, who were both killed in the line of duty. On 12 September 1980, Constable Preston died after a motorcycle he was riding collided with a vehicle on Redhill Bridge at Port Adelaide. The driver of the other vehicle was charged with drink-driving offences. On 18 September 1985, Sergeant Harnath died after the police vessel he was working on exploded at the Thebarton Police Barracks.

I would also like to pay tribute to SAPOL's first two police officers, Mounted Constable John Dunning Carter and Lance Corporal William Wickham. On 7 May 1847, both Carter and Wickham tragically drowned after their canoe capsized while crossing the River Murray near the station of Mr J.H. Wigley. For those of you who are aware of where Banrock Station is, that ceremony is held annually to commemorate those two officers who tragically died. They had been ordered to travel to Overland Corner to respond to disturbances between the colonists and the First Nations people over the movement of sheep and cattle.

This day reminds us that we must never underrate the important role our police officers play in our state and our communities and the real risks they take every day to protect us as South Australians. The South Australia Police Remembrance Day service will be held tomorrow morning at 11am at Fort Largs. I think it is really important that we take a moment to give respect and just a thought to those officers who have lost their lives in the line of duty and also those officers who continue to keep our communities safe and rise through adversity, particularly with the increased crime and the increased gang warfare we are currently experiencing.

It is also the government's role to make sure that we have adequate police resources and staffing so that we can continue to have a safe community, to have a safe state and to make South Australia a destination to be reckoned with.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:45): I rise to speak on this very important motion. I want to thank the shadow minister for bringing this motion to the house:

That this house—

- (a) recognises that 29 September is National Police Remembrance Day;
- (b) acknowledges that this day honours the memory of police men and women who have given their lives in the service of the community; and
- (c) appreciates the ongoing dedication of sworn and non-sworn SAPOL members across the city, suburbs and regions of South Australia, and their significant contribution to keeping South Australians safe during the COVID-19 pandemic, and at all other times.

I have spoken on a similar motion several times now, but I do again want to thank the shadow minister for bringing it here because it is an important motion and we should debate it each year around this time.

Police belong to a very small class of workers who willingly go into the face of danger in order to protect the rest of us. There are, of course, many professions, many industrial areas, where there are dangers, and those dangers are mitigated as well as employers and unions possibly can. The same goes for the police, of course, but policing is different, in that if any member of the community is in danger, if any member of the community fears for their life, the first thing they do is call the police. The police will willingly take that danger from that person, thereby putting themselves in danger in a way that no other civilian profession does.

It is worth remembering those 61 members of the police force who have died in the line of duty in South Australia Police, and it also worth reflecting on the many, many police officers who have been injured or have suffered trauma—whether it is mental or physical—in the line of duty. As I said, police officers willingly go into danger; they start work each day not knowing what that day will bring, fully recognising that they may well face life-threatening situations. Of course, they are trained for this, and the organisation tries as well as it possibly can to mitigate any dangers to police officers. However, it is by nature a risky job, and I do want to commend each and every one of the members of the South Australian police for the work they do every day.

The second part of this motion is not only to remember those who have died in the line of duty but also to appreciate the ongoing dedication of our current serving sworn police officers. This has been made particularly difficult over the last few years with the COVID pandemic. We have seen extraordinary pressure put on the police, just as we have seen extraordinary pressure put on our health system and other sectors of the community. However, police really have borne the brunt of quite a lot of the hard work in controlling the pandemic.

I want to commend the police commissioner and former State Coordinator, Grant Stevens, for his work. I also commend his team and his leadership team around him for steering us so well through the pandemic and out the other side and, of course, all the sworn men and women who surrounded him and took on that work, sometimes at the expense of other work, as had to be the case.

It is also pleasing to see that, following the pandemic, the contribution of police security officers was recognised. While they are not sworn members and not recognised in this motion technically, it is important to recognise the work they do, and it is being more recognised. We will see them increasingly in traditional police roles. Like sworn police officers, they are trained to do certain jobs and, as I understand it, they will be trained to do more and more of what we would familiarly call police work, of course in coordination with SAPOL and with the police union. I do want to commend their work; they keep us safe here every day and there is no reason why they cannot be employed to do other sorts of work.

Again, I thank the shadow minister for bringing this motion to the house. I pay my respects to all those police officers who have died in the line of duty, all those police officers who have suffered mentally or physically over the years in the service of South Australians and I want to pay tribute to those who are serving today. I commend the motion.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:50): I, too, rise to commend this motion moved by the shadow minister and acknowledge the consistent engagement with this motion on this important subject matter, and also by the member for Elizabeth whose contribution I listened to carefully just now. I have participated in this debate in the past, and again I pay particular tribute in respect of that part of the motion that highlights our acknowledgement on 29 September, this Thursday, of those brave police men and women who have given their lives in their service to the community and of Senior Constable David Barr, who was killed while on duty on 26 July 1990.

I refer in this regard to the observations of others in commemorating Senior Constable David Barr's service because it is emblematic of the nature of the risk that our serving police men and women place themselves in when accepting the risks that are attendant upon the ordinary work that they do day to day. David Barr died at Lyell McEwin Hospital subsequent to an attacker wielding a

knife, having stabbed him in the chest at Salisbury. He had responded with his partner, Jamie Lewcock, to a report of a man threatening a woman.

After the two officers arrived at the Salisbury Interchange, the location of the call-out, and they attempted to arrest this person, the knife was plunged deep into his heart. David Barr was a husband and a father of two young children. Although having been rushed to hospital, he died of his wounds after doctors had tried desperately to save him. I know that his memory is well and truly kept alive in the force and among those who knew him.

In singling him out today, I wish to pay tribute to all those who have suffered and provide his services as an example. It was fitting that a medal was struck in his honour following his death, one that persists in being awarded for leadership. It is a fitting way to keep his memory alive, and I again pay particular tribute to him on this occasion.

As has been reflected, the motion recognises and appreciates the ongoing dedication of sworn and non-sworn SAPOL members throughout South Australia. As the speakers before me have adverted, those duties and responsibilities are indeed wideranging. Perhaps, we would not ordinarily refer to quite such an extraordinary extension of duty as we have seen over recent years, but I do make particular reference this year to the work that police have done throughout our state in leading and undertaking the day-to-day practical tasks associated with their response to the COVID pandemic.

Particular tribute in this regard ought be paid to Commissioner Stevens and, in referring to our two most senior sworn officers, I also pay tribute to Deputy Commissioner Williams. It is true to say that South Australians have observed both the leadership at the most senior levels of police over the course of these last years and the day-to-day work of those who are sent to all corners of the state to undertake those practical tasks associated with responding to the pandemic.

I also note in this regard the important work of the Police Association, led as it is by Mark Carroll and the work that he does to speak up for the welfare of those members of his association, those among whom serve our state in this unique way. With those words, I too endorse the motion and commend it to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:57): I would like to thank the member for Elizabeth and the member for Heysen for their contributions on quite a significant day for our police force when we remember those who have paid the ultimate sacrifice. It is an important day when we recognise them because we all know that, when we are in trouble or when we are looking for safety or refuge, the first people we call are the police, and I pay tribute to each and every one of them.

As I have asked in the motion, I would like those who want to recognise remembrance day tomorrow to please give a thought to our SAPOL officers and the force for the great work they do.

Motion carried.

Sitting suspended from 12:58 to 14:00.

Condolence

CAMERON, HON. T.G.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:00): By leave, I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the death of the Hon. Terry Gordon Cameron, former member of the Legislative Council, and places on record its appreciation of his long and meritorious service, and that as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

I rise to convey the sad news that the Hon. Terry Cameron MLC has passed away. The son of federal Labor senator Don Cameron, the nephew of federal Labor MP for Hindmarsh and Whitlam government minister Clyde Cameron, it was hardly any surprise that Terry chose to spend his life involved in the labour movement and in politics more broadly.

His path came via the Australian Workers' Union before becoming the state organiser for Labor, and then Terry had the challenging task of directing the Labor Party's campaign at the 1993 state election—a very, very difficult task indeed.

Subsequently, he began his parliamentary career, filling a term through a casual vacancy in the Legislative Council in 1994, following the resignation of the Hon. Chris Sumner, before being elected in his own right in 1997 and holding the shadow portfolios of small business and transport. Each and every member of that team had the considerable task, post the 1993 State Bank election, of rebuilding Labor, in many respects, from the ground up.

At various points in his career, Mr Cameron had moments of controversy, not least of which was crossing the floor in a decision that Terry himself acknowledged as the most difficult and painful of his life. Terry was renowned for his spirited oratory and particularly his often epic speeches, which regularly clocked in at an hour or even more. We recognise the contribution of Terry Cameron and his service to the parliament and the state, and we share our condolences with his family at this sad time.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): On behalf of the opposition, I rise to speak on this condolence motion for the Hon. Terry Cameron, a former member of the Legislative Council of South Australia for more than a decade in the late 1990s and early 2000s. While this was obviously before my time in Australia, it is a privilege to speak about Mr Cameron's contribution to our parliament and to our state.

The Cameron family's association with politics, as the Premier referred to, was strong and enduring. Terry Cameron's father was the late Labor senator Don Cameron, and his uncle was the late Clyde Cameron. With that sort of political pedigree, it is no surprise that Terry took a keen interest in politics from a young age, becoming a member of the Labor Party at just 14 years old.

Mr Cameron entered the South Australian parliament to fill a Labor Party vacancy in 1994. In his maiden speech on 7 March 1995, he described himself as growing up in a political and trade union family. In 1997, Mr Cameron was re-elected as a Labor candidate; however, both he and the Hon. Trevor Crothers MLC resigned from the Labor Party after they historically crossed the floor in 1998 to support the move by the government of the day and Premier John Olsen that would involve and allow the privatisation of ETSA.

At this time, he became an Independent MLC and formed SA First. This party held the balance of power in the Legislative Council, often cooperating across the political divide to pass legislation. As history shows, he was able to work across political boundaries, and he was clearly willing to make difficult decisions in politics, even if these decisions would ultimately lead to his unpopularity amongst some and potentially curtail the extent of his political career.

SA First was a centre-based political party, which at its peak was actually the third largest party in South Australia, with more than 500 members, clearly providing relevance and inspiration to a not insignificant group of South Australians. Mr Cameron was a significant contributor to the parliamentary process, asking many questions, contributing to many debates and even making speeches that lasted, on one occasion, for more than three hours.

We wish to acknowledge Mr Cameron's significant contribution to South Australia's parliament and our state's history over a 12-year period, when he served this state and our parliament. On behalf of the opposition, I would like to pass our condolences to his family. Vale, Terry Cameron.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:05): When I first joined the Labor Party, Terry Cameron was a giant in the Labor Party. He was state secretary after having been an organiser in the Australian Workers' Union. He was the head of what was then called the centre left faction. He and Mr John Quirke, who is in the gallery today, the member for Playford, were giants in the party at the time. Terry entered this parliament and he went on to do a couple of things, which I will talk about in a moment, but I want to reflect on the 1993 election campaign and his role.

It was obvious to everyone in 1993, especially those of us in Young Labor, that we were heading for the biggest beating of our political lives; in fact, we were fighting for our very existence as a political party. I remember on election night being reminded of how lucky we were when I heard on radio the then Treasurer, Frank Blevins, answering a question from an ABC journalist, who asked,

'Deputy Premier/Treasurer, isn't this a disaster? You have only won 10 seats.' He said, 'What are you talking about? It's a great result. We won 10 seats.'

To keep that party together, to take us to the election campaign, to be able to formulate a proposition to actually ask for four more years after what had been perpetrated on the people of this state by the Bannon government and the Arnold government, was difficult, but they did it and we saved the furniture. By saving the furniture, I am talking about a rump. That rump and that organisation that Terry, John and others built up are the foundations of what I believe is the most impressive political machine in Australia.

The Australian Labor Party is underestimated at people's peril. We stand on the shoulders of organisational giants who have taught us and taught us well: structure, campaigning techniques, organisation and, of course, recruitment—recruitment being about the future, and Terry was very good at that. We parted ways, unfortunately, in this chamber, which was a very sad occurrence for those of us in the labour movement, losing two of our own, two union organisers who left us to vote for the privatisation of ETSA. They had their own reasons, and they articulated them to the parliament. We disagreed with them at the time.

A lot of awful, awful things were said about each other. The party had its last public rift during that process, but out of that process came the grand coalition of consensus within the Labor Party that allowed us to have leaders like Mike Rann, Jay Weatherill and Peter Malinauskas. We owe a debt to people like Terry and John, and Don Farrell, Michael Atkinson, Mark Butler, Patrick Conlon and Penny Wong, for the work that they did to stabilise the party after that seismic break, to have the former head of the liquor trades union and the son of a beloved senator split from us in a very traumatic and difficult way.

I have in my office still a copy of the SA First constitution, which Terry personally wrote, having based it on all the improvements he always wanted to make to the South Australian Labor Party constitution. I can say that it is a very good document for a governing group within a political party. I would not be surprised if some of those aspects of that constitution have ended up in our final constitution that we now enjoy.

Obviously, Trevor died and Terry left and moved abroad. I would see him here occasionally when he would come in on non-sitting days. He kept up friendships. I think the split hurt him. I think he may have regretted it, but I do not know. We talked about it a couple of times. He thought he did what was in the best interests of the state. We disagreed.

One thing you can never not say about Terry is that he was an independent thinker. He thought for himself. It is the first quality of leadership. I have seen it in a number of leaders. I saw it in Mike Rann, I saw it in former Premier Weatherill and I see it in our current Premier. The ability to think independently and to act off your own instincts, Terry had that in spades and he did it exceptionally well.

We were not particularly close, but I do admire the work that he did. He was once a giant. Now he has left us, and I wish his family all the very best. I wish him God's forgiveness and love, and I hope that he is now with those loved ones that he cherished so much. Vale.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Mr John Quirke, the former member for Playford and senator for South Australia, and also the Hon. John Dawkins and Sheila Dawkins.

Condolence

CAMERON, HON. T.G.

The SPEAKER: Members, please rise so that the motion can be carried in the customary manner.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

The SPEAKER: The house will stand suspended until the ringing of the bells.

Sitting suspended from 14:10 to 14:21.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

House of Assembly—

Register of Members' Interests—Ordinary Returns—Registrar's Statement—
June 2022—Corrigendum [Ordered to be published]

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

Rules made under the following Act—

Motor Vehicles Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme)—General

By the Minister for Human Services (Hon. N.F. Cook)—

Inclusive SA—State Disability Inclusion Plan 2019-23—Interim Review 2022

Ministerial Statement

ECHUNGA DAM

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (14:22): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS: I wish to provide the house with the most up-to-date information in relation to the emergency currently facing the Echunga community. Last night, the South Australian State Emergency Service was made aware of a privately owned dam, less than 500 metres upstream of Echunga, which was showing signs of structural failure to the dam wall. The SES has expertly managed this operation through the night and today in relation to the structural integrity of the dam wall, reducing the water level of the dam and managing the risk to the community, including through evacuations.

Engineers and emergency services remain on site and residents have been evacuated. The Hills Fleurieu zone emergency support team is activated and working with police from Mount Barker Police Station. The Country Fire Service are providing further support to the community through the provision of sandbags, and the Australian Defence Force are on site today to further bolster available resources.

Today, I have been in close contact with the state members for Kavel, Heysen and Hammond as well as the federal member for Mayo and Minister Murray Watt to provide them with contemporary information in relation to this event. I am committed to ensuring the best information continues to be available to members and to their communities. This is an unfolding situation and operational incident and I urge everyone to rely on trusted information and alerts from the SES and SAPOL.

I am advised this will be a continually managed situation across the next 24 to 48 hours and that emergency warnings will be updated contemporaneously with changing threat levels. It is important to remain vigilant and monitor emergency warnings, and if you are at risk leave the area and relocate to a safe place, such as the Echunga Football Club.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank the emergency services, including the SES, CFS and SAPOL for their professionalism and their cross-agency support in managing the situation and offer my best to the community of Echunga.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. It is a very distressing situation developing in the Hills. I have received a communication from the member for Mayo, who has asked me to inform ministers that the commonwealth government has communicated to her that if circumstances develop the commonwealth stands ready to assist.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:25): I bring up the 14th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr FULBROOK: I bring up the report of the committee, entitled 'Inquiry into local government land by-laws—public conveniences'.

Report received.

Question Time

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. When did the Premier receive the Hallion review and was it before or after he decided to move the Women's and Children's Hospital to the Thebarton barracks?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:27): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the question. All of the work that we have undertaken since coming to government regarding the new Women's and Children's Hospital proposal, including the thorough analysis of the former government's proposition, was done in the lead-up to us making the very significant decision to build a bigger, better hospital on the Thebarton barracks site.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is again to the Premier. When was the decision to move the new Women's and Children's Hospital to the Thebarton barracks made, and when were glossy brochures, TV and radio advertisements, flyovers and other collateral featuring the move designed? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On ABC radio this morning, presenter Stacey Lee asked the Premier, and I quote:

You didn't take it to cabinet on Monday and sign off on it and then announce it yesterday and have double-page spreads, TV ads ready to go, a fancy fly-through with graphics. These things take weeks, of course.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:28): On this side of the house, we can chew and walk at the same time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Chew gum and walk at the same time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Thank you. On this side of the house, we can actually undertake key functions of government concurrently.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We know that we are in a rush—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta! Member for Schubert!

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is called to order. He well knows the standing orders.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We are in a rush to get this project underway as quickly as we possibly can, which is why throughout—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —this iterative process, to arrive at the right conclusion that is in the long interests of the state, we have been undertaking different pieces of work along the way, along the journey, knowing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, you are warned for a second time. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that South Australians deserve to know about the very substantial plans that we have, that isn't just about focusing on jamming a hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —up against the side to make the rest of the RAH expansion opportunities in the future completely null and void. We actually undertook a substantial exercise to make sure we arrive at the right conclusion.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What's telling is that those opposite seem to be trying to defend the indefensible. They seem to be trying to defend the idea that a \$2.8 billion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Health is called to order. Member for Hartley! Member for Schubert!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange across the chamber will cease between the member for Morialta, the member for Schubert, the Treasurer and the member for West Torrens. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: They seem to think that spending \$2.8 billion of taxpayers' money on a hospital—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —\$2 billion in 2017 dollars—the member for Schubert might want to start thinking about getting her facts right before she interjects or consequently comments in the public—\$2.8 billion on a hospital that would be too small by the day you move in. Who reasonably thinks—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that the women and children of this state don't deserve a hospital that is capable of accommodating future demand? Who reasonably thinks that building a hospital on a site that would preclude any future expansion of the Royal Adelaide Hospital is a good idea?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton! The member for Colton knows better. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The member for Colton seems to discount the value of the preservation of a site that will allow for future expansion, which speaks of the sort of short-term thinking—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —that got the opposition in the pickle that they find themselves in now, trying to defend a project that was too small.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: During the course of the four years of the former government, what action did we actually see take place on that side?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Absolutely nothing, not a sod turned. Nothing ready to go, only a big bill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —for a small hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mordialta is warned for a third time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We have taken a different approach. We have the political courage to think about the long term rather than the short term. We are focused on making sure we deliver a hospital that clinicians support and meets their needs, which means meeting the needs of women and children in the long term.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members to my left, you ask the questions, but if you also supply the answers it is impossible for me to hear the answer.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier received advice in relation to how many women and children receiving treatment at the new Women's and Children's Hospital will be forced to walk or be driven

in an ambulance to the Royal Adelaide Hospital for extra care? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On ABC radio this morning the Premier said, 'They could walk.'

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:33): I am very happy to outline what advice we have received in relation to the planning of the new hospital, which is advice from the clinicians of SA Health, of the Women's and Children's Hospital—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert! The member for Colton is warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I have just come to question time from having a staff forum at the Women's and Children's Hospital, speaking directly to the clinicians, and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —I can inform the house that clinicians are overwhelmingly supportive of the government's plan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I can also inform the house that last night I went to the women's and kids' hospital, walked the wards of the hospital, met with many clinicians and, overwhelmingly, there is support for this plan, including support for the key element of our plan that we have outlined—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —which is establishing an intensive care unit for women inside the Women's and Children's Hospital. This means that women will be able to get the care that they need in the hospital and it means that the RAH and the Women's and Children's Hospital clinicians will work in network to make sure that that care can be provided.

Importantly, that means that women who need that care will not be separated in a different hospital from their babies who are also getting care inside that hospital. This has wide support from our clinicians as a fantastic outcome in terms of improving those services, making sure fewer transfers have to happen. Clearly, if we can bring the clinicians to the patient then that is better than having to move the patient to get to the clinicians. Obviously, there will be a lot of work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on three warnings.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Obviously, there is a lot of work to happen between the Women's and Children's Hospital and the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange between the Premier and the member for Morialta will cease. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The location of the new hospital on this much bigger site with additional capacity is still in the biomedical precinct, which means that there is the key ability for close collaboration between clinicians across the hospital sites, and also with the universities and also with SAHMRI and SAHMRI 2, which are going to be working together as part of the biomedical precinct. Having all those services connected in the biomedical precinct is absolutely important not only for providing clinical care but also for health and medical research that will happen across those sites.

We have been listening to the clinicians. This has been worked on in collaboration and with their leadership working on that. We have heard directly from the clinicians, who have spoken publicly about this in the past 24 hours that they are very supportive of this model, which is ultimately going to improve the care of women, children and babies in South Australia.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question again is to the Premier. Does the \$3.2 billion price tag for the Premier's favourite new Women's and Children's Hospital site include costs for decommissioning—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, leader, which I will hear under 134. The Leader of Government Business on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is clearly debate in that question, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta! Member for Schubert! Leader, I give you an opportunity to rephrase. I give the leader some latitude, as I do the Premier.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, and I appreciate that latitude, sir. My question is to the Premier. Does the \$3.2 billion price tag for the new Women's and Children's Hospital include all costs consequential to the decision?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:37): Thank you—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The question has been asked. Now we turn to the answer.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It includes the same basis of those costs as was in place for the previous costings.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: We didn't have to rebuild the police barracks.

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is on three warnings. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens! Treasurer, order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It includes the same basis as was in the previous government's plan. We now know that cost had gone from \$1.95 billion to \$2.8 billion.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:38): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house of the reaction of key stakeholders to the government's site choice, design and related aspects of the new Women's and Children's Hospital?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey! The member for Florey is warned. The member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, the exact same standing order just raised by the leader of the house.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully. Is the objection to the question?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, the question had been asked, and the answer hadn't begun, so consequently the objection is standing order 97 to the question. It contained argument or, as I could state it, exactly the same standing order you just upheld from the leader of the house.

The SPEAKER: Well, I am not sure necessarily I made a ruling. I am going to allow the question, but it may be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, please be seated. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: A point of clarification: the clear intention of the points that you made, as understood by the opposition when the Leader of the Opposition asked a question, was that he was required to rephrase, and I seek clarification as to the difference between the two points of order.

The SPEAKER: Rather than arguing the point, it is your question time and I am keen for you to have as much time to ask questions as is reasonably practicable. I am going to ask the member for Davenport to rephrase and then we will turn to the answer.

Ms THOMPSON: Can the Premier inform the house of the reaction of the various key stakeholders to the government's site choice, design and related aspects of the new hospital?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Order, member for Florey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:39): Can I thank the member for Davenport for her question because I know the member for Davenport cares about what experts think on such an important investment. When you are going to spend billions of dollars of taxpayers' money, you want to make sure you are making an investment that actually serves the purposes of the build in the first instance, and the support that we are getting from clinicians around the state, former and current, is overwhelming, including—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Did you tell them what the on-costs were?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —senior clinicians who have a substantial history in terms of their contribution to the sector but also a history in terms of advocating loudly against Labor governments in the past. For instance, I refer to none other than Warren Jones, who has been a powerful advocate on both heritage—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and hospital reform. He is a passionate South Australian. He was quoted as saying that the previous plan 'is too complex, structurally unworkable and prohibitively expensive'. Similarly, to take—

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

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —for instance, the comments of Professor John Svigos, a great South Australian obstetrician and gynaecologist, who said that the plan is, and I quote, 'an excellent compromise which will work'. Then of course there are current clinicians, such as Dr Laura Willington, who has said that it is a very exciting proposition: 'This has been a long time coming.' She is the Medical Head of the Unit of Women's Anaesthesia at the hospital. Then, of course, we have the Women's and Children's Hospital Divisional Nursing Director of Surgical Services, Sina Amabili, who said:

To know that our women and their babies who are the sickest are going to be close together...is a significant win for us.

Dr Steve Keeley, former Women's and Children's Hospital Paediatric Intensive Care Consultant, said:

I applaud the...government...People really have to be held accountable for choosing that ridiculous triangle of a site.

Bernadette Mulholland, SASMOA Chief Industrial Officer, said:

There's a possibility we'll have a really top notch hospital with top notch doctors and nurses, which is fantastic. Every possible source of advocacy across the state, industrial leaders in the medical sector, clinicians themselves, former clinicians, many of whom have a proven track record of willing to advocate against a Labor government decision, have backed this plan in.

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: It's actually not a surprise because, if they are given a choice between a hospital that is too constrained, too small, structurally unsound in terms of what we are trying to do—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —or given the choice of a bigger hospital that will actually meet the needs of the future, allow for clinical services to be delivered in a way that is best interest with patient outcomes, it is hardly a surprise which plan they are backing. What is a surprise—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —is that given all the clinical information that is now coming to the fore, now on the public record, given everything that we now know about that little triangle of a site that was the former proposition, given everything we know, what is a surprise is that the alternate—

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

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I have read the updated hourly review which came to the government, which gave—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, please be seated. Member for Morialta, your interjections are spirited; however, they also contradict the standing orders. Please depart under 137A for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: What is a surprise is that the alternate government of the state, having lost an election where health was an essential question at the election, is now persisting in what appears to be a defence of a flawed policy that would be a clinical failure, let alone too small in the long term. That's the surprise.

THEBARTON POLICE BARRACKS

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Will the minister consult Parklands and heritage stakeholders on the government's bill to demolish 10 state heritage buildings at the Thebarton barracks, and will this include public consultation and a public report by the State Heritage Council? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On 16 February 2022, the now Deputy Premier said, and I quote:

What we will do in Government is change the legislation...and Labor has absolutely no intention of knocking over any state heritage place, but in order to change the rules for the future we would ensure that there would be required public consultation on that...and that the State Heritage Council would be able to make a report on the impact, and that that would be public...so that's our policy.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (14:45): I stand by the election commitment that we made, and we will be having a report done by the Heritage Council and we will be engaging in public consultation about ways in which the values that exist on that site are able to be preserved in other forms.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister inform the house of the time lines associated with the new Women's and Children's Hospital?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:45): Thank you very much to the member for Newland. I, firstly, appreciate her question and her interest in making sure that we have appropriate services for women, children and babies for this state for the long term. This, as we know, is a project that has been discussed for a long time, but we haven't actually seen any construction work happen on it over the past nine years that this has been discussed as a project. In fact, over the past four years, \$53 million has been spent on this project without any sod being turned on that site, any construction underway.

Of course, the original promise that we had in terms of time lines, which I have been asked about, was a commitment that was made by the member for Dunstan—it's great to see him here—where he said, 'In our first 100 days, we will establish a high-level task force to drive the project and develop a fully costed project plan with a view to achieving co-location by 2024.'

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: 2024—so that's not very far away now that that project—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Schubert is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Of course, that is not very far away, and for anybody to suggest that a hospital of this magnitude could be built within 18 months, I think, is significantly off the mark. So that time line went completely out the window. In fact, what we know is that it was a task force that was completed. In fact, that task force report was never made public; it wasn't released publicly. But in fact then there was a whole lot of inaction for a whole period of time, there were more delays, more plans—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —being worked on, but I think it is fair to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! Member for Florey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —that these repeated delays in terms of this project are because of the site. I don't think it's because of the people who were working on it necessarily. I think it's because there is no way of making a hospital work on that site that gets the clinical outcomes that this state needs for women and children and babies. So many compromises would have to be made for that to happen, and that's why we have seen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —delay after delay after delay on that site, and that's why—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —when we came to government we immediately sought an update in terms of this project and what we were told was that the time lines were blowing out—at that stage, at the very earliest the end of 2027, if not 2028 by that stage. We were immediately told that the budget was blowing out ahead of what had been budgeted the previous year by the previous government and we were told that many of the clinical issues that have been raised could not be resolved, and that's why—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —we appointed Jim Hallion an expert group—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's why we appointed Jim Hallion an expert group to undertake that work to get a full picture of where that project was up to and any alternatives that we could proceed with. What we have heard in the past couple of days—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Flinders!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —is that somehow this project was shovel ready on that triangle site is completely wrong—completely wrong. There is no way that that project is shovel ready. In fact, references have been made to Lendlease being appointed. Well, they haven't been appointed to actually do the construction yet, only the early planning. There still needs to be more procurement done for the actual construction component of the project.

Time expired.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Given South Australians won't see a Women's and Children's Hospital this decade, how many millions will the government invest into sustaining the current Women's and Children's Hospital site? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The former government had already invested over \$80 million into sustainment works and this, of course, was based on the fact that a Women's and Children's Hospital would be delivered in 2026-27.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for West Torrens! The Treasurer is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:50): Well, that is a significant development. In the past few days, we have heard it was all going to happen in 2026; now we hear 2026-27 it was going to happen. They put '27' in, slotted that one in there.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The truth of the matter is that even proceeding with the smaller site with the clinical inadequacies of that project, the advice that we have is that the earliest that that could possibly happen would be 2028 for that to be developed.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So on either scenario—going with the new site that's going to have better capacity for the future and the ability to expand both the women's and the kids' and the RAH or the small site with the clinical inadequacies and no expansion capacity—there is still going to need to be sustainment works undertaken at that hospital. But the idea that the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister have been going around to the media today with their dodgy brothers consulting company figures of \$220 million is just laughable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TARZIA: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated. I will hear the point of order.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert!

Mr TARZIA: Point of order, sir, for debate, 98(a): the minister is now deviating from the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Hartley. I will listen carefully. I bring the minister back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Let's look at the facts of this and let's not look at what they say; let's look at what they did.

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: At the end of 2021—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —the previous Liberal government—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —made a budget allocation for the sustainment works until 2027. So five years more of operation of the Women's and Children's Hospital they costed at \$30 million—\$30 million they said was going to be the allocation from December 2021 to 2027, the opening of the hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is called to order. The member for Schubert is warned. The member for Chaffey is called to order.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's right, we put that in when we were in government. That had already been spent. So you made an allocation for what was needed for those five years of operation at \$30 million. We acknowledge that obviously under either scenario the hospital is going to have to continue operating longer. Under either scenario, more investment is going to be needed in the hospital. But to go from saying, as the Liberal Party did, \$30 million over five years to now the figures they are floating in the media today of \$220 million over three or four years is just laughable.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call. The member for Chaffey is called to order. The member for Schubert is warned. The member for Hartley knows better.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: There will have to be sustainment works done at the hospital, but they are much more likely to be in the order of the works that the previous Liberal government budgeted, held up in glory, saying these were great works, and \$30 million—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned again.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: It is much more likely to be in that magnitude than the figures that have been plucked completely out of the air today by the Leader of the Opposition in his desperate ploy to try to find something he can say on this project to get himself a grab on the news without actually saying whether he's going to support it or not. Is he going to back it? I hope he does. I hope that this is a project that gets support from across the community because this is a project that has the support of the clinicians, and this is a project that has the support of the families at the hospital who use this service.

Ms Pratt: At what cost? How much?

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This is a hospital that all South Australians take pride in, and I think all South Australians want to make sure that we build with the long term in mind and get it right the first time.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Who selected the sites that would be considered as part of the Jim Hallion review? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The Hallion review only looked at three possible site locations. Did the minister or the Premier select those?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55): We were very clear that we wanted them to look at all the sites in the biomedical precinct that could be considered—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on three warnings.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and that is the work that was undertaken by the review. They undertook that work. They selected the sites—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —and you can see the result of that work, which points very clearly to the barracks site that is set further off Port Road. I had the opportunity to brief the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister earlier on this, but I am happy to run through it again. There were a variety of different sites that were examined by the review—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —firstly looking at the existing triangular site, looking at the current status of that site. We have already traversed the deficiencies of that in terms of the clinical output.

The review looked at whether that site could be improved, and that was considered. There was consideration of two different iterations of building upon the city site, and that was the lowest ranked by the clinicians involved in the process. A number of issues were raised with that, including significant issues in terms of ambulance access with the traffic access on that site.

What would seem apparent in terms of being able to connect to the Royal Adelaide wasn't actually useful in terms of connecting at the wrong end of the building, so there were a number of issues there. The other alternative that was looked at was considering splitting the hospital, building the women's part of it near the RAH and the children's part on the other side. That would have involved the barracks as well, being required for part of the children's hospital and also the car parking provisions for that hospital. That was considered. That was the most expensive option that was looked at—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on three warnings.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —both from a capital perspective and an operational perspective.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So much of the different sites would have to be duplicated across those two hospitals, so that didn't get significant support in the review. It then looked at the barracks site. The review looked at a site closer to Port Road. There were a number of benefits according to that, including, as we have talked about, the ability to plan for the future in terms of capacity expansion and being able to connect those critical care services on that site. However, the downfall of that initial look that the site review did was that it was too close to Port Road. It would lead to a rebuilding of Port Road, which would have been a very expensive and disruptive proposition to have happen.

Then they looked at another alternative, which was to set it further back from Port Road, and that was the outcome that came out of the site review chaired by Jim Hallion. It had the highest overall score, the highest clinical score and the highest construction score of all the projects. That is the work that has informed the decision that we have made to build a hospital that is going to have the ability to have the best clinical outcomes now and into the future.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:58): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the escalation of construction costs and how governments have managed them?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:58): I thank the member for Badcoe for her question. We all understand the impacts of inflation, especially now that it is running so high not only across the globe but here in Australia—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and particularly here in South Australia. Each year, an inflationary environment means the costs of goods and services continue to increase. It is affecting households, businesses—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and, of course, the commercial construction industry. It is the commercial construction industry that in many cases has experienced inflation most acutely, particularly in the last 18 months and, it's true to say, over the last three years. The statistics—as they are published on the ABS website—show that the increasing costs of components required for commercial construction have soared in the last three years: electrical equipment up 32.4 per cent;

timber, board and joinery up 33.9 per cent; steel products up 28.5 per cent; cement products up 20.6 per cent; and plumbing products up 19.5 per cent.

Yesterday, I was stunned, but of course not surprised, to hear the Leader of the Opposition claim that the cost of the new Women's and Children's Hospital had 'blown out' by more than \$1 billion under this government—a deliberately disingenuous and misleading assessment of the reality of one of the most important infrastructure projects this state will ever see, because—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —right up until March of this year those opposite were claiming that the build costs for the new Women's and Children's Hospital would be \$1.95 billion, a figure first given to them in early 2019, three years earlier. Remarkable! Of course, as we know, we have done in the last six months what those opposite failed to do in the previous four years and put a rigorous and robust process—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —in place to come up with an accurately costed—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —robust project which can now be taken to market. After the review was completed, the cost of the plan of those opposite for the new Women's and Children's Hospital—that one on the constrained site—was \$2.7 billion to \$2.8 billion. That was the accurate cost of what they were pretending was less than \$2 billion.

If we really want to know the farce of the situation presented by those opposite in recent times, in their most recent budget they only had \$814 million budgeted for the first four years of what they pretended to be a 5½ year construction period. So \$800 million for the first four years and \$1,135 million over the last 15 months. That was the approach of those opposite, but of course—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —they hadn't done the work and they hadn't put the right figure in, let alone the money in the budget for it. I am not wholly and solely critical of those opposite about their approach to managing the inflationary environment construction costs because not all things went up over the three years leading up to the last election. There was some deflation of some items. For example—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —in March 2019—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton! Member for Frome!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —there were 25 members of the parliamentary Liberal Party, and in the lead-up to the last election that had shrunk to 22. So there was deflation in some parts of the economy, so perhaps they can't be held solely to account for it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister confirm whether soil contamination, investigations and potential remediation are included in the \$3.2 billion cost of the new Women's and Children's Hospital?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:03): Yes, and I would correct that we have put out the range of \$3 billion to \$3.2 billion for the construction of the hospital on the bigger site with more capacity.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. When does the new site for the police barracks have to be determined to avoid further delays on the new Women's and Children's Hospital with the completion date of 2031?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:03): Thank you for the question. We have allocated \$2 million to the police to undertake work in relation to the business case for the moving of those services that are currently on that site. A number of services are currently on that site. A number of task forces are in temporary removalist-type buildings. There are obviously the dogs and the horses, and there is the Police Historical Society as well. The police are undertaking a project in terms of—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —moving those services to other appropriate locations.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey is warned for a second time. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: This is something we have been working on collaboratively with the police. I want to thank the police minister for his collaboration in terms of this. This is something that the police have obviously had in mind for some time, particularly since the member for Heysen rezoned that land as health zoning back when they were in government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So there has been some—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Just in case!

The SPEAKER: Order! The Treasurer is called to order. The member for West Torrens is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Chaffey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: So there has been some indication that the police may need to consider this over time. Some preliminary work has already been done. Obviously, there are other elements to the hospital as well. The construction of the car park is likely to be the first element that's constructed of the hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Florey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That's on the same site of where the car park was originally proposed to be located, along Gaol Road. That's likely to be where the first construction elements take place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on three warnings.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Obviously, the faster we can get access to the SAPOL site, the faster we can get access to undertaking the construction works on that site as well. Work is underway. We want that to happen as fast as possible. The faster we can bring that forward, the faster we can get the construction works happening on that site. In addition, the faster we can get legislation approved by the parliament, that will certainly help in terms of the time line of this project as well. A key element in terms of the questions in relation to cost impact this as well, where—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, it's not the Colosseum. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: The faster that we can have the SAPOL access, the faster that construction can happen. The faster we can get the legislation, we can potentially bring forward the time line as much as possible. The more we can bring forward the time line, the less the cost. If the time line goes the other way—for instance, if we have to go a more difficult route in terms of planning—then that obviously has additional costs. We don't want to have that happen, and that's why it's really important not only to have the SAPOL work that is currently underway but also in terms of legislation that we will be bringing before the house very shortly.

THEBARTON POLICE BARRACKS

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Planning. How and when did the rezoning of the Thebarton Police Barracks occur?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (15:07): I thank member for Torrens for her question, very timely to the debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I am sure this question will come as no surprise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There's a point of order. Minister, please be seated. I will hear the member for Hartley on a point of order under 134.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Badcoe! I will hear the member for Hartley.

Mr TARZIA: This information is already in the public domain. I struggle to see what the minister could actually elaborate on.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hartley, therein lies perhaps the defect in the point of order: it speculates as to the answer. We will hear the answer.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It shouldn't come as any surprise to the 16 members opposite and the former minister who signed off on the code amendment.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Who was that?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, it was the member for Heysen. But it was his former colleague the member for Bragg who initiated the code amendment, that rezone for the Thebarton barracks, and it was one of the most significant achievements. She initiated the code amendment on

16 July 2021. What did this code amendment do? It sought to ensure that the land west of the existing city Riverbank zone, which was the site of the basketball stadium, would be rezoned a city Riverbank health subzone, a health subzone that included not just the Thebarton Police Barracks but also the old Adelaide Gaol site.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members to my right! The minister has the call.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: The former member for Bragg's code amendment—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —was adopted by her colleague—because by that stage she had moved on to other things—the member for Heysen. On 16 December 2021, the member for Heysen provided precise amendment instructions to spatially apply the city Riverbank zone in place of the Adelaide Parklands zone to the area shown on the adopted map, including the land comprising the Thebarton Police Barracks, the old Adelaide Gaol, and to spatially apply the health subzone to that mapped area.

So these changes were commenced by the member for Bragg and executed by the member for Heysen a mere two months and two days shy of the caretaker period. But it's not just there. On 16 July, when the member for Bragg initiated this code amendment, she stated in the letter to her chief executive:

The Code Amendment seeks to review planning policy applying the Riverbank Precinct to ensure the Planning and Design Code suitably aligns the future strategic land use and built form outcomes...[including, the] need to rezone the land to support the development of the new Women's and Children's Hospital.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: It gets better and better. The initiation request from the former Minister for Planning went on to elaborate on the intended policy on the code amendments that it was anticipated to propose to rezone the effective land to respond to strategic land use investigations and a review of the existing established land uses and to rezone the land, including the Thebarton Police Barracks and the old Adelaide Gaol site to accommodate health and biomedical related facilities and services. What we have here is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! The Premier is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Upon adopting the Riverbank Precinct code—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —on 16 December, 2021—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —the member for Heysen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: —formally removed the Thebarton Police Barracks and the old Adelaide Gaol from the Parklands zone and placed it in the city Riverbank health subzone, making way for the development of that site to support infrastructure initiatives of state significance in the Riverbank, including the development of the Women's and Children's Hospital.

So it should be clear, absolutely clear to everyone, that despite all the protestations from those opposite, despite all their hoo-ha on radio, despite all the questions in this house, they never, ever state their real position, but what they did in government was to prepare this area for Health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister's time has expired. The member for Chaffey is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member West Torrens called to order!

MAITLAND HOSPITAL

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:12): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, and I hope the chamber will forgive me for changing topic. I would like the minister to update my community on dialysis services at Maitland Hospital. With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain just a little bit further.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: A constituent of mine who lives near Maitland contacted me during the week and he has recently had to start renal dialysis services and can't get into Maitland Hospital, despite them offering that service. That means that he now has a four-hour round trip three times a week to Gawler to get a service that he could get a lot closer to home.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:12): I thank the member for Narungga for his question and thank him for his significant advocacy in terms of a range of health issues within his electorate. I am very happy to follow up in relation to this particular matter and this particular constituent. I do know that dialysis services are under pressure across the state, and that's why we are working in terms of planning for additional dialysis services that need to be put in place across South Australia. In terms of the specific considerations on Yorke Peninsula, I am very happy to come back to you with a detailed answer.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:13): My question is to the Treasurer. How much is the new Women's and Children's Hospital advertising campaign costing South Australian taxpayers, and has all spending been approved by the Government Communications Advisory Committee?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:13): As those opposite would be aware, we have already advised the house that government advertising campaigns are managed centrally by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. Those costs are accounted for and proactively disclosed on a monthly basis. I haven't had any involvement in the preparation of that particular campaign. I don't know the costs of it. I will undertake to find an answer for the chamber and bring it back either before or after it's proactively disclosed in the monthly reports that are put on the DPC website.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:14): Supplementary: can the minister also bring back to the house in preference prior to the disclosure on what date did the Government Communications Advisory Committee consider and approve the campaign?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:14): Yes, I am happy to make those inquiries.

SA ENVIRONMENT AWARDS

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:14): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on South Australia's Environment Awards night 2022 that occurred last night honouring South Australia in protecting our environment?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water) (15:15): I thank the member for King for her question. It was a terrific night celebrating people who, in some cases, have spent decades of their lives contributing to a stronger environment in South Australia. It was a very warm and enjoyable evening for all.

I would like to run through in order to record officially on *Hansard* the winners of many of those awards. One of the categories was Lifetime Achievers Awards and that was for people—one of whom has passed away—who have spent their entire lives dedicated to looking after the environment. Betty Westwood, for example, who has passed away, was known as the 'tree lady' and in her lifetime planted some 250,000 trees personally. She was instrumental in the organisation Trees for Life and, in fact, she has been remembered by Trees For Life with their nursery in the southern suburbs called the Betty Westwood Nursery.

Richard Willing is a medical practitioner, a gastroenterologist I believe, but also a scientist and conservationist. He is part of the Scientific Expedition Group that goes out frequently undertaking expeditions to undertake scientific research on biodiversity. He has been, I think, of that organisation on the committee, the chair, the president and indeed the patron over his many years, and he is involved in a biodiversity project they run on his own property.

It was wonderful to see Major Sumner, Uncle Moogy, being recognised for his role, recognising not only his cultural authority as a Ngarrindjeri elder but also his utter commitment to advocacy for his environment and sharing his understanding of the environment with others. He is a very generous and patient person, having seen terrible things happen to the natural environment of his people and of us collectively, particularly with the fate of the River Murray.

Margaret Lee is a very long standing environmentalist. In 1958, she became the inaugural Assistant Secretary of the Australian Plant Society because the secretary position couldn't be held by a woman. She went on fortunately—as the society came to its senses—to hold most roles, including becoming the national president of that organisation. Through that organisation, she helped fund Trees for Life, which was known originally as Men of the Trees.

The final person who was acknowledged for a Lifetime Achievement Award I particularly want to focus on is Dr Mike Bossley. When I was a young environmentalist an awfully long time ago, I went into the office of Greenpeace in South Australia to volunteer and to work with them, and he was the mainstay of Greenpeace at that time. He had been instrumental previously in stopping Australians from whaling in 1979. We as a nation stopped commercial whaling, and he was instrumental in that. As most South Australians will know, ever since he has been dedicated to supporting cetacean life, in particular the dolphins of the Port River. His contribution is widely acknowledged. He is very popular with people, and he also is very well respected amongst the scientific community.

There were many other awards given; I won't have time to read all of them, but I will make sure that they are included in some form, either through a grievance or another mechanism to acknowledge their contributions. I was particularly touched by some of the younger people though. Often in community organisations we see that the senior people are of a significant age, as is appropriate, but last night was also full of young people who are utterly dedicated to making this planet a better one than they inherited and sustainable for all.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:19): My question is again to the Treasurer. What is the current estimated total cost of the Women's and Children's Hospital, including interest payments and contingency, and what is the impact on the budget forward estimates, given the new time frame?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:19): We have already released a cost estimate of between \$3 billion and \$3.2 billion. As I was at pains to point out in my previous answer to a question from the member for Badcoe, inflation has a significant impact on construction costs. It has to be taken into account, and the longer a build program is the more it contributes to the total costs of a project. For example, the member for Hartley is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —nodding his head as if he's got some demeanour of agreement with me. You might think that if you have a cost in 2019 of \$1.9 billion and three years of delay—when commercial construction costs have gone up by 30 per cent—roughly speaking, 30 per cent of \$1.9 billion is over \$550 million. A minimum of three years of complete and utter inertia, those opposite being decisive when they were in government as glaciers whizzed past them—that is the real cost of delays on major projects.

Of course, you can say the same thing for the member for Hartley and his former Minister for Transport and Industry. We are reflecting on former ministers during this question time, aren't we, and their performance—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Fallen colleagues.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —fallen colleagues—and the delays of doing nothing on the north-south corridor and what that is contributing to overall costs. It does have a cost. It does include—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hartley is warned.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —an appropriate allowance and a recognition of a construction time frame—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey! Member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —and the impact that escalation has on that cost.

THEBARTON POLICE BARRACKS

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:21): My question is again to the Treasurer. What is the estimated total cost of decommissioning the Thebarton Police Barracks site, and how much is anticipated that their new facility or facilities will cost taxpayers?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:21): Largely, that will be—

Mr Pederick: Brick by brick or D9?

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —determined by the response we get from the market for those people who are responsible for conducting the work to decommission those buildings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: For example, when we—

Mr Tarzia interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —went out to market to decommission the old Royal Adelaide Hospital buildings, there were various estimates that Renewal SA had at the time, and then of course the ultimate estimate, and that is the one that you get back from the market. So the accurate figure for that we are not going to know until we get a response from the market. There has been an

allowance, of course, as there has been an allowance for escalation. We are not going to go into chapter and verse as to what every component of the construction cost is going to be because of course—

Mr Tarzia: Why not? It's public money.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Why not? For somebody who's got no experience in delivering projects of course you would say, 'Why not?' That's because you have to engage the market and ask them for their best price in undertaking the work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I realise that that is breaking news for those opposite because they did so little in four years. They troubled the private sector so little in getting projects to market, but having had some experience in infrastructure delivery and development in the South Australian Labor Party—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —we will be doing this diligently, carefully, and getting the best value for taxpayers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

SOUTH ROAD

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:23): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. When will the minister provide certainty to residents and business owners along South Road? With the leave of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TARZIA: On Thursday 15 September, on 891 radio Dr Robyn Sainsbury revealed that she has still not received a definitive answer as to whether the government plans to bulldoze her skin cancer clinic, with over 20,000 patients, on South Road.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:23): The short answer to that question is very soon. The long answer to the question is Ms Sainsbury then went on to ring back the program, I understand, and gave a very different answer, as she had been contacted a number of times by her local member of parliament, received many pieces of correspondence from the department—

Ms Thompson: He might want to listen to the Friday transcript.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, perhaps the member might want to read Friday's transcript because it was a very different situation. People are time poor and get lots of correspondence. Sometimes they don't read that correspondence. I am not assigning any blame; it just happens. I understand now that that particular issue has been resolved, and it has been resolved through—

Mr Tarzia: So it's their fault.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, I did not say that at all. I would also say that I am available to meet with local residents as often as they please. I meet and consult with local community groups. Local members in the area—the members for Elder and Badcoe—are meeting regularly with groups to discuss what is occurring on the north-south corridor, as do I. I meet with these groups, I talk to them and I talk to local residents. Once we have repaired the completely inadequate reference design that members opposite left us—which, to remind the house, could have meant that \$9.9 billion being spent on the north-south corridor would have made it redundant the day it was open—I have to say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order and the member for Hartley is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We have three major arterial roads funnelling into South Road. If we do not make the tunnels workable for those people who are on those arterial roads coming down from the south onto South Road—make the tunnels usable for them—they would not use the tunnels. That is, if the exit points at Anzac Highway, Richmond Road and James Congdon Drive were not sufficient to move traffic, they would choose not to use those tunnels and we would have spent \$9.9 billion on a vanity project of the former government. We have to make sure that those tunnels work properly, and the shadow minister—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Badcoe is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley! The Treasurer is called to order. The minister has the call.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I hear the shadow minister's complaints about six months. This is a project, like the Women's and Children's Hospital, that will last the state for nearly a century. We have to get it right and we are going to get it right—

Mr Tarzia: You're not even going to do it, are you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —and the member is interjecting, 'You're not even going to do it.'

Mr Tarzia: Are you?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is now 3.20. Write down this date in your diary, Mr Speaker, that the member for Hartley says we're not going to do it.

FIRE DANGER RATING SYSTEM

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:26): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Can the minister inform the house about South Australia's involvement in developing the new Australian Fire Danger Rating System and how it assists communities to be bushfire ready?

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services) (15:27): Just in time. I thank the member for Giles for his question. Mr Speaker, as you would no doubt know in your own electorate, fire danger ratings describe the potential level of danger created should a bushfire start. This is vital information provided to the community of South Australia to inform them of actions to take to protect themselves, their properties, their dependants and their animals.

While we have had fire danger rating systems in the past, this new Fire Danger Rating System has been superseded by the Australian Fire Danger Rating System (AFDRS). This new system is critically underpinned by decades of updated information and fire science. It simplifies our call to action for community members and, most importantly, creates a truly national set of ratings.

Globally, we are now living in a time when unprecedented natural disasters are now becoming the norm. We know that Pakistan is experiencing the most severe flooding in the country's recent history. Sadly, this disaster has taken the lives of at least 1,500 people, including over 550 children. Beyond this, the UNHCR estimates that 7.6 billion people in Pakistan have now been displaced by these floods. Across in California, CAL FIRE reports their state is continuing to

experience longer wildfire seasons as a direct result of climate change. Since the beginning of 2020, CAL FIRE has reported over seven million acres burned, with 15,621 structures damaged or totally destroyed and, tragically, 45 lives lost.

Further to this, the European Forest Fire Information System indicates that forest fires have burned a record of 860,000 hectares in the EU so far. Stark numbers of fires have also been recorded. This year so far, in Hungary there has been 25 times the average annual number of fires; Romania, 14 times the average number of fires; and Germany, eight times more. Disasters are more prolific, they are more catastrophic, and South Australia is not immune from that whatsoever.

Just recently we have seen the Kalka-Pipalyatjara fire, burning well in excess of 45,000 hectares. This fire, in what feels like the early throes of spring, reminds us all that we need to be prepared and ready for the first sight of fire across our state.

AFDRS is providing improved information behind fire danger predictions. This includes a more considered reflection of vegetation fuel types across Australia's landscape to better predict fire behaviour, further conditions through more comprehensive data and, in turn, this increases confidence in predictions and improves management outcomes. This is better for all communities. Better science and better predictions lead to better proactive fire management and better firefighting outcomes, thus improving safety for all.

While the science behind the AFDRS is vitally important, this science is futile if it cannot be communicated to community members so that they know what they need to do in the event of a moderate, high, extreme or catastrophic day. Moderate means plan and prepare. High means be ready to act. Extreme means take action now to protect life and property. Catastrophic means for your survival, leave bushfire risk areas.

Our state can be particularly proud of this component of the AFDRS, as it was our own Country Fire Service that led the comprehensive national social research study in relation to community understanding of fire danger ratings and associated messages. While emergencies and disasters are becoming more prolific and more extreme, we are becoming a smarter and more informed community to tackle these challenges.

Personal Explanation

THEBARTON POLICE BARRACKS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:31): Mr Speaker, I seek leave to make a personal explanation pursuant to standing order 108.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: Earlier in question time, the Minister for Planning adverted to a decision that I made in relation to the health precinct, and I fear the minister may have misled the house and has certainly misrepresented me.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Heysen, please be seated. I will hear the point of order under 134.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the member has asked under standing order 108 to make a personal explanation and then he has gone about accusing a member of the house of misleading the parliament. It is completely inappropriate.

The SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, I am advised that if you have indicated that you have been misrepresented, then they are the terms within which you need to confine your remarks.

Mr TEAGUE: I have been misrepresented, Mr Speaker, in relation to the health subzone and it was in respect of which the minister couched the rezoning. It is important that I bring to the attention of the house that the health subzone expressly included reference to the Thebarton Police Barracks and old Adelaide Gaol retaining state heritage protections and that re-use of these buildings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —as the minister well knows—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —re-use—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Heysen has the call.

Mr TEAGUE: —re-use of these buildings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer is called to order.

Mr TEAGUE: —is encouraged to complement the historic values and Parklands setting. References to the health subzone including provision for the construction of the Women's and Children's Hospital is an entirely discrete and separate matter.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier is called to order.

Grievance Debate

FESTA DI MADONNA DI MONTEVERGINE

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (15:33): I rise today to inform the house about a much-loved celebration, particularly in my local community of Hartley and indeed the Italian community, which I had the pleasure to attend over the weekend, and that is the celebration of the Madonna di Montevergine.

It was a pleasure to have attended the solemn holy mass in the morning with a number of my parliamentary colleagues to celebrate what is certainly the largest feast in South Australia of its kind. We know that it has been a hard couple of years, but I know that I and the local community were extremely excited to get the chance to celebrate this wonderful feast again. I would especially like to thank the president of the feast, Domenico Zollo, and also the committee, who were instrumental in making the feast of Madonna di Montevergine possible.

I take the time to put on the record my special thanks to the executive committee: Domenico Zollo, the president; Fedele Catalano, the vice president and public officer; Maria Trajkovic, the secretary; Nicola Zollo, vice secretary; Carmela D'Urso, assistant secretary; Michele Piteo, treasurer; Phillip Izzo, vice treasurer and public relations officer; Ennio Cavaiuolo, icon and meetings coordinator; Giovanni Angelino, liturgy coordinator; Michael Razzano, lottery committee representative; Anna Catalano, ladies representative; Carmela Placentino, also ladies representative; Carmine Scalzi, bar manager; Orazio Tedesco, grounds manager; and Mario Mignone, festa banner representative; as well as the members of the association and the Dame di Montevergine.

My thanks go to all the volunteers who spent literally hours and hours each and every week not only looking after the church but preparing for the feast every year. These feasts take tens of thousands of dollars to organise, so I would like to thank the many sponsors for helping to support the feast. Did you know this is actually the 67th anniversary of the Festa of the Madonna di Montevergine? When you look through the booklet the committee prepares each and every year, you will see the absolute plethora of companies and organisations that continue to support this feast. It really is a vital and vibrant part of our community.

I would also like to thank the many men and women who helped with the catering on the day. There were many members of parliament from both sides of the house who attended the feast, and that speaks volumes for the kind of support the festa enjoys. I particularly want to thank Nonna's

Cucina, who put on an absolute feast, making sure that they kept the volunteers and the supporters of the feast fed all day. Thank you very much to Nonna's Cucina.

The festival is obviously, amongst other things, a taste of Italian culture and cuisine, and it continues to offer a vast range of festival favourites, including plenty of pasta, trippa, zeppole, porchetta, pizza and plenty of wines, beer, spirits and also coffee. What truly makes it worth indulging in is that it all goes to a fantastic cause.

There was entertainment for literally all ages, entertainment that started around the middle of the day and went right throughout the night. I know that the kids had a lot of fun, as they always do at the festival, with kids' rides, and I believe there were also some farm animals for the kids to look at, enjoy and play with. The celebrations were followed by a traditional parish mass, which was accompanied by the talented Monteverdi Singers and finally concluded with a very festive fireworks show that occurred late into the evening. It was amazing to see thousands and thousands of people who gathered at the feast despite some wintry weather conditions.

We know that the feast is not only much loved but deeply important historically and has a special role to play in the Italian community. As I said, Sunday actually marked the 67th feast of the Madonna di Montevergine. I want to pay tribute to the migrants who contributed much to the state of South Australia all those years ago and who brought their traditions and customs. It is wonderful to represent this part of the world and to see that this festa continues to grow larger and larger each and every year.

BLACK FOREST TREES

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:38): Today, I am going to tell you a tale. This story is called 'Kate and the very special trees'. Our tale begins hundreds and hundreds and hundreds of years ago. Once upon a time, a deep dark forest sprawled across the land from Burnside to Marion. The forest was dense and thick and it was dark—so, so dark. The forest was filled with all sorts of trees: tall trees reaching up to the blue sky and little frail bushes hugging the earth, and all sorts of plants in between.

But one tree in particular prevailed; it was the hero of this forest: the grey box eucalypt. Its blackened rough bark and its gnarled branches sprawled across the land. Its limbs stretched up high and its leaves even higher to create a dense canopy. Its jet black bark made up the undergrowth and it shed to form the forest floor.

These trees, maybe millions of them, watched the generations come and go as they themselves came and went. They saw native animals, big and small. They saw searing hot days and bushfires. They saw rain and floods. For 50,000 years, the Kurna people cared for this forest and sheltered in it. It was the site of Dreamtime stories and of ceremony. Then, it was called Kerta Weeta; later, it was called the Black Forest.

After many centuries, two particular little trees sprouted right next to each other. It might have been 300 years ago, maybe 500. Those trees were big and strong by the time they witnessed Europeans arrive. For many years, the Europeans did not even venture into the forest, for it was deep and dark and scary, but soon the trees saw bushrangers fleeing into the forest and hiding among their trunks. No doubt, there were many things after that, both good and bad, that those two trees witnessed as the Europeans settled.

Bit by bit, the forest dwindled. First, a few houses were built, then orchards and farms and then roads. Then more and more trees were felled as the town grew and grew. It was such a lovely place that everyone wanted to live there. Soon, the trees were quite lonely, with fewer of their friends surviving as long as they did. Little did these trees know when they first sprouted that one day they would be surrounded by a lovely school, a big park and houses and flats, all built right around them. Still, the trees grew, surviving to be the last of their kind, the kind that was once part of the famed Black Forest.

Over time, the neighbouring folk grew worried. They loved the trees. They knew that they were very, very old. For many years, they tried to protect the trees. They tried to get orders to ensure that the trees would never be destroyed but, alas, they had not succeeded. One day, the house that had sat beside them for many decades was put on the market. The owners, who had lovingly watered

them and protected them behind a high fence for many years, had passed away and the property, with two remnant trees, was set to be sold.

The townspeople were very worried. They feared that the big bad developers could buy the land, chop down the trees, build units and make lots of money. A neighbour to the trees, named Kate Hubmayer, thought someone, anyone, should save the trees, and she was prepared to lead the fight. She talked to all the local folk. They wrote letters, they petitioned the council, but nothing much happened. She told everyone the tale of the trees and what a tragedy it would be for them to be cut down. One day, she told the tale of the trees to her local MP. The member for Badcoe agreed that the trees should be saved. It was not fair for these grey box trees to have endured so much and face such a horrible fate.

The MP went to see her friends in the new Labor government, and everyone agreed the trees should not be killed. The planning minister, Nick Champion, decreed that the land should be bought and the property put into the neighbouring school oval. He ruled that the government would then sell the house and make some of that money back, ensuring the townspeople could keep their very special trees. The MP was delighted. She told Kate, who was overjoyed, and the townspeople all rejoiced. Everyone, including the trees, lived happily ever after. The end.

WORLD TOURISM DAY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:43): I rise to speak today in celebration of World Tourism Day yesterday. I would like to touch on some of the exciting tourism initiatives that are happening in Narungga and on Yorke Peninsula and celebrate the progress that is being made in such an important industry to our local economy.

One of the most exciting things happening at the moment is that the works that have been going on for quite some time at Port Wakefield are nearing completion. The minister let me know only last week that the second bridge on the northern side is finished and that traffic is flowing both ways more freely now. As that starts to take shape, I think we are starting to see a solution that will not only improve traffic flow but obviously make it far safer and beautify the township. With Crash Corner removed and the traffic flowing a bit more freely, it will be a far more attractive proposition for those visiting our region to get there a bit quicker, and they can stay a bit longer without having to cater for so much time on the road on the way home.

As part of that redevelopment, there is a really exciting opportunity to replace the outdated Welcome to Yorke Peninsula sign that exists currently adjacent to the BP there. I am working closely with YP Tourism to try to come up with a solution that might provide a suitable replacement. The Wakefield Regional Council has resolved to remove that sign, and that will be on its way down relatively soon.

Despite the sign's importance and the time it has been there, it is quite dilapidated and falling apart, so it is probably time for an upgrade, and that redevelopment poses a wonderful opportunity. YP Tourism has a new manager starting soon, Jess Greatwich, who I am eager to meet next week, when I will catch up with her and discuss the opportunity we have at Port Wakefield to replace that sign. It is a really important gateway to Yorke Peninsula, and it will be wonderful to have it signposted appropriately.

There is a really exciting season ahead, I think, for Yorke Peninsula and Narungga. It should be a wonderful summer. There are plenty of big, healthy crops around. It should be a beautiful summer tourism season, and we are looking forward to welcoming everyone. We had such a wonderful influx of visitors during the COVID period, and if we can maintain those numbers and ensure that those people come back it should be a boom time for the providers on Yorke Peninsula.

We still feel as though we are undersold as a tourism destination. There are so many opportunities on YP. It feels sometimes that we get flown over for other destinations, but I can tell you that YP is taking off as a tourism offering. There are wonderful opportunities aboard. I have been working closely with the council and some proponents because Edithburgh is much visited and one of the best dive sites in South Australia. We are trying get a dive platform there. I have been plugging away at that for a little while, and hopefully it is not too far on the horizon and we can make that more accessible for people who like to travel to go diving.

A new information centre is coming to Port Broughton, and the council has done a wonderful job. The CEO, Maree Wauchope, has done a wonderful job planning and making sure that it is not too far away. It will provide a wonderful opportunity for those who are visiting the region and Yorke Peninsula to get all the information they need, and it will be an attractive addition to the beachfront as well.

Of course, last year we had the inaugural Seafood on Spencer festival, which was a tremendous success. I popped up there after footy, and it was wonderful to see so many people there enjoying a nice, healthy feed of seafood, as well as a couple of beers from local brewers and that sort of stuff. It was wonderful to see, and of course in its second year it promises to be bigger and better again.

There are some tremendous opportunities on Yorke Peninsula for tourism. I still think that we could do with more promotion from HQ, making sure that people are aware of all the things they can do on Yorke Peninsula. It is becoming an increasingly profitable market for our local economy, with operators are starting to pop up and we are getting more and more visitors. As it continues to mature and grow, I am sure that tourism will become an increasingly important—not that it is not already—part of our local economy.

The final thing I want to do is to congratulate a friend of mine, Helly Easter-Smith, who won the Regional SA Woman Award at the SA Woman Awards on Saturday night. It is a wonderful prize for all the hard work she has put into the tourism industry itself. She operates Country Getaways, a large business that does short-term rentals for people wanting to visit YP.

She has grown that business to a significant operation now. She has a large number of homes she rents out to people visiting, and she does an excellent job in providing that service to our local tourism economy, so it is a well-deserved award. She has done a tremendous job, and I am looking forward to seeing that business continue to grow. Congratulations to Helly on her wonderful achievement.

Time expired.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:49): I rise to speak about the health care within my electorate of Schubert, and I would like to reflect on some of the opportunities I have had over the last couple of months to really engage with members who are really passionate about driving better outcomes for their communities.

In late July, I had the privilege of hosting a well-attended forum in the northern part of the Adelaide Hills, in Gumeracha, at the Soldiers Memorial Hall. I would like to acknowledge your attendance and involvement in that, Mr Speaker, and thank you for your advocacy for better health services in the northern Adelaide Hills.

It is safe to say that the delivery of health services in regional South Australia right across the board is absolutely pivotal. To be able to go out to the community and get a better understanding of some of the challenges they are facing and then being able to bring that back to the parliament or advocate with ministers is so critical.

At the Gumeracha forum in particular one of the biggest problem areas that we were focusing on was of course the Gumeracha emergency department, which is currently, disappointingly, closed. The reason that it was closed was, in the first instance, due to COVID-19, but now we are in a real pickle when it comes to attracting and retaining the workforce that the hospital needs to keep its emergency doors open for people within that area.

On the panel I was so pleased to welcome Dr Geoff Symons from Gumeracha Medical. I was also really pleased to be able to host Joel Taggart, who is a really proud and passionate community advocate on a number of matters not just in relation to the Gumeracha hospital; my friend and colleague and electorate neighbour, Penny Pratt, the member for Frome, who was there in her capacity as shadow minister for regional health; and yourself, Mr Speaker.

I think it was a fruitful meeting. We got to hear more from the local health network about the working group they have established to really kickstart getting that emergency department reopened

and fleshing out some of the challenges we are having with workforce. It is safe to say that much more needs to be done. One of the clear challenges or clear barriers we have is in relation to that dreaded Modified Monash Model. It is a federal government boundary that is put on communities and it determines what incentives you can put for attracting workforce.

I was pleased after that meeting to write directly to the federal Minister for Health, Mark Butler. I invited him to undertake an urgent review of the Modified Monash Model, and in particular I encouraged him, and I invited all the decision-makers in relation to the Modified Monash Model, to come to Gumeracha to get an understanding of the challenges that not only our patients but also our paramedics face in getting down the hill to Modbury.

Of course, when you look at where Gumeracha is situated on the map, it is very easy for a bureaucrat to say, 'They are so close to Mount Barker,' or, 'They are so close to Modbury down the hill.' When you take into allowance those practical difficulties of getting down this swerving, winding road and you are in some strife with injury or your loved one is going through a pretty tough time, that is shocking.

That is just one of the reasons why that Modified Monash Model should change. Frankly, I do not think that it can happen soon enough. I would love to see that changed immediately if not sooner. I would like to thank all the people involved in that forum. We will keep advocating for that, and I am sure I say in unison with the Speaker, the member for Kavel, that we will keep working together on that issue.

I also had the privilege of hosting a forum in the Barossa Valley last night to speak about very similar issues in relation to the Barossa Valley hospital, in relation to different mental health services, domestic violence and a whole range of other community-focused services that can provide better health care for our regions because we all know that a strong community is a healthy one. I look forward to working on all those things and delivering better outcomes for the community.

COMMUNITY CONSULTATION

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:53): Today, I would like to touch upon an important issue in our communities, which is community consultation and the way governments go about community consultation, and not only governments but institutions as well. I think it is the difference between what is right and just doing things right. One is doing the right things—in other words, making sure we do the right things to engage—and the other is where you tick a box and just meet the requirements.

One of the trends in our community that concerns me and I am sure concerns others in this place is the increasing lack of trust in public institutions. It does not matter what level you are at, there is an increasing distrust of public institutions and the way we do things. To some extent, we are at fault for that because of the way we do things. We need to engage with communities and trust our communities and work alongside them.

This is particularly true at the local level. When you actually do community forums, as all MPs do, probably 80 per cent of the issues are local issues. They are not big world issues or big national issues but those things that impact people's lives day to day and that grate on them. People get really annoyed when either the state or, in most cases, local councils do not engage with them.

I think it is very important that we understand that we need to shift from just consultation, where you have essentially made a decision and just want to then ratify it, to actually engaging with community in the early stages to make sure that what you are doing is the correct thing and the priority.

Today, I would like to highlight a couple of examples. I did speak about this at my local council last night, although it was by phone because I was here and unfortunately I could not be there, and I raised some issues that have been raised by a number of residents in my area. There are three different issues: firstly, the issue of the proposed change to a code amendment in Evanston Park.

There is nothing wrong with code amendments; they happen all the time. The comments I am making are not about the merit or lack of merit of this code amendment or the person who owns

the land—far from it. My concern is about the way the council has gone about this. The council was approached by a proponent who wanted to do a code amendment. There is nothing wrong with that. What is wrong and interesting, though, is the decision the council made.

The council made a decision to actually support initiation of this code amendment after only speaking to the proponent. There was no engagement with the community at all. There was no engagement with the community whatsoever. This is the decision the council made do this:

2. Notes the presentation provided by the proponent's consultant...
4. Notes the administration's preliminary synopsis of issues needing to be addressed...

The decision also delegates to the CEO to work with the collaboratively with the proponent in the best interest of the community. Nowhere are the community included in that decision. You can understand residents in the area are outraged. Not only are they outraged but there is also a lot misinformation. When I had a meeting with the residents in the area, I spent most of my time trying to correct the misinformation. There was not a conspiracy theory; it was just bad decision-making.

It is very important that councils, government—it does not matter who it is—do community engagement right. Another example is dealing with the southern rural areas of Gawler. The southern rural areas of Gawler have been the subject of a whole range of discussions for many years between the community and the council and government. To say that it has not been resolved is an understatement.

This current council, the Gawler council, has a particular view about the area that is significantly at variance (using planning terms) with the view of the community. The council has initiated a whole range of reports, some of which they refused to make public when the reports were not favourable to the council but to the community, and, more recently, as part of their community consultation, they had this technical report prepared and put out for community consultation—a technical report of many pages.

The fact is a lot of people would not be qualified to make any comment on a technical report for a whole range of factors. Again, this is bad, poor community engagement. Engagement is about sitting alongside people, making decisions together, not imposing your will on the people. I raise these issues because you try to engage the council and actually suggest that they might want to do things differently, but it does fall on deaf ears. This is my way of saying we all need to do better and in this case, the example I have given, the Gawler council needs to do much better if it really does want to engage the community and get good decisions for the community.

LEWIS, BRIGADIER L.J.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (15:58): Today, I would like to talk about Brigadier Laurie Lewis AM (retired). As many members will be aware, on 12 September 2022, Brigadier Laurie Lewis AM (retired), passed away, aged 88. Laurie served as an inaugural member of the Veterans' Advisory Council, which was established by former Premier Mike Rann in 2008, firstly, as a member of the VAC for nine years and then as chair for two years following the passing of Air Vice Marshal Brent Espeland AM in September 2017.

Laurie consistently provided wise and valuable advice to my predecessors, ministers Atkinson, Snelling, Kenyon, Bettison, Hamilton-Smith and former Premier Marshall across his 11 years of service with the VAC. In his years on the VAC, Laurie was integral to the planning for South Australia's commemoration of the centenary of ANZAC, including as a member of the council's planning group for the ANZAC Centenary Memorial Walk. He was intimately involved in the planning and development of the Jamie Larcombe Centre at Glenside, tending to the mental health and wellbeing of service personnel.

It was fitting that myself and the member for Hammond in his capacity as shadow minister for veterans affairs were in attendance at Laurie's funeral yesterday, along with the Hon. Martin Hamilton-Smith and our former Governor Hieu Van Le. I offer my sincere condolences to Laurie's family. Laurie was the dearly loved husband of Di; loving father of Judith, Ian and Judy; cherished brother of Helen; devoted grandfather of Kate, James, Clara, Annie and Tahlia; and great-grandfather to Charlotte.

Laurie was a wonderful contributor to the state of South Australia. Our nation is very grateful for his 32 years of service in the Australian Regular Army, particularly during the Malayan Emergency and the Vietnam War where Laurie was mentioned in dispatches, when Platoon Commander 3 RAR during the Malayan Emergency 1957-1959 and as Officer Commanding C Company 9 RAR in Vietnam 1968-69.

While delivering his fine eulogy yesterday, one of Laurie's former soldiers, Mr Fred Fairhead, spoke fondly of his service with Laurie. I quote:

The 9 RAR Battalion book from that tour provides a compelling story about his role as the Officer Commanding C Company which had the motto of W.T.F.A.W.—the origins of which came from some obscure navigation issue. I leave it to you to work out what it means W.T.F.A.W.—But I'll give you a clue.

The letters W. T. Mean where the!

A special spirit existed in C company from the earliest days. That spirit was in the person of then Major Laurie Lewis, who possessed the unique ability to inspire all ranks with his own sense of mission, to have them work beyond their capacity, not because the boss demanded it but because they wanted to. The knowledge he had and his high personal standards earned him the total respect from all of his men—some of whom are here today in spirit.

It was a very, very moving eulogy. During Brigadier Lewis's 32-year service in the Australian Regular Army in both command and staff appointments, he saw active service in South Vietnam and Malaya. He also served overseas in Papua New Guinea and was the Deputy Army Adviser at the Australian High Commission in London. His final appointment in uniform was as the Military Secretary with Responsibility for Senior Army Officer Career Management.

Following his military service, he and his wife, Di, retired to Adelaide and he was appointed as the General Manager of the Aged Care and Housing Group, beginning a long association advocating for ageing South Australians. He was Chairman of the Repatriation General Hospital between 1993 and 2005, an institution he cared deeply about.

Throughout his later years, Brigadier Lewis remained involved with the ex-service community in South Australia as patron of the Royal Australian Regiment Association (SA Branch) and the Guards Association, Vice-Patron of the Association of Totally and Permanently Incapacitated Ex-Servicemen and Women (SA Branch) and Adviser to the War Widows' Guild of Australia (SA Branch). He was also an active member of the Veterans Review Board and the Ministerial Advisory Board on Ageing.

It was fitting that Laurie was made a Member of the Order of Australia for service to veterans as an administrator of aged-care and health services, as an adviser to state and national ex-service welfare groups and through support for charitable organisations in the Queens Birthday 2006 Honours list.

It is worth noting that the former Director of Veterans SA Rob Manton said in his excellent eulogy yesterday that this award and recognition predates the creation of the veterans affairs portfolio in South Australia, such is the magnitude of Laurie's contribution to veterans, their families and those who provide them with services to support their health and wellbeing.

I was pleased to have the opportunity to speak with Laurie and Mrs Di Lewis at the Vietnam Veterans Commemorative Service on 21 August 2022. The affection and respect shown to Laurie and Di at that service were very clear. Laurie was a man of quiet strength, kindness and dedication. Laurie will be mourned by members of the Royal Australian Regiment Association (SA Branch) as their patron and by the wider veteran community of South Australia.

We will remember Laurie. I note that all South Australians are tremendously grateful for Laurie's service, sacrifice and dedication to all veterans and their families. We will remember the Brigadier Lawrence John Lewis AM. Lest we forget.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart—Minister for Local Government, Minister for Regional Roads, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (16:04): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 18 October 2022 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

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

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 September 2022.)

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (16:05): I rise to speak in support of the National Electricity Law (South Australia) (Consumer Data Right) Amendment Bill 2022.

Back in 1597, English philosopher and statesman Francis Bacon coined the phrase 'knowledge is power'. What was true then is even more so today in our era, when knowledge about us as individuals has reached unprecedented levels.

An investigation by the Australian Productivity Commission in 2017 found that the creation of data was growing exponentially. It estimated that as much data was being created every two days as had been created over an entire year around the turn of the century. Undeniably, that pace of growth has accelerated in the years since the Productivity Commission's report, and more and more of the data is about us individually: our habits and behaviours, our preferences and our spending.

The commission said that 68 per cent of Australian internet users had some form of social media account and that 84 per cent were enrolled in at least one business loyalty program. Despite this clear willingness to participate in the online environment, there was growing concern by consumers about the privacy and use of their data, with three-quarters of people surveyed for the Office of the Australian Information Commissioner expressing their growing disquiet.

The Productivity Commission report was a foundation in the development of the bill before the house today. At its heart, this bill seeks to give consumers more control over the data about themselves, which has been gathered by businesses and authorities, including the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO). It will allow consumers to authorise sharing and use of that data by accredited businesses to deliver more benefits to combat cost-of-living pressures, reduce their personal carbon footprint, enhance their comfort or pursue whatever agenda the consumer chooses.

The Productivity Commission summarises benefits from structured access to data rights, saying:

- it will facilitate access by consumers to products and services which are better tailored to their particular needs or circumstances;
- it will allow access to new products and services; and
- it has the potential to reduce everyday costs.

It will improve competition between businesses and foster innovation by:

- lowering barriers to entry for new market participants who would otherwise not have access to databanks held by bigger institutions;
- promoting linked services in interoperability of technologies; and
- addressing the market failure of asymmetric information.

It would also potentially enhance social licence by creating a system with greater levels of accountability and trust.

That final point should be of great interest to the house. For society to function successfully, it is essential that the public has trust in the institutions that are the building blocks of our shared community. In recent decades, that trust has waned. Global communications firm Edelman is among professional organisations that track trust in institutions, including publishing a Trust Barometer for Australia.

During the height of the COVID-19 pandemic, trust in governments actually rose as the public realised authorities were acting to preserve lives, in particular in regard to vaccinations. However, now that the majority the population is vaccinated and the pandemic is less front of mind, trust in governments, business, media and NGOs has fallen again, according to the Edelman barometer.

Looking at individual industry sectors, health care has the highest level of trust, at 74 per cent, according to Edelman. That is not surprising given the extraordinary dedication and sacrifice of our nurses, doctors and allied health professionals, particularly over the last few years. The energy sector, in contrast, ranks poorly, with just 51 per cent of people surveyed saying they trust energy companies. That finding is consistent with surveys conducted by Energy Consumers Australia, the independent company that was established to promote the interests of consumers.

Energy Consumers Australia regularly conducts surveys to gauge sentiment about the sector. In its most recent survey, published in June this year, it found that just 44 per cent of consumers believed the energy market was working in their long-term interests. Some 20 per cent gave a negative rating, implying that many people thought the market was actively working against their interests.

The Consumer Data Right bill we have before us today is one of the measures that needs to be taken to help address that situation. It will put greater power back into the hands of consumers so they can opt in to get better deals, products and services they want and partnerships with companies whose goals they support. This government supports consumers and it supports consumer choice.

Along with this bill, the government is pursuing reforms to increase transparency in the energy market and put downward pressure on prices. Now that the Labor Party has also been elected federally, a decade of denial and confusion over energy with no coherent policy has ended. Now the commonwealth is working with states to fix the mess made by the Liberal Party, a mess that left consumers feeling abandoned and vulnerable.

Under the Labor Party, South Australia is again taking the leadership role in developing an energy system that is fit for the future. This government supports reforms that will pave the way for consumers to enjoy reliable, affordable and cleaner energy. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:11): I also take the opportunity to speak today in parliament about the National Electricity Law (South Australia) (Consumer Data Right) Amendment Bill 2022 and indicate that I am the lead speaker for the opposition. The Consumer Data Right is an initiative of the commonwealth government. Its purpose is to provide consumers with greater choice and control over their personal data that may be held by a business. It enables a consumer to transfer their data between businesses so that they can find products and services that are tailored to their specific needs, which saves them not only time but potentially money as well.

It was envisaged that the Consumer Data Right would help consumers monitor things such as their finances, utilities (in particular, energy) and also telecommunications, amongst other services. This will allow them to be able to compare and switch between various products and services in each of those sectors. The commonwealth government has already implemented the Consumer Data Right in the banking and finance sector and has now committed to extending it to the energy sector. If I talk a little about some examples in the banking sector, it can give people a better understanding of what the potentials are and apply it to data that is held in an energy perspective for customers as well.

In terms of banking, one use is to allow customers to manage all their finances in the one spot. If they have different credit cards from different banks, they will be able to look at them all in the one spot. The customer can allow access to their data via this Consumer Data Right to potentially a consolidator of this information. It could be a software provider who then allows a software service to then list all those credit cards, and they will know when payment is due for each. Hence, it will make life easier and potentially cut down on interest payments and late payments.

Other examples are in terms of finding the best services that each different bank can offer for that personal service for that personal customer, rather than just having a blanket description. An example of this is in securing loans. Customers can allow access to their credit history. Similarly, in energy, sometimes a credit history is required for setting up electricity or gas accounts. They can

then allow this through the Consumer Data Right to create personalised loan comparison reports. There are examples then to find out what the best loan is specifically for that customer. So you can see that it definitely saves time and potentially, by allowing for the best decision to be made by a loan customer, it can save money as well.

Another aspect that is envisaged in this Consumer Data Right is that after that consent and data sharing process is complete, consumers can use the accredited data recipient's website, or app in the case of these softwares, to delete the data once it is no longer required. That is certainly very important in terms of security of data. We do not want data being held where it is no longer required. We have seen instances very recently in regard to big telco companies around what happens when customers' data is breached, so the less data that is stored when it is no longer needed is certainly an optimal result.

You can see those sorts of applications can certainly be applied also in the energy domain, and that was the intent of the energy ministers and the commonwealth government in terms of now moving this Consumer Data Right through into the energy sector. But for this to be successful, the framework will need to be created that will assist customers with the ability to share their personal energy data between energy retailers.

Again, as I have mentioned, the intention over time is to encourage more competition between energy retailers, knowing that it is very easy for their customers to compare and, so that customers do not get lost in different plans between energy retailers, that will then drive them to deliver more innovative and attractive retail products and strategies and to encourage new innovative products, rather than just what is already available, and look to service the customers in a better way.

Another advantage of this Consumer Data Right is using personal energy metering data, as it allows customers to make much more considered personal energy investments as well. What potentially is the optimal size of solar panels for each household, basing it on energy usage that customer has? Similarly, should a home battery be added at the same time as solar panels or, if you already have solar panels, is it advantageous to get a home battery? If so, what would that capacity be? Again, by sharing this customer data, that work can be done by sophisticated software programs as opposed to being done by the consumer themselves. This could even apply to electric vehicles where consideration could be made around what impact it would have on their energy bill for the different capacity EVs as well.

There are definitely advantages to doing this and that is why this has been progressed, moving from the banking sector now towards the energy sector. As I said, the commonwealth initiated this some time ago, going back to 2017. They announced their intention to create a Consumer Data Right regime in Australia and in the banking sector and now the energy sector; eventually in telecommunications. This was in response to a number of commonwealth government reviews that recommended the development of rights for consumers to better access and transfer their personal information in a usable format.

As you can see, each data holder would have customers' data in a different format. So to make it easy to use, if there is a consistent format, it certainly makes it easier for the customer to obtain it, understand it and then also pass that on to a trusted third party.

In regard to energy, in 2018 the commonwealth government announced their intention to include the energy sector within the Consumer Data Right regime and, alongside that, in 2019 the commonwealth government implemented the Consumer Data Right through amendments to the commonwealth Competition and Consumer Act 2010. The act itself covers most areas of the market, including relationships between suppliers, wholesalers, retailers and consumers.

The purpose of the Competition and Consumer Act is to enhance the welfare of Australians by promoting fair trading and competition through the provision of consumer protections. That is why that act was amended to allow for the Consumer Data Right. Under that act, the commonwealth Treasurer is provided with the power to designate various sectors and datasets under the Consumer Data Right, hence the investigation now into energy. As I said, in 2019, the energy ministers came together and looked at the priority issues in terms of the energy sector and saw this as an opportunity to assist consumers to also reduce their electricity bills.

As a result, the energy ministers directed commonwealth senior energy officials to develop amendments to the existing energy legislation that will facilitate the Consumer Data Right for energy. Moving on to 2020, the commonwealth Treasurer then made the energy sector designation instrument that specified what datasets and energy data holders will have the Consumer Data Right applying.

At the same time, consultation was started such that by 2021 consultation had been done on this Consumer Data Right for energy. It concluded in 2021. A lot of this consultation, as it moved between 2018 through to 2021, was undertaken during the previous term of the former Liberal government and the former minister for energy and mining was intricately involved in that.

Finally, in November 2021 the commonwealth government implemented the Consumer Data Right for energy through amendments to the Consumer Data Right rules that are made under the commonwealth Competition and Consumer Act. That is from a commonwealth perspective. These amendments included creating and implementing a peer to peer data-sharing model for the energy sector.

Whilst these amendments were made to the commonwealth act, changes are still required to the National Electricity Law and also the National Electricity Rules to reflect these amendments as well. Energy ministers have agreed on these amendments to the framework. As South Australia is the lead legislator for the national energy laws, we now see these changes coming to parliament here for consumer data rights.

As I have said before in this house, and as the energy minister has also made mention of previously, the convention for such changes to national energy laws is that the legislative amendments are supported by both sides, and so I indicate that the opposition will be supporting this bill as we go forward. As I said previously, to get to this point a lot of the consultation and input was from the former energy minister before it finally arrived here. That is a fair indication that we will be supporting the bill for that reason as well.

I will speak a little bit about what the amendment bill does. It is part of a suite of changes, as I said, initiated by the commonwealth government, aimed at ensuring that consumers will have the requisite access to their personal energy information so that they can easily compare products and services, which will, of course, maximise the benefit that they can receive from the energy market and help reduce costs as well.

The bill will also allow consumers to opt to have their personal energy information provided to a trusted third party or an accredited data recipient, which has to be designated by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission, to then undertake that comparison for them and ensure that it is done in a safe and secure manner.

What that means is that the data is not just provided. A company cannot just set themselves up and say, 'I'm ready to receive your energy data. Please provide it.' They have to be accredited to make sure they are doing it in such a way that is safe and can be trusted, which then provides a safeguard for consumers so that they are not caught out by malicious actors as well.

Some of the Consumer Data Right for energy data include generic and tailored tariff data; distributed energy resource register data, which includes details on batteries and solar panel installations, which I mentioned previously; billing data; customer-provided data; and also metering data. As I mentioned earlier, a peer to peer model is to be set up where the consumer can direct a data holder to provide their consumer data to an accredited data recipient in a format that is compliant with the rules. It is important to say that the rules state what that data format is and that will marry up with what is in the commonwealth act.

If a consumer has provided an accredited data recipient with their personal energy information, the accredited data recipient will use it only for the purpose that the consumer has requested. Again, that speaks to the fact that they have to be accredited as a third party and trusted and not misuse that.

One of the ways these trusted third parties can use this data is tariff comparison, again to show what the most competitive rate is. That does not necessarily have to be another retailer. A third party could be a software provider that collates all these and compares different retail offers. The

data can also be used for energy efficiency audits, the sizing of solar panels on roofs and battery storage.

The commonwealth government has mandated that the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC) will lead the public education, rule making and enforcement of consumer data rights. That is the enforcement body to make sure that the energy rules that are set in place are being complied with. As stated previously, these changes have to be made to the National Electricity Law and National Electricity Rules.

One of the changes made that has to be legislated in this particular act relates to the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) because they will have further responsibilities as a data holder under the Consumer Data Right for energy, which will include constructing and maintaining the relevant Consumer Data Right application programming interfaces. That basically enables the sharing of data in a uniform format and some interoperability between data holders and trusted third-party providers. This will allow energy retailers to request and receive data and ensure that the relevant record-keeping obligations are followed.

These responsibilities that have been given to AEMO are a significant expansion of AEMO's role in terms of data provision and have been set up in the amendment of section 49. Consumer Data Right functions of a data holder relating to the energy sector will be added to the list of AEMO's statutory functions. Enshrining these functions within AEMO's statutory functions also enables the Energy Market Operator to recover the costs of performing these functions through participant fees as part of its normal cost recovery functions.

As to additional changes to this amendment bill, as with previous changes to the National Electricity Law, with South Australia being the lead jurisdiction, it enables the South Australian energy minister to use the minister-initiated rules power to make the initial amendments to the National Electricity Rules, which was common practice previously. Again, this ensures consistency between the Consumer Data Right rules and the National Electricity Rules from the start of the introduction of this bill and for any future rules that are made.

The Australian Energy Market Commission, as the rule maker under the national energy rules, will have the power to amend the National Electricity Rules further for any future changes that are contemplated. As I said at the outset, the intention of these changes is to provide consumers with more control over their energy data, which enables them to access and share data with accredited third parties, fundamentally to access better deals for energy products and services as a result. The opposition will be supporting this amendment bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge that in the Speaker's Gallery at the moment are members of the Adelaide Telangana Association, celebrating the Festival of Flowers. They are guests of the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Welcome.

Bills

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

Second Reading

Debate resumed.

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (16:28): I rise to speak in support of the National Electricity Law (South Australia) (Consumer Data Right) Amendment Bill 2022. It is very pleasing, having heard the member for Morphett speak, that this will also be backed by the opposition. This bill before the house should be seen as part of the set of reforms aiming to increase opportunities for consumers to manage their affairs and to improve the energy market.

As I am sure most would agree, the energy market has undergone immense change over the past few years. The former Labor government rightly put South Australians ahead of the pack in the unstoppable transition to renewable energy, setting the trajectory to lower prices and cleaner

power. At the same time, innovation in communications and the digital world has created a new environment for the way we go about our lives.

This bill will allow households to benefit from these changes rather than leave them vulnerable to unscrupulous profiteering. Consumer Data Rights or CDR, is a significant, economy-wide reform designed to empower consumers to benefit from the data Australian businesses hold about them, and in doing so strengthen innovation, competition and productivity.

They empower consumers to share data held about them with accredited and trusted third parties so that they can deliver direct benefits. The system has already been introduced in the finance sector, and I understand it will be extended into telecommunications after the energy sector. Importantly, the reforms will be managed and monitored by agencies with strong investigative and enforcement powers. This will protect consumers at the same time as creating many opportunities.

I find it assuring that, to participate in data sharing, businesses will have to be accredited by the Australian Competition and Consumer Commission (ACCC). To become an accredited data recipient, a business must meet strict criteria around data collection, use of storage, information security, protecting a consumer's privacy and obtaining a consumer's consent.

Once accredited, a business will have ongoing obligations consistent with these criteria. If they do not meet these requirements the ACCC can suspend or cancel their accreditation. It should also be stressed that it will be entirely voluntary for consumers to opt into a data sharing agreement.

It is also significant to note that this bill dovetails with federal laws that are already in place. These include provisions about privacy, which are crucial for the successful acceptance of the data-sharing system. There are 13 legally binding privacy safeguards contained in the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 to protect a consumer's data in the Consumer Data Right for energy. They set out the privacy rights and obligations to users of the scheme, including the requirement for a consumer's informed consent for their data to be collected, disclosed, held or used.

The Competition and Consumer (Consumer Data Right) Rules 2020 also supplement privacy safeguards by prescribing further detail about these requirements. The rules provide the framework for how the CDR operates. They also define the elements for consumer consent, outline the accredited framework for accredited data recipients and elaborate on the privacy aspects of the CDR scheme.

In addition to several obligations under the privacy safeguards, data holders must also comply with some key privacy obligations in the CDR rules, and these include:

- providing consumer data request services;
- disclosing CDR data in response to consumer requests;
- asking consumers to give or amend authorisations;
- managing authorisations by including the use of consumer dashboards;
- notifying consumers of certain matters in relation to their data-sharing arrangements; and
- providing access to copies of records when requested by consumers.

The Office of the Australian Information Commissioner enforces the privacy safeguards and privacy-related CDR rules. They also handle complaints and notifications of eligible data breaches relating to CDR data.

These provisions will be important to South Australians to understand the appropriate protections that are in place. It is pleasing that these reforms are taking shape concurrently at both a state and federal level, with new Labor governments working together to deliver greater opportunities for consumers that mirror the times that we live in.

To get to the point where we are today has taken significant effort, and I commend those who have worked behind the scenes to make this all happen. This bill is one cog in a reform system to empower consumers, and I am pleased to have this opportunity to commend it to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:33): I wish to thank the opposition and the house for the manner in which this debate has been conducted. This is an important national reform that was, again, a carryover that has been consistent in this parliament.

We are the lead legislator for these matters, and there has been a consistent bipartisan frame around the management of our National Electricity Rules, and this again continues that fine tradition of the opposition agreeing kindly to national reforms made, quite frankly, with their absence, and that is very difficult to do. I did that for four years, the former Liberal opposition did it for 16 years and the current opposition is off to a flying start again.

It is a difficult, difficult job for this parliament. We have it in two areas: we have it in energy and we have it also in transport. That is being conducted well. I would like to thank the opposition. With those concluding remarks, it is also the wish of the house to go into committee.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PATTERSON: With regard to Consumer Data Right, we have spoken in many contributions about the importance of access to data for customers. I also mentioned some of the issues around data and the safe retention of that data. Could you give the committee some updates in terms of the data holders: are they required to store the customer's data in a secure environment? Is that either in the current rules or in the rules that are proposed to go with this amendment bill?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am advised that there are 13 legally binding privacy safeguards contained within the Competition and Consumer Act 2010 to protect consumer data—consumer data rights and consumer data rights for energy. They set out the privacy rights and obligations for users of the scheme, including the requirement for a consumer's informed consent to collect, disclose, hold—which is the part you are interested in, which I think is now the topic du jour across the country, given what has happened with Optus—or the use of their consumer rights data. You should also note that the CDR for energy is an opt-in system. The privacy safeguards cover the following topics:

- open and transparent management of CDR data by data holders and accredited data recipients. Accredited data recipients are accredited by the ACCC;
- anonymity and pseudonymity of a consumer when dealing with ADR in relation to their CDR data;
- the process for accredited data recipients seeking to collect a consumer's CDR data;
- ADR use of unsolicited CDR data received without the consumer's consent;
- ADR notification to the consumer when they collect the consumer's CDR data;
- ADR use or disclosure of CDR data;
- ADR use or disclosure of CDR data for direct marketing;
- ADR overseas disclosure of CDR data;
- ADR adoption or disclosure of government-related identifiers, which I assume are things that could identify you in terms of passports and any other information that might be relevant;
- ADR and data holder notification of disclosure of CDR data;
- ADR data holder obligations to ensure the quality of CDR data;
- importantly, ADR obligations regarding security of CDR data and destruction or de-identification of redundant CDR data; and

- ADR and data holder obligations to correct a consumer's CDR data in response to a request from the consumer.

That was just basically me reading out a series of acronyms that could be of some use to the house, but importantly (and I am happy to go backwards and forwards on this with the shadow minister) these data rights and rules are made under an act that is governed by the commonwealth government, which obviously has the regulatory agencies—Australian Signals Directorate, ASIS, ASIO and the other security agencies—at its disposal to ensure that the regulatory requirements in these Competition and Consumer (Consumer Data Rights) Rules are properly affiliated.

I understand and I am advised that there is a regular audit done by the appropriate minister of the accredited agencies that hold data that could be compromised or valuable to people, so there are a number of safeguards. As I said, the Competition and Consumer (Consumer Data Rights) Rules 2020, which are the CDR rules that we are discussing now, are made under that act. They supplement the privacy safeguards by prescribing further detail about their requirements.

The CDR rules provide the framework for how the CDR operates. That federal act operates a framework. They define the elements for consumer consent, outline the accreditation framework for the recipients of the data and elaborate on the privacy aspects of the CDR scheme. What we are basically doing is taking data consumed, generated at a state-based level, regulated by the states, and using the commonwealth legislation to protect the privacy of it because, quite frankly, they would be better equipped with the agencies at their disposal.

In addition to the obligations under that act and the privacy safeguards, data holders (the people who receive the data) must also comply with some key privacy obligations in the CDR rules, including:

- providing consumer data request services, so we have to have a process for that;
- disclosing CDR data in response to consumer data requests;
- asking consumers to give or amend authorisations;
- managing authorisations;
- notifying consumers of certain matters in relation to data sharing arrangements; and
- providing access to copies of records when requested by consumers.

In terms of protecting consumers' privacy, the commonwealth act governs the safeguard measures that are meant to be put in place. If at any time the ADRs, who are the recipients of this data, are unable to protect the consumers' privacy through an audit process, they have ongoing obligations consistent with the criteria. If they do not meet these requirements, the ACCC can suspend or cancel their accreditation.

Does that mean that there will not ever be a data breach? We have sovereign nations that are working overtime with the resources of sovereign nations to hack our data, and there are also state sponsors and bad actors involved here. Given the privacy provisions, I am satisfied, as is the national energy minister's body satisfied, as are the national agencies that govern this satisfied, that the data can be held securely.

I am happy to take any other questions the minister might have. If he has any other concerns, I am prepared to offer our officers offline or between houses to give the opposition a full briefing on the operation of that commonwealth act in terms of accrediting people who receive this data.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for that fulsome answer. I think it puts on notice for those data holders that to pass this legislation security of consumers should be front of mind. They are really the only questions I have for this bill, so we can move on that short title.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (2 to 7) and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:45): I move:

That this bill be now read at the time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

MOTOR VEHICLES (ELECTRIC VEHICLE LEVY) AMENDMENT REPEAL BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 May 2022.)

Mr TARZIA (Hartley) (16:45): I rise to speak to the bill concerning the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Repeal Bill of recent times. At the very outset, what I want to say is that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition and that we certainly will not be opposing the repealing of the act. What we do want to do is to highlight why the act was introduced, the implications of repealing it and put to the government that there are several aspects of this that require serious consideration.

Obviously we respect the government's commitment to repeal the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Act 2021, but it does leave some serious questions unanswered. We know that in October 2021 the former Liberal government introduced the EV levy act in response to prevailing and emerging EV ownership in South Australia. The former Treasurer was the lead minister for this policy. It was developed in coordination with other state treasurers through the Board of Treasurers Forum. To ensure national consistency as far as possible, the road user charge was modelled on similar schemes in New South Wales and in Victoria at the time.

Since the act's commencement, the last time I checked Tasmanian and also Western Australian governments have also signalled that they will be introducing a similar road user charge. The last time I checked, Queensland remained the only jurisdiction that had not yet contemplated introducing a similar scheme. Currently, there are very few zero and low-emission vehicles in South Australia with, at the time that I checked, EVs making up only just under 2 per cent of new vehicle sales in the state.

In terms of why we needed the act in the first place, without the act the arrangements in place at the time would have resulted in EV owners arguably not paying their fair share of road maintenance and infrastructure through the avoidance of fuel excise taxes levied by the commonwealth government. It would have also helped to pay for government-funded EV charging infrastructure.

The act originally introduced a road user charge for EVs calculated at 2¢ per kilometre (indexed) for plug-in hybrid vehicles and 2.5¢ per kilometre (indexed) for any other EVs. It was due to commence from July 2027 or when EVs reached 30 per cent of new vehicle sales, whichever came sooner. Both, in any event, are a long way away. Motorists who drove petrol and diesel powered cars obviously continued to pay a fuel excise. Given that EVs are battery powered, obviously EV owners can avoid the existing fuel excise.

The introduction of a road user charge is a way for EV owners to pay their fair share for road maintenance infrastructure and contribute to the provision of government-funded EV charging infrastructure. The road user charge was designed to be applied as part of the annual car registration process. This was estimated to result—and I thank the minister for the briefing—in an annual road user charge, and a number was mentioned of around \$300 for an average passenger EV, compared with approximately \$565 per annum collected from fuel excise for an average passenger internal combustion engine vehicle.

A lower per kilometre charge recognises the environmental and also the health benefits associated with electric vehicles. It is expected that the uptake of EVs will increase, obviously as they reach price parity with internal combustion engine vehicles. If you read recent articles, such as in the *Financial Review*, there is differing opinion as to when that may occur.

The charge was expected to generate \$3.5 million in its first year, increasing to about \$11 million in 2028-29. By 2030-31, it is estimated to raise \$21 million based on an estimated 40,000 vehicles being subject to the charge. To provide an idea of the long-term revenue potential, if all vehicles were subject to the road user charge in 2021, it would generate approximately \$410 million. Revenue raised through the road user charge could have been hypothecated, going into the existing Highways Fund. It was the intention to expand the use of that fund to include the expenditure on the installation and management of charging facilities for the EVs.

My particular opinion is that I believe that this is an area where we need to see stronger national leadership. We need to see stronger national leadership on electric vehicles, especially in this current climate. We know that governments have their challenges in this regard. We know that the fuel excise is in terminal decline while the total number of vehicle kilometres travelled is growing.

Fuel excise emerged gradually as an increasingly unsustainable tax but will quickly become untenable, some say, as those who cannot afford an electric vehicle must foot a growing road bill for those who can. The question is: why should everyone else subsidise the roads when people who can afford, say, a Tesla do not pay anything towards this level? How is that fair and equitable?

The road user charge policy was coordinated through the Board of Treasurers, and while the fuel excise is a federal tax, states have been incentivised to take a first mover advantage in claiming an ongoing revenue stream that is stable and reliable in the form of a road user charge. The previous Liberal government's approach was taken in the absence of national reform, but I think this is an opportunity for the current Labor Albanese government to take the lead.

I know that the current member for West Torrens has a very special relationship with the federal government, and perhaps it is something that he could take up with Prime Minister Albanese, and that is leadership and national reform in the EV area because a national approach would ensure greater consistency between the states and greater coordination of policy across state boundaries. This is a highly fragmented area at the moment.

It may require the states to somewhat cede power and revenue to the commonwealth. Given that the states have moved to roll out the policy in a semi-coordinated fashion without the commonwealth, some of that is going to be difficult to roll back. In the absence of nationally led reform, South Australia risks being one of the only jurisdictions without a policy to deal with the inevitable fall in fuel excise revenue. I know that would be keeping the Treasurer awake at night.

During the development of the legislation, the former Liberal government received support from key industry bodies, including the RAA, Federal Chamber of Automotive Industries and also Infrastructure Partnerships Australia for introducing a road user charge that will help drive the take-up of environmentally friendly, zero and low-emission vehicles while ensuring that there is a long-term sustainable model for critical road funding.

Obviously, there have been some critics of the charge, and I respect that. Critics argue that the charge will discourage the uptake of EVs, which will impact the state's approach to addressing climate change, but there is no reliable evidence to my mind to support this proposition as experienced, for example, in Victoria, where an active road user charge already exists. The take-up of electric vehicles in that state is one of the fastest in Australia.

We know that there are a number of alternative ways to encourage EV take-up, and when I was on another trip I did take the time in the States once to visit the Tesla factory. It was one of the most rewarding things that I did. There is no doubt that this is the future and we have to embrace the future. As I said, I believe the states really do need to work collaboratively with the federal government to develop the right structure around these EVs.

The previous government had a clear path responding to climate change. We know that we aimed to reduce the state's emissions to nation-leading ambitious target levels. In December 2020, we also released a very powerful vision for climate action of any South Australian government in history, I believe. The SA Government Climate Change Action Plan 2021-2025 was developed with input and advice from renowned climate change expert Professor Ross Garnaut. That plan shows that South Australia could achieve a level of renewable energy that is more than five times the current local grid demand by 2050.

To support the passage of the road user charge and the uptake of EVs, the former Liberal government made significant investment of over \$36 million to encourage the uptake of EVs, including an \$18 million EV subsidy package providing \$3,000 in subsidy incentives (we are the party of incentives) for the purchase of up to 6,000 electric vehicles in South Australia—the subsidy is more generous than a similar subsidy offered in Victoria—\$13.4 million to accelerate the rollout of a statewide charging network, targeting 53 preferred service locations to deliver approximately 500 rapid and fast-charging stations; and up to \$3.6 million for smart-charging trials to demonstrate how EVs can be coordinated to charge during periods of high renewable electricity generation or low demand to support the power grid.

Recognising the market for EVs was still being established, the road user charge was to commence from 1 July 2027, or when the sale of battery electric vehicles reached 30 per cent of new motor vehicle sales in South Australia—which was obviously a long way away but whichever was earlier. The delay in the commencement of the road user charge was in response to feedback received from some groups during the consultation on the draft bill, where a delay in the introduction of the road user charge was sought until there was an increase in the uptake of electric vehicles.

If the act is repealed, we have serious questions that I hope our learned minister may be able to address, because we know that there are some economic arguments that remain unresolved in this regard. Serious questions arise regarding the maintenance and the management of the state's roads. For example, what will the Labor government's alternative sustainable long-term road funding model be to replace the one established under the EV levy act? How will the decision impact the future distribution the fuel excise from the Australian government to South Australia?

If the fuel excise continues to reduce, who is going to fund road maintenance? Where is that bucket of money going to come from? Will the Labor government commit to funding the \$36 million EV initiatives announced under the former government? How will future governments be able to maintain safe roads without the cost falling on those who cannot afford an EV? Last time I checked, there was still some disparity. This technology has a long way to go.

Further, how will the revenue shortfall from reductions in the fuel excise be recovered? Will the repeal of the act lead to a reduction in maintenance and quality of road infrastructure? Will the repeal of the act lead to a reduction in road safety?

Whilst we do appreciate the government's mandate, and we can count on this side of the house, I do sincerely hope that the minister takes these economic aspects on board, and I look forward to hearing the government address these concerns. In the long run, as a former road safety minister, I can say this: we know that the regions are over-represented when it comes to lives lost on our roads and, if we allow roads to disintegrate over time, we risk that trend continuing, and we cannot have that. So there are some fundamental concerns.

As I said, we will not be opposing the repeal of the act, but we certainly will, on this side of the chamber, highlight why the original act was introduced, the implications of repealing it and aspects of the act that require serious consideration.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:59): I rise to support the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Repeal Bill 2022. This bill will repeal the new tax that the previous Liberal government introduced because this government wishes to encourage the use of vehicles that have a substantially lower impact on our environment.

The levy was a distance-based charge for electric vehicles as an addition to the registration of an electric vehicle—a penalty, in fact, for those who want to reduce emissions. From the levy's commencement, electric vehicle owners would have been charged 2¢ per kilometre travelled in a plug-in hybrid vehicle or 2.5¢ per kilometre for any other electric vehicle.

Why was this tax applied allegedly as a substitute for fuel excise which is a federal tax? It is not a like-for-like tax and would contribute nothing to new roads or infrastructure in South Australia. The estimated \$1 million would have gone into general revenue and potentially funded further Liberal waste rather than worthy projects.

The former state government, like its federal counterparts, did not value the environment. The now Leader of the Opposition chipped away at small projects while neglecting our River Murray.

Our government is taking a national approach and accessing the best experts from across Australia by contributing to Australia's first National Electric Vehicle Strategy, led by federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy, Chris Bowen.

This government is taking the opportunity for South Australia to lead the way, rather than imposing taxes that would hurt the growth in electric vehicles. The levy introduced by the previous government would have been a major disincentive to purchasing an electric vehicle. While the road user charge would not have commenced for some time, passing this repeal bill as soon as possible will provide certainty for those looking to purchase an electric vehicle.

A survey undertaken by the Australia Institute in 2021 showed that seven in 10 South Australians would be less likely to purchase an electric vehicle if a new road user charge were to be introduced, seven in 10 South Australians who would choose petrol or diesel vehicles over electric due to the tax imposed by the former government. So 2¢ or 2.5¢ per kilometre may not sound much, but with the rising cost of living every cent counts.

Abolishing the levy will deliver on another government election commitment because the Malinauskas government is a government that delivers on its commitments and listens to South Australians. This government is not just axing the tax but also encouraging the uptake of electric vehicles. There are average annual savings estimated for electric vehicle adopters for fuel costs and maintenance costs.

This bill will support the uptake of electric vehicles by preserving financial benefits for the ownership of electric vehicles over internal combustion engine vehicles. Electrifying our transport fleet is a vital part of the overall transition from carbon-emitting technologies to a greener, cleaner future that accords with our state parliament's recent declaration of a climate emergency.

Passenger cars make up almost 10 per cent of Australia's CO₂ emissions. Supporting the uptake of electric vehicles will contribute to South Australia's ability to achieve net zero emissions. Our state government is delivering 7,000 electric vehicle purchase subsidies of \$3,000 and a three-year registration fee exemption. I know that this is music to the ears of Sally Knight, the Chair of the Australian Electric Vehicle Association in South Australia and one of my constituents in Gibson. Incentives, not taxes. Support, not additional costs.

This government is supporting the RAA to construct the state's first electric vehicle charging network of over 500 charging stations at 140 sites in 52 locations around South Australia. The South Australian government awarded a grant of almost \$12.4 million to the RAA to construct and operate Australia's first statewide electric vehicle rapid charging network. The network will comprise 536 fast and rapid chargers across 140 electric vehicle charging stations in 52 rural, regional and metropolitan service locations.

While exact locations are still being finalised, there are plans for 26 sites in Adelaide, including 10 in the CBD. The RAA will start the design and construction of the EV charging network in supermarkets, car parks, town centres, council-owned sites, hotels and motels throughout South Australia. It is anticipated that the network will be finalised by the end of 2023. The rural and regional sites will provide certainty for electric vehicle owners travelling across our state and will forever kill the myth of the former federal government that the rise of EVs will end the weekend.

Additionally, our government is progressing nine electric vehicle smart-charging trials to demonstrate how electric vehicle charging can be integrated into the grid to realise electricity cost savings for all South Australians. As part of these government-supported trials, smart-charging stations will be installed across metropolitan and regional areas, including shopping centres, off-street car parks, hotels, motels and holiday parks.

The smart-charging trials will demonstrate ways electric vehicle drivers can be incentivised to charge during periods of high renewable electricity generation or low grid demand. This will support the grid, reducing electricity costs for all consumers. Some trials involve vehicles providing electricity back to the grid, acting as batteries on wheels.

New business models are also being trialled that will improve charging service availability and improve financial sustainability for operators. This will include tapping into new revenue streams, such as frequency services in the National Electricity Market, which will reduce operator reliance on

charging service fees for financial viability. In total, there are nine recipients of the \$3.2 million in grant funding.

The trials will deliver a total of 142 new fast and rapid electric vehicle charging bays for South Australian motorists and attract around \$4.8 million of private investment in the development and construction. The trials will also lead to 12 months of data collection and knowledge sharing for innovative smart-charging infrastructure and systems.

I am proud to see three of these trials will be in or very close to the electorate of Gibson. The first trial is the Jolt trial in Marion. This trial will tap into drivers' instincts to seek a bargain at the bottom of the fuel cycle. Using roadside LCD advertising displays and in-app notifications, Jolt will promote low-cost surge pricing to activate consumer behaviour to turn in and save during incentivised times. The key objective of this trial will be to quantify the impact of charging incentives on consumer behaviours and demonstrate the role that EVs can play to balance electricity supply and demand loads during the day.

The second local trial is being run by ENGIE in car parks 2, 3 and 9 at Flinders University. This is one of Australia's largest vehicle-to-grid trials, with ENGIE integrating 22 managed smart-charging stations into a campus-level virtual battery to demonstrate how electric vehicles could be harnessed to support South Australia's electricity system during peak demand periods. The trial will demonstrate the alignment of electric vehicle charging and discharging to periods of renewable generation or grid demand through participation in ENGIE's South Australian Virtual Power Plant.

The final trial is with Planet Ark Power at the Foodland Pasadena Shopping centre. This trial includes the installation of 14 fast and rapid charging bays and a battery energy storage system that will store as much renewable electricity as 125 home batteries. The trial will measure benefits including renewable energy use, customer satisfaction, return visits, and the economic value to shopping centres of electric vehicle charging stations.

The smart chargers will fully charge an electric vehicle in 15 to 45 minutes as a customer enters the shopping centre and activates the electric vehicle boost, enough time to complete a shop at Foodland, browse the local specialty shops or grab lunch. Once completed, the battery storage system here will be the first of its kind built at a South Australian shopping centre. These are three very exciting trials and I encourage all electric vehicle owners in the south or east of Adelaide to utilise these facilities and motorists from across Adelaide to look out for other trials underway.

There are over 6,500 vehicles in the South Australian government fleet. In total, these vehicles travel around 110 million kilometres, equating to over 21,000 tonnes of CO₂. There is a requirement for South Australian government agencies to transition to plug-in electric vehicles if they are cost effective on a total cost of ownership basis or if the additional cost can be managed by improving fleet utilisation.

The benefits of the orderly transition of our government fleet to electric vehicles will be twofold. It will meaningfully contribute to lowering our state's carbon footprint and help us to achieve net zero emissions. Additionally, it will help saturate the second-hand market with electric vehicles, reducing a current lack of availability as well as reducing the up-front cost for people looking to purchase an electric vehicle.

It would be remiss of me not to mention that South Australia has been part of the World Solar Challenge since 1987 and, further, that the global Formula E series is looking at Australia as a future destination for a round. Sally Knight would like to see an electric Adelaide 500, which I personally believe would be a very exciting event, especially given the huge support we have for the traditional Adelaide 500. I look forward to that race in December. I commend this bill to the house.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (17:11): I rise to speak in support of the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Repeal Bill. When I look at my two young children, Audrey and Ned—they are six and three—I realise that they will never stop at a servo to fill up their car's tank with petrol because they will really only know driving electric vehicles, but I do not want to have to wait 10 years until Audrey is due for her learner's permit, as terrifying as that will be, for this to become commonplace.

The quicker we can reach this new reality, the better for everyone, and this repeal bill is a step in the right direction. When the former Marshall Liberal government announced last year its tax on electric vehicles, my overwhelming feeling was actually embarrassment. It was up there with ScoMo carrying a lump of coal into parliament, labelling our big battery 'the Big Banana' and claiming electric vehicles will ruin your weekend. It really was the ultimate facepalm moment for the former Liberal government.

Under previous Labor governments, we had become a world leader in renewable energy technologies, from the Tesla-Neoen battery at Hornsdale Wind Farm at Jamestown, where I was proud to be on the night it was switched on, to our huge uptake in solar PV as well as our plans to establish a green hydrogen industry here in South Australia. We have a track record and a vision to be proud of, but here was the former Marshall Liberal government, actively going out of its way to disincentivise the purchase of greener electric vehicles.

The levy unsurprisingly received community backlash for the message it sent to road users thinking of opting for a green-energy vehicle option. As the member for Gibson earlier stated, a survey undertaken by the Australia Institute in 2022 showed seven in 10 South Australians were less likely to purchase an electric vehicle if a new road user charge were to be introduced. We want more South Australians to be making more environmentally friendly choices, not putting barriers and penalties in the way that will dissuade them.

That is why we committed during the election campaign to introducing this bill to repeal the Liberals' tax on electric vehicles; in fact, this bill will repeal the tax before it even starts to take effect on South Australians. In the current climate emergency, as declared by the Malinauskas Labor government recently, this bill will support our efforts to reduce and mitigate our carbon emissions. To increase the number of electric vehicles on our South Australian roads is to reduce the state greenhouse gas emissions from transport and improve our air quality, which benefits everyone.

This bill, in conjunction with many of our other election commitments, shows our communities that we are committed to a greener, more sustainable future for South Australians. For the benefit of our state, we should be encouraging environmentally friendly modes of transport like electric vehicles, not disincentivising them. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:14): I also rise to speak in support of the Motor Vehicles (Electric Vehicle Levy) Amendment Repeal Bill. I will probably bring a bit of a country perspective, and in doing that I think that I will provide a bit of a framework.

Some of the opposition might say, 'Well, there are hardly any electric cars out in the country,' which is entirely true, but it is very clear what is going to happen in the very near future. We are going to see the rollout of high-quality charging infrastructure in regional South Australia, which will be a real plus, and the big element is going to be the reduction in the cost of vehicles.

As it is already, when it comes to a recurrent cost basis electric vehicles beat internal combustion engines hands down, but they are still expensive. The cars are still expensive for a range of reasons, but especially in Australia given the limited choice thanks to the previous federal government and its incredibly hostile approach to electric vehicles—those things that were going to destroy our weekend.

As a member of parliament from a regional electorate, I am particularly concerned about how the legislation affects my constituents and other South Australians living beyond city limits in comparison to how the legislation affects people in the Adelaide metropolitan area. The Liberal Party's electric vehicle levy act is a great example of how legislation can disproportionately disadvantage people in regional and remote areas. It was legislation that the Labor Party opposed from the word go. It was legislation that I spoke against in October last year when I said that there were many positives to be gained from electric vehicles, and that their uptake should be encouraged. Putting taxes on things does not encourage uptake.

I said that EVs should not be discouraged by slapping extra costs on electric-vehicle-owning motorists. At the March election, many thousands of voters in regional areas realised that the Liberal Party do not act in their best interests—just look at the votes. It is another of those myths that do the rounds: the idea that the Liberal Party are the natural party of regional people. What thousands of

regional voters realised was that the Liberal Party, especially the leadership of the Liberal Party, were city slickers who had no understanding or empathy for regional voters and country people's issues of concern. Instead, the Liberals take regional votes for granted.

The EV levy was a new tax on motorists created by the Liberal Party. It had no precedent as a state tax. Because the Liberal Party do not see things from the perspective of life in the regions, they clearly did not consider how their new tax would be especially detrimental to the residents of South Australia's regional and remote areas in the not too distant future.

It almost goes without saying because it is so intuitive, but perhaps I need to spell it out to those opposite: country people do a lot of driving, I do a lot of driving, and most of the people I know do a lot of driving. If you live on a farm, you are going to be driving a lot further to and from your local shops and service centres than somebody living in the suburbs who simply pops down to their local Foodland, Coles or Woolies.

If you have kids at school, there is going to be a lot of driving to get them to everyday events, especially if they have extracurricular activities even with the school bus services in regional areas—at least in some regional areas. If you or your kids play sport, buckle up because you are going to be driving—in some cases, extraordinarily long distances—just to get to a game on a Saturday or a Sunday, and it is much the same for residents of country towns.

Many parents spend hours ferrying their kids to special school events that do not occur in their communities or to academic courses or to play sport. If you need a specialist, or any medical treatment in the city or other services in the city, you are in for a long haul. Can you imagine being a pensioner living in Coober Pedy and having to drive all the way to Adelaide to access services?

Do not get me wrong: we country people love where we live and we would not exchange our lifestyle for living in the suburbs in Adelaide, but we strongly object to government imposing a new tax which hurts us more than it would hurt the residents of Unley, Burnside or South Brighton, which of course falls in the member for Black's electorate. The EV levy would affect regional residents more because it was designed to be levied according to how far you drive.

Country residents who drive considerable distances every year would pay a lot of tax. Inner-city residents, who do not need to go far to get to work, school, sport, shopping or services, would not pay nearly as much tax. Indeed, there is a whole bunch of people in the inner city these days who do not even have a car. Their services are at hand and they are incredibly well served when it comes to public transport. You do not get that in regional communities.

This tax is in contrast to existing state-based taxes and charges on motorists. When you register and pay compulsory third-party insurance on your vehicle, a lower rate will apply if you live in a regional area. If you own a four-cylinder sedan or station wagon, it will cost you \$685 a year in metropolitan areas and \$560 a year in country areas. The same rates—\$685 in the metro zone and \$560 in the country—apply to electric vehicles.

A favourable differential between the regions and the city has long been accepted and supported by the public, by members of parliament, that is until the sad moment in South Australia's history when the Liberal Party was in government and the member for Black and his colleagues sat around the cabinet table and came up with a new tax on South Australians, a tax which unfairly targeted motorists living in regional areas. Compare that lack of concern for regional voters with how this government, the Labor government, has considered regional residents.

In the 2022-23 budget, brought down by the Treasurer, a vehicle registration concession of 50 per cent was brought in for residents of outer areas, including Kangaroo Island, Coober Pedy, Roxby Downs and all the unincorporated areas. Consider that. That concession was in place for many, many years under both Liberal and Labor governments because they recognised the additional costs incurred by country people when it came to travel, when it came to servicing their vehicles and when it came to the incredibly high cost of fuel, especially in the more remote communities.

That is one of the differences between Labor and the Liberal Party. On this side, we look after all South Australians, including people living in regional areas. Those opposite do not think

things through, and they make decisions which hurt regional people. That is one of the reasons we are determined to lift the yoke of this new tax off the shoulders of our regional residents.

Let us consider another aspect of this new tax which demonstrates how the Liberal Party does not think things through. In his budget speech, when he announced this new tax, then Treasurer Rob Lucas downplayed its impact, saying it would not cost South Australians very much. The levy was estimated to raise about \$1 million a year, Mr Lucas said. Yes, the levy might not have raised much in its first year, given the still low number of electric vehicles on South Australian roads, but it was disingenuous not to be up-front with the South Australian people about how much they would be paying under the new tax in the years to come. All major vehicle manufacturers are moving to change the vehicles they offer from internal combustion to electric.

The Australian Energy Market Operator conducts extensive and detailed research into energy use now and in the future. As part of its Integrated System Plan, the blueprint for the electricity grid, AEMO has worked with the CSIRO to estimate how many electric vehicles we should expect to be on the road in the coming years. AEMO models several different scenarios, but it is instructive to look at one of the ones in the middle rather than the extremes, the so-called step-change scenario which has to date come closest to reality.

In AEMO's step change, it expects the number of electric vehicles, aggregating fully electric vehicles and plug-in hybrid electric vehicles, to increase in South Australia from fewer than 4,000 now to 264,000 by 2030-31. You can go and have a look at all of their assumptions. They lay them all out very well.

By 2040-41, that forecast is to grow to more than one million EVs registered in South Australia. This change is going to gather pace as time goes on. Do not be fooled into thinking EVs are only city runabouts or fancy sports cars for the wealthy elite. I will acknowledge that at the moment electric vehicles are aimed at the high end of the market. This will not last. This will change and this will change quite rapidly.

There has been a lot of nonsense put out recently by the Liberal Party that you will not get an electric ute, as one example. Actually, there is a grain of truth in that, but not because the car makers do not make utes, but rather because they will be in such demand they will be difficult to buy. There is another factor here in Australia. Given the hostility of the previous federal government to electric vehicles and their lack of policy, Australia was not seen as an attractive market for EV producers overseas. That is going to change.

Look at what is happening in the USA: Ford's F-150 Lightning electric ute has been so popular the company has stopped taking any more orders. Bear in mind, the United States are really into some heavy duty vehicles, more so than just about any other advanced country, but the uptake of this ute has been extraordinary. There is a whole range of other utes coming down the track. General Motors, Tesla, Rivian and a host of other manufacturers have utes in production or on the way.

Regional SA residents will drive EVs and there will be plenty of utes on the market to choose from. Country people are incredibly practical. We are waiting for the changes to happen. As I said, we are waiting for the rollout of the infrastructure and we are waiting for the cost of vehicles to come down. As soon as the cost of vehicles come down and that infrastructure is in place, the change is going to be rapid. You imagine going fishing or camping with a ute with its powerful battery. The things that you could do at your campsite thanks to that ute are going to be pretty amazing.

In South Australia at the moment, we have 1.478 million registered vehicles. Collectively, we travelled more than 17 billion kilometres on SA roads in 2020-21, according to the Bureau of Infrastructure and Transport Research Economics. Let's calculate how much money the new Liberal tax might be expected to raise and therefore how close to the mark the Liberal Party was with their \$1 million a year estimate.

With the number of registered vehicles at 1,478,000, and the distance travelled at 17 billion kilometres, the vehicles averaged 11,500 kilometres a year. As I have argued earlier, regional motorists would do a lot more than that, but for simplicity's sake let's stick with that simple average. The Liberal tax set a rate of 2¢ (indexed) per kilometre for a plug-in hybrid, and 2.5¢ (indexed)

per kilometre for a battery electric vehicle. There are probably more battery electric vehicles than hybrids on the roads, given the dominance of Tesla, but, again, for simplicity, let's say the 4,000 total is half. We will not go into the detail, so we will just say the number of vehicles attracting a levy at 2¢ and at the higher rate of 2.5¢.

What that means, when you look at what is going to be raised at the moment, is that it is not much. When you combine the two of them, it is just over \$1 million. It is \$460,000 a year for the hybrids. For the battery electric vehicles, at the moment, given the distance they travel and the 2.5¢, it equals \$575,000 a year. So it is very close to the Lucas estimate for one year. But wait, there is more—a lot more. It is no wonder that, despite the glint in his eye, Mr Lucas stopped short of coming clean about how big that tax burden on South Australians would grow.

If we keep the same conservative estimate of half plug-in vehicles and half electric, a motorist continuing to travel about the same distance each year, then the tax revenue would increase considerably. In 2030-31, it would increase to more than \$80 million a year and, by 2040-41, South Australians will be forking out a completely new tax, a completely new state tax—\$392 million—because of the new Liberal tax. As I explained earlier, an unfair proportion of that would come from the pockets of regional residents.

No wonder regional voters have deserted the Liberals. Indeed, in one of the booths in my electorate, an incredibly strong Liberal booth, I lost it by four primary votes. I was very close to winning it. In Roxby Downs, where I used to get 32 per cent two-party preferred vote, I now get 62 per cent of the two-party preferred vote. They are sending you a message.

I am sure Treasurer Stephen Mullighan would love to have an extra close to \$400 million a year coming into his books, but Mr Mullighan, like all members of parliament on this side of the house, knows that it is our duty to look after South Australians, all South Australians. We are not the party that gouges taxpayers. Gouging taxpayers is the prerogative of the Liberal Party, especially when it comes to regressive tax—because this will be a regressive tax.

As I said when this levy was proposed and debated in this house last year, EVs are going to be a real plus. Their recurrent operational costs are significantly lower than the cost of running and maintaining a fossil fuel vehicle, and their operational costs are much more stable than those of internal combustion vehicles.

For too long, we have been subject to price rises at the petrol bowser as some faraway event puts pressure on the price of oil, and this is especially so in country areas. When something goes wrong overseas, the price of diesel and the price of petrol in a place like Coober Pedy are just massive. They are just absolutely massive, and that is before the current set of circumstances. What those people had to dish out was just huge, and that went for all those remote communities when it came to the cost of fuel.

With EVs, we have the opportunity to break that nexus, to break that dependence on overseas oil when it comes to our vehicles. This is going to be a huge plus, and it is going to be an absolutely huge plus in a state that is blessed with this massive global quality solar resource and massive wind resource that overlaps that solar resource in a significant part of our state. We should be doing all that we can to encourage the uptake of electric vehicles. The Labor Party looks forward to a cleaner, more affordable future, a future in which EVs will play a big part.

I have been going on about the country, but if you are in the city one of the advantages of the shift to electric vehicles, whether it is the light vehicle fleet or some elements of the trucking fleet, is that you get rid of all that particulate emitted by internal combustion engines. Look at the figures in this nation when it comes to the number of people estimated to die each year, largely in the metropolitan areas, as a result of particulate pollution most of which comes from vehicles.

We do not have that problem to anywhere near the same degree as a place like Whyalla. You might say Whyalla is industrial but, I tell you what, the atmosphere in general is better than in a lot of parts of Adelaide. Thanks to vehicles and internal combustion engines—they have served their purpose. Their day is coming to an end, so we should all be welcoming electric vehicles. We should all be encouraging electric vehicles. We should not be putting disincentives in place when it comes

to taxes. We should be encouraging what is a good thing. That is why this new tax devised by the Liberal Party must be scrapped right now

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Tuesday 18 October 2022 at 11:00.