HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 28 September 2023

The SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan) took the chair at 11:00.

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

SELECT COMMITTEE ON ACCESS TO URINARY TRACT INFECTION TREATMENT

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:02): I move:

That the final report of the committee be noted.

I rise as the Chair of the Select Committee on Access to UTI Treatment and to speak to its 29 well-researched and rigorous recommendations. I would like to start by thanking my fellow committee members.

It is fair to say that we each arrived at this issue with different ideas and different perspectives, and I think the committee was a great example of where we worked productively to interrogate the evidence, to look at some of the criticisms seriously and to assess some of the evidence, which was conflicting, and arrive at a position where we are unanimously recommending that women aged 18 to 65 should be able to access UTI antibiotics from a specially trained pharmacist under some tight safeguards.

I would also like to thank our research officer, Dr Amy Mead, who came to this issue with some professional experience of her own, which has really benefited the committee, and also Patrick Dupont, who ably assisted us in receiving the whopping 151 submissions over the nine-month inquiry and who organised so well for us to take evidence.

Since tabling the final report yesterday afternoon, I have been inundated with texts, emails and social media messages. There must have been hundreds so far from women like me who have suffered the debilitating effects of a urinary tract infection, better known as a UTI. Some have been very emotional, and the sentiments have reminded me why I first brought this matter before the parliament and why we are all here—that is, to make a difference for the people of our state. One wrote to me and said:

Amazing work, thank you so much. Last time I had a UTI, I had to find a random GP who was free to welcome me straightaway as my GP was unable to see me for days.

Another said:

Thank you so much for this. This means I can get onto this straightaway instead of having to wait days to see a GP. We know when it's coming days before it hits us, so thank you.

Half of South Australian women will get a UTI, so those sentiments are not uncommon at all. For those who are unfamiliar, this infection is usually sudden and unexpected. It leads to a burning urination, a feeling of having to go to the bathroom, even if you do not need to go, and also considerable discomfort. For sufferers, the symptoms are unmistakable. Once a woman has had it once, they are pretty adept at identifying it again.

The committee heard that when a UTI strikes it has some serious social and economic consequences for women. We heard that for many it means they cannot work and they cannot earn money. We heard from Nicki, who is self-employed as a landscape gardener. She simply cannot do physical labour and has to call clients suddenly and cancel the jobs when it strikes. She loses money from that, and that has an impact for her as she waits several days usually, she said, to get into a

GP and to get a prescription, despite all along knowing exactly what she needed. Many others echoed that experience in their evidence to our committee. Even those in desk jobs found it hard to work and had to take time off, awaiting access to effective treatment.

I think that this is a measure that women deserve. They deserve to have their pain taken seriously, and they deserve that members of this parliament think seriously about what can constructively be done to address that, rather than saying, 'Well, this is the way it has always been done.' For others, it prevented them from caring for loved ones like children or older relatives, either costing them money to put children into child care or they would simply be in excruciating pain while trying to continue those caring responsibilities. Of course, there were many women who just could not do the things that they loved—swimming, socialising or even reading—because of this very intense and distracting intimate pain and discomfort.

We also heard from many patients who ended up in the queue at our emergency departments, either because they had no way of getting a script for the medication or because they had not gone to get that medication in a timely way and were suffering the complications and needed to be admitted to hospital. The member for Elder shared her personal story of ending up in the emergency department when she was younger. Because she was concerned about the cost, she put off getting treatment and she ended up in hospital. That story is certainly not alone.

The committee received evidence from SA Health that in 2021-22 more than 8,800 people reported to our emergency departments with a UTI or a kidney infection. Of those, more than 2,700 were admitted to hospital—that is 31 per cent—so it can be deduced that some portion of the remainder were provided medication (antibiotics) and sent home. Some of those people may not have been eligible for this proposed scheme, but many of them would. I am of the view that whatever we can do to relieve pressure on our emergency wards and take preventative measures to avoid hospitalisation we should certainly be doing, and that means faster and better care for those who do require the expertise of our doctors.

So what is proposed? We have recommended that women aged 18 to 65 be able to access this scheme. For very good reason, we have not extended that to children, people over 65 or, indeed, men. That is because the evidence before our committee was that those groups are more likely to suffer a complication and would benefit from having a GP do a more detailed examination than a pharmacist is probably able to do.

These recommendations lay out the basics of the proposed scheme and also a framework for implementation. Some of the things we touch on are the additional training for pharmacists, enabling them to provide this new service; their use of a checklist to identify any red flags that should see them refer the patient to a GP; and three lines of antibiotics should be made available. I will go into some detail about that. We also looked quite carefully at privacy measures, such as whether consulting rooms, quiet areas or privacy shields should be mandated, and I will expand on that as well.

We also settled on the fact that a consultation fee should be able to be charged, around $20. We did give some consideration to whether that cost should be waived or the service should be made free and in fact paid for by the government, but the patients were very helpful in saying that they felt that that was a considerable saving from the amount they are paying to go to a GP and that in fact as health consumers they would feel comfortable paying that amount.

I might turn to some criticisms, which we did go through in some detail over the nine months of the inquiry. There was a great deal of criticism from doctors' groups around pharmacist training and claims that pharmacists are not qualified to assess a patient for an uncomplicated UTI. We took that on board and tested it by looking at the training that is provided to pharmacists. We heard from UniSA, which provides the only pharmacy qualification in the state. They submitted that UTI, as well as things like antimicrobial resistance and how to be respectful of privacy, forms part of their core university degree training. Our pharmacists are actually trained for UTI dispensing, even though they are not allowed to prescribe in SA at the moment.

We also heard from regulators and accrediting bodies for pharmacists and the medical sector, who stated that diagnosing an uncomplicated UTI is well within the scope of pharmacists right now and that no further training is even needed. The committee obviously took that into account, but

also took on board that not all pharmacists in our state would be trained by UniSA and that some pharmacists may have been trained at uni many decades ago, before this training module was offered.

We have recommended that additional online training is required for participation in this scheme. That training covers a range of matters, including antimicrobial resistance, but we are also recommending cultural competency training and data security training to make sure that our pharmacists are well on top of their responsibilities.

It was concerning, I have to say, from my point of view that some advocacy groups expressed on one hand that they worked collaboratively with pharmacists yet on the other hand seemed to have little or erroneous knowledge of the training and scope of expertise of our pharmacists. I personally felt that some of the criticism of the lack of ability or aptitude of our pharmacists was unwarranted, and I do not think it was borne out in the evidence that we heard from many parties and experts throughout the inquiry.

Criticisms were also made of the Queensland trial, which we looked at in some detail. Chiefly, those criticisms were from doctors' groups. I think it is worth putting on record that there has been some misinformation about the Queensland trial. The committee carefully assessed the outcomes of the Queensland trial, and in fact went up there to see it in action, which was very instructive for us.

The main area, though, that was criticised, which we did think warranted investigation by the committee, was the follow-up mechanism and the rate of replies after a patient had been seen, replying to the pharmacist indicating whether the treatment had been successful or not. There was criticism that that follow-up rate, or response rate, was quite low. We have made a recommendation that the minister looks into an automatic text message service, so that an automatic text might be sent to users of the service three to seven days after their treatment, just to check in with them.

This would be, firstly, to check if their symptoms are continuing but also to remind them, as they will be told in their in-person consultation, that if their symptoms have not resolved then they should go and see a GP. That is critical advice, and obviously advice that pharmacists dispense daily to customers, that if the treatment that they are provided at the pharmacy is not effective they should seek further examination and treatment from a GP. I hope that recommendation will be taken on board and technologically can be achieved.

Antimicrobial resistance (AMR), I thought, was something that was a criticism but something well worth looking into. UTI sufferers like me are acutely aware of AMR and the risk it poses very directly to us. When you suffer a condition that can only be treated by antibiotics and you may have that condition for your whole life, you are conscious that you want it to work for your whole life, and you need it to, so AMR was a key focus. While I put a different weight on different concerns presented by doctors' groups, this is one on which they are certainly on the money.

We spoke at length with the peak AMR authority in this state, SAAGAR, about the safety of this program in terms of AMR risk, and there are a few points in evidence to draw out. One was that this program does not result in a greater overall volume of antibiotics being prescribed; it is simply a different avenue to get them. A patient will absolutely need antibiotics if they have a serious UTI. All this is doing is saying, 'Well, instead of getting that particular dose from your GP after several days' wait, you'll be getting that same dose from a pharmacist.' So it is not contributing to an overall increase in the amount of antibiotics in the community. In fact, we heard that it may reduce the need for large volumes of antibiotics to be given to patients later on if they suffer complications like kidney infections.

There was consideration by us of whether to offer one or three lines of antibiotic treatment. SAAGAR recommended one line of treatment but said that was a very borderline and contentious or debated proposition that they put to us. We tested that against other expert witnesses and also against what is happening in other states, and even overseas, and have ended up recommending that three lines of antibiotics should be made available. Trimethoprim will cater for about 80 to 90 per cent of patients—maybe even more—but the other options are available there in case someone cannot take trimethoprim.

The evidence was also that safeguards, which have been outlined in our recommendations, are sufficient to address AMR. But it is important, I think, that we do note that antimicrobial resistance is a huge issue, that there is a huge amount of work to be done and that it should be taken incredibly seriously. To the extent of this program further exacerbating those issues, there was no solid evidence that this program would seriously exacerbate the threat that AMR poses, though it is real.

Another issue that was raised was privacy, and this is also a valid concern and one that we spent some time on. While I now find myself talking quite willingly about UTIs, previously I was actually pretty embarrassed and shy to be talking about this, and I can understand that many people going to either their doctor or a pharmacy will not be wanting their conversations to be overheard by anyone. Patient privacy, especially in the pharmacy, is very important.

Ideally, I think the committee thought that it would be great if every pharmacy did have a private consulting room, but that is not achievable in some areas. Particularly, we had a mind to regional areas and outer suburban areas where there may be only one pharmacy, and if that pharmacy did not have a private consulting room it would not be eligible to offer this service. We thought that that was an issue of equity, so we have not put any prerequisite for a separate consulting room but we have said that separate consulting rooms, quiet areas for consultations and also privacy shields should be considered and should be implemented by pharmacies as a priority.

I hope I will have an opportunity to round off later, but I am very much looking forward to hearing the other committee members' contributions.

Ms PRATT (Frome) (11:17): As a committee member, I also rise to speak to this final report on the Select Committee on Access to Urinary Tract Infection Treatment. I take the very first opportunity to thank—as did the member for Badcoe—Amy Mead and Patrick Dupont who, in supporting us as the secretariat service and research service, did an outstanding job to consolidate what has been quite technical scientific and clinical information.

The duty of our committee, of course, was that we were established to examine how pharmacists could safely and promptly dispense medication for painful urinary tract infections without the need for a visit to the doctor. At the outset, I take the opportunity to thank my committee members who sit across the chamber and our Chairperson, the member for Badcoe. I concur with her on the experience of working through this committee.

I think we have achieved a collegial committee culture, we have all been actively engaged in this process and, speaking on behalf of the opposition, we were fully engaged with the topic and it has been an important national health policy conversation to bring to a parliamentary committee to consider. That being said, it is notwithstanding that, while I think we shared the same objective, we were not always in agreement and we have needed the committee process to explore all avenues that were presented to us.

I want to thank the stakeholders, the industry groups and the UTI sufferers who came in person, in a virtual capacity or in writing to give their evidence. They often spoke with some vulnerability, including the professionals, either making comments that might have gone against their own profession or, as the member has already outlined, sharing some very personal and private health information. Perhaps today we are normalising that.

Speaking again about that collegial approach, I think our objective was, of course, to explore opportunities to make recommendations that would improve and promote public health options for UTI sufferers—in this instance, very specifically, for women aged 18 to 65. To reflect on some of the priorities of this committee, for me I felt that our first consideration needed to be patient safety. That was paramount: patient safety, patient outcomes, patient privacy.

The task that the committee had before us allowed us also to reflect on more options for women's health and to explore opportunities and health services for women. I certainly took time to reflect on the pressures that our GPs are currently facing in terms of workload, both in the metro and rural areas. This committee gave us an opportunity to reflect on what an expanded scope of practice might look like for community pharmacists.

As an individual committee member, it was my duty to hear the evidence, to interrogate the science and to weigh that against the portfolios that I share, the rural community that I represent,

and the difference in opinion between stakeholders including pharmacists, UTI sufferers, researchers and general practitioners.

The member has touched on points we will all share today, I think, that we came to understand: the concerns that were being raised by medical practitioners as well as researchers—in fact, every stakeholder, I think, was alive to issues like global supply of antibiotics, the pressures that pharmacists find themselves in in just dispensing the standard medications that they need to fill through prescriptions, and also antimicrobial resistance. There was no getting around the fact that there are barriers to this treatment being provided by pharmacists.

Committee members know that I used my seat at the table to interrogate our process, to quibble on wording and to question, perhaps, the pace of some of the recommendations. I want to pick up the member's, I hope, proud acknowledgement that this committee has really begun and completed its work in about seven months. This house is often criticised for not moving nimbly and getting results in a meaningful amount of time. I think that we did our duty to the task ahead of us.

However, I do have reservations about the pace we are now setting for the implementation team, the minister and the rollout of the recommendations that we are supporting. I will speak to that shortly. It is certainly good to get these outcomes from a committee in reasonable time, but I think that some of the language that we have debated now sets a bigger task for the minister and the implementation team.

Submissions to the committee from GPs and pharmacists have been quick to point out that they share a symbiotic relationship. I want to address that fact, that GPs and community pharmacists alike in their submissions were quick to say that they rely on each other, that there is mutual respect and that one really does not exist without the other. There is a natural and important level of independence between a doctor who is prescribing medication and the independence of the pharmacist who is dispensing that medication.

The member for Badcoe has beaten me to the punch by starting to reference the importance of our country rural community pharmacists. They are a profession that I hold dear. I had an opportunity to make sure their voice was at the table when we tried to understand the recommendations that we are setting and the practical implications for them in perhaps rolling out these recommendations. They go above and beyond in country SA. They provide wellbeing support to their customers. They know everyone by name. They do not all have private consulting rooms, but I am sure they appreciate that their profession has had such a platform.

The committee process certainly allowed us to have robust conversations and where we might not have always agreed, we did find consensus, and that is how we have come to be able to put forward a final report like this. I think that we tried to make the final report and set of recommendations as rigorous as possible, with safeguards and pharmacy practice protocols written into these recommendations.

If I quickly reflect on a national jurisdictional review—what is happening in the rest of the country—we know that this committee was established or triggered by a trial that was initiated in Queensland and that has had much ventilation and is really still current today, with industry groups still reflecting on the outcomes and the experiences of those users.

Since then, other states have followed Queensland's model with some variation. Really, there is a split, as I see it, between states like New South Wales and Victoria, which are well on the way to beginning to implement a trial. WA, Tasmania and now South Australia are really going to bypass the trial or pilot program option and go for full implementation. The member for Badcoe has explained why the committee feels that the recommendations from our state to the minister say that he should consider getting on with the rollout.

It will not surprise committee members that I have expressed interest in the New South Wales trial, which commenced in July and will run for 12 months. It is an opportunity to learn from another state separate from Queensland, which has become contentious in its interpretation, and to really use them as guinea pigs to see if there are any more learnings that could have been adopted.

While I make those comments, I reiterate that there has been no dissenting or minority report and that as a committee we have worked well and put forward our recommendations. As the shadow

minister for preventative health, I have worn a different hat, which is to reflect on what is likely to become, should the minister agree, a statewide change to health policy. There has been unanimous committee support for these recommendations and now it is a matter for the minister to consider. I commend the report.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (11:28): I rise to speak as a member of the committee for access to UTI treatment. I would like to begin my remarks by thanking the member for Badcoe for initiating this investigation. It is incredibly worthwhile work and you have begun making a difference to women's lives and I thank you for that. It is incredibly important and will be highly valued from here on in.

Health care, unfortunately, is highly gendered and women often find it very difficult for people to listen to their concerns, to take their health issues seriously and for, in fact, research to be done properly with regard to health issues that impact purely women, so this has been a real opportunity for us as a committee to make a difference in that regard. I am very pleased to be a part of recommending a report for accessible and safe health care for women who are suffering from a UTI.

I would also like to take this opportunity to thank all the people who took time to provide evidence, both the sufferers and the professionals, who had an interest in this matter. I also acknowledge that it is not for everyone an easy thing to talk about publicly, and the fact that they did has really meant that we have been able to thoroughly investigate this issue, and I do thank them for that.

I, too, would like to state how thorough I believe the committee has been in our deliberations. That has also been supported by the work of the parliamentary staff who have worked on the committee: our secretary and research officer. We could not have done this work in such a thorough and timely fashion without their support, and I thank Patrick Dupont and Dr Amy Mead for their work.

I would also like to thank the member for Waite, the member for Unley and the member for Frome. It has really been a worthwhile investigation. I, too, would like to state on the record that our work together has been collegial and we have always taken the time to listen to each other, consider different views and want to find a way through. I really appreciate having had the opportunity to be on this committee.

I do not have anything to add with regard to our recommendations, other than I am so pleased with what we have put together in this report and I commend it to the house.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (11:31): I rise to speak as the token male on this committee. I do appreciate the manner in which the Chair took my contributions seriously when I participated in the process. I also thank those who did share, in many instances, their intimate stories about the difficulty they had in getting treatment for a mild UTI.

For a man, it was quite an interesting experience to learn how ironic health can be. We all hear that men do not pay enough attention to their health and, from this committee, we learnt that women have barriers in the way of their attending to their health. It is easy for men and they do not do it; it is difficult for women and they insist on doing it. I think there is something for men to learn from that experience.

There are a couple of recommendations I would like to speak specifically to. One of the things we heard from a pharmacist in Queensland was that she was a UTI sufferer and she was not even aware that Queensland was going through a trial and that she could go to a pharmacist and be issued the antibiotics to deal with it and go through a process of identifying whether she qualified. She was told by someone outside of pharmacy that this process was available.

So one of the recommendations is that the scheme should be publicly advertised. There are suggestions of that through news media, mainstream paid advertising, social media, out-based advertising, and also that pharmacists be encouraged—and, of course, I am sure they will do this—to have in-store promotions. If somebody is looking at cranberry juice, for example, there might be a sign saying, 'By the way, we can help you if you are suffering from a UTI. Ask us how.' I think that would be important because we want women to be aware that this is an opportunity for them.

There were some criticisms from those who were against pharmacists taking on this additional role, in that privacy was more difficult to offer in a pharmacy, as opposed to a doctor's surgery, when women wanted to discuss these issues. Of course, everything has changed since COVID. Pharmacy changes happened way before COVID, when pharmacists were given the ability to give flu injections.

I do recall there were sections of the health sector that opposed pharmacists being able to give flu injections. Now, of course, it is a big part of pharmacists' services, and most people go to pharmacists as opposed to their GP to get flu injections and also COVID vaccinations. We know that COVID vaccine injections are a very big part of the service that pharmacists provide.

Every day when so many Australians were working from home, and people who needed to visit their GPs were told to wait in the car park rather than in the waiting rooms before they came in for their appointment, pharmacists were in their pharmacies servicing patients' needs during this time. You simply cannot work from home as a pharmacist. In order to deal with those flu vaccinations and COVID vaccinations, lots of investment has been made in private consulting rooms for that process. That will continue.

I think the other issue was there was some debate about a consultation fee. I know in the New South Wales trial the government is picking up a $20 consultation fee; the state government is paying pharmacists for doing that. A very important point raised when we visited a pharmacy in Queensland was that there is this perception out there that you can go to your pharmacy and have things done for nothing. There was no resistance from UTI patients about paying $20. As a matter of fact, they were very pleased that they could get access immediately and that it was only $20, not the $50 to $70 gap fee they would pay if they visited their doctor, if they could get in.

We also heard representatives from the Royal Australian College of GPs claim that special time slots are available for women with UTIs who ring up, but not a single witness who was a UTI sufferer was able to validate that they got an early appointment because they said they had a UTI. This was quite surprising for the committee to hear.

By having a $20 fee—the case has been $20 in the trials—we felt we did not want to have any barriers to the government implementing this. We did not want the health minister or the Treasurer saying, 'Where are we going to find this extra money for this to happen?' Well, this is a solution. It does not mean that during the two-year period in the lead-up to a review we cannot look at whether there needs to be a package for socially disadvantaged people who might struggle to find that $20, because we understand that that could be an issue for some people. We certainly did not hear any evidence of that.

Another issue that was raised as a reason why pharmacists should not be doing this is that they do not hold the patients' health records, but that was smashed by the fact that there is a product called My Health Record. People's vaccination records are there, and records of the drugs they have been prescribed are there. It is an opt-in or opt-out process. About 97 per cent of Australians are in the My Health Record program, so that information is available.

If a pharmacist issues an antibiotic to deal with a UTI, it is recorded in their My Health Record and it is there for their doctor to see. It is not just a matter of handing over an antibiotic when a pharmacist deals with a patient. They always finish with the advice, 'If symptoms persist, see your doctor.' What I learnt during this campaign is that you always hear about a doctor-pharmacy rivalry and we certainly saw that in some of the evidence we heard that was presented to the committee.

I want to finish by saying that during this committee process we also saw at a federal level the introduction of the 60-day prescription, where basically the Labor government in Canberra, the Albanese government, said that they were going to reduce the cost of pharmaceutical products—or, if you like, prescriptions—to the community. They were doing that by basically telling pharmacists that they had to prescribe two prescriptions of drugs for the cost of prescribing just one.

The average pharmacy earns about $180,000 a year. The entire business model is based on the pharmacy agreements that are made every five years. We know that already in South Australia these cutbacks will not deliver savings to pharmacy patients because pharmacists will now have to charge for things that they have been doing for free like blood pressure tests, like Webster packs.

Ms Pratt: Delivery.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: And delivery, of course. All these things are done for free. A Yorke Peninsula pharmacy was suggesting it could add $300 a year to those who might be benefiting from the Pharmaceutical Benefits Scheme cap of $400 a year, where they get medicines free after that. No longer will that be the case.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (11:41): I, too, rise to support our report for the Select Committee on Access to Urinary Tract Infection Treatment. I want to start by thanking the member for Badcoe and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing for bringing together the opportunity to have this committee in the first place. I know there was a lot of work there by the member to make it happen, but it has definitely been incredibly worthwhile. I would like to thank the members of the committee as well for the tussle of conversation we had sometimes to get through to the recommendations, but I think we have come out with a report that we can all be incredibly happy with.

Access to UTI treatment—myself, I do not tend to suffer from UTIs but I do know plenty who do. I have from time to time, and the pain is incredible, especially when you know what is wrong with you, you cannot access the medication that you need quickly; it is incredibly frustrating. It does not matter how much cranberry juice or Ural you consume, you know you are not going to be able to stop it.

It has been an incredible opportunity to be part of this committee. It is the first select committee that I have been on as a new member of parliament. To hear all the evidence that was provided, from not only sufferers of UTIs but also stakeholders such as the universities, the pharmacists and the GPs, was really interesting and sometimes conflicting, which then allowed us to sit back and fully understand what they were all saying to be able to come up with the recommendations.

As an endometriosis sufferer—I am loud and proud to say that—I think women struggle to access health care, just like the member for Frome mentioned, and it is unfair in a number of ways because we often are more in tune with our bodies perhaps, as the member for Unley suggested indirectly, and we do sometimes know what is wrong with us. Even today I rang up to access a GP and I have had to book an appointment in 2½ weeks, so that leads you to the understanding of what we go through.

When we spoke to the GPs about that, they mentioned that if a woman rings up with UTI symptoms then they will be triaged and prioritised, but then in speaking to other sufferers we sometimes heard that that is not always the case. It can also be that those sufferers are too embarrassed to tell the receptionist what is going on or did not even realise if they did mention it then they might have had an opportunity to see the doctor quickly. So the fact that we have come up with the recommendations so that women hopefully will be able to access the medication through their pharmacist is going to save a lot of women a lot of pain on weekends and in the evenings.

It is good that one of the recommendations talks about affordability, and I thank the member for Unley for his conversation when we talked about what is affordable. For me, it was important that the cost was advised up-front; as somebody who has spent many years without a great deal of disposable income, it is important to know that there is a cost up-front. Whilst it is $20, for some $20 can be that last meal for the week, so it was important we were clear about that.

What I can see through this process, and the project that will be rolled out, is that the impact on our emergency departments will come through very clearly. Women who have currently not been able to get in to see their GP often get to a point where their pain is unbearable and tend to present at our emergency departments; hopefully, this will lower the number of those presentations, which will be a good thing.

Our work was long, and I enjoyed our trip to Brisbane to see the process happening in person and see the pharmacists working together to support women when they came into their store. Some had private areas and some just had some sort of shielded-off areas; I think we will have to do our best with that. It is sometimes an embarrassing topic to talk about, but as we are becoming more

and more equitable in our community women are getting better at talking about themselves and their health issues out loud—even here in parliament—for everyone to hear.

I would like to thank the witnesses who came forward. As I said, they did sometimes have to talk about embarrassing things—including the members for Elder and Badcoe letting us all know—but it is important that we heard firsthand from them because, while we can read as much as we like and take as much as we want from the pharmacists and the GPs, it is the sufferers who are going to benefit from this. It was good to be able to hear from them.

I would like to thank our parliamentary secretary and the team that worked on this, Amy Mead and Patrick Dupont. They have done an incredible amount of work, and the report is very, very thorough. Even when we were away they did a very good job of keeping us organised, and I thank them for all the work they did.

I am very pleased to have been part of such an important outcome for women going forward. As the member for Badcoe said, I think there will be so many women everywhere happy that they are going to be able to access care as soon as they need it and get onto these things quickly, because the quicker you can get onto it the quicker you can get on with your life. Again, I thank all our members for being part of the committee, and commend the report to the house.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (11:47): I will start by very warmly and genuinely thanking all the members of the committee for their contributions here today in the house. They have picked up on some very important areas that the committee analysed, and sometimes grappled with, and found our way to recommendations.

I reflect on the member for Frome's contribution in relation to patient safety. That was really the key thing at the end of the day: is this safe, and is this something we should be introducing to South Australian women? We arrived at the position that, yes, this can be done safely with a range of safeguards in place, as we have outlined in the recommendations.

The member for Frome also brought to the committee a real focus on the regions, and I admire her tenacity in always bringing us back to that and to the importance of making sure people in regional and remote areas are well serviced. The fact is that they are not at the moment, and a lot more needs to be done there. I thank her for her contribution.

The member for Gibson made an excellent point in relation to women's pain, that we do not take it as seriously as we could; certainly historically women's pain has not been taken seriously. There are some great advancements being made in that area, and this committee is one more step towards recognising that pain and, more critically, trying to address it with real action.

Having a bloke on the committee, the member for Unley, was greatly appreciated. At first I thought, 'Why does he even want to be on this committee?' You brought a perspective that was really well needed and, as always, you were not afraid to ask the hard questions. I am very grateful. You have made the recommendations we have reached stronger by your presence, so thank you. I really appreciate the contribution you just made in relation to the promotion of the service.

I suppose everyone would like to think that we could put forward recommendations and they cost nothing. I think a good investment of government funds would be in promoting this service properly to pharmacists to make sure that they enrol and get the training and come on board with the service, to doctors so that they know what their pharmacy counterparts are doing—undoubtedly, they will get referrals from this service, and it is important that they know what it is the pharmacists are doing before those patients ending up with red flags are being sent to GPs—and also, of course, to women aged 18 to 65.

We did hear in Queensland that, although it has been in operation for years up there, women are just busy: they are working, they are caring and they are not necessarily turning their mind to this until they find themselves at a point of crisis. It would be a valid use—and the Minister for Health is right here—to use government funds to properly promote that service and make sure that people know about it so that we can realise some of the benefits to our health system, and particularly our emergency departments.

I would like to reflect as well on the member for Waite's contribution. I know that she is very hot on the issue of women's health. On the issues that she advocates for and this one, I hope that people will come to terms with the fact that these should not be embarrassing and shameful things for us to talk about. They are important matters of public policy, and I am so grateful that this committee has treated these issues with the seriousness they deserve and demonstrated to the community that these are things that we think are worthy of discussion.

I would like to take the opportunity to urge the minister to take on board this very thorough work that our committee has invested its time and effort into. We were lucky to hear from some people with incredible expertise. I would like to particularly thank SAAGAR, and also the Chief Pharmacist, who spent some time with us.

We have a recommendation that an implementation team should be established, and that should be headed by the Chief Pharmacist. We would certainly, as a committee, like to see that recommendation taken up as the starting point for seeing this scheme rolled out and delivering the benefits to women that we think it will. So thank you very much for the expertise and professional experience that so many people contributed.

Lastly, I would like to sincerely and deeply thank all the sufferers of UTI who came forward and shared their views with us. Their real-life, real-world experiences were critical in us assessing some of the assertions that were being made with what is the real on-the-ground experience that these women are going through. They had a real, purposeful and important influence on these recommendations. I thank them so sincerely for sharing their quite intimate experiences with us.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW WOODVILLE AMBULANCE STATION

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:53): I move:

That the 32nd report of the committee, entitled New Woodville Ambulance Station, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) proposes to establish a new Woodville ambulance station, providing significant expansion of service delivery capacity and capabilities for the South Australian Ambulance Service (SAAS). This project will aid in managing emergency responses across metropolitan Adelaide and surrounding regions.

The new station forms part of the state government's 2022 election commitment to improve the infrastructure, increase staffing and provide additional resources for SAAS. SAAS is the state's provider of emergency ambulance transport, clinical care and patient transport services. It operates 119 ambulance stations across South Australia and the MedSTAR emergency medical retrieval service at Adelaide Airport. It will provide alignment to the SA Health strategic plan by strengthening primary health care, and enhancing hospital care, by providing more services close to where people live, ensuring:

- patient-centric emergency services that are designed around community needs;
- SAAS emergency preparedness and response capacity is commensurate with state and national emergency management arrangements; and
- ambulance services evolve in line with the health system.

The entire program of works proposed will deliver four new and four rebuilt ambulance stations, 10 upgraded ambulance stations, the purchase of 36 new vehicles and the recruitment of 350 additional staff. The total investing budget for the project is $7.8 million, with the total budget to deliver the scope of the election commitment at $70 million. Construction is scheduled to commence later this year, with practical completion and commissioning in September 2024.

The new station will allow SAAS to improve its ambulance coverage and response in metropolitan and regional centres in South Australia and more directly in the Woodville and Arndale areas. The station will act as a training facility and house 16 paramedics, garage three ambulances and include provision for two light vehicles.

There has been continued demand for SAAS services in South Australia over the last few years. This new station will address the increased demand in the Woodville area and will complement the existing stations in Fulham Gardens and Brooklyn Park. The ambulance station will be located on Hanson Road, Woodville Gardens.

After detailed investigation and consultation with SAAS and Renewal SA, the site on Hanson Road was identified as a preferred and suitable location, as the current service demands cannot be met by maintaining the stations in Fulham Gardens and Brooklyn Park. These current stations are a significant distance from The Queen Elizabeth Hospital and there was an identified need for increased and more responsive service delivery in the Arndale area. The new Woodville ambulance station will address the outlined challenges in SAAS response through the improvement of service delivery.

The station design has been strongly influenced by the site configuration and the approach of ambulance vehicles utilising the adjacent road network. Ambulances will depart the site directly left onto Hanson Road and will have the ability to turn right via traffic management signalling and a designated gap in the median strip. The driveway and exit points have been designed to promote safe and quick traversing out of the site for operations, and the main garage will allow for a drive-through function, to allow ambulances to enter and exit the building without restriction

Plans submitted by SA Health call for the construction of a new Woodville ambulance station to include garage space for three ambulance vehicles; a training room with seating for 20 persons; a simulation room; office spaces; a kitchen/dining room; a crew rest room; four personal work rest break rooms for staff; staff and visitor car parking spaces, including one accessible space; and covered light fleet parking for two vehicles.

The expected outcomes of the project include improved ambulance response coverage for consumers in the western suburbs, increased capacity for additional crews and vehicles to meet increasing demand, enhanced consumer care, additional/expanded SAAS crew training facilities, and the opportunity for expansion to meet future growth.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport has confirmed that a general building contractor will be appointed under a design and construct form of contract. The contract will be executed in two main stages, with stage 1 addressing and supporting design and the undertaking of early works and stage 2 constructing the main works.

SA Health asserts that the delivery of the project will follow the best principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. To achieve this, extensive consultation, management of a project program, establishment of a cost plan and the implementation of risk management strategies will be adhered to.

Ecologically sustainable development strategies have been incorporated into the design, construction and operation of the new ambulance station. SA Health states that the project team has established formal processes to ensure that sustainable development principles are comprehensively incorporated during all phases of the project life cycle.

To enable successful delivery of these aspirations, an independent consultant will be appointed by SA Health. Design measures to support increased adaptability and changes of use with minimal impact during the building life have been incorporated and include flexible engineering spaces, provisions for future electric vehicle charging stations and options for full or partial solar input.

SA Health states that engagement and clinical consultation has been a key theme throughout the feasibility and concept planning and will continue with various stakeholders throughout the final stages of the design. Stakeholders include clinical and non-clinical staff, consumer reference groups and industrial bodies. Consultation with the local community is underway and will be supplemented by targeted letter drops and community engagement sessions.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the new Woodville ambulance station. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were Mr Tim Packer, Executive Director Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; Mr John Harrison, Director Building

Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; and Mr Rob Elliott, Chief Executive Officer, South Australian Ambulance Service. I thank the witnesses for their time.

Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Motion carried.

Bills

HYDROGEN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 September 2023.)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (12:00): I wish to continue my remarks on the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill 2023 talking about the importance to the South Australian economy and to our small business sector, particularly manufacturing, of having a strong green hydrogen and renewables sector here in South Australia.

By utilising green hydrogen in the production of green iron, we can reduce our carbon footprint in our manufacturing processes and enhance the sustainability of our industries. For way too long we have simply dug up our resources and shipped them overseas. Green iron provides us with the opportunity to add value to the resources we dig out of the ground and ship off overseas. This transformation can create new jobs and provide further diversity of our economic portfolio, making South Australia a hub for green innovation and sustainable manufacturing.

The Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill 2023 will empower South Australian small businesses by providing a strategic framework to leverage the opportunities that hydrogen presents. This bill is timed perfectly with the recent release of the South Australian Small Business Strategy. The support programs provided in the strategy will assist local enterprises to tap into the beginnings of a hydrogen sector.

This presents not only a chance for small businesses to thrive but also a chance for South Australia to strengthen its position as a global leader in hydrogen and renewable energy technologies. Local entrepreneurs and small enterprises can tap into the hydrogen value chain, from production and storage to transportation and distribution.

The bill will create opportunities for small businesses to thrive in the emerging hydrogen economy, but it is not just about supporting our local businesses; it is also about ensuring their competitiveness on an international stage. The global market is rapidly shifting towards sustainability and achieving net zero emissions. I saw this quite starkly on a recent trip to the UK and Europe and the push there, in particular, for net zero. South Australian businesses must adapt to these changing market dynamics to remain competitive.

In today's interconnected world, consumers and investors are increasingly demanding products and services that are environmentally responsible. The Small Business Strategy identifies boosting business sustainability as a key theme for South Australian businesses. The Small Business Sustainability Support Program, which is part of the strategy, will provide achievable strategies to improve businesses' environmental sustainability and climate resilience. Companies can demonstrate their commitment to sustainability by achieving net zero emissions and will have a distinct advantage in the international marketplace.

By embracing hydrogen and renewable energy, South Australian businesses can not only reduce their carbon footprint but also enhance their global competitiveness. Small businesses are the lifeblood of this state's economy, and their success is integral to the overall prosperity of South Australia. As we transition to a hydrogen-based economy, we must ensure that our small businesses not only survive but thrive, and the Small Business Strategy, coupled with the opportunities presented by hydrogen, will empower them to do just that.

Hydrogen is not just a fuel; it is a form of energy storage and can balance the intermittent nature of renewables, ensuring a steady and reliable energy supply. This enhances energy security for our businesses and homes, safeguarding us against disruptions in power availability. One of the challenges of relying solely on renewable energy sources like wind and solar is variability: they produce energy when wind blows or sun shines, but not necessarily when we need it the most.

Hydrogen can use that excess energy in times of abundance and release it when the demand is high. This flexibility makes our energy grid much more resilient and reliable. Imagine a future where we have an integrated energy system that seamlessly combines renewable electricity generation with hydrogen storage and distribution. This will provide us with a continuous and stable energy supply, reducing our dependence on fossil fuels and ensuring that South Australia remains a leader in sustainable energy practices and achieves its target of 100 per cent net renewable energy by 2030.

The Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill 2023 is a landmark piece of legislation. It will shape the future of South Australia. It is not merely a matter of environmental stewardship but it is a strategic move towards our economic prosperity, our energy security, small business empowerment and a sustainable future for our state.

What I want is for us to join together to embark on this journey towards a brighter future where South Australia stands as a beacon of sustainability, innovation and economic growth. By passing this bill, we are not only securing our present but also paving the way for a better tomorrow for ourselves and generations to come. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:05): I rise to make a brief contribution to the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill and in doing so congratulate the government, the Minister for Energy and the Premier on their vision in both the Hydrogen Jobs Plan and this bill, which will make it all possible in the end.

I am proud of the fact that South Australia is a recognised world leader in the global energy transition and in the adoption of renewable energy generally. This, of course, started under the Rann government, was accelerated considerably under the Weatherill government and is now being continued under the current Premier and his cabinet, particularly the Minister for Energy. The bill extends the state's leadership even further.

As well as giving expression to our election commitments, it introduces the nation's first legislative framework for the coordinated rollout of a hydrogen industry, supported by our considerable renewable energy resources. It is worth reflecting on some of the initiatives that have got us here in the first place. It is easy to forget that just 20 years ago South Australia generated almost all, if not all on most days, its electricity from fossil fuels. Now, on any given day, most of our energy comes from renewable resources. I think something like, on average, 70 per cent of our energy on any given day comes from renewable sources.

This dramatically reduces our carbon emissions, of course, and really sets an example for the rest of the world. It makes sense in an environment where sources of renewable energy such as wind and solar are in abundance and, as other speakers have said, coexist with each other like almost nowhere else in the world. But still this transition does not happen by accident. It takes governments with vision and courage and premiers and ministers who are willing to make a plan and stick to it, to do the right thing despite the risks along the way and, in some cases, despite the opposition of vested interests.

When the Rann government was elected in 2002, it adopted a target of 26 per cent renewables by 2020. Decisions were made to exploit the fact that South Australia's best onshore wind potential was located between Port Augusta and Adelaide, where there were existing transmission lines, meaning that any energy generated from wind farms along this 300-kilometre stretch of road is relatively easy to exploit and link to the grid. As this transition progressed, it coincided with the winding up and eventual closure of the coal-powered power stations at Port Augusta.

Early in my first term, or perhaps my second term, I had the opportunity to chair a select committee that looked at the closure of the Port Augusta power station and the challenges that

brought. I was joined on that committee, and in fact it was instigated, to be fair, by the then member for—I cannot remember the name of his seat now, but he was certainly Deputy Premier—van Holst Pellekaan—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): It's Stuart.

Mr ODENWALDER: The member for Stuart, of course, the then member for Stuart and later Deputy Premier and energy minister, Dan van Holst Pellekaan. We served on this select committee which, although it was looking at the closure of the Port Augusta power station, was primarily looking at the opportunities available in terms of solar thermal energy generation.

Ultimately, of course, to date the option of large-scale solar thermal energy has not been taken up and realised in this state or, indeed, anywhere else in Australia. However, we can see the fruits of these investigations in the solar thermal arrangements at the Sundrop Farms greenhouse, which the member for Giles would be very familiar with. This was enabled by a $6 million state government grant, and it was a project that employed some 220 people in its construction.

In other measures, in May of this year I was very happy to welcome the Minister for Energy and also the Minister for Social Housing to my electorate to meet with friends of mine Elizabeth East residents Craig and Yvonne, who were part of the first phase of the state's Virtual Power Plant. The Virtual Power Plant, for those of you who do not know, is the partnership between Tesla and the state government, partly funded through the state's Renewable Technology Fund, which was an initiative of the Weatherill Labor government. I know that, in the lead-up to the 2018 election, it was very popular on doorsteps. Although the final result of that election was not one everyone would have liked to have seen, that particular initiative was extremely popular, and it was one that I campaigned on very hard.

The Virtual Power Plant is a network of distributed energy resources, in this case Housing SA homes with solar and battery systems, which all work together to create a single virtual power plant. Sophisticated technology and software are used to control the flow of energy coming into the solar panels on residents' roofs and into home batteries to charge or discharge that energy and allow it to be traded on the national energy market.

The idea, of course, is that these many systems work together. They harness the relatively small and individual amounts of energy that are generated by households to support the grid and also to provide affordable energy to the participating householders themselves, which of course is why it was popular in an electorate like mine, where there is a considerable amount of social housing, Housing SA and community housing, so they can take advantage of this particular offer.

Small amounts of energy stored in individual home batteries can become large amounts of energy to help support the grid in times of need. Indeed, the capacity and power of a virtual power plant can sometimes match or even exceed a traditional power station.

As of May this year, and as the Minister for Energy and the Minister for Housing helped us announce in Elizabeth East, this virtual power plant, which by then provided cheaper electricity to more than 4,000 public housing tenants, began to get even bigger. Tesla launched phase 4 of South Australia's Virtual Power Plant, enabling even more South Australians on low incomes to share in the benefits of renewable energy.

As a result of this investment by Tesla, an additional 3,000 South Australian households will ultimately benefit from low-cost electricity and the comfort of battery backup. For the first time—and again this is very important in Elizabeth, where a lot of Housing SA properties have transitioned to community housing—the project will include households from the community housing sector. It is also important for the member for Ramsay, who now represents the good people of Elizabeth Vale. There is a large section of community housing there that will have the opportunity to take advantage of this offer from Tesla.

Tesla's continued expansion of the Virtual Power Plant demonstrates that the decision made in 2017 by the Weatherill government to invest in this program has delivered a successful result and continues to leave a significant legacy. The rollout will also support 200 full-time jobs, including 70 apprentices.

It is also important to note that, as part of hosting Virtual Power Plant solar panels or batteries on their homes, public and community housing tenants get access to the cheapest retail electricity price in the state, currently 23 per cent below the default market offer. This represents a $423 yearly saving for a typical household. It also benefits all South Australians by providing important grid services that had previously only been provided by centralised more traditional equipment, like the now defunct Port Augusta power station.

As I said, under the project 4,100 households have already had solar and Tesla Powerwall systems installed. This next phase will bring the number up to over 7,000. Tesla have plans, ultimately, to have 50,000 South Australian homes connected over time, which would not only benefit those on low incomes and those who are eligible for the rollout of this program but also benefit South Australian further services to the grid.

Under the Weatherill Labor government, we saw the establishment of the world's largest lithium-ion battery at Hornsdale, a project that not only leant stabilisation to the grid but in the process created more than 1,000 direct and indirect jobs during construction.

With this bill, we will be putting South Australia in exactly the right position to capitalise on what will be a renewable energy goldrush as we streamline and coordinate the development of hydrogen and renewable energy projects. This bill was the nation's first legislative framework, designed to provide a coordinated approach to the burgeoning hydrogen and renewable energy industries.

We know that the existing frameworks by successive Labor governments—and I have spoken about some of those initiatives—have served South Australia well, helping us reach over 70 per cent renewable energy, but we also know that our state is headed for a new wave of large-scale hydrogen and renewable energy development on a scale we have never seen before. As a result, of course, we need to get the regulatory framework right.

The change in scale and complexity, including several very large complex projects, demands a single end-to-end framework that can consider the needs of the environment, native title holders, landowners, communities and the state's strategic and economic direction.

The Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill is, at its heart, six acts being merged into one, minimising red tape for prospective investors. It will facilitate a straightforward, competitive, government-led approach to large-scale hydrogen and renewable energy development in the state, supporting the government's Hydrogen Jobs Plan.

The bill applies to both freehold and government-owned land, as well as state waters, and will ensure community investor certainty and clarity, as well as consistently reliable performance across the social, environmental and safety aspects of the industry.

On freehold land, proponents will need to secure access to land through direct agreement with landowners, preserving current arrangements. A new competitive system will be introduced for conferring access and licences for projects on pastoral land and state waters, enabling the government to responsibly assign access to some of the state's most prospective areas for renewable energy development.

The declaration of these release areas will only occur after a consultation process involving government agencies, native title holders and other impacted stakeholders. The declaration of a release area will enable a competitive tender process for feasibility licences over that land and waters, with applicants to compete based on transparent selection criteria. This will ensure the state only hosts those projects willing to embrace coexistence with current land uses and deliver community and environmental benefits through their projects.

As other speakers have noted, there will be five licence types created relating to the key stages of renewable energy projects, from the early research and feasibility stage right through to the construction, operation and closure of facilities, namely:

- the renewable energy feasibility licence or permit, which enables exploration for renewable energy, including construction of monitoring equipment;

- the renewable energy infrastructure licence, which permits construction, operation, decommissioning and rehabilitation of renewable energy infrastructure;
- the renewable energy research licence, which permits construction, operation, decommissioning and rehabilitation of renewable energy infrastructure for the purpose of researching the capabilities of a technology, system or process;
- the hydrogen generation licence, which permits construction, operation, decommissioning and rehabilitation of hydrogen generation facilities; and
- associated infrastructure licences, which permit ancillary infrastructure (transmission, roads, water treatment and so on) and associated facilities, such as hydrogen power plants, ports for hydrogen product export and desalination for hydrogen production.

The bill has been subject to extensive consultation over the past year, including with native title holders.

The Malinauskas government is committed to the renewable energy transition and to a renewable energy and hydrogen sector that is ecologically sustainable and responsible. The bill is designed to give confidence to international investors looking to invest their capital in growing the industries of the future right here in South Australia. It will also give the community confidence that these projects will be delivered in such a way that they protect the environment and the interests of communities, landholders, native title holders and the environment. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Basham.

SUCCESSION BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September 2023.)

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (12:19): I rise in support of the Succession Bill 2022 and straight up remind everyone that they need a will. Whilst it is a morbid topic, being prepared so that your family knows what you want to happen with your estate will free them up to grieve, rather than having to chase around and deal with the many acts this bill seeks to condense. This bill represents some of the most extensive law reform ever undertaken in South Australia since the development of the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act in the seventies.

As someone who has had to navigate the system when my husband died without a will, I cannot emphasise enough the importance of having a will and, with these changes, ensuring your directions are clear. This bill has been designed in conjunction with the recommendations from the South Australian Law Reform Institute to identify areas of succession law that were most in need of review. The bill enacts the recommendations from the SALRI reports that are legislative in nature and have been accepted by government. Most significantly, this bill repeals the Administration and Probate Act, the Wills Act and the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act and consolidates the provisions into this one new act.

This bill seeks to amend the Aged and Infirm Persons' Property Act, the Guardianship and Administration Act, the Law of Property Act, the Public Trustee Act, the Supreme Court Act and the Trustee Act. Having one piece of legislation to deal with all aspects of succession law will greatly enhance usability of the legislation. Updates to language will make it easier to understand given the sensitive time that one may have to seek to understand the law.

The bill organises the provisions that are to be consolidated from other legislation so that the bill is set out in a logical manner, something that cannot be said for the depth of related legislation that exists currently. I will not enter into all the changes and provisions today, as the bill is very long and has many parts, but briefly part 1 contains the preliminary provisions. In the definitions section, some of the definitions have been modernised or simplified. Part 2 contains the provisions that formerly made up the Wills Act.

Part 3 of the bill contains provisions relating to the granting of administration or probate and incorporates a small number of amendments arising from the SALRI recommendations. Part 4 of the bill deals with the process of administering deceased estates and contains a number of changes recommended by SALRI. Part 5 of the bill contains the provisions that deal with intestate estates, which is an estate where the deceased person has died without a valid will. Part 6 of the bill deals with claims for family provision and contains the provisions formerly in the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act. Part 7 of the bill contains the miscellaneous provisions.

The Succession Bill 2022 represents the culmination of a number of years work from SALRI, the Attorney-General's Department and parliamentary counsel on these reforms. It is sadly the case that sometimes when someone dies the family can disagree on the contents and meaning of a person's will. Whilst the deceased may have nominated their executor, other family members may wish to view the will to ensure they are happy with the distribution and outcome.

One of the SALRI recommendations that does come with part 2 of the bill is a new provision that gives certain classes of persons the right to inspect a will of a deceased person. The classes of person include persons named in the will, beneficiaries, surviving spouses and domestic partners or former spouses and domestic partners, parents or guardians of the deceased, and persons eligible to a share of the estate under the rules of intestacy had the person died intestate. Persons with claims against the estate in law or equity can also inspect the will but only with the permission of the Supreme Court if they have a proper interest in the matter and it is appropriate for them to do so.

This is an important change for those who are wishing to better understand the deceased person's wishes. I return to my original comments that one should always have a will. To be honest, I am probably speaking to myself right now. Whilst I know I have one somewhere, it definitely needs updating.

Part 6 of the bill addresses family provision. The feedback collated to SALRI during the review of the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act was generally supportive of the notion that claims under the act were too easy to make and not enough weight was placed on the wishes of the testator. A lawyer in my electorate has reported to me that this part will provide a vast improvement to his clients in the future. Within the new bill specifically he suggests that section 116 is a big change for inheritance claims. It now provides that when determining whether to make a family provision order the court's primary consideration is the wishes of the deceased person.

The court may also order a party to the proceedings to give security for costs that may be awarded against the party if it appears to the court that the party's claim for family provision is made without merit or the party is unwilling to negotiate a settlement of a claim for provision. This amendment is aimed at discouraging unmeritorious claims. This means that when we write our wills we need to be clear on the reasons why we are making these wishes and why they are noted. The bill sets out a framework for what should be contained in those wishes.

So it is the case that we will need a will. We all need to be clear about what our wishes are and when we need to communicate them effectively. This bill contains a huge amount of work, and I would like to thank the Attorney-General and his team and the members of the SALRI review committee for bringing it to completion. I commend the bill to the house.

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) (12:24): I will not linger. This is a bill that I think enjoys support across the chamber in its intent. I thank all of the participants in the debate, particularly having just heard the most recent contribution in which the member gave a very nice summary of the purpose and the contents of the bill, and I commend it to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr TEAGUE: This is a bill that has been a long time coming. The history of the preparation of the bill has been canvassed once again in the course of the debate in the current parliament, both in this place and another place, as is the nature of things with the Attorney in another place in this parliament.

At the outset of the committee process, I will make some remarks by way of acknowledgement of and thanks to those who have worked on this over its many years in the coming together and now the consolidation of this wide range of legislation into a single document.

I acknowledge, to start with, the commencement of that process by former Attorney-General the Hon. John Rau in 2011 when he asked SALRI to identify those areas that were most in need. I was last spending some time with the Hon. John Rau in the context of SALRI's work at the university some weeks ago. It is not something I have taken the opportunity, however, to perhaps ask or remind him about whether or not he anticipated at the outset that that referral to SALRI might have led to quite as comprehensive a body of work as then transpired over the course of what then turned out to be many years.

As we know, the reports of SALRI have covered the field by seven separate reports in the period 2014 to 2017. It is those reports that have really been the body of work that has informed now the coming together in a single bill. As has been said, the bill enacts recommendations across the entirety of those seven SALRI reports. The former government had accepted the vast bulk of those recommendations in bringing the bill that was before the last parliament here, and that bill has been very substantially, though not quite comprehensively, replicated by this bill, the Succession Bill 2022.

It is often the case that we have occasion to thank SALRI for its contribution to areas of law reform and for promoting a thoughtful discourse on challenging areas. This is one case where it is of particular note to thank and express appreciation to SALRI for its wideranging work over those many years, particularly 2014 to 2017.

There have been some who have, hopefully, been identified in person before—I know some of them have been thanked by me in the course of my previous contributions—but it is well to repeat particular acknowledgement. Thanks for their contributions ought go, firstly, to Professor John Williams and to Dr David Plater, both of whom are longstanding and well-recognised leaders of SALRI. Also, over the course of those years significant contributions have been made by Dr Sylvia Villios, by Louise Scarman, by the Hon. Tom Gray KC (who is, of course, a former Justice of the Supreme Court), Ms Dianne Gray, and the law reform class at the University of Adelaide.

It was that class that, just a few weeks ago, was the occasion for me to cross paths with John Rau, which I referred to a moment ago. David Plater's leadership of that class, and the way he therefore engages those who are coming through with areas of reform that can be focused on, is an extension of SALRI and a tremendous one. As the previous Attorney did over the course of the last parliament, special acknowledgment for her valuable contribution needs to be made of Helen Wighton, the founding Deputy Director of SALRI. Helen was present at the start of this important reference but, as we are aware, sadly passed away in 2014.

It is often the case that legislation has a range of thoughtful inputs. It is particularly so for this one and so, as we commence to step through the body of the bill, I recognise SALRI in particular for its contribution.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 4 commences at part 2 which, as we know, contains those provisions that were formerly making up the Wills Act. Having just spoken at some length about SALRI and recognising SALRI's role, we would perhaps just recognise that there are very few of the SALRI recommendations that are dealing with the provisions of the Wills Act, so the changes here in this part of the bill are focused on, as we understand, modernising and simplifying the language where that has been possible, and I might come to SALRI's contribution to that part of the bill.

In terms of the approach to modernising and simplifying the language—we have a modernised definition of 'will' for example, and that has drawn on interstate legislation—is there anything that might be said in terms of informing the committee about the approach, in taking this opportunity to bring those provisions of long standing from the Wills Act into the new bill, that was taken in terms of drafting?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that we took a fairly minimalist approach working with parliamentary counsel just to identify where it was absolutely necessary to modernise. So for part 2 largely it is as it was.

Mr TEAGUE: I would flag that this area was not entirely clear of SALRI input. Again, I am curious to note anything the minister might have to add further about the modernisation of the definition of 'will', so I invite any further observation about that.

In terms of the SALRI recommendation that is relevant here, there is now consideration for those classes of persons who now have the right to inspect a will of a deceased person. We know that those classes of person include those named in the will: beneficiaries, surviving spouses, former spouses, domestic partners, parents or guardians of the deceased and persons eligible to a share of the estate under the rules of intestacy, had the person died intestate.

We know persons who claim against the estate in law or equity can also inspect the will, but only with the permission of the Supreme Court if they have a proper interest in the matter and it is appropriate for them to do so. Is there anything that has guided, as it were, beyond taking up that work of SALRI in this respect, that broadening of the classes of person who are able to inspect the will and the purpose that that might now serve into the future?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think I understand that there are two areas that are being questioned here. One is about the definition and the other refers to the persons who are entitled to inspect the will. With the definition, the legislation was updated, given that the existing definition drew on and referred to the reign of King Charles II, which has an interesting balance in the title of our current monarch. Interstate definitions were looked at and used in determining a more modern and simple definition for what a will is.

Moving to clause 48—Persons entitled to inspect will of deceased person, this is where SALRI had a significant piece of advice to give. This substantially follows that advice, I am advised, in terms of making sure that anyone who has an interest or a potential claim is able to inspect the will but also introducing the element of a court application for people. This is in order to ensure that there is not a speculative approach, where creditors' businesses may just go looking at wills to see if there is any way in which they can insert themselves into having an interest. It needs to be able to be demonstrated through a court process.

Mr TEAGUE: I will perhaps just stay with that point. We might come back to it in a bit more detail when we get to clause 48 more particularly. I note that clause 48 spells out those who are now entitled to inspect a will, including the process of going to the court as may be necessary for those purposes. As I said at the outset, this is one of those parts of the bill that is largely bringing across those existing provisions, but it is that area of inspection that SALRI focused on, to the extent that it considered the area. That is, of course, caught by report No. 10 from December 2017, which is entitled 'Who may inspect a will?'

It is interesting to note that not this report, but the reports all have suitably historical images and some of them have quotes, including from Shakespeare, about the relevant subject matter, and, appropriately, report No. 10 appears to depict the reading of a will before those, presumably, beneficiaries of it. In terms of report No. 10 from December 2017, SALRI in fact made four recommendations. The first of those was to recommend that there be no change to the present law to allow inspection of a will prior to a testator's death, and that is subject to any existing limited situations contemplated by current law and practice, so no inspection prior to a testator's death.

In recommendation No. 2, SALRI recommended that the legislation, the reform aspect of it, ought to provide for entitlement to inspect a will after a testator's death based on the structure of the New South Wales act—the Succession Act 2006 in New South Wales—and, as such, provision should extend to six categories:

- firstly, any person named or referred to in the will, whether as a beneficiary or not, or any person named or referred to in an earlier will as a beneficiary of the deceased person—that is so as to therefore broadly capture those beneficiaries in that extended way;
- secondly, the surviving spouse or domestic partner, whether same sex or not, or child or stepchild of the deceased person;
- thirdly, a parent or guardian of the deceased person;
- fourthly, any person who would be entitled to a share of the estate of the deceased person if the deceased person had died intestate;
- fifthly, any parent or guardian of a minor referred to in a will or who would be entitled to a share of the estate of the deceased person if the deceased person had died intestate; and
- sixthly, any person committed with the management of the deceased person's estate under the Guardianship and Administration Act 1993—that is the South Australian act—immediately before the death of the deceased person.

We know—and I am going back now to the national committee and its work in preparing a draft wills bill in 1997 that was intended to be adopted across Australia—that clause 52 of that bill dealt with the inspection of a will. The categories that I have outlined just now as being the subject of recommendation 2 by SALRI's report I think are consistent with those categories and based on the provisions of that bill.

Further, we understand that similar laws to that suggested by the national committee are now applied in New South Wales, the ACT, the Northern Territory, Queensland, Tasmania and Victoria, and that South Australia and Western Australia are the only outliers at the time of preparation for these types of provisions. I have only gone to recommendation 2 of four; I might come back to 3 and 4 when there is an opportunity.

Just in terms of their adoption, therefore, is there anything that the minister would add, including whether or not there is any update as to Western Australia's position? Are we now in a situation where we are now achieving uniformity across the country in terms of those categories? Partly because I think I am on my third question for the clause, but also because it might be convenient, I think the relevant provision is going further to divide those categories of person who have an automatic right to inspect the will and those who require a court order. Is that similarly now a matter of uniformity across the country?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have that information here, but given we are getting close to the close we will make sure we have an answer when we come back into committee.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Are there any other questions on clause 4? We have had three contributions, member for Heysen. You can make it brief.

Mr TEAGUE: Perhaps, just for the sake of *Hansard*, before 1pm and to complete the references to SALRIs work, if I may, otherwise I can perhaps address them in clause 5 if that is—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): No, go ahead quickly.

Mr TEAGUE: I note then the balance of the recommendations that are found at the outset and summary of the report are:

> …provision should be made for a party (including a creditor) who has or may have a claim at law or in equity against the estate of a deceased person to be able to inspect a will but only by order of a court—

and this is where we get to this second category—

> and such an order should only be granted where the applicant has some proper interest and can establish why inspection of the will is appropriate.

The fourth recommendation recommends the consolidation of South Australia's succession law legislation into a single act. Here there is convenient reference to the advantage of doing so for these purposes, being to then incorporate reforms to the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act 1972 and then

going back to SALRI's report relevantly on intestacy. SALRI had a fair bit to say specifically about the reform of the family provision legislation and we know happily that is included now in the single bill.

Hopefully, recommendation 3 catches those who are in that extended category, those who need to go to the court for an order to inspect but who will now have the opportunity to do so. Recommendation 4 reminds those who had been caught up in the work that it goes now very much directly to the kinds of persons who are going to be the subject of what was the Inheritance (Family Provision) Act 1972 and that is indeed what has occurred.

We perhaps do not need to come back to recommendation 4, but the answer in due course might then deal with the categories in recommendation 2 and, further, those other persons who are the subject of recommendation 3 and who will therefore now be able to access for inspection, but only with the benefit of any necessary court order. Unless there is anything to add in response at this stage, that is just perhaps to bookend what I might have said in the course of completing my third go at this stage.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Annual Reports 2022-23—
Office for Public Integrity
Office of the Inspector
Ombudsman SA [Ordered to be published]

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

Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee—Annual Report 2022-23

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

Regulations made under the following Act—
Education and Care Services National Law—
Bassinets
Miscellaneous
Miscellaneous—No. 2

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: We welcome students, parents and teachers from Port Neill Primary School, guests of the member for Flinders. Welcome to parliament today.

I also acknowledge the presence in the gallery of Mr Hedley Bachmann AM and Ms Anne Bachmann OAM, guests of mine. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

DEFENCE STATE

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:01): My question is to the Premier. Is Labor committed to ensuring that South Australia remains the defence state? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It has been reported that at least 800 troops from two combat units currently based in South Australia are being transferred interstate.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:01): I think the Leader of the Opposition knows all too well that the answer to his question is, yes, South Australia absolutely is the defence state and I think it will be for many, many decades to come because the pipeline of work that is now committed and coming South Australia's way is so substantial that the question is no longer where is the work coming from, but the question is how do we meet the demand that is there. That is a real challenge, which I am happy to speak to potentially in another question or at another time.

The state government is aggressively pursuing the strategy of making South Australia the defence state, as has been the bipartisan position now across a number of governments, and we appreciate the bipartisan support the policy enjoys.

In respect of the announcement on the back of the Defence Strategic Review and the movement of infantry troops, namely, the 7RAR, to which the Leader of the Opposition refers, yes, initially when reports emerged—and I think this has been discussed previously in this place—the potential for 7RAR being relocated back to Darwin emerged. Naturally, I picked up the phone to my friend the Deputy Prime Minister of the nation and sought detail on this issue.

Naturally, he was unable to provide that on the phone, particularly given the national security nature of the conversation, but what I was able to do over the phone was affirm the position that is well known in any event, and that is that if South Australia were to experience a change in policy that resulted in a net reduction in the number of people employed by the Defence Force in South Australia, they could expect a very firm response from the government actively opposing such a move. I made that abundantly clear on the phone, as I do repeatedly through the media and any other opportunity I get.

One thing that won't be happening during the life of this government is a sense of subservience to the Prime Minister or a federal Labor government. I don't really care who is in charge federally, the Coalition or Labor, when it comes to decisions around defence policy—if they undermine the state, we will call it out; if they support the state, we will actively welcome it.

In respect of the movement of 7RAR, the unfortunate element of that movement is of course that we see a dilution in the number of infantry troops based in South Australia for a period before it escalates in the medium term back up. The time line that we have received as a state government, the advice that I have received, is that numbers will start creeping back up not too long after we start to see 7RAR troops leave the state, namely, in 2025.

Very quickly then we reacquire the position that we have, the status quo terms in numbers. But the big opportunity isn't just the number of troops staying the same in the medium term. What matters far more is that we are now establishing a brand-new 10th Brigade that will have its home in Adelaide. It will be the home of the long-range fire unit, which is a highly technologically advanced unit that will create demand for the defence industry beyond the Army personnel themselves. That is a real opportunity that will in actual fact leave the state in better terms than is currently the case in terms of the status quo.

What we will do progressively over the immediate years ahead, including during the life of this parliament, is make sure that the commonwealth honour the commitments they have made to the people of South Australia today and, provided they meet those commitments, it will be a better outcome for our state.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier received confirmation from the Prime Minister that the federal government will honour its commitment for the full life-of-type extension for all six Collins class submarines?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:06): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. I have spoken to the Prime Minister of the nation around our submarine

program naturally on more than one occasion. In fact, as recently as Monday I had the opportunity to address the beginning moments of the federal cabinet meeting that was held here in Adelaide. Obviously, given that opportunity, the naval shipbuilding program was something that we discussed.

In respect of the specifics of the Leader of the Opposition's question around the life-of-type extensions, yes, both the Deputy Premier and myself have sought those reassurances from the commonwealth. Most of those discussions, if not all of those discussions, have principally been with the Deputy Prime Minister, though, as the defence minister.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is again to the Premier. Has the Premier received advice from the federal defence minister that the Hunter class frigate program will not be cut and, if not, why not? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The federal defence minister and Deputy Prime Minister said that he would receive the surface fleet review this week.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:07): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because it provides an opportunity to put this information on the record, because it's something that I feel rather strongly about.

I have spoken to the Deputy Prime Minister about the frigate program, particularly given the surface ship review that is occurring on the back of the DSR. That was supposed to be a 90-day review. The state government has made a submission to that review, and both the Deputy Premier and myself have repeatedly, beyond the written submission itself, informally and in a number of conversations made clear to the commonwealth, including the Deputy Prime Minister, that it's our firm expectation that the Hunter program continue. So yes is the answer in terms of our engagement with him.

We await the outcome of the 90-day surface ship review. That has not been finalised nor has it been released publicly, but let me make clear on the record in this place that I want that to happen. That work is supposed to be a 90-day exercise. I appreciate there will be a little period beyond that for the commonwealth to contemplate the outcome of the review before any announcement is made publicly, but we are asking them to get on with that job. Every day that passes that has with it any ounce of uncertainty about what the future holds for that program has a real-world consequence for the ability of the industry to recruit the people who are going to be required to build those frigates.

I don't think the commonwealth has any time to waste here. I think there is a price to be paid by industry for any delay. So we do want that 90-day review to be concluded and its conclusions to be announced publicly as quickly as possible. I have made that known directly to the Deputy Prime Minister, including as part of the discussions that we had more recently around the movement of 7RAR.

So I hope that this government is in lock step with the opposition in quite frankly demanding of the federal government that they conclude that review, make the decisions, provide the certainty that industry so desperately wants so that we can get on with the task of building a world-class frigate for a Navy at a particularly important time strategically.

DEFENCE INDUSTRIES

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:10): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Does the government have a plan to maximise the participation of South Australian industry in the defence and space supply chain and, if so, what is it? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: *The Australian* recently reported that, 'In the absence of specific measures to ensure the participation of domestic firms, industry figures warned the new force posture plan would also favour foreign suppliers, eroding sovereign capabilities.'

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) (14:10): I am pleased to speak about this very important issue because we should make no mistake that our role as state government is not to participate in considerations of the strategic nature of defence but to maximise the economic and therefore social benefit of having defence industry located here.

To do that we need to not only be successful as we have been in attracting large-scale projects, including most recently announced of course being the AUKUS submarines, but be able to ensure that our people are working on site and are also involved in the design and the innovations and the research associated with the complexity of those very large beasts, those large submarines.

We also need to make sure that our supply chain is as engaged as possible in providing be it components, be it design, be it project management, and even human resources contributions and IT contributions, that they are all able to feed into this process. That's important not only for those companies so that they are fully engaged themselves and growing but also because what tends to happen is that you have cognate businesses that are not exclusively devoted to defence that also start to get an uplift in their technological capability, their manufacturing capacity, their design capacity, their IT skills, and that then leads to what is often called the technological spillover into the economy from the existence of this very large, very sophisticated manufacturing.

So the South Australian government's task, as I say, is not simply to be fully present, engaged with the federal government in making sure that these projects come, but also to be as engaged in the skills and training involved in getting our workforce ready, working with the universities to make sure that they are offering the courses and they are engaging in the right kind of research, and working with supply chain companies of various sorts.

How that happens in South Australia happens in a variety of ways. One of course very immediate one is the Industry Capability Network, which is about directly making sure that smaller companies are plugged into the work of larger companies and are able to know what the tender processes are and how they are able to bid for them.

Of a different nature is having something like Lot Fourteen where both for defence and for space you are seeing companies that are innovating, able to research and benefit from the collaboration of being co-located to be able to get a centre that is attractive to the right kind of people who are going to be part of developing that more sophisticated side of our economy.

The work that we are doing with the two universities, considering the merger process, is not unrelated to this either. Each of the three universities in South Australia is very engaged with businesses in South Australia and how they can be better ready to participate in defence, for example Flinders University. We have put money into their Factory of the Future, Line Zero, which is a collaboration with BAE Systems and working on enabling companies, smaller companies, to be able to go and test technology and test mechanisms of manufacture in order to fully participate. But the merger of the other two institutions is about having a university of sufficient size to get the research input required for this state to be ready for AUKUS, amongst other benefits.

At each level of engagement what is important is that we make sure we highlight the best of what we have to offer, and make sure that that is very well understood by the large-scale manufacturers and that we are able to fully participate and benefit.

DEFENCE SA

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:14): My question is again to the Deputy Premier. Why did Richard Price resign as CEO of Defence SA, and can the minister provide an update on the international recruitment process? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PATTERSON: Defence SA CEO, Richard Price, who has provided exemplary leadership and service to South Australia's defence industry, announced his resignation last month.

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) (14:15): Yes, he did and, again, I am grateful to the member for the question so that I can put on record my gratitude to Richard Price, who is an exceptional executive. The moment I arrived in the portfolio everybody—interstate and in South Australia, from Sir Angus Houston down—told me how important the institution of Defence SA is, the construction of it, the nature of it, and also the extraordinary role that several chief executives over time have played, including Richard.

I am, of course, sorry to see Richard go. He has made his choices in terms of the next stage of his career and his life, and I don't want to speak on his behalf in any way, but he is a loss. There is no question that not having him involved is a loss to me and the government; however, there are many talented people associated with defence.

What is important, as the member has referred to, is that we undertake an appropriate selection process in order to find that right person for this next stage of development of Defence SA, of AUKUS and of our participation in the defence and space industries. There are several people in Defence SA of very high quality, one of whom will act in due course when Richard leaves and several who may wish to apply for the job. But, as the member mentions, we are interested in doing an international search because defence is of such crucial importance to us that we want to ensure we are testing the best possible candidates.

As the member and members opposite will know, chief executives report to the Premier. Erma Ranieri, as the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, and the head of Premier and Cabinet, Damien Walker, are working together to establish the appropriate committee. By my suggestion they have started by talking to the Defence SA board, people of immense experience and levels of contact, who will be able to guide that selection process so that we ensure we get the right person.

As I said, I would like to put on the record my immense gratitude to Richard for the work he has done. I expect he will remain in South Australia as he moves into the next stage of his career and his enjoyment of life, but I also note the excellence of the staff within that agency and therefore have every confidence it will continue to be managed well as we go through this process.

AUKUS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:17): My question is again to the Deputy Premier. Who is leading the Office for AUKUS, and how many FTEs currently work in the office?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:17): I might answer the question, simply because the Office for AUKUS has temporarily been established—or when I say temporary, it has been established—within the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. An official from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet has been allocated to that role. I more than happy to take on notice the exact details around the quantum of the budget and the number of FTEs. It is not a huge sum of money, nor is it a huge number of FTEs, but I more than happy to take that on notice.

The reason for its establishment in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet at this particular point in time is that it is seen to be a coordinating function in terms of a cross-government efforts regarding the AUKUS response. The biggest challenge we have in realising the AUKUS opportunity is all about people and skills, but there are also other areas of state government responsibility that will be impacted through AUKUS.

For instance, one of the things we are negotiating at the moment is the land swap that we, as the state government, have put upon the table. That actively involves work from the Minister for Planning, for instance, through Renewal SA. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport, along with the Department for Energy and Mining, have issues in regard to gas infrastructure, electricity infrastructure, going across Torrens Island. The Department for Environment and Water has considerations that need to be factored in from DEW, particularly around land at Osborne. So it is sought to be a cross-government function and hence its establishment within a central agency, namely, DPC.

AUKUS

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:19): Supplementary: how many times has the Premier met with the head of the Office for AUKUS?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:19): Nominally, it's through the Chief Executive Officer of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, and basically almost daily. I can't think of a 48-hour period that has gone by when issues to do with AUKUS haven't been raised.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

Mrs PEARCE (King) (14:20): My question is for the Premier. Can the Premier advise the house about the establishment of the office for early childhood development?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20): I thank the member for King for her question. The member for King has had a lot to do with the development of our early childhood policy, given her interest in the area both on a personal level and also on behalf of her constituents. I am very pleased to report to the member for King and the house more broadly that the state government has now appointed a chief executive for the new office for early childhood development.

We have appointed Ms Kim Little, who we have recruited from the state of Victoria to lead this effort. Both myself and naturally the Minister for Education, who is immediately responsible for the office of early childhood development, have met with Ms Little and I think we have 'struck gold' is probably not the best analogy but I think we have been very, very fortunate to be able to procure the services of Ms Little, whose experience in early childhood education, particularly in the state of Victoria, is extensive.

Ms Little has been responsible for a massive period of change within the state of Victoria in terms of early childhood services, particularly around preschool, and she will lead the reform for the early years system being developed in the state of South Australia and ultimately the delivery of universal preschool for three year olds. One of the key recommendations that came out of the royal commission was the establishment of a brand-new office: the office for early childhood development. This is something we want to get on with establishing expeditiously, hence the appointment of Ms Little at the first available opportunity so she can get on with the work.

The Minister for Education, and the government more broadly, is seeking to bring in a piece of legislation that more formally establishes the office of early childhood development. That is a piece of legislation we aspire to have brought into the parliament at the beginning of next year, but in the interim we can appoint a chief executive who can now get on with the work.

We should not be under any misapprehension about the size and the scale of this challenge. This is the biggest change to education service delivery in South Australia in 50 years. We are effectively providing a whole new year of service delivery for three year olds across the state. We choose to do this not just because we committed to it at the election but because we see it as being the most material and substantial thing that a state government can do to address the opportunity of improving educational outcomes across the system but also the opportunity to improve the volume of early childhood developmental delay that we see in South Australia.

The number I think is, from memory, 23.8 per cent of children who start reception in South Australia have at least one form of developmental delay. Our aspiration is to get that number down to 15 per cent. That is a massive task, and I suspect not just the Minister for Education but also most likely the former Minister for Education, both the Deputy Premier and the deputy leader, appreciate just how herculean an objective that is, but we are committed to it because if we are able to move the needle in the right direction here we don't just change young people's lives but we actually improve the output and the productivity of the state more broadly.

It's not just an education policy; it's an economic policy. Ms Little has the experience and the expertise to deliver on the recommendations of the royal commission, and we are very grateful to be able to announce her appointment.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): In what form or function will the office for early childhood development differ from the Office for the Early Years established two years ago?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:24): First and foremost, they will be responsible for the delivery of three-year-old preschool in a universal form throughout the state of South Australia.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): When the Premier met with Ms Little, did she provide advice to the Premier as to how the government is going to recruit 800 extra early childhood teachers by 2026?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:24): I thank the member for his question. It is an important one because that very question speaks to the size of the challenge that we have before us. Yes, we did speak about workforce as being a principle challenge and both Ms Little and I were, I think, rather candid with each other, and I understand that during a subsequent conversation that the education minister had with Ms Little, following my meeting with her, this matter was discussed.

We were candid with each other about the size of the challenge. Ms Little was very keen to inquire of me what the government's plans are to resource the effort that is required to meet that challenge. I think my interview with her was as much a testing of how serious the government is to realise its ambition. Naturally, I was able to furnish Ms Little with the policies that we are enacting in order to be able to meet that challenge, not least of which is, for example, the establishment of technical colleges. One of the paths and the streams at those technical colleges, including at the first technical college at Findon, has early childhood education as part of it.

We discussed it. Ms Little has experience in expanding the scope of services in Victoria, which naturally includes those workforce challenges. Not dissimilar to AUKUS, this is something that occupies our minds. We do have the lowest unemployment rate in South Australia in our history. We have never had an unemployment rate as low as the one we have now. That is a blessing. That is a good thing, but it does bring with it its own challenges, particularly when you talk about the scope of the work that is coming the state's way.

We are committed to addressing it in as timely a way as we possibly can. The nature of the mixed model that the royal commission has recommended in no small part is because of the workforce challenge. That informed the royal commission's recommendations, as did the staggered nature of the rollout across the years ahead. While the challenge is real and moving towards us at pace, we believe that we are capable as a government of rising to the occasion to honour the recommendations of the royal commission, because the recommendations of the royal commission have been designed to be achievable, notwithstanding the tight labour market that we have at the moment.

EARLY CHILDHOOD DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): My question is to the Premier. Is the government considering workforce incentives to recruit teachers from interstate? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Royal Commission into Early Childhood Education and Care by Commissioner Gillard points out that there are currently 2,000 early childhood bachelor-qualified teachers in South Australia at the moment, but the model the Premier has been talking about requires 2,800. The government has committed to three-year-old preschool by 2026, but is 800 teachers short. The Victorian government, from which Ms Little has been recruited, has offered workforce incentives in the tens of thousands of dollars to bring teachers from other states to Victoria.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:28): I thank the member for Morialta for this important question. I guess the short answer to the question is, no, not at this stage, but we have said publicly, both myself and the Premier, that we will consider any options that we think we might need to meet the workforce challenges, which are very clearly set out by Julia Gillard in her report.

I made some comments myself, I think, at the first education ministers meeting that I attended in Canberra with the new federal Minister for Education, the Hon. Jason Clare. These were quite pointedly directed at Victoria at the time, to be honest, which was the solution to the national shift to three-year-old preschool but also the skill shortages and national crisis that we are currently dealing with in a whole range of professions.

I was with the federal skills minister, Brendan O'Connor, this week at the Tonsley Innovation Precinct, where he commented that the official list of professions in short supply in Australia had grown, I think, by more than 100 in his time as minister. It is obviously a really acute issue in a range of areas.

I said to the gathered group that the solution nationally is not having states going off and offering big cash incentives everywhere to attract staff from over the border. The solution is doing what we can as independent states and territories to actually grow the pie locally—which, of course, is good because we aren't cannibalising the workforce of other states which are trying to do the right thing, particularly in terms of three-year-old preschool here, but it also means local jobs for local people which, of course, everybody in this place agrees with.

Having said that, we have made an election commitment and we are determined to deliver upon it. We will look and take advice at what incentives, if any, we need to offer to meet those very clear workforce challenges set out by the Hon. Julia Gillard.

I might just touch upon the member for Morialta's reference to Victoria and the money it is throwing at getting staff. These are figures I am somewhat familiar with at the moment through the deliberations we have had on the enterprise bargaining agreement with the Australian Education Union. I think the figure, last time it was updated to me, on the number of teacher positions that were vacant in South Australia, at least last week, was 51. I think the figure for Victoria, last time I checked, was 2,583 and I believe New South Wales was north of that.

Yes, Victoria are doing some appealing things around free degrees and money for relocation, but they have about 2,500 vacant spots. I don't want to see this state get into that position and we need to do things to protect ourselves from that happening. One is the point that the Premier just made in the answer to the member for Morialta's earlier question around tech colleges. Tech colleges—the five that we are building in Mount Gambier, Port Augusta, The Heights, Findon and Tonsley Innovation Precinct—are there—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: How many early childhood spots?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: They don't like the tech colleges, sir. I think we have established that.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: But the great thing is, sir, every time they criticise them publicly I get a big jump in enrolments, so just go your hardest, please. You can just do the hard work for us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The member for Morphett is a gift, sir.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The member for Morphett is one of the best members of our team I think, actually—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hartley! Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: You're welcome here anytime because you do some fine work for us. Thank you very much. In essence, we will look at what needs to be done.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: If incentives are something that we think need to be done, we will look at that, but we are doing the hard yards here in our state with things like tech colleges and fee-free TAFE to actually grow the pie—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —to actually grow the pie, rather than focusing on trying to attract workforce numbers from interstate.

The SPEAKER: Minister, your time has expired.

ULURU STATEMENT FROM THE HEART

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier provide an update to the house on the delivery of the Treaty and Truth parts of his election commitment? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: Labor's Celebrating Aboriginal People election commitment states, and I quote, 'South Australian Labor has already committed to a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement of the Heart that includes Voice, Treaty and Truth.'

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:33): I thank the member for Heysen, the shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs, for his question. The state government has made very clear, consistent with much of the advice and representations we have received from Aboriginal people themselves, that in terms of the Uluru Statement from the Heart the first step in the equation is to establish the Voice, and that is exactly what we are doing here in South Australia, as we discussed yesterday. It is my hope, my sincere hope, that that is also what we see on the federal level.

The initial plan from the state government, having passed the legislation in March this year, despite its opposition from those who had once supported the Voice, was to have the elections for the representatives to the Voice in September, with the view of then having the Voice providing its representations to the parliament shortly after that.

Having received advice from a number of sources, the Commissioner for First Nations Voice in the state of South Australia, Mr Dale Agius, also upon receiving advice that I understand came from the Electoral Commission, the decision was made not to have a Voice election occurring for the State Voice at the same time as the referendum for the national Voice. Subsequently, the decision was made, of course, to defer the election until March next year and that is what will occur, regardless of the outcome of the federal referendum.

We will have our election for the Voice in March next year. That in and of itself is actually quite a substantial undertaking. Arranging elections in regional communities for state and federal elections always brings with it logistical challenges. This will be no different, particularly given that it is the first election of its type.

I am happy to foreshadow that we desperately want to see a yes vote for the national referendum—not just because we believe in the Voice, but a no vote I fear would serve as having a bad signal to members of regional and Indigenous communities that somehow the Voice has now been rejected, which might dilute the perception of the State Voice in terms of whether or not it still exists.

I say through this forum: it is important that Indigenous communities across the state know that the State Voice to Parliament has been established, the election will occur and this parliament will enjoy having representations from our First Nations people within it. That is something that we are very proud of, particularly on this side of the house, and will be delivering upon. Having delivered upon the State Voice during the course of next year following the election, then the government from there will turn its mind to the remainder of the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

REGIONAL ROAD VEGETATION CLEARANCE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:36): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister consider updating vegetation clearance measurements to take into account the current maintenance schedules and the growth of vegetation along our regional roads? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: I have been contacted by a truck driver in my electorate who is extremely concerned about trees that hang dangerously close to his vehicle. The constituent drives semitrailers and has explained that on numerous roads—including Old Kalangadoo Road to Penola, Penola Road to Naracoorte, and the road back to Naracoorte and Robe as well—the trees pose a safety risk. The constituent believes the current maintenance isn't enough and that road users are being put at risk by overhanging branches.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:37): That is an excellent question, and I know that the member would not be raising it unless there weren't legitimate concerns about that. I thank him for it, and I thank him for bringing it to the house for the parliament's attention, because it is an important issue.

The advice I have received is that the current vegetation clearance envelope that we have in the South-East is sufficient, but given the member's concerns I will ask the department to give me an update on whether or not we need to increase it. I think there is a backlog of road maintenance across our regional roads. It has been quite an issue for us, especially after the privatised contract in the previous parliament, which has put us at quite the disadvantage.

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: Outsourcing, you mean.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Outsourcing? Oh, it's different from privatisation, is it?

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: Ask the electorate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much, I appreciate my young friend giving us a definition he will accept of privatisation. To give the member opposite some context here, there are 23,000 kilometres of road that we are maintaining and a lot of vegetation clearance is necessary. There are specific issues in the South-East, and I will now investigate the roads that he has raised. I thank him for bringing it to my attention. I will get onto it as quickly as I possibly can. I do note some members want more vegetation clearance to make our roads safer for trucks; others do not.

FLINDERS RANGES SACRED SITES

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:39): My question is to the Deputy Premier in her capacity as Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Has the minister spoken with Beverly Patterson? With your leave, sir, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: In relation to recent reports about cultural genocide in the Flinders Ranges, the minister said today, and I quote:

> We still don't at this stage have clarity from the traditional owners about exactly what harm has been done and what else around there needs to be protected.

She also said:

> Whether there's been a significant amount of destruction or whether it is a relatively small area, I don't know.

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) (14:39): What I was concerned to do in answering questions both yesterday and on the radio this morning was not get in the way of the due process that was initiated at the end of August, I believe, by the department in asking the traditional owners about a cultural survey for that area.

So, while there has been significant commentary made and I accept all the commentary that has been made, there is nonetheless a process that is being undertaken at present that it needs to have time to be able to work its way through for an appropriate cultural assessment to be made.

Given that there has been some activity that has occurred with the contractor going into an area that had not been approved by the traditional owners—not at that point been surveyed by the traditional owners—I am uncertain, because we do not have advice from the traditional owners of the extent to which that has caused harm. We will find out. It is undoubted that it has caused harm because we have heard that feedback, but what I did not want to do on the radio was in some way get ahead of the process that is being undertaken by the traditional owners.

FLINDERS RANGES SACRED SITES

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:41): Supplementary: it might be an opportunity to more directly answer the question. In not wanting to get ahead of the process, has the minister spoken with Beverly Patterson? Indeed, is the minister aware of Beverly Patterson?

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) (14:41): I have not spoken to people in relation to this because, first of all, there is a process that has been initiated by the department prior to the action that was undertaken by the contractor that needs to be worked through and, also, although I want to talk to the traditional owners who have been affected and I have the phone numbers, I am concerned to be a little clearer about what our process will be for the review and the interaction with the traditional owners before I speak to them because they will be legitimate questions raised by them.

SA WATER PIPELINE

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Can the minister confirm if there are plans to extend the SA Water pipeline to Wellington East? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: Wellington East is located 11 kilometres from Tailem Bend. It has a permanent population of around 200 people that grows to 1,000 during the holidays. The town's water supply is not suitable for drinking, as it is pumped straight from the River Murray. SA Water guidelines say the water is only fit for watering gardens and flushing toilets; however, given it is the town's main supply, residents are using it for dishwashing, washing machines, handbasins and the like. This worsened during the River Murray floods, when contaminated water from upstream further polluted Wellington East supply. Some residents contacted my office saying this water was poised as a health risk.

The solution lies in SA Water connecting the pipe that currently runs along the Princes Highway to Meningie. This would also involve a kilometre of piping, a build that would make a world

of difference to those living in the town. Despite years of discussions and meetings involving the Coorong District Council, nothing has been done.

The SPEAKER: There are certainly a lot of facts there, but, since there is no point of order, I am going to turn to the Deputy Premier.

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) (14:43): I thought he sought leave for an explanation for that. Thank you to the member for raising the question. It is another example of his excellent representation of his community. As the member laid out, there is a challenge with a water supply that is a private scheme owned by the Coorong District Council. For some time, there has been a question about whether that might be acquired by SA Water and turned into a scheme that is capable of delivering drinking-quality water or indeed whether a pipe might be taken some kilometre, I believe.

That proposition was not in the regulatory proposal to ESCOSA under the previous government for the four years that are coming to an end mid next year, nor is it in the draft proposal for this next one, so at present that is not a proposition that SA Water is supportive of. However, there has been over time—and I appreciate how long it has taken and it has been very frustrating—interaction between SA Water and the council over that existing supply and whether it can be upgraded. It was interrupted by the floods. There was an assessment process that was delayed for some time. I recall writing a letter to the mayor on the subject during the flood period.

I am now pleased to say that that assessment has been undertaken and has been forwarded by SA Water to the council, and the council expressed an interest in working with SA Water. SA Water is unlikely or perhaps won't take over a private system that isn't at the standard SA Water would expect a system to be, and so there will be a discussion between the council and SA Water about how that improvement is to be achieved. Nonetheless, at present there is some progress on that possible solution, but regrettably at this point not on the one that's preferred by the member.

MOUNT GAMBIER PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can the minister inform the community of Mount Gambier when the bus contract will be announced and whether it includes any extra funding?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:45): I can inform the house that LinkSA is the new contractor for the Mount Gambier region and they commence services this Sunday. In relation to the funding envelope, obviously funding is indexed and we do all we can to try to provide as many services as we can to regional South Australians.

I know that the member is a staunch advocate and fierce advocate for more services in Mount Gambier. It is no surprise to anyone in this house that he has been in my ear and the previous government's ear about increasing services in Mount Gambier, especially public transport. There are a lot of legacy services in Mount Gambier that probably aren't fit for purpose today, and there needs to be a comprehensive look at how we deal with those. I look forward to working with the member about those.

The member has also raised with me a very important issue that is dear to his heart and many regional members, that is, why the Seniors Card exemption does not exist in regional South Australia, and that is a very good question. The reason there is not free public transport for seniors in regional South Australia is because there is a different contracting fare structure in regional areas.

The regional contracts are heavily subsidised. Regional operators also retain the fare revenue, as opposed to here in Adelaide. Therefore, if we mandated free public transport for seniors in the regions, this would impact on the total fare collection that they have already factored in and could make a lot of those services a lot more vulnerable and susceptible to not being commercially even affordable. That would put a huge burden on those regional communities and South Australia. We do a fair bit of subsidising.

That next step, I completely understand members calling concern. I can see our own regional MPs looking at me quite concerned about this as well. It is an issue and I accept that it is an issue. I know the advocacy of members on the crossbench over this has been quite fierce. I am going to ask the department to consider this perceived inequity between regional communities and metropolitan communities, have a look at it and do what we can and come back to the house with a more considered answer to the member's question. I thank him for his advocacy.

PUBLIC AND COMMUNITY HOUSING

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Has the build-to-rent site at Eastwood been delayed and, if so, why? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: It has been suggested to the opposition that successful bids, including the community housing provider, should have been announced by 30 June this year.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:48): The simple answer is yes and it's in order to make sure that we get the best deal for people of South Australia to provide the most in terms of the outcomes on that site. We did review the probity and the procurement when we came in, and the department is still working to secure the best outcome on that site for people.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:49): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Can the Deputy Premier update the house on the South Australian government's renewed response to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission report?

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) (14:49): Yes, we have issued a new response to the Murray-Darling royal commission, which might seem a little odd given that the commission reported in 2019. But it has come not only at the perfect time to have a more comprehensive and fulsome response to a very important royal commission for the future of South Australia but also at a time when we are on the cusp of making significant advances in delivering the plan.

We need to marshal all the advocacy we can to make sure that politicians in Canberra are listening because, as here, the upper house, the Senate, is not controlled by the government. So we are going to be looking for every Liberal, particularly Liberals from South Australia, and every crossbencher to consider the merits of what is being put forward to finally make the changes required to deliver the plan.

The Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission, many will recall, was initiated because of theft of water but rapidly was expanded to understand the nature of the plan and the extent to which it was or was not being delivered. The answer is it wasn't being delivered in anywhere near the levels required. The recent announcement of the need to extend time lines, which is part of what is before the parliament in Canberra, comes as no surprise to anyone who has been paying attention from before the commission, then the commission and, of course, numerous productivity reports as well as the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, which keeps having the red lights warning this thing is not being delivered.

The royal commission emphasises that law and science ought to be at the basis of our response. It shouldn't be politics, and it certainly shouldn't be interstate irrigators' views that every drop of water that goes over the South Australian border is somehow wasted. It should be based on the law, which says this plan must be delivered, and on science, which says it must be delivered because otherwise we won't have a sustainable Murray-Darling Basin.

The royal commission report goes into some detail on the various numbers that one may have heard of. I always run out of time when I talk about the Murray-Darling Basin, but it is a 3,200 gigalitre plan, with 605 gigalitres that has been set aside for various projects that will deliver

water-like activities, many of which are yet to be delivered by the other states and which have been extended if the law changes.

The reason that's important is because, if they are not delivered, all irrigators will lose allocation. South Australia at the moment has overdelivered its amount of water for that part of the plan and therefore is not at risk of having to lose much unless there is significant shortfall, in which case interstate inaction will fall on our irrigators as well. Crucially, the 450 gigalitres needs to be delivered. We have delivered something like 26 gigalitres being contracted in all the 10-odd years of this plan being in existence, when 450 is the target.

If ever you needed proof that continuing to do the same thing that is unsuccessful is the definition of stupidity, have a look at the people who are arguing that we shouldn't change our approach in how to deliver the 450 gigalitres. The royal commission has argued cogently and powerfully and based on law and based on science that buybacks as well as efficiency measures need to be part of how we deliver those 450 gigalitres. Anyone in South Australia who cares about the Murray needs to use that response as the evidence base to lobby everyone in Canberra to get that law changed or we will never have that plan delivered.

HIGHGATE PARK

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:53): My question is again to the Minister for Human Services. Has the Highgate Park site, or the former Julia Farr Centre, been sold and, if so, for what value? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: On 7 March, the minister announced that Highgate Park was being placed on the market for sale, with expressions of interest to close on Friday 5 May 2023.

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (14:53): Thanks for the question; it's really important. As the trustee, my responsibility is to ensure that whatever happens with the Highgate Park site provides the best possible outcome for people with disability. As did the previous government, we have continued to work with groups such as JFA Purple Orange to ensure that, moving forward, that's exactly what happens. As you have said, the site has been put on the market for sale. As this is a commercial process, I can't tell you any more at this particular point, but be assured that as soon as we have some news that we can share we will be sharing it.

WEST END BREWERY

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Will the government require federal funding to develop the West End Brewery site and, if so, how much?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (14:54): Well, the purchase of the West End Brewery site and the project that we are undertaking for renewal will be going to master planning next year, and the following year we will be beginning civil construction, and after that we will be trying to get people into houses, which is what this government's priority is.

We have not, at this point, had discussions with the commonwealth government about that site in particular. We have had discussions with them around a range of other sites and of course, if there are federal funding streams, either through NHFIC or through the happily legislated Housing Australia Future Fund, they would be most welcome. But the development of that particular site is not reliant on federal funding at the moment.

MOUNT LOFTY SUMMIT ROAD

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will the minister take any action to improve road safety at Mount Lofty Summit Road in Cleland and, if so, what action and when?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:55): The minister for road safety is not in the room, so what I will do is I will take that question on notice and refer it to him to have a look at. But if the member wants to come to me—and I am not sure if he has written to me about this or not, but I

will check—and if there are some specifics he would like to put to me about the issues with that road as a local member of parliament, I will check it out for him and get back to the house as quickly as I can or to the member directly.

ENERGY BILL RELIEF

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:55): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer update the house on the rollout of the energy rebates announced in the 2023-24 budget?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (14:56): I am very grateful to the member for Gibson for her question because I know that she will see many of her constituents, like many of the rest of us, see an enormous benefit to them as a result of the energy bill relief plan.

As we know, energy costs are a very significant component of the cost-of-living pressures currently faced by both households and businesses. Yesterday's monthly consumer price index released by the ABS showed electricity costs increased by 12.7 per cent through the year to August across the country. This highlights how important providing energy bill relief is at this time. That's why, of course, the state government's most recent budget, handed down in June, contained more than $127 million as our contribution towards a co-funded energy bill relief plan with the commonwealth.

That package provides $500 in electricity rebates to eligible households. It is anticipated that up to 420,000 households in South Australia are able to benefit from this relief. That is nearly 50 per cent, or one in two of every household in South Australia. This package massively extends the cohort of eligible households entitled for energy bill relief by up to 200,000 people, and that comes as a result of the inclusion of households that receive Family Tax Benefit A and B. This rollout of this additional cohort of family tax benefit recipient households has commenced.

These eligible households are able to register for their relief following a campaign by the commonwealth government agency Services Australia to highlight to those households the availability of the relief for them, and I encourage all eligible South Australians to ensure that they register for and receive this energy bill relief. This relief package will come off in quarterly bills, with the exception of those households that don't register in time to receive it on the first quarter's bill; that will be paid in a subsequent quarter's bill. That means that these households receiving both the state government energy concession and this additional rebate will save up to $763 of their energy bill in the 2023-24 financial year.

I am also pleased to announce today that the state government will be extending the cohort of small businesses in South Australia that will be eligible for the energy bill relief. There has been some consternation, including correspondence that I have received from Business SA, worried that businesses that receive energy bills as part of an embedded network would not be eligible for the energy bill relief plan. Today, I am announcing that the state government will be extending the energy bill relief plan to the thousands of South Australian businesses that are part of embedded networks. This will mean there will now be significantly more than the approximately 86,000 small businesses that were already slated to benefit by up to $650 of energy relief from the existing package, and that is welcome news.

I thank Andrew Kay, Business SA, and the other business representatives who have made representations on behalf of that part of the business community for making the case and causing the government to take this action. This is, without question, the most comprehensive cost-of-living relief package a government in South Australia has ever deployed, and it gives me great pleasure to announce not only an update of where we are up to but a further extension to this package.

ENERGY BILL RELIEF

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:00): Supplementary to the minister's answer: how many eligible households have registered to this point?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (15:00): I am happy to take that on notice. As I said in my answer, this is a process that to date has been coordinated by Services Australia, a commonwealth government agency, but I will see what information we have got and will bring it back to the member for the benefit of the house.

TAFE SA

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. How many fee-free TAFE places will go to non-government providers out of the 15,000 announced for South Australia earlier this week?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (15:00): I thank the member for Morialta for the question. It is very pleasing to get a question from the opposition about fee-free TAFE, I must say, because it is such an important policy and investment for this state. Already I have been on my feet in this place during this question time talking about workforce challenges, as has the Premier.

We know we have skills pressures and professions in demand in a whole variety of areas, not just here but right around the country as well. We were very quick to sign a one-year partnership with the new federal Labor government last year that delivered twelve and a half thousand fee-free places, and a number of those were for non-government providers as well.

I said from the outset it was important that, if we are to actually make a dent in the skills shortages we have here, we need to have all parts of our skills and training sector pulling together where we could, and I thought we were pretty generous in the way we did that with the first tranche of fee-free TAFE positions. I am happy to come back to the member for Morialta around what will be provided in this next tranche of fee-free TAFE positions, which is 15,000 across three years.

So many of the jobs and qualifications that have been provided on that list, that people can access fee free, are areas that are in incredibly high demand and sought-after by a full range of industries. An example I gave when I stood with the federal Minister for Skills and Training at the Tonsley Innovation Precinct this week, and at Urrbrae TAFE, was that in the case of a Diploma of Nursing, for instance—a two-year diploma which is on the fee-free list—the saving to a person who could access that fee-free course would be in excess of $11,000.

For someone accessing early childhood education and care, one of the critical qualifications we need to build the workforce to deliver our three-year-old preschool, the saving would be close to $5,000 over the life of that degree. These are really important investments—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: As the Premier has said, from day one, in the very first press conference I did with the Premier upon coming into government, at the TAFE CBD campus, where we went to announce that we were returning degrees in disability individual support, ageing—

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, there is a point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: the question was rather narrow. How many places were to be provided to non-government providers? The minister is nowhere near it; he is debating.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Minister, I bring you back to the question. It may be that you are coming to your conclusion.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Thank you, sir. As I said, I greatly appreciate the member for Morialta's interest in this topic—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The member for Unley, the architect of TAFE's demise, has chimed in. It is always fantastic to hear from him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: How does the saying go? There is no 'i' in team, but there are three in 'David Pisoni'.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: That is exactly right.

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, that is close to the line.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: As I said earlier in my answer, sir, I will come back to the member for Morialta—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will just sit down then, that's fine.

The SPEAKER: Has the minister concluded his answer?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: No, I haven't, sir.

The SPEAKER: Then you have the call. The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: If only they could find this passion at other times, sir, it would serve them very well. As I said at the start of my answer, I will come back to the member for Morialta with specifics around this tranche; I didn't say that I didn't know. But this is a government that has committed from day one—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: This government has committed from day one to rebuild TAFE after four years of cuts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Four years of cuts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Morialta is warned!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —by the member for Morialta and the member for Unley.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: That is exactly what it was.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Now they are trying to rewrite history. No-one is buying it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: You can keep shouting in your echo chamber, nobody cares.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister—

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: We are going to get on with rebuilding things, and you will be a little footnote on history.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Morialta! The minister has concluded his answer, and question time has also concluded.

Grievance Debate

DEFENCE STATE

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): South Australia has a great and robust reputation as the defence state. It is a state known internationally for its contribution to the defence world, not just in an Australian context but also in an international context. Our state makes a significant contribution to the defence effort of our nation. It has done for many decades, and hopefully it will for many, many decades—generations—to come.

Our state relies not only on the presence of the defence industries in South Australia in terms of the construction of frigates and submarines, and the maintenance of those machines as well, but also the presence of defence personnel in our state, largely based around Edinburgh in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. It is key to providing economic stimulus to our state and to ensuring that we play our role in our nation's equipping of defence capability in terms of our soldiers and the personnel who wrap around them. Also, those personnel often provide a civil pipeline of workers to our defence construction industries when they leave the armed forces.

There is suddenly a very significant risk to South Australia's defence personnel. The first decision to be handed down or to be made public from the federal government's Defence Strategic Review to affect South Australia is bad news for South Australia. We have discovered, via an announcement from the federal government, that Adelaide's 1,700-strong defence forces based out of Edinburgh will be reduced over the coming couple of years to only 800.

This is significant. Such a reduction will no doubt lead to a significant economic impact, particularly to the northern suburbs but further afield and also, worryingly, hinder that pipeline of capable defence personnel who might move to work on civil defence projects providing that skills pathway to working on AUKUS. The opposition is extremely concerned about the impact of this reduction of 800 staff in South Australia, and we want to make sure that the Labor state government is standing up for our defence industries in this state.

We have significant concerns that, because we have a federal Labor government and a state Labor government, the state government is not taking the fight up to their mates in Canberra. When I ask the Premier questions about defence in this place, I do so with a tone of bipartisanship. I give him the opportunity to talk about how we can work together and to put information on the public record as to how our defence industries in this state and our relationship with the military in this state are progressing.

We do not throw barbs. We have demonstrated a significant bipartisanship. That bipartisanship is largely around the end goal, whether it is to maximise the benefits from the AUKUS deal and the arrival of nuclear-powered submarine building in our state, whether it is around the construction of frigates or whether it is the life-of-type extension for the Collins class submarines—we continually extend the arm of bipartisanship.

We want to see South Australia do well here, but it does not mean that we will not challenge the government along the way on how they are going about this. We know that there is a massive lift required in terms of skills around making sure we can meet the demands and the needs of AUKUS, but also we need to continually hold the federal government to account to make sure that South Australia gets the most out of this deal.

Any walking away of our numbers of defence personnel and an almost unbelievable idea that they will return in the never-never at the end of the decade, worries us greatly, because it could see South Australia miss out on so many opportunities in the future. We are the defence state, but we must fight continually to retain that title.

RAWLINGS, MR A.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:10): I rise on behalf of a local constituent of mine who is dear to my heart, Shirley McPherson. Shirley is a nurse and an all-round wonderful human being. I got to know Shirley when we were part of a community campaign together, which began a few years ago to prevent a tower being built in front of her apartment block in the CBD. She and her husband, Ross, are kind, hardworking, community-minded people.

It was with great concern and anguish that Shirley contacted me on 11 August to let me know that her dad, Alfie Rawlings, who lived in Lahaina Maui, was missing. Catastrophic wildfires had ripped through the idyllic Hawaiian community of more than 12,000 people. Alfie lived in assisted living units. He was a wheelchair user and could not travel far from the units without assistance. Shirley began a social media campaign in search of information on her dad, spending hours making phone calls to Red Cross but hearing nothing.

As her dad was Scottish American, unfortunately the Australian US consulate could not assist. Through various contacts, we were able to eventually have the British consulate contact Shirley to establish communications regarding her dad, followed by the FBI, but just on Saturday, at 7am, the FBI called Shirley to officially confirm that her beautiful dad, Alfie, had died in the Lahaina fire. My deepest condolences to Shirley, Ross and her extended family as they grieve the loss of her beautiful dad.

Shirley wants to thank her friend Deb Mader; Colette Payne, who is an ER nurse at Maui Memorial Hospital; her dad's rock, Jen; special agent Mindy Krantz of the FBI, who always took Shirley's calls day and night; as well as Alyson Langdon from the British consulate and also Australian consulate staff.

As Australians, we know only too well the devastation and heartbreak caused by bushfires, and our hearts go out to the families of loved ones lost in the catastrophic Lahaina wildfires that have claimed the lives of almost 100 people, with many others still unaccounted for. I would like to end by saying a few words written by Shirley about her beloved dad, Alfie:

> Growing up in Scotland, my Dad was a black cab taxi driver and drove double decker buses. He moved to Boston 38 years ago and then La-hi-na Maui 31 years ago. He drove tourists about in a double decker bus in Maui until he had a heart attack and a triple bypass. He loved to chat and worked as a concierge for two restaurants. He also worked at a shop selling wood carvings in Front Street. He worked until he was 82 years old.
>
> Because of his thick Scottish accent, people were drawn to him. Everybody knew my Dad. He was well loved by lots of people in La-Hi-Na. He visited Australia twice and loved it. He lived and he died in Paradise. He always said this: 'I live in Paradise and I will die in Paradise.' Rest In Love. Vale Alfie Rawlings.

ADELAIDE BEACH MANAGEMENT REVIEW

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:13): I rise today to make a contribution in regard to the Adelaide Beach Management Review that is being undertaken specifically in regard to the beaches in the western suburbs of Adelaide. The review was announced in April 2022 and commenced in December 2022 and, as we have just learnt, despite being finished the public release of the recommendations to come from that review will not happen until 2024. So already we have learnt that the time frame for getting this done, which was originally committed to be 12 months, is going to be close to two years into the term of this government.

What we learnt from the review options that were presented nearly a week or so ago was that there are three potential options, ones that we already understood: to dredge, to build a recycling pipeline, or to continue tracking sand on our beaches, with a number of subvariants to that. This is information that we already knew. What we do not know, however, is what the time lines are for implementation in regard to any of those options. That has not been made clear in the document that was released last week.

What we also do not know are the answers to a number of key outstanding questions in regard to the dredging options. We do not know, certainly as far as I am aware, whether there has been an actual offshore sand source that has been identified. We know in previous years that Port Stanvac has been ruled out due to the lack of sand there. We know that Section Bank has been ruled out due to the Pacific oyster mortality syndrome that has been detected in the sand deposits there.

As I understand, there has been no additional sand testing or core sampling done of any offshore deposits. We do not understand or have any assurances on whether the EPA will provide approval due to turbidity or plumes, if dredging is to go ahead.

There are so many questions to still be answered in regard to the possible or potential dredging options. What we do know, though, without a shadow of a doubt, is whatever option the government goes with, we need assurity that there will be a mass fill component onto West Beach as part of this. We know that the language may have changed and the government is now calling it restorative nourishment, but that must happen.

You have to remember that the former government was halfway through delivering a mass fill onto West Beach. I note that through all the documents that have been provided out to the public at the moment, the picture of the West Beach Surf Club sitting there on the corner at the end of West Beach Road, with a dry high tide beach in front of it, was at the point where we were halfway through that mass fill before it was cancelled by this government and the review implemented. We were halfway along the track of getting this done, yet here we are.

As I have always said, I am agnostic in which direction we go. I want sand on our beaches and I want a long-term solution in place—of course, after the Labor Party tore up the contract and stopped the long-term solution that was already in place—and I want my community to participate in this process fully to ensure that we do get the right outcome. I encourage everybody to jump onto the YourSAy website at yoursay.sa.gov.au/abmr-shortlist for the Adelaide Beach Management Review and to complete that survey to the best of their abilities because it is important. The responses for that survey close on 15 October at 5pm.

The options need to be viable, they have to be legitimate and they have to be real. Given how few options have actually been put on the table, and the fact that we already knew and have considered these options previously, you would have thought at the very least that there would have been some new science here, that there would have been some high-level determination of whether any of these options are actually viable, to determine if a sand source was going to be available—yet here we are.

The longer this process takes, the more our beaches deteriorate, and this is quite clearly at the hands of this Labor government.

DEMENTIA AWARENESS

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (15:18): I appreciate this opportunity to shed light on one of the largest health and social challenges facing Australia and the world. Dementia is the second leading cause of death for Australians and the leading cause of death for women, and yet it is still poorly understood in Australia.

Dementia is not merely a condition that affects the memory; it is a complex spectrum of disorders that impacts thinking, behaviour and daily activities. It affects not only the individual but their loved ones. Understanding dementia and its effects is the first step towards a compassionate and supportive society. Imagine a world where individuals with dementia are met with understanding, empathy and respect, a world where their unique abilities and experiences are celebrated rather than overshadowed by their condition. By educating ourselves and others, we can contribute to making this vision a reality.

At the heart of dementia awareness is empathy. It is about putting ourselves in the shoes of those battling dementia and understanding their challenges, their fears and their frustrations. It is about recognising the person behind the condition, acknowledging their worth and cherishing those moments of clarity and connection. We can cultivate a more informed and inclusive society that does not stigmatise those affected by this condition. We can adapt our communities, our public spaces and our healthcare systems to better accommodate and support individuals living with dementia.

Earlier this year, as conveners of the Parliamentary Friends of Dementia, Ms Penny Pratt and I hosted a parliamentary roundtable discussion with representatives from Dementia Australia, members of parliament and members of our community who have been touched by dementia. The discussion was about how we can pave the way for a more dementia-inclusive society.

It was a great opportunity to hear experiences and perspectives of those directly impacted. I thank the team at Dementia Australia for all that they do. Their dedication to raising awareness, driving research and advocating for change is commendable. I know that our roundtable discussion was just the beginning of a relationship that will lead to actions that will make lasting impacts on the lives of those affected by dementia. As well as improving awareness, we have a responsibility to offer quality care.

Our government is committed to continuing to provide specialised dementia services at the Repat which continue to provide care to patients with complex dementia. As part of our government's joint $400 million investment at the Flinders Medical Centre in partnership with the federal government, we have been able to expand the Geriatric Evaluation and Management service across the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network, with the allocation of 26 new beds at the Repat anticipated to be complete and operational by mid-2024.

It is also excellent that last month a unique dementia care village was announced for the Repat. It is a place where residents will live in small household cottages and help with daily tasks, such as preparing meals in their own kitchen. The new 70-place dementia care village is being delivered by one of Australia's leading health and aged-care providers, HammondCare, in partnership with the federal and state government. This unique model of care creates a homelike environment for people with dementia, which is so important for their health and wellbeing.

The cottages will be built around a village green and they will include an onsite cafe, a children's playground, a hairdresser, a general store and an older persons exercise park. The design aims to maximise autonomy and minimise disability, as recommended by the recent Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety.

Our research community deserves recognition of their ongoing work to better understand, prevent and treat dementia. Health and medical research into neurodegenerative diseases will go a long way in working towards long-term treatments. I would also like to recognise the ongoing care and contributions of families, carers and support networks who are continuing to care for South Australians living with dementia. We know that the ongoing support of these support networks is essential in caring for and assisting South Australians living with dementia.

As many of us know too well, the impact of dementia extends far beyond those affected—the individuals themselves—touching the lives of caregivers, family members and loved ones. So let's commit to spreading awareness in our homes, our workplaces and our communities. Let's engage in conversations that promote understanding, share resources that empower caregivers and extend kindness to those navigating the challenging journey of dementia.

SCHUBERT ELECTORATE

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (15:23): I rise today to reflect on what I think is one of the best times of the year—that is, finals time for all the fantastic winter sport that we have right across South Australia, particularly in my region of the Barossa Valley and the northern Adelaide Hills. Just last weekend, we had the Barossa Light and Gawler grand final that was hosted at Lyndoch. It was a glorious day. The local footy and netball club teams, the Barossa Districts, did a really remarkable job in showing such warm hospitality on what was ultimately a pretty warm and glorious day in itself.

I will start by reflecting on some of the netball results, particularly in the senior 1s, because the Angaston senior 1s won their first grand final for the first time in 56 years and that was something that the Panthers were particularly proud of. In fact, we have made the grand final twice in 56 years and the last time that Angaston senior 1s played in a grand final was 16 years ago and I was actually a member of that team. It makes me reflect and think that I am somewhat old, but I was 16 years old at the time.

Unfortunately, we did not come away with the win, but I was just so honestly delighted to see this year's senior 1 team come away with the victory and to see so many of the life members who put in so much time and effort into the club. They were all so proud and rightly so. To Belinda Harris, who is president of the netball club, and to the committee and the players, I congratulate them.

The senior 1s were not the only team that was able to play in the grand final. They had four teams in and the senior 4s went back-to-back. It was wonderful to be able to watch them and also to

see so many of our juniors out and about celebrating. In the junior grades, I think that Tanunda, Angaston and Nuri were all represented, so that was really fantastic.

I will move onto the football. The Nuriootpa A-grade side gave it a red-hot crack, but unfortunately were unable to come away with the win. Well done to Josh Norton and the entire team. The entire town of Nuri did a remarkable job in setting the standard with decorating the businesses in the main street, so well done and I certainly wish them all the best for next season. We should not have too much sorrow for them because they did manage to win the B-grade. I would like to congratulate Aaron Modistach, who is a former schoolmate of mine from Nuriootpa High School, as he came away with Best on Ground, so that was wonderful to see.

In the women's football, the Barossa Districts under 13s and the Angaston under 16s made it to the big dance, which was really remarkable. They also gave it a red-hot crack. Unfortunately, they did not come away with the win, but the grit and determination they have shown right across the season has been fantastic. I was not able to make it on game day because I was in Perth celebrating my brother's last game of his 333 AFL games, but I sent them a bag of oranges each. Unfortunately, it was not enough juice to get them across the line, but it was a good day nevertheless.

In the Adelaide Hills, Gumeracha came away with back to back in the A-grade, so a massive shout-out to the Magpies and their president, Tony Hannaford. It was great to see them go back to back. The B-grade had their first win since the 1930s. I was delighted to be at Kersbrook Oval for that grand final. I presented the best on ground to Gumeracha player Woody. Well done to you, Woody, and well done to all the teams who were involved in that weekend.

The Birdwood under 16 boys came away with a win and also the Kersbrook under 14s, who beat Meadows by over 100 points, so that was a bit of a whitewash there. In the under 13 div 2 netball, Birdwood came away with a victory, so I congratulate everyone involved there.

In the rugby, the Barossa Rams came away with a double victory for their reserves in the third men's team, so congratulations to the president, Fraser Vivian. That was a fantastic year. It is their last season at Lyndoch before they move to their new HQ at Tanunda, so congratulations, boys, and good luck for next year.

There are a number of others, which I will be reflecting on at the next opportunity I have in my grieve, but to all the volunteers, players and coaches thank you so much for an awesome season. I am looking forward to winter sport coming back next year.

MOTLEY, MR G.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (15:28): When I was just a young girl, my friends and I would often be out riding our bikes around the neighbourhood. We were not particularly aware of who lived where and what they did, but there was one house we all knew about and who lived there and that was the Motleys.

Only three streets up from where I grew up, we would often ride past in the hope that we would see the legend Geof Motley or his son Peter out the front and be able to say hello. To us, a local legend, but to the game of football, a hero, Geof Motley sadly passed away on Tuesday after a short illness. He was aged 88. I would like to take this opportunity to pay my and our community's respects to a true gentleman of the game.

Geof Motley grew up in and played for Port Adelaide, debuting in 1953. He was the club's most decorated premiership player. He played 258 games, kicking 156 goals. He was involved in all nine SANFL premierships the club won between 1954 and 1965 during what can only be classed as a golden run and one our current AFL team can only dream of.

He also claimed four Best and Fairest awards, all in Port Adelaide's premiership years. He was never once reported for on-field behaviour, nor did he waste time arguing with the umpires. In 1964, he won the Magarey Medal. Geof also played 28 state games for South Australia. In 2001, he was honoured by being named as halfback flank in Port Adelaide's Greatest Team of All Time. Geof is a member of the Australian Football Hall of Fame, the South Australian Football Hall of Fame and the Port Adelaide Football Club Hall of Fame—more than just a local legend.

The great Fos Williams, who coached Motley in eight of the nine premiership victories, once described Motley as the most reliable footballer—

An honourable member: The Motley Crew.

Ms HUTCHESSON: The Motley Crew. Fos Williams said, 'He is the first player I think of when asked to name the player who provided confidence and loyalty at Port Adelaide.' South Australian Football Commission Chairman, Rob Kerin, yesterday paid tribute to the legend.

Geof will be well remembered by the South Australian football community as a fierce competitor, but one who was also incredibly fair and highly respected. There are few SANFL players who have surpassed the incredible successes of Geof Motley, and it is certainly a sad time to lose another great of our game. Jeff Pash paid tribute to Geof in *The Pash Papers,* saying:

> He is fearless and resolute, but the resolution is jolly and good-humoured—no kicking in ruck. The shape of his flying play for the ball and of his recovery is brave and pleasing; he flies with abandon and bounces up smiling from some impossible rolls and spills.
>
> Others certainly have more elegant techniques, and they, too, are admired in their place; but Motley is unique.

As mentioned, Geof Motley shares the SANFL record for the most premiership wins as a player. He shares this with Chris Gowans and James Gowans from Central District. He was Port Adelaide's captain-coach for the last flag, a position he held for three seasons before continuing as captain. He was awarded Port Adelaide life membership in 1962. Geof also coached the North Adelaide team from 1967 to 1969. Geof Motley was awarded the Medal of the Order of Australia on 26 January 1992 for his service to sport administration and Australian Rules football.

Closer to home, Geof was married to Gaynor, who was an elite sportswoman herself, playing basketball for Australia, and netball, and represented South Australia in softball until her death in 1999. Their son Peter played for rival SANFL club Sturt and Victorian Football League club Carlton and was also inducted into the SA Hall of Fame. Motley's second cousin was Port Adelaide's captain, Warren Tredrea.

Geof leaves behind his children Wanita, Peter and Brett and their families. I often see and chat to Wanita at the gym in Blackwood, and I would like to take this opportunity to pass on my condolences to her and the rest of the family. In an article titled 'Mots joins the greats' by Jason Phelan, he wrote:

> During his career, Motley was never dropped from the league…and [he] was never reported. During his time in league football, not being reported for foul play was a rare thing for a player as at the time having a certain amount of mongrel or thuggery was seen as a common thing.

A true legend in Glenalta, a true legend of the game, may he rest in peace.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:33): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 17 October 2023 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUCCESSION BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 5.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Perhaps I could get an indication whether there are indeed any questions or observations on clause 5.

Mr TEAGUE: I think I am waiting for an answer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: A question was asked earlier about the similarity or otherwise of the section that refers to the way in which people with interests in the will have access to being able to see the will. I will give a quick summary of the conditions in other states.

Western Australia has no provision for that; it is on application only. New South Wales is the model that was used as the basis for the advice from SALRI to us, except that it does not include the special provision for creditors to have to go through the court. They are automatically on the list as being entitled to see the will. The ACT is similar again but does not mention creditors. The Northern Territory, Queensland, Tasmania and Victoria, again are very similar in all other respects and include having creditors having access to see the will.

Therefore, the South Australian position, although consistent in most respects with most other states, has forged a path where creditors are acknowledged but there is a special role for the way in which creditors are able to have access to seeing the will.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): That did not appear to be an answer on clause 5, so I will be generous and allow you three questions on clause 5, if that is the case. Having just stepped into the chair, that is where we are up to, I assume.

Mr TEAGUE: As I think the Deputy Premier has indicated, you are in charge of the chamber, absolutely and completely, Acting Chair. I respect that very much, as I do and appreciate the answer of the Deputy Premier just now. I make the observation that we might hopefully have a chance fairly shortly to get to it relevantly when we are at part 6.

It is actually interesting in substance, it seems to me, to be comparing the bill with particularly New South Wales because part 6 is another good example of where we have seen a departure from what is happening there. It is therefore perhaps helpful to note that there is that departure here for creditors. Yes, there is an extension of access to the will, but with a requirement that there first be a reference to the court. As we will get to, we also have not gone down the path, for example, of an insolvency-style clawback about wills made within six months of a testator's death.

So in terms of that access to inspect the will and the broader notion that there are interested parties involved at and around the time, we have preserved the important principle that there is no access prior to death and that there is no clawback for any period where a will is made shortly prior. We have also kept a category of interested party that needs the court's approval to get access.

That is just by way of appreciation, I suppose, of the answer and good to have that comparative on the record. In terms of other jurisdictions, as I understand therefore, Western Australia are now particularly the outlier in terms of uniformity.

Clause passed.

Clauses 6 to 33 passed.

Clause 34.

Mr TEAGUE: In relation to clause 34, and just a running reference point, there might be a series of opportunities to note where there is amendment—there are very few of them—either by reference to a SALRI recommendation or by reference to what was previously a provision in one of the acts comprising this new bill or indeed as an amendment from the previous government's version, and there are very few of those.

At clause 34, I note—and with appreciation to the Attorney-General's office in this regard—the indication that the Law Society by its 2023 submission for the reason that there are no succession duties or death duties was the source of a recommendation that the clause could be amended by removing the words 'to a valuation made or accepted for the purposes of assessing succession duty or any other form of death duty' and replacing them with 'to be made for the purposes of the will'.

It might be an opportunity to appreciate another party that has made a material contribution to the bill. I just ask the minister whether or not there has been any other source of reference to be sure indeed that that is a sufficient rationale for removing that previous reference that was there of longstanding regarding a valuation made for the purpose of assessing succession duty, or rather death duty, and that we can be sure that there is no other work for that to do and that we find

clause 34 in the form that it is. That is, if a will refers expressly or by implication to a valuation to be made for the purposes of the will, that reference is to be construed as if it was a reference to a valuation made by a competent valuer.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, indeed. The Law Society did point out that there was reference to duties that no longer exist, and therefore we took that advice, having overlooked that previously.

Mr TEAGUE: It might be just underscoring this, but I suppose it is a statement of confidence—and a welcome one—that there is no prospect of such things re-emerging. That might be an optimistic note.

Perhaps I will just note that the Law Society was even more belts and braces than that. There was a further suggestion that I omitted, and I hope I will be forgiven for not referring to that more particularly. However, that was the substance of it, as I understood it.

Clause passed.

Clauses 35 to 38 passed.

Clause 39.

Mr TEAGUE: We are still within part 2, so we are talking about wills, and clause 39 concerns the validity of statutory wills made outside the state. Again, there is a contribution from the Law Society in its 2023 submission. Given the history of all this, it is interesting that we have these worthwhile submissions from the Law Society coming along in 2023 against the background of John Rau commencing a process in 2011 and then the bulk of the SALRI work being done over the years 2014 to 2017, and then a bill that was before the last parliament—all that sort of thing.

I do not know what the answer to that is. There might be a good answer as to why the Law Society has made these helpful and relevant suggestions just now in its 2023 submission, but there we are. Here is the second one of them.

Again, with thanks to the Attorney-General's office, the suggestion of the Law Society in that 2023 submission was that the words 'or domiciled' be added after the word 'resident' to allow for a situation where a statutory will has been made for a person in another jurisdiction where that person is domiciled but not currently resident, hence the recommendation to add those words 'or domiciled'. I am interested in any explanation of the government's consideration of that recommendation, and its satisfaction that that was appropriate to add at this late stage.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am not a lawyer, as I find myself saying frequently, and therefore I am not certain there is a common definition of the two words that require the repetition in the sense that, to my reading, it is not referring to having a status of residency such as might be conferred through a visa. Nonetheless, I am very pleased that we took advice from the Law Society that suggested adding 'domiciled', presumably in order to be sure that, if someone was not living somewhere in an ongoing sense but was there temporarily, that would be covered as well. Indeed, New South Wales is another jurisdiction that has chosen to use both words.

Clause passed.

Clauses 40 to 44 passed.

Clause 45.

Mr TEAGUE: Clause 45 concerns the will being deposited with the registrar, and provides that:

(1) A person may deposit a will with the Registrar.

(2) The deposit of a will under this section must be done in accordance with the rules.

My reference to the report recommendation being adopted is to the wills report at recommendation 3, but it is not a reference that I would have first got out. I will perhaps just ask the question: where are the recommendations relied upon for the purposes of adopting the clause in that form?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: My understanding is that it comes from the South Australian Law Reform Institute, Final Report 5, October 2016, 'State schemes for storing and locating wills', and that recommendation 3 recommends this form of capturing the language.

Mr TEAGUE: Thanks, that is an answer. I do not have any more questions until clause 48.

Clause passed.

Clauses 46 and 47 passed.

Clause 48.

Mr TEAGUE: Here is where I was jumping ahead earlier. We dealt with this really quite substantially in the course of dealing with clause 4 because that was really at the beginning of the relevant part about wills. This really very much substantially concerned clause 48 so far as SALRI and its reports on the topic were directed, and the entitlement to inspect. This might have been covered already in the answer that was given at the outset.

I note recommendation 3, which recommends extending access to those interested parties to include parties having a claim at law and equity against the estate of a deceased person to be able to expect the will be done by court order, including a creditor. That was informed by but departed from the situation in New South Wales where such interested persons would be entitled under that act to access.

I would just ask whether or not there was anything further that perhaps informed the government's consideration of that matter, knowing as we do that that recommendation, like the bulk of this, has been now well settled by that report going back six years. Has there been any consideration more recently, and is there anything that the minister would add to the answer that the minister gave at the beginning of this session?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The SALRI report and process for preparing the report did undertake, as the member will be very well aware, an extensive amount of consultation and making sure that workshops and so on were available to be able to discuss these matters. The advice through that was that, although New South Wales has otherwise got a pretty good system, including creditors as being able to, as a matter of right, see the will was too much and that there was a preference to have some form of process that they needed to go through. There has not been anything more recent. We are still operating from that report.

Clause passed.

Clause 49 passed.

Clause 50.

Mr TEAGUE: Perhaps at clause 50 I might just for the record ask the question, because I am not sure: is that an amendment of some sort since the 2021 bill, or is it just an explanation in terms of the adoption of the smaller states' reported recommendation 4, and how did that pan out? That is a fairly open question. I am just not sure about what the genesis of that is at clause 50.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We are glad you asked the question; this is interesting. The report recommendation indeed recommended that the Supreme Court retain jurisdiction for small deceased estates, but then it was discovered that the jurisdiction of the Supreme Court was defined differently in the Administration and Probate Act 1919 and the Supreme Court Act 1935, so there was some consultation with the report, and the decision was made to refer to the definition in the Supreme Court Act.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, that solves it.

Clause passed.

Clause 51.

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

Amendment No 1 [DeputyPremier–1]—

Page 24, lines 20 and 21 [clause 51(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

(3) A person is only eligible—

(a) for appointment as the Registrar or acting Registrar if the person is a legal practitioner of at least 5 years standing; or

(b) for appointment as a deputy if the person is a legal practitioner.

This amendment provides for the requirement that the registrar or acting registrar of probates must have been a legal practitioner for at least five years in order to be appointed, and for the appointment of a deputy registrar of probates the person must be a legal practitioner. This amendment has been made to ensure that the office of the registrar can continue to employ junior legal practitioners—that is, with less than five years post-admission experience—to process simple applications for probate, which requires them to be appointed as an associate deputy registrar.

I am advised that the Chief Justice wrote to the Attorney-General to raise that the current drafting of clause 51 in the bill might preclude the office of the registrar from continuing this practice in relation to appointing associate deputy registrars. The proposed amendment has been discussed with the registrar and I am advised that she has indicated her support of the change as drafted.

Mr TEAGUE: I appreciate the explanation just now and I appreciate the engagement, once again, of the Attorney-General's office. That is my understanding as well, that it is the current practice for the administration of probate to engage a junior practitioner, and so there is practical provision for the appointment of a deputy as a legal practitioner without the requirement for so many years standing. That amendment is supported and I note the explanation for it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 52 to 72 passed.

Clause 73.

Mr TEAGUE: I note again there has been a minor modification here, adopting as it does, in part anyway, the recommendation of SALRI's small estates report.

The note on the table indicates that this was adopted in this form, with modifications arising from consultation with the Public Trustee, the court and the Registrar of Probates. I would just be interested if the minister can outline what, if any, practical matters were raised by the Public Trustee and the court and the Registrar of Probates that informed the adoption of that recommendation and those modifications?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: To the best of my adviser's recollection, there are two main areas where this bill differs from the advice that was given by the Public Trustee. The first is in subclause (1), where there is a maximum monetary value of property. The Public Trustee suggested that that be indexed and that the indexation be placed in the legislation. As can be seen, the decision was made that there would be a methodology that would be adopted essentially by regulation or by notice in the *Gazette* in order to allow more flexibility to the government of the day in how to administer that.

The second area is in the way in which notice is given. SALRI's report largely stuck with the idea of being available online, whereas as you can see the bill also countenances giving notice in the *Gazette*.

Mr TEAGUE: I appreciate the answer. The *Gazette* gets a good run in terms of those modifications. I just indicate an appreciation for that answer, that there is therefore, as I understand it, capacity to make a more substantial change to the monetary amount in (1)(a) if that might be desirable and, so far as notice is concerned, that the *Gazette* has a role as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 74.

Mr TEAGUE: With part 4 dealing with the administration of deceased estates, it is an opportunity to note the fact that this is one part of the new bill that SALRI really addressed very substantially, particularly in relation to intestacy. I note in this regard report 7, July 2017. That is the

subject of 58 recommendations. There is a note at the outset of the report that the last systematic review at that stage was 43 years ago, so now getting on for 50 years ago, in 1974, that being the subject of the Law Reform Committee of South Australia's 'Relating to the reform of the law of intestacy and wills' report No. 28 of 1974, as if to emphasise that succession law should be reformed as needed to reflect change, social values and circumstances and modern expectations and needs.

I think SALRI was moved to footnote that observation and seek authority from the Victorian Law Reform Commission, but it might be said that that was otherwise plain. The review, particularly in relation to intestacy, was well and truly due even at the time that it was done. There was, therefore, a large body of work and a large number of recommendations that have found their way into the bill.

I recall the contribution of the member for Waite, for example, in the course of the second reading of the debate, exhorting people to consider taking steps to make a will and to ensure that they properly do that. The need to address that probably reflects the fact that there are many who will not have taken those steps. With SALRI's work in this regard considering the rules of intestacy, not only is there a long time between reviews but it speaks to a time where we have seen changes in practice. As in other areas of the bill, SALRI's work in this regard ought to be recognised and appreciated.

I think that probably amounts to a series of observations. I do not know that there is a question in there. In terms of dealing with the part, it might be possible to deal with the part more broadly in that course if the minister had anything to add about that helpful report No. 7 from July 2017. In terms of anything else that has come along more particularly that has been of assistance in terms of part 4, I invite the minister to take the opportunity now. There are a couple of references down the track—clause 83, for example—but we might be able to deal with it all in one go.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have a lot to add and there has not been anything since that report, as referenced by the member. I will note there are many recommendations in that report, but a high number of them recommend keeping the status quo. Although it looks like a lot of recommendations, it does not necessarily result in a lot of changes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 75 to 100 passed.

Clause 101.

Mr TEAGUE: I extend those remarks to part 5 as well. There is an interesting observation that might be made about the intestacy reported at recommendation 6 and the definition of personal chattels in the old act. As I understand it, for the purposes of all of part 5, recommendation 2 of that report is adopted, so there is no change to the property that is available for the distribution on intestacy. I think they are two separate observations about those defined terms at clause 101. The minister might just indicate whether there is any substantive change, the result of those two recommendations being adopted.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No, there is no substantive change.

Clause passed.

Mr TEAGUE: I have an indication about amendments moved by the Attorney in another place that go back to March.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): My advice is that no further amendments have been filed in this place. Those amendments were in the upper house, but no further amendments have been filed here. The bill we have here incorporates the amendments made in the upper house. The next one is at schedule 2.

Mr TEAGUE: The next one in terms of this place is the money amendment, which needed to be made here, so that is the one we are dealing with. I just note the recent amendments, commencing at clauses 105, 114, 115—and there are several at 115—that reference a spouse or former domestic partner and former spouse and former domestic partner. There is a further amendment at 115(6)(b) that, again, relatively newly now, is inserting a modified reference to a parent

who cared for or contributed to the maintenance of the deceased person immediately before the person's death, and the parent was maintained wholly or partly by the deceased person immediately before the deceased person's death.

Is it possible for the minister to indicate the reason for that? It might be convenient to do so for the amendments that we see more recently included at clauses 105, 114 and 115. Some of that is out of order, but it might be convenient to deal with that, coming up as it has en bloc earlier this year.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It is an omnibus. All of them, as I understand it, arose from the Law Society's 2023 submission—the magic submission. I will explain each of them. For clause 105, the provision was drafted so that the amount of the preferential legacy could be increased by notice in the *Gazette*. This approach was taken to allow for the maximum flexibility to ensure the amount keeps pace with inflation. However, the Law Society, in their submission, indicated that prescribing the amount by regulation would allow for greater scrutiny. The government has accepted this feedback and so this amendment makes that change.

For clause 114, this amendment also arises as a result of the submission from the Law Society and acts to preserve the stepchild relationship after the dissolution of a marriage between the person's parent and step-parent for the purposes of making a claim for family provision. This is also the position taken in several other Australian jurisdictions.

For the amendment of clause 115, this amendment arises from the Law Society's submission and is intended to avoid any doubt that the reference in the section is intended to be read as 'former spouse' or 'former domestic partner'. I believe there are a few others that I think are consequential on that explanation.

Another one in clause 115 is the amendment arising from the Law Society submission that requires that a grandchild of a deceased person is eligible to make a claim for family provision where the parent who was the child of the deceased person has died rather than requiring both the grandchild's parents to be deceased.

A further alteration to clause 115, arising again from the Law Society: the Law Society indicated that they had concerns that parents who relied on their most likely adult child to support them financially may be left without a way to make a claim for family provision if they had not been providing care to that child before the death of the child.

This amendment does not restore parent as a category of automatic claimant, as exists currently. However, it does account for situations where the parents were being maintained by the child as a criterion to be eligible to make a claim for family provision. This will allow parents who have true need to make a claim for family provision to do so.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): In an effort to bring us back to the standing orders, unless you have any questions on any of the clauses before clause 116, I might put the clauses, or would you like to go back to a clause?

Mr TEAGUE: No, clause 116 is where it is at.

Clauses 102 to 115 passed.

Clause 116.

Mr TEAGUE: I recognise that we have moved into part 6—Family provision. Again, I will take the chance to recognise report 9 in particular from December 2017 from SALRI. This has been addressed, including by me in the course of the second reading debate most recently, and I will also address the fact that there has been this adherence to New South Wales as a model in all sorts of ways but not entirely. I draw particular attention to subclause (2) and that important point:

> (2) In determining whether to make a family provision order—
>
> (a) the wishes of the deceased person is the primary consideration of the Court;

SALRI, in conducting its work in this regard, was really quite thorough, not only with the report but also in considering other mechanisms around the notion of interfering with the face of the will. SALRI

gave some fairly thoroughgoing consideration to the concept of the notional estate and consideration of clawback provisions of the kind that I have talked about before.

Ultimately, SALRI landed with a view that such a mechanism ought not be adopted, really in the interests of that principle in clause 116(2)(a) that the wishes of the deceased person are the primary consideration. So, unlike in other jurisdictions, notably New South Wales, where there is this application of the notional estate and clawback provisions, it is not something that has been adopted in South Australia and it is one important aspect in which there is a distinctly different approach that has been adopted. I am really just emphasising that point. If the minister has anything to add about SALRI's contribution to coming in to land at that point, or the government's consideration about questions of the notional estate, I would certainly invite such observations.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The SALRI recommendations relating to this provision are drawn on the Victorian legislation in this instance, rather than New South Wales, both in having a list of factors to which a court must have regard and also a recommendation that the overriding consideration be the wishes of the deceased person as being the primary consideration. That is the way it has been interpreted into the piece of legislation before us.

Clause passed.

Clauses 117 to 139 passed.

Clause 140.

Mr TEAGUE: I just indicate that my understanding is that the clause has been produced as a result of the work of the Hon. Connie Bonaros in another place. I note and commend that, although with some trepidation, indicating that there is now to be a review as a result of subsection (1) after the act has been in operation for a period of five years. Here we are, a dozen years after the initiation of the last review.

I am just observing that that is some relevant context. I have heard reference to consideration of intestacy going back 50 years between drinks. So here we are: we will be back at it, or at least the minister will be back at it, within five years. I do not know if the minister has anything to add to that, otherwise I just make the observation.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Yes, I take the larger point that we are accelerating the speed of consideration, but the reason for five years rather than less than that—which a lot of reviews, particularly in the first iteration, ask for—is to wait to see if there is litigation in order to be able to see how the legislation has been tested.

Clause passed.

Schedule 1 passed.

Schedule 2.

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

Amendment No 2 [DeputyPremier–1]—

Page 70, after line 20—After Part 4 insert:

Part 4A—Amendment of *Stamp Duties Act 1923*

8A—Amendment of section 71CB—Exemption from duty in respect of certain transfers between spouses etc or former spouses etc

(1) Section 71CB—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) An instrument executed after the commencement of this subsection is exempt from stamp duty if the sole effect of the instrument is to transfer to the spouse or domestic partner of a deceased person an interest in a dwelling acquired by the spouse or domestic partner from the deceased's estate in consequence of an election made by the spouse or domestic partner under section 102 of the *Succession Act 2022*.

(2) Section 71CB(4)—after 'instrument' first occurring insert 'described in subsection (2)'

(3) Section 71CB(6)—delete 'This' and substitute 'Subject to subsection (2a), this'

8B—Amendment of Schedule 2—Stamp duties and exemptions

Schedule 2, Part 2, clause 16—after item 27 insert:

27A An agreement for the distribution of an intestate estate, or part of an intestate estate, approved by the Supreme Court under section 111 of the *Succession Act 2022*.

This amendment provides for two amendments to the Stamp Duties Act 1923 which will implement two recommendations from the report of the South Australian Law Reform Institute into the laws of intestacy. The amendments are being introduced here rather than in the other place because the nature of the amendments is such that they constitute money clauses, and therefore the typical practice is for such clauses to be introduced into the House of Assembly.

The two recommendations from the SALRI intestacy report that are being implemented in these amendments are recommendation 48 and recommendation 56. Recommendation 48 is:

The Stamp Duties Act should be amended to exempt from ad valorem stamp duty a transfer to the surviving spouse of the intestate's interest in the home in which the spouse was ordinarily resident at the time of the intestate's death pursuant to the exercise of the spouse's statutory right under the Administration and Probate Act 1919 to elect to acquire that interest.

Recommendation 48 seeks to rectify unequal treatment of surviving spouses in relation to stamp duty. When a surviving spouse inherits their spouse's share (where they are tenants-in-common) of a property under a will, they do not have to pay stamp duty. However, when a surviving spouse of a person who died intestate elects to purchase the deceased's share of the dwelling they are required to pay ad valorem stamp duty. Therefore, the surviving spouse is disadvantaged through no fault of their own because their spouse did not have a valid will in place.

The change described in recommendation 48, exempting surviving spouses electing to purchase the deceased's share of the family home, will ensure that they are treated equally in terms of stamp duty whether or not their spouse had a valid will in place. Recommendation 56 was:

The Stamp Duties Act should be amended to include an exemption from stamp duty for redistribution agreements.

Recommendation 56 relates to redistribution agreements. A process for formal redistribution agreements in intestate estates to be approved by the court has been introduced in clause 111 of the bill in response to another SALRI recommendation. This will allow an administrator and beneficiaries to agree to the distribution of an intestate estate and apply to the court for the agreement to be approved. It will then have the status of a court order.

SALRI made this related recommendation that property transfers in accordance with a redistribution agreement be exempted from stamp duty. There are already exemptions for property transfers pursuant to different types of court orders contemplated in the Stamp Duties Act. For example, property transfers pursuant to orders by the Family Court for a binding financial agreement are exempted from the payment of stamp duty. Therefore, this amendment will mean that the treatment of redistribution agreements in terms of liability for stamp duty will be consistent with other court-ordered property distribution.

Amendment carried; schedule as amended passed.

Remaining schedules (3 and 4) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

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) (16:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

PASTORAL LAND MANAGEMENT AND CONSERVATION (USE OF PASTORAL LAND) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 September 2023.)

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:37): I rise to continue my remarks. This bill confirms the Pastoral Board's ability to approve a range of uses of pastoral leases, including for conservation and carbon farming, which have been in place on the ground for over 30 years. We want to make sure this can continue, as we are about enhancing practices and improving flexibility for our farmers.

This bill will enable the ongoing efforts by lessees, Aboriginal people and regional communities to manage pastoral lands in a variety of ways. These changes confirm that significant environmental benefit offsets and heritage agreements under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 can be implemented on pastoral leases. These tools provide leaseholders with opportunities to receive funding for conservation activities on their lease.

Clause 3 of this bill introduces a definition for carbon farming, that is, land management activities that avoid or reduce carbon in the atmosphere or sequester carbon in the landscape as defined in the regulations. This bill also formally recognises previous Pastoral Board decisions, approving the use of some or all of the pastoral lease for non-pastoral uses. The Pastoral Board's powers in relation to the management of pastoral lands will not change. Current leases will not change. All leaseholders will still need to actively manage their leases and remain subject to Pastoral Act obligations.

Clause 3 also introduces a definition for conservation purposes, which is conservation of biodiversity, ecosystems or native vegetation, including by way of heritage agreements or environmental benefits under the Native Vegetation Act 1991 or other ancillary conservation uses. These definitions achieve our mission to ensure that current practice can continue and be enhanced by this bill. Pastoralists and conservationists have worked together side by side across the rangelands for more than 30 years, and this bill confirms they will be able to continue this.

Twenty-one pastoral leases are already wholly used for conservation with the approval of the Pastoral Board, and five leases are being used for carbon farming. This work is critical, as the Ecological Society of Australia informs us that since European colonisation 100 Australian species have been listed as extinct and further that nearly 1,800 species are listed as threatened with extinction. This is in addition to the biodiversity and ecosystems that have been changed or lost as a result of climate change.

The bill also amends the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 to insert the requirement that:

> (3) The Minister must consult with the following bodies on any regulations proposed to be made for the purposes of the definition of carbon farming in subsection (1) before those regulations are made:
>
> (a) the Board;
>
> (b) the Conservation Council of South Australia Inc.;
>
> (c) First Nations of South Australia Aboriginal Corporation;
>
> (d) Primary Producers SA Incorporated;
>
> (e) Livestock SA Incorporated.

This consultation is important, and it is crucial that it is undertaken with these groups to ensure that the perspectives of everyone who cares about land are being considered, starting with our First Nations people, who walked the land long before any agriculture was undertaken; the Pastoral Board with their diverse expertise; Primary Producers SA and Livestock SA, representing those who work the land; and the Conservation Council, representing those who protect, restore and conserve the land.

Clause 4 of the bill amends the act to allow pastoral land to be used for conservation purposes and to allow pastoral land that is being used for pastoral or conservation purposes to also be used for other appropriate purposes, such as carbon farming. This clause, along with clause 6, provides farmers with the flexibility to use their land for pastoral, conservation or other purposes. This protects families who may have farmed the land for generations.

These changes will not impact on native title rights or agreements. The government recognises the importance of Aboriginal peoples' spiritual, social, cultural and economic connections to country. I thank everyone who has participated in consultations regarding this bill. Further discussions occurred with pastoralists coordinated by Livestock SA and several conservation organisations coordinated by the Nature Conservation Society of SA.

I would like to conclude my remarks by stating that the main point of this legislation formalises what has been occurring in South Australia for over 30 years. We can trust our pastoralists and conservationists to continue doing great work as they both care deeply about their work and our state. I commend the bill to the house.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (16:42): I rise as the opposition's shadow environment minister to be the opposition's lead speaker on this bill, although despite being the lead speaker my contributions will still be quite brief overall. I am pleased to make a contribution on behalf of the opposition to this bill, which will amend the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act, which was brought into force in 1989.

The scope of this amendment is very discrete and will allow the holder of a pastoral lease to use the land for purposes other than pastoral purposes. The amendment will allow pastoral land to be used for conservation purposes and other appropriate purposes, which specifically aims to make sure that our pastoral leases across regional outback South Australia can include carbon farming.

During my time as South Australia's environment minister, it became apparent that there was some ambiguity around the operation of this act and it could have meant—I say could because we are not 100 per cent sure; it had not been tested in the courts and I am glad that was not the case—that existing conservation purposes which are underway, and have been for some decades in the case of some pastoral leases, could have been operating illegally. It is unlikely that they would have been punished for doing so, and it is unlikely that anyone would have ever pursued this to the courts but, equally, clearing up this ambiguity is a good thing.

The previous government had a reform imperative around the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act. I think it is fair to say that, certainly from my perspective—and I think it is important to reflect on this—that was not managed or engaged in with both the conservation community and the pastoral community in a way that might have led to meaningful and appropriate reform.

I am pleased that the government is moving ahead with this, but moving ahead with the reform of this bill in a tight way and in a way that cleans up the act, modernises it with the addition of just a handful of words and ensures that conservation activities happening on our pastoral lands—our rangelands, as they are often referred to—can occur legally under this legislation. It is important that it happens for a couple of reasons; firstly, as I mentioned a moment ago, for the fact that this is something that occurs anyway.

Of the 323 pastoral leases across South Australia, 21 of them are already used wholly for conservation purposes. These are large properties. They are by and large remote properties. They create the opportunity for very significant landscape-scale conservation projects to be undertaken, and those projects are underway. As I mentioned, they have been underway for several decades in the case of some of the better known properties. We want to make sure that is encouraged where appropriate, we want to make sure that it happens under this legislation in a lawful way and we want to celebrate the success of these conservation projects to date.

Some of these pastoral leases are exceptionally well known. They are almost household names, as far as pastoral properties can be household names across the state—Arkaroola, for instance. I know the Deputy Premier was in Arkaroola recently and one of the places that—

The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I actually heard about that, too, Deputy Premier. For the benefit of *Hansard,* the Deputy Premier referred to her flat tyres.

Arkaroola is a place that is almost life changing when you go there because it is so different from probably anywhere else in the world and, to have that in our far-flung backyard in South Australia, is phenomenal. It is hard to get to, it takes a while, but it is very much worth visiting. It is a place of significant geological interest and also of conservation importance. I remember being there in 2017 and seeing the yellow-footed rock wallabies bouncing around that landscape. You would not go so far as to say they were common, but they have a healthy population in that landscape, a population that has been restored through sustained effort to remove feral species from that pastoral lease.

Other projects in the conservation realm that sit across our pastoral leases include the Arid Recovery project, which is a big environmental benefit project initiated by BHP just out of Roxby Downs. Kalamurina, adjacent to the Munga-Thirri-Simpson Desert National Park, is the largest national park in Australia and its landscape-scale benefit is expanded outside the park boundaries by the privately owned Kalamurina pastoral lease, a conservation project led by the Australian Wildlife Conservancy. The Australian Wildlife Conservancy, like many conservation organisations in this nation, is a brilliant organisation leveraging private money from right across the world to do really significant conservation work up there in the north-eastern corner of the state of South Australia.

Witchelina and Hiltaba are both well-known pastoral leases operated by the Nature Foundation. They are often held out as the real jewels in the crown when it comes to conservation activity happening over the long term because, to be successful, all these projects must happen over the long term. It cannot be something that happens for a moment in time and then you withdraw the effort, because the feral species and the degradation of that landscape will quickly take over again.

The work of the Nature Foundation at Witchelina and Hiltaba needs to be recognised, celebrated and, quite frankly, needs to be replicated as well. It has largely taken place through private philanthropy over an extended period of time, making a real difference to the environmental sustainability of the rangelands. We have to recognise and celebrate the volunteers who have been part of these sorts of projects over an extended period of time.

It is one thing to get the private donations and the philanthropy; it is another thing altogether to put it into action on the ground in an intensely remote part of the state, a part of the state where it is actually almost impossible to work for several months of the year because of the heat. Those initiatives, those volunteers, we really do need to recognise them. Because they are so far away and because they are fairly hard to access, the excitement and the success of what ought to be celebrated can be that little bit harder because not a lot of people in the scheme of things have been able to celebrate and visit those places firsthand.

This act will not only clear up the ambiguity around the conservation side of things but also ensure that carbon farming can happen across the rangelands landscape. We know that significant market-driven opportunities around carbon farming are available now. We want our rangelands and our pastoral lessees, whether they be for conservation purposes or for more traditional pastoral purposes, to be thinking about the opportunities to undertake carbon farming. We do really want to make that as easy as possible. Investment requires certainty. When you have ambiguity sitting in the legislation, it is going to inevitably deter investment and inevitably deter the significant long-term planning and commitment to carbon farming projects that are necessary to get them across the line.

From a conservation point of view, from a carbon farming point of view—which is linked to conservation—other activities could also fall under the appropriate purposes clause here as well. The most significant one that springs to mind in my thinking is tourism. We see tourism across that landscape. Tourism is a significant part of what happens at Arkaroola and also in Witchelina, Hiltaba and Kalamurina from perhaps a less significant point of view, but it is still an important part of the offering of those sites and those lessees.

I think the approach of the government here is to just tidy up this legislation in a way that is fairly light touch, that does not go too close to the quite significant. It can be a difficult space here, the pastoral rangelands policy settings, because getting the balance between pastoral activity and

conservation can be difficult. There are loud voices, influential voices—and it is appropriate for them to be so—on both sides of the debate there. That is really not what this bill is about today.

My party may propose some amendments in the upper house, but for today as the state's shadow environment minister I want to strongly suggest that the party that I lead is supportive of this legislation. I think it is a sensible approach and worthy of support. I commend this legislation to the house and again thank our volunteers and conservation pioneers who are looking after that far-flung part of our state.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:54): I also rise to add my support to the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation (Use of Pastoral Land) Amendment Bill 2023. Given it covers a vast area of our state, it is good to see this bill has bipartisan support. It will be interesting to see what the amendments are in the upper house, but I am sure they will be in the spirit of doing the right thing by our pastoral lands.

There are a number of members here who have very extensive pastoral lands within their electorate, the seat of Giles being one of them and the seat of Stuart. The seat of Flinders would have some and I believe the seat of Chaffey would have some unincorporated pastoral land as well because we are talking about a vast area of the state—400,000 square kilometres. You can compare that to a place like Germany. The whole of Germany, including some of its coastal areas, is only around about 357,000 square kilometres, so our pastoral lands alone are larger in land mass than the nation of Germany.

I always like pointing out that the electorate of Giles is the largest of the state electorates, with close to 500,000 square kilometres, and I also like to then compare it with the seat of Unley. The seat of Unley is the smallest seat, when it comes to land mass. I think it is something like just over 14 square kilometres. It is interesting making that comparison between one and the other. Of course, it is all, at the end of the day, governed by the number of voters.

Whyalla itself is built on land that was at one stage part of a pastoral station and indeed the Mount Laura Homestead, which is next to the Westland Shopping Centre, used to be the home of the Nicolsons. It is probably worthwhile acknowledging the Nicolsons, who are no longer on the land adjacent to Whyalla because of the massive defence department extension.

In a lot of ways, the Nicolsons epitomised the sort of approach by a lot of pastoralists when it comes to that combination of running a business and also looking after the land. They certainly looked after the land around Whyalla in an exemplary fashion. Indeed, on part of their holding, they had the Middleback research station of the University of Adelaide. I am not sure if Flinders Uni was involved as well where a lot of semi-arid land research was done.

Unfortunately, a lot of that has now gone because of the defence department expansion, but we see throughout the state pastoralists taking on board a stronger conservation effort and some of them have for many years. Not all of them have, but certainly most of them, so that is a real plus.

Of course, this bill before us is relatively simple. It is straightforward. It is, in a sense, providing some clarification and legislative and regulatory certainty around what can be done on pastoral properties. Carbon farming has been taking place on a handful of leases already on pastoral lands, as has activity around conservation. I think the Leader of the Opposition indicated that there were 21 leases currently dedicated to conservation. In that vast area, we have 219 stations and 323 leases and many of these leases cover vast areas, as has already been indicated.

When it comes to Australia's record on conservation, it has not been a particularly proud record when you look at the number of mammalian species that have been lost since European settlement. We have lost 34 mammal species and we are still losing on a regular basis each decade between one and two species, so it is important that we act to ensure threatened species are conserved. The pastoral lands do play an important role when it comes to that.

Last Friday, I was in Roxby Downs. We went to Lake Mary, which is full of water at the moment, and that was to launch the Kokatha Ranger Program. That is an exciting initiative, funded by the state government. I think it is great the Aboriginal Ranger Program has support and it would be great to see even more support because of the on-the-ground really practical work that is being done, but in some places being done in partnership with a very strong scientific approach.

Not only was it the launch of the Kokatha Ranger Program but it was also a time to celebrate the partnership with Arid Recovery, which is just outside Olympic Dam. Arid Recovery is just over 12,000 hectares, completely protected by vermin-proof fencing. That particular initiative is doing great work. Some of the stats around it are quite amazing, with around 250 species, both botanic and animal, within the enclosure.

Out of the work that has been done at Arid Recovery, 107 peer-reviewed scientific papers have been developed. There is a lot of fencing, 80 kilometres of fencing, and there are 76 collaborative research organisations involved with Arid Recovery. There are seven threatened animal species within the site itself. There are some specialised enclosures within the site and some of those specialised enclosures are about getting native animals used to, to a degree, predators, such as cats, which in the semi-arid and arid areas are incredibly efficient killers.

These little bastards knock off millions on a continental scale and are one of the drivers of extinction, along with a number of other feral animals, but if you are going to pick out one you have to pick out the cats because they are incredibly well adapted to the dry areas of the continent. What they are attempting to do at Arid Recovery is expose native animals to cats, at least in low numbers, to see if they can change their behavioural repertoire.

This is important because Arid Recovery are entering into a partnership with Kokatha Pastoral. There are a number of stations around Roxby Downs: there is Roxby Downs Station, there is Andamooka and there is Purple Downs. Kokatha manage those three pastoral leases, if you like, on behalf of BHP. So a partnership is being entered into between the Kokatha and Arid Recovery to start releasing some of these threatened species on to the stations. This is where the Kokatha Ranger Program starts to play an incredibly important role.

These stations are partly commercial. There are some cattle run on some of these leases and there is some outside expertise that is providing assistance. There is also conservation effort, there are conservation corridors between these leases and there are also sites that are very significant to the Kokatha people, the recognised traditional owners in that area. I probably should add that, given there is sometimes a bit of conflict about who has got what, but the Kokatha are doing some good work and that work is now going to continue with Arid Recovery.

This bill, in a sense, is supportive of those approaches. One of the elements in the bill, and I am not sure if it has been mentioned, is that there is that capacity to adapt when it comes to carbon farming. Sometimes this is a bit of a vexed area about the decent accreditation of carbon farming initiatives and carbon offsets. There has been in this country a significant amount of controversy. Indeed, the United Nations actively promotes the need to urgently respond to climate change, and quite rightly, but it appears that the United Nations itself, when it comes to some of the carbon offset programs for their own carbon use, has been caught out getting what could be called junk carbon offsets.

So there is a real issue, in both this nation and globally, in ensuring that what is done is properly accredited and is monitored in a decent way so that there is compliance, so when people do enter into offset arrangements, it is a genuine offset that is going to make a genuine difference and not something that is just ticking a box and often making middle people a significant amount of money. That is something that has to be watched.

People have mentioned in the pastoral area that for a lot of stations tourism has become very important. There are station stays, and there have been in this state for many years. I think it might have been the Fels up near Flinders Ranges who were one of the first of the families, because they went through a really hard period, to combine a pastoral property with a tourism outlet as well. All these years later, tourism provides an important contribution to their business.

They get onto me on a regular basis when it comes to the state of the roads up there. I should one day talk about the state of the roads. We really do need to review the maintenance that goes on in the unincorporated areas. I am going to be formally bringing it up at some stage, because there is a real issue. Like a lot of things, it is about drawing on the local knowledge that exists. When you get told about the way some of the maintenance is done and some of the gear that is brought in from elsewhere, it just does not make much economic sense. So I think there needs to be a bit of a look at that.

Going back to when Ian Hunter was the conservation minister, there was a tweaking of the act at that stage as well (I think it was this act) to enable pastoral properties to potentially benefit from renewable energy projects. When I drive up to Roxby Downs, there are dune areas and then you have these vast gibber areas with major transmission lines going up to Roxby Downs. There is the capacity to do some very significant development in areas like that—it would be solar up there, not wind—where some of the infrastructure is in place. It will probably have to be enhanced, and there will have to be discussions with BHP. I think there is some real potential there.

We have been debating the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill this week. I think most of us appreciate the scale of some of the things that are being proposed. I always look at these things because Whyalla is a bit of an epicentre when it comes to a lot of this stuff. In one sense, I am an enthusiastic supporter, but in another sense I have been around for a long time and I do not count my chickens before they hatch.

I know that we are involved in a very intense global competition. We will never be able to match, nor should we, what has been put on the table in the United States and European Community when it comes to subsidies. We just have to be smart and we have to play to the strong comparative advantages that we have when it comes to both land and our natural resources in the form of wind and solar.

If some of these projects do go ahead, these major hydrogen-based projects, pastoralists will benefit and they will benefit significantly. We should ensure that they do benefit. They will get a decent income stream that will secure them through the climatic changes, through the changes year to year, that will help secure their businesses for the long term, and there might also be other advantages in terms of the infrastructure that goes in and a whole raft of other factors.

One of the organisations that is heavily involved with the whole of the unincorporated areas is the Outback Communities Authority. I hate using a fossil fuel term, but they are expected to cover those areas on the smell of an oily rag. I am hoping that one of the things that some of these major projects in the outback will deliver is more funding for outback communities.

These are communities that are often expected to get by on a voluntary basis, with a small number of volunteer hours that have to go into some of these small communities. They are unincorporated, out in the pastoral country. You see people get burnt out in some of these communities because of what it is they have to do. It is stuff that people in larger communities in the city take for granted and gets done for them, yet people in small communities are expected to do it often on the basis of voluntary effort with not much in the way of support.

So, if we get some of these major projects in the unincorporated areas, there needs to be an income stream that is going to support the pastoral areas, the small communities in the unincorporated areas. Indeed, even in communities like Coober Pedy, which is not unincorporated, there needs to be a decent income stream to support these communities and the pastoral areas of our state.

It should not be forgotten that we talk about tourism and we talk about carbon farming, we talk about the potential for renewables, we talk about conservation, but the primary business of most of the pastoral leases is around providing wool and meat. These are industries that have been sustained for many, many years, and they make a contribution to our state. In terms of the overall scheme of things, people can say it is neither here nor there, but that is not true. It is significant and it does generate employment elsewhere apart from just on the stations themselves, with the abattoirs, the supply chains and a whole range of things.

The other thing about it is if these properties were not there, if these businesses were not there, the land would be virtually empty. There would be nobody looking after it. The challenge for the state when it comes to managing vast areas of land is usually from a conservation effort. Yes, that is challenging in a place the size of Australia. So the pastoral properties and the businesses that are there do play an important role, and we should recognise that and we should enhance that role, if anything.

In recognising it, maybe at a federal level, there should be financial recognition when it is done properly. When conservation on leases is done properly, and even on freehold where some

good work happens as well, there should be a reward of sorts for being the custodian of the land that people find themselves on.

I have spoken at length about what is a very simple bill. It is a simple bill, clarifying stuff that is already happening and giving it a bit of a legislative tweak so that we do have that certainty. I commend the bill.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (17:14): I, too, rise to make a contribution in support of the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation (Use of Pastoral Land) Amendment Bill. I would like to start with a little bit of history of our pastoral lands, because it is a really interesting history lesson in one way, shape or form.

While my family have not technically owned pastoral lands, my father travelled much of the pastoral country for many years, buying sheep. We know that pastoral lands, in a good year, are one of the great lands for breeding sheep, raising sheep, and producing some of the great pastoral livestock industries.

First and foremost, if we look at the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act—and we are about to amend that—and back at 1894 to the state's first Pastoral Act, the first Pastoral Board was formed of three prominent public servants, and the first major issue was the northern drought of 1902. If you look back in the history books it was a drought that changed the landscape forever in those pastoral countries; however, the main task was to oversee the establishment and development of pastoral leases throughout South Australia. That, more or less, went unchanged for more than 95 years.

In 1936, the new Pastoral Act was introduced to manage overstocking and land degradation—which continues today, sadly. The pastoral lands have seen significant challenge: we have droughts and we have floods. They are a giving land, but they are also a very fragile land, and we see the impact of some of the natural events that really do change the landscape.

In 1948, Fred Jessup was appointed Chief Scientist and joined the Department of Agriculture to further investigate land degradation while also surveying the arid lands. Until 1989 a long review of the lands was undertaken by H.P.C Trumble from the Department of Agriculture, who worked alongside the Minister for the Environment back then, the Hon Don Hopgood. There were great gains and achievements in those early days to better manage pastoral lands. What we saw back then was really a change in the landscape, a change in the way we treated those fragile lands until 2000.

After another 10 years, and $6 million, we saw that leases had been scientifically assessed, and once those leases had been assessed we had a much better understanding of exactly what that meant, until 2004 when the Arid Lands Information System was formulated. That saw data management adopted in assessing plant species, soil types, stocking densities, the relevant aspects of arid lands.

That is where we get to today. We know that pastoral lands are very fragile, as I have said, but the 40 million hectares covered by 323 pastoral leases represent about 43 per cent of the state. A pastoral lease allows the occupation of Crown land for grazing and raising livestock, but it is more than that. It is about conservation, about pastoralists conserving those fragile lands but also those almost uninhabited lands that very few people understand in terms of their isolation, their tyranny of distance, the scale that pastoralists have to work with to make their businesses viable, as well as the independence they have to work under to make a successful go of being a pastoralist.

The Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act ensures that pastoral leases are well-managed, resourced and maintained, but we have to tweak the act to better manage our lands. I want to commend the majority of the pastoralists for the work that they do in arid lands, in rangelands and on our pastoral lands, and for the work that they have done over many years to keep that country alive. When we talk about the challenges of natural weather events, when we talk about overgrazing or mismanagement in certain aspects, pastoralists know that is unviable. They know that it cannot continue to happen because they are there for the long term.

In my most recent visit, I was very fortunate to be given the opportunity to fly at low altitude through a lot of pastoral lands in South Australia and into Queensland, into some of that Channel Country up there, just to understand how that landscape works, how the waterways, the tributaries

out of some of those river systems and creek systems work and how they feed life into our pastoral lands. It really is a sight to behold.

Pastoralists make a valuable contribution to not only exports but the economy at large. As the member for Giles said, there are very few people up there but it is a large economy that is derived. We see large numbers of livestock coming out of that part of the world, but we also see large environmental benefits. The management of those lands is not about locking country up, it is not about walking away; it is about managing it and making sure that pastoralists breathe life and hope into what is known as one of the great land management exercises in this country.

I will touch on a little bit of what is happening in Chaffey; I do travel the electorate often. There are 19 pastoral leases partially or completely within the electorate, and the pastoral areas cover about one-third of the electorate. Twenty-five per cent are wholly used for conservation purposes, and I have visited a number of those conservation parks, Danggali being one. We know that Danggali had a significant fire through it not that many years ago, as did the Cooltong Conservation Park. Those fires in one way promote regeneration, but again they do change the landscape.

We look at the Murray River National Park. The Chowilla Game Reserve has seen significant change, particularly with the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and the re-management of the basin that travels through some of that pastoral country. We are now seeing that a lot of that reserve has changed, particularly at Chowilla. My most recent visit was out to Gluepot. The volunteer bases and the work that they do at these parks is to be commended. It is all volunteer-based. They go out there, they care for the wildlife and they care for the lands. In a 10-year period, what those volunteer groups have achieved is nothing short of amazing.

There are comparative photos of what was and what we have now—the tree planting and the native fauna that has been promoted into some of that landscape—but it is also attracting wildlife. It is attracting the regeneration of birdlife species in particular, which have almost disappeared. They are now flourishing and it is a sight to behold. In particular, at Gluepot they have won a number of environmental awards that have been second to none. It is all driven and derived by good leadership and the volunteer base, so I really do commend that group.

The act will confirm that pastoral leases can be used for conservation. As I have already said, there has to be a balance. The conservation of those parks cannot be derived by locking country away. It has to be derived by opportunity. It has to be derived by pastoralists, it has to be derived by conservationists, it has to be derived by passionate volunteers and it is also, as I said, derived from economic opportunity.

We are on the cusp of a changing landscape. We are talking about variable climates. I must say that I think a lot of people, particularly some persuasions, dramatise climate change. They dramatise what is currently underway. I am proud to say that if you look at a glacier, if you look at it over thousands or millions of years we are all going through different stages of climate variation, whether it is ice ages, whether it is heat, whether it is dust, whether it is wind, whether it is rain and flood or whether it is drought. It continues to evolve and over the course of history that landscape is affected. It changes, it adapts, it manages, just as we do. As a primary producer, we have to deal with a varying climate every year.

As I have said, 21 leases in South Australia are already wholly for cultivation. That is, I think, a finely balanced conversation. There cannot be an overarching mass shift to conservation only. We need to make sure that there is that balance, I think, managed by a variety of the leases: individual, family, non-government organisations. I am sure every person in this chamber has visited Arkaroola. It is one of the great wonders of this country, in the Flinders Ranges. The Sprigg family has been custodians for many years. You can go up there and understand how that landscape is working, how it is managed, how it is mined and how we have that very fine balance with pastoralists, with mining and making sure that the conservation agenda is also maintained.

At Arid Recovery, BHP has quite a significant program. Kalamurina country is also the Australian Wildlife Conservancy. I think that has been mentioned by the Leader of the Opposition, as well as Witchelina and Hiltaba through the Nature Foundation. They are being managed well.

They are not having their gates locked. They are up there making sure that there is regeneration, there is opportunity. They are programs that I fully endorse.

I must mention again the important work of conservationists in our regions. The largest pastoral lease in the electorate of Chaffey is Calperum Station. They are doing some very good work training in Indigenous programs and in regeneration of our flood plains. A lot of Calperum Station has recently been underwater, and to see the regeneration once those floodwaters recede is nothing short of amazing.

That gives an opportunity for those training and education programs now to go out and again promote the landscape, promote planting of native flora and make sure that the work out there under the custodianship of the Australian Landscape Trust is progressed. It is the responsibility of government to make sure that they are given a level of support and funding to promote traineeships, people who are custodians of that country.

Calperum starts about 10 kilometres north of Renmark and runs almost to the top of the border, but the habitat and, as I have already said, the species, the conservation, the research and the public education are resulting in more and more visitors in the tourist sector going out there, inhabiting some of the quarters. People come away from Calperum in awe of what is being achieved out there. It is about scientific research and the public education to understand exactly what pastoral leases can achieve and how well we can manage them and the results that we get.

Regarding declared critical habitat for species conservation under commonwealth legislation, I think it speaks for itself. That is a corporate responsibility on any pastoral lease, any Crown lease or any lease, full stop. It is very fragile country, and it does tell a tale very quickly if those lands are not being managed and if those lands are not being looked after to a high degree because, as I have stated a number of times in my contribution, it is a very fine line with that land, that very fragile, low rainfall land. It does rely on opportunity.

I do want to touch a little bit on carbon farming, and I think a few have made contributions on this. Carbon farming is in its infancy. We know that carbon farming is going to present opportunity. Until we can actually understand what carbon farming will mean—if we are talking about credits or if we are talking about the management of farming carbon, we have to better understand it. I think governments need to work better, work harder and promote it more, to make sure that we extract the most out of the carbon opportunity. Whether it is about credits, whether it is about farming or whether it is about sequestration, we have to understand and educate ourselves as legislators so that we can promote the opportunities for carbon farming.

There has been talk about opportunities for transmission lines and wind towers. It really does beggar belief that we could degrade pastoral country with lots of towers, lots of poles and lots of wires because, let's face it, wind farms equal transmission lines and transmission lines equal electron loss. We look at the long distances that we will have to string wires across our pastoral lands, and it will mean that there will be huge loss—

Mr McBride: Opportunity.

Mr WHETSTONE: It is opportunity—but also, for those who are economic rationalists, how many poles and wires do you want to put across our country for some gain? Let's be real. How much loss in a thousand kilometres of transmission line, and for what gain? Yes, I am a supporter of renewable energy, but there is a place and there is an equation about reducing the number of poles and reducing the number of towers to achieve the same result. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (OMBUDSMAN AND AUDITOR-GENERAL) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (OBJECTS OF ACT AND BOARD ATTRIBUTES) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION (TISSUE DONATION STATEMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:35 the house adjourned until Tuesday 17 October 2023 at 11:00.