

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 17 October 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 Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: An absolute majority is required. Being present, I accept the motion. Is the Premier's motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I put the question for suspension, it being seconded.

Motion carried.

Motions

ISRAEL

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (11:01): I move:

That this house—

- (a) unequivocally condemns the attacks on Israel by Hamas, which are the heinous acts of terrorists, and have encompassed the targeting and murder of civilians, including women and children, the taking of hostages and indiscriminate rocket fire;
- (b) stands with Israel and recognises its inherent right to defend itself;
- (c) condemns antisemitism and recognises that generations of Jewish people have been subjected to this hateful prejudice;
- (d) calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages;
- (e) recognises that Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people, nor their legitimate needs and aspirations;
- (f) acknowledges the devastating loss of Israeli and Palestinian life and that innocent civilians on all sides are suffering as a result of the attacks by Hamas and the subsequent conflict;
- (g) supports justice and freedom for Israelis and Palestinians alike;
- (h) supports international efforts to establish and maintain humanitarian access into Gaza, including safe passage for civilians;
- (i) reiterates Australia's consistent position in all contexts is to call for the protection of civilian lives and the observance of international law;
- (j) acknowledges what has unfolded is deeply distressing for many in the South Australian community, close to the heart of many, and it is important that we maintain respect for each other here at home as people express their views;
- (k) condemns all forms of hate speech and violent extremist activity, including antisemitism and Islamophobia;

- (l) recognises an attack on any religion is an attack on all religions and that we all share a responsibility to unite, condemn and defeat such an attack on our common values and way of life; and
- (m) affirms in the strongest possible terms that hateful prejudice has no place in South Australia.

We gather today as South Australians, members of a multicultural and united community, with a heavy heart. On Saturday 7 October, the terrorist group Hamas launched a series of coordinated attacks upon the people of Israel along the Gaza Strip, killing over a thousand civilians and taking hundreds of hostages in what has become the deadliest militant assault in the life of the nation.

This was an unambiguous attack, an unambiguous act of terrorism against the state of Israel and its people, and an equally unambiguous act of hate against the Jewish people, with the attacks timed to coincide with a day of Jewish celebration. Since then, the situation in Gaza has become one of blood and terror, with casualties rising by the hour.

I want to say plainly that we condemn Hamas for their acts of indiscriminate violence and murder. To the people of the region, I offer our great sympathy. We share your anger, your sorrow and your outrage. I also say this: no matter the cause, no matter the provocation, it is the innocent who invariably suffer most in these moments of violence and bloodshed. It is the men, women and children who have no side, who profess no political or ideological agenda, who pay the greatest price when the bombs begin to fall.

There has already been devastating loss of life, Israeli and Palestinian alike, in the war zone that Gaza has become. We recognise the right of Israel to defend itself from attack, even as we continue to support solutions that would allow the people of the region to live together in peace and mutual recognition. This motion seeks to convey a clear message that the Parliament of South Australia and the people of South Australia wish fervently for peace in the Middle East and the return to a rules-based order.

We support the international humanitarian efforts being made to aid the people of Gaza, and we call for the establishment of corridors to allow safe passage for aid workers, civilians and critical goods alike. We join the international call for the immediate release of all hostages held by Hamas, and we continue to advocate for adherence to the international law and for the protection of civilian lives as a matter of clear and urgent priority.

We also recognise that many South Australians have family, friends and communities in the region, and we know that they are experiencing immense personal distress through this dark and difficult time. I ask that we continue to show respect for one another regardless of individual views on the conflict and reiterate that there is no place for hate speech or extremist violence in our peaceful state. With this motion, the South Australian parliament expresses hope for a swift end to this violent conflict and its horrific cost on human lives and wishes for peace, freedom and justice to prevail for Israelis and Palestinians who call the region home.

I have had the pleasure of visiting the region myself quite a number of years ago. I went to Palestinian territories, meeting with Palestinian people, and also had the opportunity to be in Israel. It was a study tour, so inevitably the theme of the visit for the delegation I was part of was to familiarise ourselves with the complexity of the landscape politically for all concerned. It was striking, having spent some time in Israel and then moving into the West Bank, that there was one absolute truth that was underpinned by consistency, and that was the shared ambition of the Israeli people and Palestinian people to simply have decent lives, to live peacefully with one another.

Whenever we had the opportunity to speak to ordinary Israeli families and ordinary Palestinian families, their preoccupation was with providing for their families and wanting a better future for their children. That was the consistent, paramount desire that each of those families had, that ran secondary to any ideological or political concerns they had about the future. I hope that over the coming days leaders in the Palestinian community, in Gaza and more broadly, and also leaders of Israel have the common sense to contemplate the innocent lives that are currently at stake and in grave danger.

The attack on Israel was unprovoked and undoubtedly necessitates a response from the state of Israel, but there is an opportunity for Israel in its response to be proportionate and contemplate the humanity that I think exists at the heart of the Israeli state generally. I think some of

the images that we have borne witness to in more recent days, since the attacks themselves, of thousands upon thousands of bombs falling on Gaza, have profound implications for innocent people in Gaza whom Hamas does not represent.

As a state parliament, through this motion we call on the better angels of both sides to act with decency and a sense of humanity. The state government, as is the case with the commonwealth, supports the long-term pursuit of a two-state solution being realised as being the only practical means to recognise the deep connection that Palestinian people have with the land in that part of the world, and the right of Israel to exist peacefully without the fear of elimination, as is the policy position currently held by other states that it borders, including the leadership of Hamas.

Israel has the right to exist peacefully and to be a proud liberal democracy that it is, but the Palestinian people deserve a prosperous future with a connection to parts of the land that they naturally call home. A two-state solution is something this state endorses, but today we make clear that any act of terrorism is not something this parliament will bear witness to without standing against. I look forward, hopefully, to the parliament endorsing this motion to send the clearest possible signal that this parliament stands for peace.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (11:12): As the lead speaker on this side of the house on this motion and as the Leader of the Opposition, the leader of the Liberal Party in South Australia, I rise to provide bipartisan support for the motion that has been placed before parliament today. Throughout history, there have been many different groups, ethnicities, faiths, people located in particular geographical locations through no fault of their own—just by the lottery of birth—who have been subject to persecution, who have been subject to attacks by others who may not agree with them or what they stand for or how they ended up being where they are on this planet.

But there can be no more persecuted group, in my assessment, in modern times—and by modern times, I mean in the last century or so—than the Jewish people. The Jewish people have done it exceptionally tough in the last century. There are many people alive today, including my own father, and the parents and grandparents of many people in this chamber today, who can recall the Holocaust when six million Jews lost their lives, because that is within the living memory of far too many people who are with us today.

The Jewish people have been persecuted for millennia to a greater or lesser extent, depending on what moment in history we are talking about. But in modern times that persecution continues to exist. It continues to create great pain and great fear and trepidation amongst a race of people, a race of people who choose to practise Judaism, their chosen faith. That persecution was writ large a little over a week ago in Israel in the Middle East when the terrorists—and they were terrorists—from Hamas swept across the border and into Israel.

We believe around 1,400 people lost their lives in those few hours following that invasion. It could be more, and that number could rise in the coming days and weeks and months. It will inevitably rise as a consequence of the conflict which has now emerged. It is a terrible thing, and we condemn it. We condemn it through this motion, and we say very clearly that we stand with the Jewish people, particularly in Australia but even more so in South Australia, because in this chamber we represent South Australians, we represent all South Australians, no matter their race, no matter the religion that they practise. We represent them all, and we represent the Jewish community.

It is a special thing to have representatives of the Jewish community join us this morning—Norm Schueler, a significant leader in the Jewish community in South Australia. We appreciate you being here, Norm. We know it is a difficult time for you and your community, and we thank you for the leadership, the compassion and the practical action that you have undertaken in recent days as you have sought to provide support and coordination for those in your community who have family and friends and connections within Israel, within that conflict zone. We also thank you for sitting down and praying with and for your community, both here and in Israel.

Our thoughts are with the Jewish community here but, at a more macro level, our thoughts must also be with the people of Israel right now. The uncertainty that is hanging over that nation and the fear that is embedded within its people right now sits across both the Jewish people in Israel and

the Palestinians who live in and around that nation, whether it be in Gaza or whether it be further afield.

As the Premier said, we must grasp the humanity of this situation, and we must turn our minds to the innocent people who are caught up in this. Whether they are of Jewish background, whether they have an Islamic faith or whether they have no faith at all they have found themselves in that part of the world at this time, and there is an immense challenge and an immense fear shrouding potentially millions of people at the moment.

Yes, we hear calls for a proportionate response, but I think it is very difficult to quantify or describe what that level of proportionality looks like at this moment in time. I do not want to turn my mind to that at the moment; rather, I want to make it extremely clear that through this motion this house seeks, in a bipartisan fashion, to condemn what happened a little more than a week ago in Israel and make it abundantly clear that we are with our Jewish community at this time.

It should be the case, perhaps it should be the logical case, that the real fear sits with the people who are geographically anchored in Israel at the moment, but unfortunately, because of the nature of this type of conflict, that has spilt over to other places. I know that members of the Jewish community in Australia—hopefully not in South Australia, but certainly in Australia—have gone through pain as a result of antisemitic slurs and a potential fear of attack in this nation.

What we saw on the steps of the Sydney Opera House a week ago was the most grotesque behaviour that you would ever think to see in Australia. I am so grateful that we have not seen that level of antagonism, that level of hate occur in South Australia. Long may we be a jurisdiction, long may we be a melting pot of faiths and cultures where, Norm, you and your community feel that you can walk down the street and worship in your synagogue, connect with your traditions and practise your customs without that fear.

Because your parliament is working hard to guard against that behaviour and to create a foundation of multiculturalism in this state through a range of mechanisms, I hope that at this moment in time you do not feel that fear and, if you do, that this parliament—whether it is the Labor government or the Liberal opposition, or Independent members of this parliament or other political parties—can come together and make sure that your community is protected and given the sense of belonging in this state, because we are better than that. This motion, but more broadly this time, gives us an opportunity to reflect on the great things about this state. Again, in my heart of hearts I hope that your community feels safe and secure in this great state.

Like the Premier, I have had the great privilege of going to Israel. It was just on the cusp of the COVID-19 pandemic in February 2020 that, as South Australia's water minister, I was able to travel to Israel to look particularly at the incredible water innovation that occurs there. Israel is so well known for its innovation and entrepreneurialism across so many different sectors, water being one of them.

One thing that struck me when I went to Israel was the immense diversity of the nation and its relative size compared with Australia. It is a small place. I drove right around Israel in the best part of a day from the Negev in the south, the desert lands, following the Dead Sea, into the north, turning west at Jericho and ascending into the hills around Jerusalem. It started off hot with a baking heat down in the south, to foggy, cold and drizzling when I arrived in Jerusalem. It is a country where, around every corner, there is a historic site stretching back to biblical times.

Israel is a nation whose people are welcoming, steeped in tradition and have a real sense of purpose and geographical place in the world. It is a cosmopolitan place too. I stayed several nights in Tel Aviv, that Mediterranean city, looking towards the west—both physically and symbolically. It is a modern city and a city with great diversity of humanity gathering there. My brief three-day visit to Israel underscored the importance of that place to so many people, and the importance of leaders in places like this and across the Western world and beyond, making sure that we stand up for Israel and that we speak out for Israel when bad things happen there.

My other connection to Israel can be traced back to November 1995, when my mother chose to take my grandmother to the Holy Land for her 60th birthday. My grandmother, a committed Christian, wanted to go there and see those places of significance to her faith and to the faith of the

Jewish people. November 1995, though, became an immense turning point for the modern history of Israel because my mother and grandmother were in Tel Aviv when an extremist Israeli pulled out a weapon and killed Prime Minister Yitzhak Rabin. Prime Minister Rabin was working exceptionally hard to create a two-state solution and to bring his people together. It was a difficult task, but he was making progress. On that evening of 4 November 1995, when my mum and grandmother were just around the corner, he fell to the ground.

In February 2020, I had the opportunity to visit the spot where Prime Minister Rabin was killed. It was a very, very difficult time for my family in 1995 when my grandmother and mother were trapped in Tel Aviv, unable to leave their hotel. The fear that we had back in rural Scotland was real. It is nowhere near the extent of the fear and the sadness that the Jewish community in South Australia are experiencing today, but I do have that little connection, that geographical understanding, of the fear that can be inflicted on a community when something goes wrong there.

To the Jewish community in South Australia, please be assured that the party that I lead will be your voice. We will be a calm voice, we will be a reassuring voice, but, when need be, we will be a loud voice for the Jewish community and the people of Israel. This is a hard time for the Jewish community. It may get harder. We hope it gets easier, but the uncertainty that shrouds Jewish people around the world, including here in Australia and South Australia, is real and it is likely growing at the moment. In supporting this motion, my message is abundantly clear: we are with you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:26): I cannot imagine what it would be like raising a family now in Israel or Palestine. I cannot imagine what it would be like to have the fear of not being able to keep your family safe or to understand exactly what will occur next. We take for granted the safety of our homes. We take for granted the safety of walking about, going about our daily business. Our children are safe in our schools. Our children are safe at home in their playgrounds. We are not worried about unexploded ordnances. We are not worried about missile attacks. We are not worried about terrorist activity. I can only imagine what an Israeli or Palestinian father is thinking right now about the safety and security of their family.

Violence is never the answer, but too often it is. Israel is home to the three great religions of humanity: Judaism, Islam and Christianity. It has been a long aspiration of mine to visit the Holy Land and to see those sites where our Lord walked, lived and died. It always breaks my heart to see the violence that erupts throughout the Holy Land, and it seems counterintuitive.

Israel is not perfect, but it is a liberal democracy. A liberal democracy has a right to defend itself, and Israel will defend itself. Palestinians have a right to live in a safe and secure home. I hope that the international community and Israel and Palestine can come together and find a solution. Hamas does not speak for Palestinians. Hamas is a terrorist organisation that must be condemned. What they have done is appalling. The atrocities that they have committed cannot be supported and are not supported. They are not supported by Israelis or by the international community. They are not even supported by Palestinians. Hamas have behaved terribly. That is why as a parliament it is important that we speak with one voice condemning violence.

Context is important here. I know that context can be very, very difficult when you look at this 75 years worth of violence. However, these attacks by Hamas go deeper and darker than we have seen before, and they must be condemned. This motion condemns them, and this house condemns them. I hope the Australians who are caught in Gaza can get out.

I understand from our defence minister, our Deputy Prime Minister, that there are 40 Australian families who are stuck in Gaza. I think of and pray for them. I know there are some South Australians who are a part of that cohort and I hope they can get to safety soon with their families. It is a very, very trying time.

The Jewish community of South Australia are a respected community in our state and they are valued, as is our Islamic community and our Palestinian community in our state. I think you have seen the very best of those communities in South Australia, who have shown restraint and who have, I think, conducted themselves exceptionally well in comparison with some other protests, as the Leader of the Opposition mentioned, that were, quite frankly, abhorrent.

I do not know how this conflict will end. I do not know what happens next. What I do know is that innocents will suffer, civilians will be killed and families will be displaced. Hopefully, the violence one day will end.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:30): I thank the Premier, the opposition leader and the Leader of the House for the comments they have made. This house will support this resolution in a bipartisan fashion and we will do so because this parliament sees the importance of recognising that this act of grotesque terror that has been inflicted by Hamas on Israel, and the people of Israel, cannot go uncommented on and uncondemned.

We also have to recognise that these are challenging and difficult times. They are the most challenging and difficult times not only for families living in Israel and Gaza but also for our community in South Australia and the community around the world. Anyone observing these atrocities cannot help but feel a connection—if they find their humanity they will feel a connection—to the experience of those families who are experiencing this terror.

We also have other connections. We have Australians who have family in Israel and in Gaza who are directly feeling that challenge. There is distress felt by people in Australia, who have not just personal connections but also spiritual connections with Israel and Palestine, who will feel particularly affected. I think sometimes people ask why this house would talk about issues relating to international affairs when that is not the mandate of the state parliament. Unfortunately, the experience of people living in South Australia—and I think particularly in the Jewish community for reasons I will get to in a moment—is that the experience of antisemitism is still, unfortunately, present.

We must consider that. That is a clear and immediate issue with which the state parliament's responsibilities are squarely brought into play, something that the government does give consideration to. I appreciate that in the last year alone issues raised at Adelaide University were raised by the Leader of the Opposition and responded to by the Premier in a very firm way. I think that was important for our South Australian Jewish community to understand.

I will touch briefly on all three of these matters. The first is in relation to the grotesque inhumanity experienced little over a week ago when a dance party was turned into a place of slaughter and terror, when we saw—and it is dreadfully unfortunate that the experience of social media in the world made it necessary for there to be pictorial evidence shown—children slaughtered, brutalised and burnt. The experience of families whose homes were invaded by terrorists who were not acting in inconsequential ways. They were acting in intentional ways to terrorise a community by seeking out innocents, by committing atrocities intentionally. That was the end. It was not an unintended circumstance: that was the goal.

It must be said—and it is so important to say—that Hamas does not equate with Palestine or with Islam. Hamas does not speak for our Palestinian community or our Islamic community in any way. Hamas is a terrorist organisation. Indeed, the atrocities that Hamas has committed upon the Palestinian people and Islamic people—and through their actions we have seen what has happened to Palestine, and what has happened to Islamic people—I think has it squarely as an enemy of all peoples.

The inhumanity must be understood. It must be understood that there is no reflection on the Palestinian community and Islamic community in South Australia when we identify the grotesque inhumanity and atrocity committed by Hamas, the terrorist organisation that it is.

It is important in a local context to identify the difference between expressing sympathy and solidarity with innocent victims of a conflict and those who are celebrating the brutal behaviour of Hamas. Hamas is a terrorist organisation. I have not seen anything like what we saw in Sydney here in South Australia in recent times, and that is to be acknowledged, but those who would seek to celebrate such behaviours are celebrating terrorism. There are actual hate speech crimes that are on the statutes that should be enforced.

It is also important that, at a time of reflecting on an atrocity, our parliament stands united in desiring a peaceful future for the whole world, obviously. For people who have family in Israel, in Gaza, we want them to experience peace in their lives. Our desire to see that in the years ahead is

worth stating on the record, as the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the Leader of the House and now I do.

I come to the relevance for South Australia. We are joined in the gallery not only by Norm Schueler, as others have recognised, but also by Kathy Baykitch and members of the board of the Adelaide Holocaust Museum and Andrew Steiner Education Centre. The Leader of the Opposition reflected on the last 100 years. Again, the grotesque industrial genocide committed upon the Jewish people by the Nazi regime in the Shoah (the Holocaust) is an important matter for all South Australians, all our children, to understand and learn about at all times.

I think the behaviours of some people in the community, in fact the behaviours of people with no personal religious or ethnic connection to Israel or Palestine in Australia, is worth highlighting and the importance of Holocaust education. I am going to go back a step further than that and then come back to the work of the Holocaust Museum and thank them for their work. The resilience of the Jewish people in the face of repeated upon repeated generations and millennia of repression and persecution is something to base our hopes for a peaceful future on.

Just in the last week and a half, the Israeli flag was put on display on the Arch of Titus in Rome. Titus was a Roman general, the son of Emperor Vespasian, who would later become Emperor of Rome. Titus was leading the siege of Jerusalem in the decades following the birth of Jesus, and in that siege atrocities were committed on the Jewish people, and there were years and years when the Roman army surrounded Jerusalem prior to the eventual taking of the city. The city was sacked and looted.

The Arch of Titus is seen now as a tourist attraction outside the Coliseum that Vespasian and Titus built. It is seen as a beautiful symbol we think of as ancient history, but for the Jewish people it is so much more than that. As I understand it, in recent decades it has become a symbol of that Jewish resilience. The Jewish population in Rome has continued to be an important part of the Roman community for a very long time, especially in the period since the Second World War, and the Arch of Titus with the Israeli flag on it, as I understand it, has become a symbol of that Jewish resilience.

The Jewish people have been persecuted singularly in unique ways over the millennia since as well. The Magna Carta we think of as a foundational document in our history, in our heritage of the Westminster tradition and in the freedoms of our people to be free from persecution from kings, oligarchs and autocrats. We have one displayed in our own parliamentary library, as I think we should. It is an important and useful historical document. It is more than something to just look at behind a glass because we got this copy from Westminster. It actually bears reading and translation at some point.

For our Jewish community, reading that document highlights again the persecution that they suffered. It was by no means the worst persecution the Jewish people suffered in the last millennium, but Jewish people are singled out in that document for different treatment from Christian people. Jewish people in England, in the time of the Magna Carta, were singled out for different treatment. Jewish people have been expelled from entire countries throughout Europe over the last thousand years.

I reflect on my own faith—I am a baptised Lutheran, as many people would know—and the history surrounding the Reformation. It is a challenging moment when we are thinking of the resilience shown by the Jewish people over millennia, and it is challenging to look through the works of the interpreter of theology who was at the basis of the Lutheran Church. Martin Luther was a persuasive and important figure in world history, and he wrote, at one point, a treatise called *That Jesus Christ Was Born a Jew*. He was working very hard to bring Jewish people into the Lutheran Church at that time.

Some years later, when not many Jewish people had joined the Lutheran Church, perhaps unsurprisingly, Martin Luther wrote a piece called *On the Jews and Their Lies*, which several hundred years later, 400 years later, was used, published, republished and circulated by Adolf Hitler, again propagating the hate that backed up his regime of horror and terror.

Antisemitism is not the only example of racist hatred that the world has experienced and become familiar with. Many minorities, religious and ethnic, have experienced persecution and hatred and have had to deal with that. But I think in the 20th century—following the Holocaust in which six million Jews were murdered on an industrial, intentional and genocidal scale—the fact that 70 years later so many young Australians do not have an understanding of something like the Holocaust and that it influences their behaviour today is most unfortunate. I think it has consequences for our community.

I mentioned the Holocaust Museum before. We had a body of work undertaken in 2020 and in 2021 in the education department, when I was the Minister for Education, which was focused on Holocaust education. It was much broader than that: it was a body of work that was writing curriculum units for use in public education, and for non-government schools that would want them, across all levels of the Australian Curriculum.

The Holocaust Museum, which was recently established, was very important in ensuring that the material presented in units that dealt with the Holocaust in the history curriculum were accurate, because there is a lot of material out there, some of which was at one point potentially going to be used in the curriculum, which is actually counterproductive and unhelpful. The museum was of very great assistance to the education department, and I hope that the relationship continues as the materials are updated. The Holocaust Museum was able to identify materials that trivialise the Holocaust in any way and made sure that they were not part of the curriculum that we were offering.

It is important that our young people have access to this information. It is important that schools teach about the Holocaust because, firstly, it occurred in the lifetime of many people in our community. We have Holocaust survivors in our community and we have people like Andrew Steiner who teach young people about the Holocaust. But they will not be with us forever, so the museum and the curriculum become tremendously even more important.

The Holocaust is a tangible experience for so many people in our community who have parents, grandparents or great-grandparents who had some experience of it. It is something that can be taught in schools to give us an understanding, not just of antisemitism and the profound, negative and disastrous role that it has played in our heritage and history but also of all hate, all racism.

The Holocaust Museum, if people have not had the chance to attend, is on Wakefield Street, on the corner of Gawler Place, and easy to get to. School groups are there almost every day it is open. Get in touch with them, please. I encourage you to go and have a look because it is not just a historical perspective of the Holocaust itself but an appeal against racism. It is an appeal for humanity.

It is relevant to our Aboriginal Australians as well. It tells the story of the appeal by Aboriginal leaders in the 1930s to the German embassy on behalf of German Jews. That broad story needs to be told and understood more. I think there is more we can do in our schools and the rollout of those resources is tremendously important.

In supporting this motion—and I trust it will be supported unanimously by the house—we acknowledge the reprehensible and grotesque nature of the acts that were committed and perpetrated by Hamas. We recognise that Hamas is responsible for what has happened since as well.

I want to finish with a couple of reflections on how the world is looking at this. I note that President Macron of France, Chancellor Scholz of Germany, Prime Minister Meloni of Italy, Prime Minister Sunak of the United Kingdom and President Biden of the United States took the extraordinary step of putting out a joint statement last week. Part of that statement said:

All of us recognize the legitimate aspirations of the Palestinian people and support equal measures of justice and freedom for Israelis and Palestinians alike. But make no mistake: Hamas does not represent those aspirations, and it offers nothing for the Palestinian people other than more terror and more bloodshed.

From our party's point of view in Australia and the federal parliament, the shadow minister for foreign affairs, Simon Birmingham, said:

... Hamas has brought Israel's response upon itself and, in doing so, it has tragically exposed to danger the very people they falsely claim to stand for. Hamas are responsible for the current loss of Israeli, Palestinian and other innocent lives... Nobody wants to see innocent lives lost, least of all those of other children.

They deserve our care and support too. That is why the Coalition supports properly targeted humanitarian assistance.

However, let us not be led into false equivalences.

In attack, Hamas acts with surprise and with intent to brutally kill women and children. In defence, Hamas acts with cowardice by using women and children as shields.

Israel, in contrast, provides public warnings to minimise civilian losses, acting in defence to target the weapons, capabilities and perpetrators of terrorist acts.

Here in this house, we pray for peace. We pray for the peace and wellbeing of people in Israel, Gaza, Palestine and the world and for South Australians of Israeli, Jewish, Palestinian or Islamic heritage and faith we pray for peace as well.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer) (11:47): I rise to support the motion that has been put to the house and is being supported in a bipartisan manner. I thank those members who have spoken already: the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the deputy leader and the Leader of Government Business.

I think all of us acknowledge the genuine shock and horror that we all felt when the news was first reported of these horrendous acts of terrorism. These were not only acts of terrorism perpetrated by Hamas on the sovereign nation of Israel but they were designed in particular to target as many defenceless members of the civilian population as possible.

They were also particularly barbaric, which is saying something given what can sometimes be reported across the media. The world has responded with genuine shock and horror at some of the barbarous acts undertaken with precise and deliberate motive by Hamas upon Israel's civilian population, in particular those two events singling out not only young attendees of a music festival but the even more almost unspeakably horrific acts committed against babies and very young children who were captured and slain.

These were not acts of one organisation against military installations or against military personnel. They were deliberately designed to be such shocking acts of terror so as to not only inflict terrorism on the Israeli people but also they were calculated to try to engender a response which would cause undeniable further loss of civilian life. Nothing—nothing—can excuse or accommodate that behaviour. I am really pleased that members on both sides are joining together to condemn this most vile behaviour, particularly vile behaviour conducted in these modern times.

I would also like to echo the sentiments of the Leader of the Opposition and the Premier to acknowledge the extraordinary continuation of leadership of local communities here in South Australia which represent those communities more broadly, in particular in this region of the Middle East, that are profoundly impacted by this act of terrorism last week.

I think all of us absolutely abhor the conduct of those people in Sydney immediately following the terrorism attacks in Israel last week. I think it stands not only as our quite different approach as a community here in South Australia, but the strength of leadership shown in particular by the leadership of the Jewish community here in South Australia and also leaders of community groups representing Palestinian people and more broader communities across the Middle East.

I have had the great privilege and fortune to get to know some of these communities by virtue of being a member of parliament. I have had the opportunity to speak with some members of those communities and I know how profoundly and deeply hurt they feel. Many have family members or other people known to them, friends or other loved ones who are caught up in what is happening right now over in this region. I think few, if any, of us can imagine what that must be like, having family members or other acquaintances or loved ones that are caught up in this.

Of course, we all reconfirm our views that we abhor violence of any type in these situations and that we want these sorts of hostilities—if I can put it gently—or atrocities to end as quickly as possible. That is why I think this motion is as necessarily detailed as it is, not only to be absolutely categorical and fulsome in the condemnation of the Hamas attacks on the people of Israel but also to

reconfirm what we all together take great pride in reaffirming, and that is that we do not want to see any of this sort of behaviour anywhere on our planet, and that if there can be any efforts to bring these hostilities to an end as quickly as possible, then of course we support those.

I am very glad that this house has taken this opportunity to focus quite correctly and quite specifically on condemnation of what happened last week, rather than trying—as some people more broadly across the Australian and global community have tried—to have this as an opportunity to relitigate their personal perspective on broader issues that they believe are also at play here. No doubt that will occur in different places and at different times.

I am very pleased that this house is taking this opportunity to stand firm in specific condemnation of what Hamas has done to the Israeli people. It is deeply shocking. There is absolutely no justification for it whatsoever, regardless of what they believe to be their context. I am very pleased to lend my support to this motion.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (11:55): I, too:

- unequivocally condemn the attacks on Israel by Hamas, which are the heinous acts of terrorists, and have encompassed the targeting and murder of civilians, including women and children, the taking of hostages and indiscriminate rocket fire;
- stand with Israel and recognise its inherent right to defend itself;
- condemn antisemitism and recognise that generations of Jewish people have been subjected to this hateful prejudice;
- call for the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages;
- recognise that Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people, nor their legitimate needs and aspirations;
- acknowledge the devastating loss of Israeli and Palestinian life and that innocent civilians on all sides are suffering as a result of the attacks by Hamas and the subsequent conflict;
- support justice and freedom for Israelis and Palestinians alike;
- support international efforts to establish and maintain humanitarian access into Gaza, including safe passage for civilians;
- reiterate Australia's consistent position in all contexts is to call for the protection of civilian lives and the observance of international law;
- acknowledge what has unfolded is deeply distressing for many in the SA community, close to the heart of many, and it is important that we maintain respect for each other here at home as people express their views;
- condemn all forms of hate speech and violent extremist activity, including antisemitism and Islamophobia;
- recognise an attack on any religion is an attack on all religions and that we share a responsibility to unite, condemn and defeat such an attack on our common values and way of life; and
- affirm in the strongest possible terms that hateful prejudice has no place in South Australia.

I also stand for the preservation and the protection of civilian lives. I call on the civilised world not to turn its back on humanity here. I call out the absolutely unnecessary loss of life that is occurring here in this devastating, tragic set of circumstances.

I was supposed to be in the Middle East, visiting the Holy Land, only a couple of weeks ago. For various reasons, having a young family and a change of schedule, it did not work out. The point is that there are so many people who are stranded in the Middle East who are innocent, who are civilians, who are tourists, young families, who are there trying to get out at the moment. This tragic set of circumstances has led to thousands of innocent people being killed. It is just so devastating,

and it is important that we as a house send a very strong message that we condemn the attacks that occurred about a week ago.

Like many of us in this chamber, I have good, peace-loving friends who are Israeli and Palestinian. I have been in touch with them, ensuring that hopefully their friends and family are safe as well. In one circumstance, I know a young couple here who are expecting their second child. The gentleman is Israeli. He only recently became an Australian citizen, a matter of months ago, and it is only by pure chance that he has not been called up again for military service, with a baby here and another child on the way. Unfortunately, we know that there are people who are in the conflict. It is their home. They cannot escape. Our hearts go out to these people who are affected by this tragic set of circumstances that we have seen.

Much has been said about antisemitism. I was only recently looking at a post by an Italian politician. Sometimes what you see on the 6 o'clock news, for example, might only be a snippet of what is actually occurring in the world, so I do like to watch overseas news channels. To quote Matteo Salvini:

October 16, 80 years ago, breaking in the Rome ghetto, 1,259 people dragged into camps, many of them women. Almost everyone died, only 16 made a return.

That was 80 years ago nearly to the day and, unfortunately, still we see people out there who want to spread antisemitic hate, Islamophobic hate, hate against other religions. It is important that we call these things out and that they cannot go on any further.

To see young women, children, families, babies and innocent young people at a music festival literally barbarically killed in the way that they were was absolutely brutish. It is shocking and the civilised world has to call this stuff out and make sure that we get behind the powers that be to ensure that more citizens, more civilians, are not killed in this devastating situation at the moment.

There are also many peace-loving Palestinians and peace-loving Israelis who are now paying a terrible price. They are paying a terrible price for what is continuing to unfold in the Middle East. It is important to also understand that Hamas is the enemy of peace. Hamas are not conducting themselves in a way that will further the cause of peace-loving Palestinian people.

I certainly hope that there can also be safe passage for innocent civilians. I hope that there will be a negotiated two-state solution, with internationally recognised borders, so that peace-loving Palestinian people and peace-loving Israeli people can move forward. Unfortunately, we know that that is still a long time away. We cannot even imagine the trauma that people are going through in the Middle East at the moment, but genuinely and sincerely I hope that the fighting ends soon and that peace does prevail soon.

I also want to take this opportunity to pass on my sincere regards to those in South Australia who are from the Israeli community and also the Palestinian community—as I have said, people I have come to know who are good, law-abiding and peace-loving people. Many of you may be aware that I had, for example, the great nephew of Andrew Steiner as a very good staff member of mine in government. At the same time, I have also come to know many in my local community who have Palestinian origins as well.

As has been alluded to today, we have not seen any of the scenes that we saw, unfortunately, around parts of the East Coast of Australia and around other parts of the world, where people have been allowed to spread these messages of hate that have also deteriorated into violence. This is absolutely shocking stuff. We all have a responsibility here as members of a free and democratic society to hold onto this concept dearly and to make sure we do what we can to stamp out any situation of hatred that is spread.

I want to wind up by saying that I really do hope that this conflict ends soon. I pray for the families and the friends of those who are impacted by this devastation, and I hope that the situation reaches an amicable agreement in the not too distant future.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:04): I rise to commend the motion and, in doing so, I wish to emphasise that it is important we speak plainly on this occasion, as so many who have contributed to the debate have. The reason we are here debating this motion today is the result of the most horrendous act of terrorism that the world has seen in many decades—indeed, a single act of

terrorism the likes of which Israel has not seen and the Jewish people have not seen since those horrible years of the Holocaust. It is important that we are clear about this.

This act of terrorism was brutally imparted upon civilians in the south of Israel with no notice and with the most horrendous and callous lack of humanity that one can possibly imagine. It was brutal, it was murderous, it was inhumane. It was characterised by wholesale slaughter of young people, of men, of women and of babies, and it included what we have seen then and since: the rape, the torture, the beheading of the most vulnerable and most innocent people.

Those acts of terror were imposed by the terrorist organisation called Hamas. Israel has every right to remove Hamas. We stand with Israel in taking action to defend Israel to remove Hamas, and we stand united in what is that important cause ahead.

But why are we here, even more particularly, reflecting on these horrors? We are reflecting on these horrors in circumstances that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has so ably articulated—against the background of hundreds of years of existential threats against the right of the Jewish people to exist throughout the world. It extends now to the right of Israel to exist. These acts were perpetrated by a terrorist organisation whose objective is to maintain a fight against the right of Israel to exist. Hamas must be removed.

In standing with Jewish people and endeavouring to understand just some modicum of what Jewish people, both in Israel and throughout the world, feel and experience in response to an act of terror committed by a terrorist organisation committed to the end of Jewish people and the state of Israel, this is truly the contemplation of an existential threat to people we hold dear here in Australia and here in South Australia. We stand with those of us in South Australia who are Jewish, as we stand together with Israel as it lives through this horrible experience.

The presence today in the chamber of Norman Schueler OAM has been recognised. I, too, recognise your presence, Norman, and your leadership, steadfast as it has been in South Australia over decades. Norman Schueler was chair of the then South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission, director of the Australia Day Council and, of course, long-time president of the Jewish Community Council of South Australia, just to illustrate the extent of commitment to leadership in our South Australian community that Norman has demonstrated. I say this: those of us in South Australia who are Palestinian or of Palestinian heritage have a great friend in the Jewish Community Council and in its leadership, and in Norman in particular.

I look for opportunities for those of us from those communities to look for ways, here in Australia, to support one another, to understand one another and to do what we have so successfully been able to achieve in South Australia, and that is to demonstrate what the multiple cultures that are brought here to South Australia can achieve in this place.

In speaking plainly, as I have, about an act of terror that we condemn today, I want to emphasise that there can be no peace, no resolution, no outcome of long standing, unless we recommit ourselves to a rules-based order, to the application of principle and to the necessary application and bringing to justice of those events. If we equivocate and look to contextualise, then we fail to identify and we fail in our task to address those acts of terror, so it is very important that we do so. I have spoken, of course, to the special context in which those acts of terror have been committed on the state of Israel.

Australia, of course, is committed to Israel. Australia supported the UN partition plan in 1947 and, as others have said, including in the federal debate that we heard in our parliament in Canberra just yesterday, was among the first countries to recognise the state of Israel in 1949. We here in the parliament of South Australia stand with those members of the Jewish community in South Australia, we stand with the state of Israel, we seek justice and, of course, we seek a peaceful resolution to what is an ongoing distressing and most difficult circumstance in Israel at this time.

I commend all aspects of the motion. Let there never again be seen the kind of horrendous terrorism that was seen on Saturday 7 October 2023.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:13): I rise to support this motion in support of Israel, and I, too, want to acknowledge Norman Schueler OAM and other guests in the gallery here today. This house unequivocally condemns the attacks on Israel by Hamas, which are the heinous acts of

terrorists and have encompassed the targeting and murder of civilians, including women and children, the taking of hostages and indiscriminate rocket fire.

What we saw in recent days was the absolutely cowardly attack by Hamas terrorists on the innocents of Israel—the innocent babies, the innocent children, the innocent men and women, especially the young men and women who were at that music festival, enjoying themselves. As has been described already, there were heinous acts—heinous acts—of beheadings and other terrible ways to murder civilians to try to get some message across. Well, it does not work. It does not work, especially against a state, a country, like Israel. We do condemn these heinous acts, and the people of Palestine must do their bit as well to shut Hamas down.

We do stand with Israel and recognise its inherent right to defend itself. In talking about that, I want to acknowledge the citizens of Israel; its defence force, the Israel Defence Forces; and the reservists who are being flown home from all over the world, willingly, to defend their homeland. Our thoughts and prayers are certainly with them.

We certainly condemn antisemitism, and we recognise that generations of Jewish people have been subjected to this hateful prejudice. We have seen this happen over millennia to the Jewish people, because they are successful. They are very successful in a whole range of ways, whether it is engineering, whether it is in finance. But, certainly, in standing up for themselves, as they have had to, I would suggest they would be the toughest people in the world—because they have had to be. They have had to stand up for themselves.

We certainly call for the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages. I note that hundreds of hostages have been taken, and I really feel for them. I know that the Israeli defence force will be doing its utmost to get their release, and I cannot but think of the terror, not just for them but for their families. It would be too horrific to bear.

As I have already indicated, we recognise that Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people, nor their legitimate needs and aspirations. They certainly do not, and they continue to send rockets into Israel, knowing that innocent civilians will be killed not just in Israel but in Palestine, the place they think they stand for. I could not think of anything further from the truth.

We acknowledge the devastating loss of Israeli and Palestinian life and that innocent civilians on all sides are suffering as a result of the attacks by Hamas and the subsequent conflict, and that is ongoing. We do support justice and freedom for Israelis and Palestinians alike, and we support international efforts to establish and maintain humanitarian access into Gaza, including safe passage for civilians.

I want to acknowledge the restraint shown by the Israeli defence force in giving time lines on any possible movement into Gaza, restraint that has been extended multiple times, because they are trying to get realistic outcomes in the defence of their homeland. We reiterate Australia's consistent position in all contexts to call for the protection of civilian lives and the observance of international law.

We do acknowledge that what has unfolded is deeply distressing for many in the South Australian community. It is close to the heart of many, and it is important that we maintain respect for each other here at home as people express their views.

Before the Palestinian protest on the weekend here in Adelaide I was asked by several people what my views were and I said, 'I support peaceful protest,' and I do. The rights that we have in this country are to be celebrated, but once things get away from being that we have problems. From all reports it was a peaceful protest. It is a good thing that people have the right to speak out, and certainly the Israeli people have that right as well.

We condemn all forms of hate speech and violent extremist activity, including antisemitism and Islamophobia, and we recognise that an attack on any religion is an attack on all religions and that we all share a responsibility to unite, condemn and defeat such an attack on our common values and way of life. We affirm in the strongest possible terms that hateful prejudice has no place in South Australia.

I hope that this conflict comes to an end sooner rather than later. I urge everyone to have a good hard look at what is going on, on whatever side of the line they are, and to use restraint and negotiation where possible. I certainly support Israel and its right to defend itself, but I also urge restraint in the broader Middle East region from Israel's neighbours and others and also from the massing western forces. I know that the United States has sent two carrier groups. We need this to be resolved peacefully, and I urge that to happen not just for Israel but for the world.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (12:21): I stand today to voice my unequivocal support for the motion that condemns the attacks on Israel by Hamas. These attacks—undoubtedly the heinous acts of terrorists—have caused immeasurable suffering and loss of innocent lives. It is imperative that we come together to address this issue and affirm our commitment to peace, justice and the protection of civilian lives.

Let us begin by acknowledging the gravity of the situation. Hamas has been responsible for the targeting and murder of civilians, including women and children. These are not isolated incidents; they are part of a larger pattern of violence that threatens the very essence of human dignity. The taking of hostages and indiscriminate rocket fire further underscore the ruthless tactics employed by this terrorist group. We cannot and must not remain silent in the face of such atrocities.

As we condemn these attacks we also affirm the inherent right of Israel to defend itself. Every nation has the right to protect its citizens from external threats. The attacks by Hamas have forced Israel into a defensive position and it is our moral obligation to support their efforts to ensure the safety and security of their people.

Simultaneously, it is essential that we condemn antisemitism in all its forms. Generations of Jewish people have been subjected to this hateful prejudice and it is our duty to stand against it. We must remember that an attack on any religion is an attack on all religions, and as a diverse society we share the responsibility to unite, condemn and defeat such attacks on our common values and way of life.

Our call for the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages is an expression of our unwavering commitment to human rights and the protection of innocent lives. Hostage-taking is a grave violation of these rights, and we cannot stand idly by while innocent individuals suffer in captivity. It is crucial to recognise that Hamas does not represent the Palestinian people or their legitimate needs and aspirations. The actions of these extremist groups do not reflect the desires of the broader Palestinian population for peace and prosperity. We must distinguish between the actions of terrorist organisations and the aspirations of an entire community.

The ongoing conflict has resulted in a devastating loss of life on both the Israeli and the Palestinian sides. Innocent civilians are suffering and the humanitarian situation is dire. We must support international efforts to establish and maintain humanitarian access to Gaza, including safe passage for civilians. This is a crucial step in mitigating the suffering and the loss of those caught in the crossfire.

Furthermore, it is our responsibility to reiterate Australia's consistent position in all its contexts, which is to call for the protection of civilian lives and the observance of international law. We also acknowledge that the events in the Middle East have deeply distressed many within the South Australian community. This issue is close to the hearts of many and it is important that we maintain respect for each other as people express their views. In this parliament, we must ensure that dialogue and understanding prevail when opinions differ.

In line with the commitment to justice and freedom we bring to this place, we must also condemn all forms of hate speech and violent extremist activity, including antisemitism. Those forms of hate have no place in our society and must be confronted head-on. We cannot allow intolerance and discrimination to flourish.

We must firmly affirm that hateful prejudice has no place in South Australia. Our collective voice against these heinous acts in support of Israel's right to defend itself and in condemnation of antisemitism is an expression of our commitment to peace, justice and the protection of human lives. Let us stand united in pursuit of a better future for all in the Middle East and here at home as we uphold the values that define our society.

I reflect on the horrific story that we heard, that occurred on Saturday 7 October, of the indiscriminate murder of about 260 young people whose only crime was attending a music festival. The men were shot in the back and shot instantly. The women were shot in the legs so they could be raped before they were murdered. Can you imagine? Can you imagine the horrific last minutes of those women's lives? This is what Israel is dealing with in this issue, such hatred for the Jewish community by the Hamas terrorists.

I am appalled and shocked by the actions of four Green members of the federal parliament, when every member of the Labor Party and every member of the Liberal Party and every Independent member of the parliament voted to support a similar motion in the federal parliament yesterday and the Greens voted to support terrorism. It is an absolute shame, an absolute disgrace.

What message does that send to those many young people who turn to the Greens for advice and guidance—to support terrorism? What we have seen from the Greens and other extreme groups in recent years is that they are prepared to ignore conventions and ignore the law if they are fighting for a cause that they believe in. That is not how society works.

This place has many elements that reflect its violent past, because the House of Commons was a house of the common people. People were not necessarily as articulate as those in the House of Lords, and consequently when men wore their swords in this chamber violence would break out. To this day, we all have allocated seats that evolved from the removal of violence in a political debate, starting with the bloodline that was set up for people to stand behind when they spoke so that their swords could not connect, if they drew those swords.

The mace is there reminding everybody of the authority of the Speaker, but the mace's role was initially as a tool to use in a violent manner against members of the House of Commons who behaved inappropriately. Today, it has evolved to remind us all that the Speaker is in control of this chamber and we must respect the Speaker.

The actions of Hamas and terrorists like Hamas have taken their claims, their argument, back about 800 years when violence was seen as the only alternative to winning a debate. The world moved past that many years ago. We must return to civil debate based on facts, based on what is fair, based on what is right, based on democracy—and that is what I call for.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (12:29): I rise to briefly speak on this motion. I think it is especially pertinent that at the first opportunity this place comes back together that we, in a bipartisan manner, unequivocally condemn the attacks on Israel by Hamas, that without any ambiguity around that condemnation we come together and highlight that these acts were those heinous, hateful, vengeful acts of a terrorist organisation and the targeting and murder of civilians, especially the women and children, the taking of hostages and the indiscriminate rocket fire, we absolutely condemn.

We are living in a time when the world feels smaller than it once did and the connections that there are across different countries back to different areas of our world cannot be denied. That is why it is also important that the 13 parts of this motion have all been highlighted, but especially that we acknowledge that what has unfolded over the other side of the world, but being so close, is deeply distressing for many in the South Australian community and the Australian community, that it is close to the heart of many. It is important that we maintain that respect for each other in South Australia, as each of us come to grips with what has happened.

Especially important is paragraph (b), that we stand with Israel and recognise its inherent right to defend itself. The nation of Israel has gone through a challenging past and has been spoken about already through decades, through centuries, through millennia. There should be no excuse for hateful, antisemitic behaviours or speech and we should recognise that generations of Jewish people have been subjected to that hateful prejudice.

The taking of hostages I think is one of the most incredibly vile forms of terrorism that we have seen, and that is why this motion calls for the immediate and unconditional release of all hostages. Using human life as a bargaining tool, as a weapon of war, is a disgusting and heinous act. My heart goes out to those people who are caught in this, the families who have family members there, they do not know if they have been murdered or taken hostage—they do not know the circumstances of each individual.

Those individual personal circumstances are far beyond our understanding in this place, but we do, through this motion, through these 13 parts, highlight that this deliberate attack, one to deliberately inflict terror onto the people of Israel, the Jewish community across the world and the population of the world as a whole, should be utterly condemned. At this time, as we move this motion, I am sure I join all of us in praying for Israel, praying for its people and for the innocent people caught up in this conflict, but most of all we pray for peace.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Could members please rise so that the motion can be carried in the customary way.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

Bills

HYDROGEN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2023.)

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Planning) (12:35): I rise to make some remarks about this bill. We all know that the reduction of reliance on fossil fuels is absolutely critical if we are to address the climate crisis. In this crisis South Australia has already embarked upon a really fundamental journey—from around 2006 when the Rann government passed the renewable energy act—in addressing that crisis and shifting from gas and brown coal at that time, a system totally dominated by fossil fuels, to a system now totally dominated by wind and solar with peaking plants being provided via gas.

We know that the next stage of resolving that crisis, of answering that crisis, of reducing our overall reliance on fossil fuels is, of course, hydrogen. That is the key way in which South Australia will not just decarbonise its own economy but also assist in the decarbonising of our trading partners' economies as well. We have a huge ability to contribute both in demonstrating how you can do this, in providing advice to other jurisdictions about how you might go down this path, and also, critically, as I said before, through the export of hydrogen or energy or green steel or green iron or green minerals.

All of that, I think, puts us in a very unique place, and one thing that we have to do is to tell that story not just once but over and over and over again. My department, in collaboration with other state government agencies, is very keen to provide that support. Invest SA is out there educating people about markets, most recently at the Hydrogen 2 conference in Washington, talking about South Australia's unique journey and about how we have built the bridge to a renewable energy economy, as we are literally walking across it, and pitching that story.

I think all too often South Australia's achievements are lost or obscured by Australia's journey in toto. Sometimes people are very focused on Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria, which are, of course, totally dominated by brown and black coal, totally dominated by a reliance on gas and totally reliant on an inadequate attention and vigour applied to renewable energy. We have a job in making sure that South Australia's unique position is acknowledged by the rest of the country.

Of course, the Hydrogen Jobs Plan, the Premier's signature election commitment, is now government policy, with \$593 million to build a world-leading green hydrogen power station, electrolyser and storage facility at Whyalla in the Upper Spencer Gulf. Delivering on that plan will enable South Australia to continue the leading role, to continue being on the cutting edge of what is a global energy transformation. It is one of the key pillars in our economic strategy and our policy agenda over the next four years. It is about harnessing renewable energy to produce hydrogen and it is also about the opportunity for jobs, investment and business activity.

There is some \$20 billion worth of investment in the pipeline around renewable energy. This has the potential to unlock vast areas of the state's economy. Of course, that investment activates the sorts of developments that we need to meet our investment and export targets and to support local mineral processing and energy. We know that around the world there is a huge amount of

investor interest in hydrogen, especially green hydrogen sourced from renewable energy, as a substitute for fossil fuels.

On nearly every one of my trade missions, we found round tables of investors—whether it was in Singapore, Japan, South Korea, the US or in Europe and the United Kingdom. People are very interested because they have their own jurisdictions, their own challenges and their own issues. Wherever we go to talk to investors, they find South Australia's experience over the last 20 years to be very instructive, they find the resource that we have in terms of wind, solar and also critical minerals to be truly unique and they find that the next steps that we are taking to also be instructive.

This act is designed to regulate the whole life cycle of hydrogen and renewable energy projects and, critically, provide a single window to government approach. So what is new? We have a pre-competitive identification for priority areas on Crown land and that determines, basically, where we can sustainably host renewable energy projects and where project proponents will compete for licences and for land tenure. We are going to have an orderly process on Crown land. We are not going to have the dust of a hundred wagons as people have a goldrush mentality; we are going to have an orderly process that is in the interests of the state.

We are going to have a competitive allocation of licences to proponents on Crown land. Applicants, subject to a transparent selection criteria, will compete for licences on Crown land—which are mainly pastoral leases—and on state waters. As I said before, that makes sure that it protects the interests of the state. It also ensures that we host only those projects willing to embrace coexistence with current land uses and deliver community and environmental benefits through those projects.

We are going to have new licensing arrangements and impact assessments for projects across all land types. That enables regulation for the whole of the project life cycle, avoids land-banking activities, or where projects are sitting around indefinitely waiting for investment, and facilitates the capture of resource data on Crown land, freehold land and state waters—a really critical element to having a coherent response, and that is why this is in part such a critical piece of legislation.

We are also going to have environmentally sustainable development, a framework that places development in the context of ecologically sustainable practices and the circular economy, which we know that we have to embrace not just because it is more climate friendly but also because it is much more efficient. It creates economic incentives, which we have already seen in waste collection and the like, and it makes better use of finite resources.

We are going to have well-resourced and effective regulation, full cost recovery for government services through licence fees and charges, with fit-for-purpose compliance and enforcement powers. That is one of those things that rolls off the tongue pretty easily, but cost recovery for government services is actually critical in providing the private sector with fast and efficient government.

All too often you hear people complain about government, business often complain about government, but all too often that is because cost recovery is not applied as a measure. If you have cost recovery applied as measure, then you can employ the public servants who are necessary to complete these approvals in a rigorous, sensible and efficient manner. If you want efficient government, you do have to have cost recovery. In the same way as if you were running a business—you do not run at a loss—government has to account for the cost of providing these regulatory services.

We want to have land protection and restoration. We want to have financial assurance requirements to ensure that land is rehabilitated and returned to pre-existing conditions. That is really critical. As the Minister for Housing and Urban Development, having Renewal SA in my portfolio, Renewal SA looks after a lot of land that has been very heavily polluted from industrial activities, sometimes dating back as far as the 1900s. Brompton Gasworks is one of the most prominent examples, but there are a whole range of other industrial activities, industrial land that we hold, in the north in particular, where there are remediation issues which have to be accounted for and were not factored in when those industrial developments were contemplated in the first instance.

Often you talk to car workers who are now retired, or workers who had been in the plastics industry or what we would regard as heavy manufacturing now, who will tell you about some of the practices that went on—tipping chemicals into drains, effluent going out into local creeks and the like—which often had pretty dramatic effects on the local environment. Remediation falls back ultimately, nearly always, on the state, if it was not accounted for in the first instance. Making sure at the outset that the remediation of land is thought about, contemplated and costed is just so critically important.

As to pursuing multiple land use outcomes, obviously there are existing communities and people have existing land rights. There are landowners, and those people who are already out there on Crown land do need to be accommodated. Their interests do need to be thought through while we avail ourselves of what is a magnificent solar and wind resource.

Finally, and perhaps most critically, we want to drive benefit for the entire state. We need a financial mechanism to share the future benefit of the value associated with the access of the state's natural resources. The solar and wind resource, which has been mapped by the department of my colleague Minister Koutsantonis, is quite rightly a resource held by the state, and the benefit from that needs to come back to the state as well.

There has been a really comprehensive consultation process. That is important when we are thinking about this sort of legislation; we do need to consult. A comprehensive issues paper was released in late 2022 and a draft bill in May 2023. The government received nearly 200 submissions throughout that consultation. Of course, from the inception, the advice of our First Nations people was sought on the design of these reforms. The state hosted two South Australian Aboriginal Renewable Energy Forums in Port Augusta, one in November 2022 and the other in March 2023, to understand the issues and challenges impacting on Aboriginal groups and to discuss the opportunities to work together on the development of renewable energy.

There has been a regional visit, a dedicated workshop and an online webinar, which has been delivered to the pastoral community to support quality engagement with the government on the draft bill. A total of 18 information sessions were conducted across South Australia's regions during that consultation, and two online webinars—because everything is online these days—were held and recorded with over 200 recorded attendees and a further 300 views on the recordings post that. There were dozens of meetings held with key stakeholder groups and individuals, providing an opportunity to hear directly about the proposal and ask any questions of the government.

Of course, that is not the end of these conversations. The government will continue to work with stakeholders and rights holders to develop the associated regulations and to move forward in identifying the very first release areas for competitive tender under this framework. That is important because we know that sometimes in the community consultation is met with a degree of cynicism, but, in fact, if you look at the way consultation operates with government it is taken seriously.

The more you do of it, you do see the changes to bills and to the way things are developed. Most importantly, it is just inherent in projects like this—which will span over governments and over generations of politicians—that consultation is an absolutely critical part because the following generations of ministers and politicians will look to the work we did in the establishment of this bill, in the same way that we look back at very far-sighted and courageous actions of the Rann government that really saw what the future held and tried to embrace it rather than resist it.

I can tell you that I saw a different approach happen at the commonwealth level, which is now talked about as a climate war. Having been a participant in that, most notably I remember Alan Finkel did a very substantial report that was then released and, rather than seeing sensible and thoughtful consideration of it, what we found was that there was one party room meeting in the Turnbull government and it died an early death. It was actually a very good report about Australia's energy system which I commend to members. I remember thinking how incoherent an approach we were taking at a federal level and that, whatever your politics, it was just not the way you should go about things.

Members on each side of the chamber often have a lot of ability through consultation, through expertise, through parliamentary committees—and ministers through their ability to undertake these consultations and do these regulations—to learn a lot by listening to people. You do not always agree

with them, but you often learn something that you later incorporate into regulations and the like. Of course, that means that there are review provisions. There is a review locked into this act, so there is a review five years after the commencement and then every five years thereafter. You can see with consultations that it is not 'set and forget'. This is an approach undertaken by the government that is all about continual learning and refinement in this act that I think is absolutely critical to this government's approach.

This project is just the beginning of our ambitions for South Australia as a world leader in the hydrogen economy. We are really eager to develop mutually beneficial international relationships around hydrogen. As I said before, the Premier, Minister Koutsantonis and I went to Japan and South Korea. I have been back to Japan for the Fuel Cell Expo, I have been to Singapore and the Premier and Minister Koutsantonis went to Germany and to Rotterdam. We have now established an office in Europe, in Germany, based around the hydrogen economy, and we want to make sure that we engage with the rest of the world on this really important issue.

Most recently, I attended the Australia-Japan business conference in Melbourne (AJBCC), and really the interest in hydrogen and renewable energy in that pathway in Australia's journey—and in the mutual interdependence of Australia's and Japan's economies—is still there. There is a lot of interest there. As I said before, my department was represented at H2 in Washington, and I think there will be just a relentless drumbeat around renewable energy and hydrogen.

Finally, I would certainly like to thank my colleague Minister Koutsantonis. As part of this bill, I have ceded some of the planning responsibilities I have to his department. I think that is a sensible and coherent thing to do—to have one window to government and one regulatory minister. I think this will be an act that will be celebrated by other jurisdictions and copied, inevitably, and I commend it to the house.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:56): I thank all members for their participation in this debate. It is a historic bill. I do want to thank my friend and colleague the Minister for Planning for his cooperation in this matter. It is been a long, long journey to this point.

We are about to enter into a very long, I imagine, committee stage of this bill. There will be a number of questions from members on both sides about this bill. This bill is historic. It is unique in the commonwealth, as it is a one window to government for all renewable developments in South Australia on freehold, pastoral and Crown land, which is unique. The reason we do so, the reason we have these ambitions, is that it is South Australia's time to re-industrialise on the back of renewable energy.

The critics of renewable energy believe that renewable energy has been the cause of deindustrialisation. I believe that they are wrong. I believe that we can harness the sun and the wind, and our other renewable resources, and that we can use our vast amounts of land and our coincident sun and wind to beneficiate what God has given us in vast amounts of magnetite reserves across the nation, especially here in South Australia.

Our magnetite is unique. Our magnetite is possibly the best anywhere in the world. I pose this question to members of the house: would it be easier for us to export hydrogen to markets around the globe, or would it be easier for us to decarbonise manufactured goods here and export them traditionally? I am talking about green iron or green steel. I think the answer is obvious. With those few words and the—

Mr Odenwalder: New information has come to light.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: With those few words, I will continue my remarks for another moment or so.

This bill was not an election commitment that we made. This bill came about—and I mean this not as a criticism of the former minister—because as energy minister I was meeting with proponent after proponent who was meeting with pastoral leaseholders, signing individual agreements for vast tracts of South Australian Crown land from the pastoral lease for renewable projects which had no time line and no work plans. They were basically locking up vast parts of South Australia to suit their own timetables and not ours.

What we are proposing are timetables, much like an oil and gas tenement or a mining tenement, where we want to see work plans up-front, we want to see spending plans up-front, we want to regulate and monitor how they are being performed, and I think that will give us more development faster. With that, we could see gigawatt scale behind the mineral renewable resources built that could be used to split water to make hydrogen, to make ammonia, to make toluene, to make forms of energy that we can use here or export, which could dramatically alter the landscape of South Australia. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

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

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey): Presented a petition signed by 12,436 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to commit to the duplication of the Sturt Highway Truro freight route to address safety concerns and boost productivity for the 4,500 vehicles that travel the Sturt Highway daily.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Report 8 of 2023—Annual Report 2022-23—

Part A: Executive Summary [Ordered to be published]

Part B: Controls Opinion [Ordered to be published]

Part C: Agency and Audit Reports Reports [Ordered to be published]

Independent Commission Against Corruption—

Annual Report 2022-23

Integrity State: Corruption prevention recommendations Report September 2023

Parliament of South Australia—Assembly of Members of both Houses for the election of a member to fill a vacancy in the Legislative Council caused by the resignation of the Hon. Irene Pnevmatikos—Minutes—17 October 2023

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

Auditor-General's Department—Annual Report 2022-23

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

Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009—Assumed Identities and Witness Identity Protection—Australian Criminal Intelligence Commission—

Annual Report 2022-23

Civil and Administrative Tribunal, South Australian—Annual Report 2022-23

Commissioner for Victims' Rights—Annual Report 2022-23

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board—

Actuarial Review 2022-23
Annual Report 2022-23

By the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water (Hon S.E. Close)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Local Nuisance and Litter Control—
Amendment of Act, Schedule 1
Guidelines

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Motor Vehicles—Speed Limits on Beaches
Road Traffic—
Miscellaneous—Speed Limits on Beaches
Road Rules—Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions—Speed Limits on
beaches

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia) Act 2010—
Amendment of Law—No. 2

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. A. Koutsantonis) on behalf of the Minister for
Local Government (Hon G.G. Brock)—

Local Council By-Laws—
District Council of Mt Remarkable—No. 4—Local Government Land
District Council of Ororoo Carrieton—
No. 1—Permits and Penalties
No. 2—Moveable Signs
No. 3—Local Government Land
No. 4—Roads
No. 5—Dogs
No. 6—Cats
No. 7—Waste Management

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:05): I bring up the 45th report of the committee, entitled Adelaide Aquatic Centre Development.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr BROWN: I bring up the 46th report, entitled Roma Mitchell Secondary College Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

Mr BROWN (Florey) (14:06): I bring up the final report of the committee, together with the minutes and proceedings of evidence.

Report received.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: Before I call questions without notice, I acknowledge the presence in the chamber of students from Golden Grove High School, guests of the member for King. Welcome to parliament today. It is a pleasure to have you with us.

*Question Time***ULURU STATEMENT FROM THE HEART**

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Is the government committed to the implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In July 2019, the Labor Party committed to a state-based implementation of the Uluru Statement from the Heart that includes Voice, Treaty, Truth. Over the weekend, 64 per cent of South Australians did not support the alteration of the Australian constitution to establish an Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Voice.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:07): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The South Australian people made clear on the weekend in a significant majority that they are opposed to an alteration to the Australian constitution, as the Leader of the Opposition has identified. That is a result that speaks to a degree of consistency around the relative caution that Australians have had towards changing the constitution.

I think most Australians accept that we live in an exceptional country with some proud traditions and that we are well served by the Australian constitution, so they are naturally wary about any alterations to it. Obviously, I was supporting the yes campaign and have been supportive of a Voice in our federal parliament enshrined in the constitution, but the Australian people have rejected that proposition overwhelmingly and I and my party overwhelmingly accept the determination that has been made not just by South Australians but I think by the citizens of every state around the country.

In respect of the legislated Voice to Parliament, which of course is very different in nature to the constitutionally enshrined Voice, yes, that is government policy. As the Leader of the Opposition is obviously well aware, that legislation passed our parliament earlier this year. It's a proposition of having a legislated Voice to Parliament that has had bipartisan support in the past.

As recently as last year, of course, the shadow minister for Aboriginal affairs introduced legislation for a state-based legislated Voice to Parliament. It was different in its construct to what we now have in the state as a matter of law, but there was that unanimity of opinion across the political divide that we should have a state-based Voice to Parliament.

That position subsequently changed, which I could go into in great detail about if those opposite would like, but one thing I do note was a reference made by Senator Liddle in today's *Advertiser*, or I understand it was reported at least online last night, but I think it is in today's *Tiser* as well. She quite rightly said, and I quote:

The difference between the proposed, now-defeated Voice proposition and the SA Voice is that the SA Voice is legislated, not enshrined within the constitution.

And I could not agree more. It is a statement of the obvious truth. So we will maintain the policy proposition.

I think that what is clear to me—particularly on the back of the results of the weekend—is that the state-based Voice now has a test before it. The state-based Voice has an opportunity before it, an opportunity, once it is up and running and established in this place when it makes its representation, for it to have a positive impact on the policy development around Indigenous affairs in our state.

There is, I think, consistency between all members in this parliament about a desire to close the gap, to improve the abhorrent state of Indigenous disadvantage. The Voice will have an opportunity to contribute to policy development that seeks to address that. That's an opportunity that we look forward to and it's one that I hope only enhances the deliberations of this parliament not just in the years ahead but hopefully for the years beyond that as well.

ULURU STATEMENT FROM THE HEART

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is again to the Premier. How does the government plan to implement measures to progress Truth and Treaty in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The First Nations Voice Act 2023 states that the provisions of the act are intended to be read in conjunction with and to complement the provisions of any other act that implements measures to progress Truth and Treaty as identified in the Uluru Statement from the Heart.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question again.

As the Leader of the Opposition is well aware, the government has been very deliberate in its approach around the application of the Uluru Statement. Obviously, the Uluru Statement finds itself in a difficult position on a federal level now by virtue of the weekend's result, but for the purposes of South Australian government policy we were very clear from the outset that Voice comes first. Voice will be established and up and running throughout the course of next year, all things being well, and from there the government will turn its mind to Treaty and Truth.

What I would say about Treaty before anyone tries to, I think, unreasonably cause concern about it, is that we see state governments delivering on Treaty propositions in different forms right throughout the country, but we are very clear about the fact that Voice comes first, and we await the implementation of the Voice next year.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. When will the Premier fix ramping? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: South Australian patients and paramedics spent 3,290 hours stuck on the ramp in September 2023, which is more than 400 hours worse than the worst month under the former Liberal government.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:13): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. Since the parliament last met, if my dates are right, the September ramping data was released. We release our ramping data on a monthly basis. We don't hide it. We don't seek to fail to disclose it. We have a very different approach to what the shadow minister for health undertook when she was advising the former Premier about ramping data. We put it out in a monthly organised way.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: We are willing to be transparent about this data.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Schubert!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: When we released the data only a couple of weeks ago for September, we were pleased—in a modest way, we are pleased about the fact that there has been an improvement in the September data. Throughout the course of this winter, we saw improvement on last year.

Mrs Hurn: That was the worst year on record.

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Last year was a particularly difficult year, that is absolutely true, when it comes to ramping data.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Last year was challenged by the fact that it was the first time in the history of the state that we had flu and COVID in the state at the same time, dealing with a legacy of cuts that were made by the former government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The former government, in their wisdom, decided to make our health staff redundant during the course of a global pandemic. We rejected that policy and we went to the election with a different policy, and that is to invest in more beds and more people, so we are opening a lot more beds and we are recruiting a lot more nurses and doctors to the hospital system. That has manifested itself in an improvement on the statistics this year, with May better than May last year, April better than April last year, June, July—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —August and September all being true. What we have been clear about is the need for more improvement and we are actively delivering on that. In respect of the other key metric outside of ramping hours itself and that of course is ambulance response times, which we were crystal clear about—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —in multiple forums in the lead-up to the election that we were very keen—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: Don't talk about ramping!

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hartley!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —to make sure we improve ambulance response time data, again that has continued to improve as well.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Now the opposition interject and the opposition would seek to imply that ambulance response times might not matter. Well, they matter to us.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Morialta! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: When people call 000, they want to know that there's a chance the ambo might roll up on time. We know when those opposite were in charge there was a two in three chance they were going to roll up late.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Well, now, as a result of the policies that we have implemented, the opening up of hundreds of beds—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Frome!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —the recruitment of hundreds of nurses—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —and over a hundred extra ambos already on the books as a result of our policies, ambulances are now rolling up on time at a far greater level than was the case when the former mob were in charge. So it's worthwhile South Australians being conscious of the fact that had we not had a change in government, then South Australians would have been left in peril on two out of three occasions, waiting for their ambulance to roll up on time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Well, now they are rolling up on time and that means lives are being saved, which is exactly what our health workers want to deliver.

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the leader, the member for Morialta and the member for Chaffey are warned.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier agree with the Deputy Premier that ramping figures in September were incredibly pleasing? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In a media release on 6 October, the Deputy Premier described the 3,290 hours lost to the ramp in September as, and I quote, 'incredibly pleasing'.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:18): The short answer to the Leader of the Opposition's question is that I always agree with the Deputy Premier in almost every instance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: There are occasions where the Deputy Premier and I might have a different view on various matters, but in respect of this particular case I can assure you that the Deputy Premier and I are in lock step. The Deputy Premier, I think, is right to acknowledge where there has been improvement. We have hundreds of people, extra new people who have been recruited to our health service, on top of the thousands of others—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —who dedicate themselves day in, day out, trying to deliver the highest quality healthcare service that money can buy. Those people deserve commendation when they start to deliver improvement. Those people are worthy of recognition when they deliver a better outcome than what we have seen in the past.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: So the Deputy Premier is absolutely right in her remarks to acknowledge the contribution that those health workers are making, to acknowledge the improvement where we see it, because it is okay in our health system to celebrate success—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for a second time.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —where we see it. For some in politics, all they want to do is focus on the negative.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: That is in full display from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta, order! Member for Florey! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: I for one am very glad to be in lock step with the Deputy Premier in acknowledging the hard work of those people on the frontline, including where we see improvements in the system.

Members interjecting:

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

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mrs HURN (Schubert) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Does the minister take responsibility for ramping in South Australia? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mrs HURN: The Malinauskas Labor government has delivered the worst 16 months of ramping on record, with this government's worst month being 1,100 hours worse than the worst ever month under the former Liberal government.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:20): Thank you very much for the question. Certainly, as we have made very clear in this house, this is our number one priority in terms of addressing the issues—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert, you have asked the question. We have turned to the minister. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —that we see in our healthcare system, and the ramping crisis is top-line of those issues. Of course, as we have said before, to address that you cannot just do one thing. There is not one single fix that can be done to address it. There needs to be a comprehensive—

Mrs Hurn interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Schubert!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —set of measures, as we announced before the election, that we are in the process of implementing to make sure that we can address the issues in terms of patient flow that see people stuck in emergency departments, that mean people get stuck on the ramp, that mean people calling 000 cannot get an ambulance when they need it. Every element of that system we have needed to address in terms of the investments that we are making and in terms of the system improvements that we are putting in place.

Clearly, as we said before the election, we had the ability, more quickly than other measures, to hire additional paramedics. That was clearly needed because, even on days under the previous government and under this government when there was low ramping, we were not seeing response times at the level that they were at four or five years ago. We put in place those additional resources, and we have seen improvements in those response times, as the Premier has articulated.

What we still need to do is address the patient flow situation, where we see regularly people who are stuck in emergency departments waiting for a bed elsewhere in the system. That is partly because we do not have enough beds, and we are in the process of building hundreds and hundreds

of extra beds in our healthcare system. This is the first time in decades that this has been tackled. Right now, there are beds under construction at the Lyell McEwin Hospital and beds under construction at Flinders Medical Centre and at the Repat.

Right across the system, we are putting in place additional beds to make sure we have that capacity. Of course, we also have to deal with the issue in terms of making sure that people can leave hospital when they are ready to do so and do not get stuck in hospital longer than they need to be. Part of that is working with the commonwealth government in relation to the NDIS and aged care, which is a key barrier for discharge, but also a measure that we put in the most recent budget is additional staff to work across the weekends in our health networks to make sure that patient flow can continue over those periods and people do not get stuck waiting for discharge.

All these measures need to be addressed in conjunction to make sure that patient flow can happen. As the Premier said, we certainly welcome the fact that we have seen over the past four or five months an improvement compared with the same time last year. We know that there is a long way to go, and that is why we have a very detailed plan in terms of putting these measures in place, very opposite to what we see in terms of no plan, no suggestions whatsoever, other than just attacking and throwing stones at this—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Schubert, member for Morialta! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: What we do not have are propositions of bringing in corporate liquidators, of making staff cuts, of making frontline nurses redundant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: —hundreds and hundreds of frontline nurses, making them redundant, making privatisations. That is not our plan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, shadow treasurer! The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Our plan is about investment in additional—

Mr Cowdrey interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Colton!

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Our plan is about investing in additional capacity and additional doctors and nurses and addressing those patient flow issues so that people can get the care that they need.

NATIONAL SKILLS AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. How many places in the government's skills agreement will be reserved for or available to the non-government skills sector? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The government has just announced a skills agreement claiming 150,000 places over the next five years, but this matter does not appear to be detailed in the publicly available information—certainly not in the minister's press release. A substantial portion of skilled training in South Australia, especially for apprentices and trainees, is undertaken by non-government providers, including both industry-led not-for-profits and independent providers. In the recent rounds of the fee-free TAFE program, many such providers were given very few or no places.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:25): I thank the member for Morialta for the question. I am pleased to have the opportunity to talk about

the very substantial skills agreement that the Premier and I just announced, along with the member for Adelaide, not more than an hour ago.

We all know the challenge that is in front of us as a nation; I know the member for Morialta knows that too. We are amidst a national skills crisis. There is a lot that we need to do, not just to meet existing demand but also to plan for future demand, particularly in areas of state priority if we were to look at things like AUKUS and the delivery of preschool for three year olds and hydrogen. There are big workforce challenges and targets that we need to meet to make sure we deliver on those opportunities as well.

What has been announced in the last 24 hours, and then announced by the Premier and I this morning, is that we have signed up to a five-year National Skills Agreement with the federal government. Within that is 150,000 training places over five years, which is a 50,000 increase in places. I asked the agency to go back and do a little bit of work on how long it has been since we have seen an uplift of this magnitude in our state, and the answer was they couldn't find one bigger in recent memory. I think that paints a picture for the house of the significance and magnitude of the agreement that we have struck today.

To the specific question that the member for Morialta asked about how many of these places will be available to private or not-for-profit training providers, there certainly will be. We know, and I have said, I think, since day one of being the Minister for Training and Skills in South Australia, that if we are to be serious about getting on top of the existing shortages that we have and being able to actually deliver on the workforce targets that we have for some of those priority areas in our state, we will need all parts of the training and skills sector in South Australia working together.

I think that we were pretty up-front in what we delivered within the first 12 months of government. The member for Morialta refers to fee-free TAFE. Well, I can say that in the twelve and a half thousand places that we delivered in an agreement with the federal government at the end of last year, there were I think something like 2,000 of the twelve and a half that were set aside for not-for-profit and some for-profit providers as well, which was significantly more than a lot of other jurisdictions did. That was done because—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It made it worse. They were terrible and slightly less terrible.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: Certainly it was twelve and a half thousand more fee-free places than the previous government offered. We had said from the outset that we needed to make sure that all parts of the training and skills sector—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: We said from the outset that we needed all parts of the training and skills sectors—government, for-profit and not-for-profit—working together to make sure that we get on top of existing demand and vacancies and plan for future demand. We delivered that in a very significant way in the first tranche of fee-free TAFE places that we offered, which have all been expended now, such was the uptake. In terms of the 150,000 places that the Premier and I announced today in conjunction with the commonwealth government, a lot of those will be accessible by for-profit and not-for-profit training providers.

Today, we have announced the envelope, the amount of money behind it, a five-year agreement worth \$2.29 billion, an uplift in the vicinity of more than \$600 million for South Australia alone, and the heavy lifting in terms of that uplift actually being done by the South Australian state government, by the Malinauskas government, with more than \$400 million of that uplift coming from this government here.

We will now work with it, making our own skills plan and using the power that we have protected to be able to decide our priorities ourselves in terms of exactly what professions and qualifications will be available under that 150,000 places, and then we will be able to communicate to the sector—government, for-profit and not-for-profit—about what will be available to them.

NATIONAL SKILLS AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Supplementary: has the government determined a figure in line with the federal government on how many places will go to non-government providers, or is that negotiation still to take place?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:29): I thank the member for Morialta for his supplementary question. There is a body of work that we will need to do now as we put together the state's Skills Plan. We have now secured the money and the subsidised places that we believe we need to help deliver on existing shortages and plan for future workforce demand, particularly in areas of state significance. I mentioned before AUKUS, the introduction of preschool for three year olds, and hydrogen as just three examples.

We will do the Skills Plan work now to make sure that we decide and allocate those 150,000 places in areas where there is that need and where there is that demand. Of course, we will be working with the private sector as well as the government training provider, TAFE, as well as not-for-profit training providers as we put together that Skills Plan to talk to them around how they can play a role in the delivery of the 150,000 training places over the next five years that we have secured.

NATIONAL SKILLS AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): Supplementary: in relation to the \$1.4 billion the government has announced that this government will invest in the agreement, was any of that already in the forward estimates of the state budget, and, if so, how much?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:31): I thank the member for Morialta for his question. In terms of precise figures, I think it's \$690 million of uplift or money that is new over and above what we would have already been spending as a state—that is new. Of that, I think \$440 million, from memory, is state. The difference between the \$440 million and the \$690 million figure is federal government new money to put together a total uplift in the vicinity of \$690 million of new money.

As I said before, upon preparing to make this announcement today with the commonwealth, we asked the agency, the training and skills part of the Department for Education, about how long it had been since we had seen an increase in new money uplift like that in South Australia, and they went back—

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Two years ago.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: No, that wasn't their answer. Their answer was they went back as far as they could and they can't, in living memory, remember an increase like this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The biggest increase, in fact—

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Florey, order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: The biggest increase that the department—this is the agency responsible that has done a lot of the grunt work in the negotiations. I think it's a good opportunity for me here today to pay tribute to the people in the training and skills department for the huge body of work they have done in the last few months to come to an agreement in a relatively short period of time.

Let's put this in perspective: we have been a government for about 18 months, thereabouts; the Albanese Labor government for a shorter period than that. This is the second National Skills Agreement we have signed in that time—that's how serious—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —we are about this. We announced twelve and a half thousand fee-free places for South Australia alone—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: —at the end of last year, twelve and a half thousand fee-free places for South Australia alone at the end of last year, ten and a half thousand of those to TAFE, 2,000 to be shared by for-profit and not-for-profit training providers, and they are basically all gone. They are all gone, all used already, and we have now signed up to new fee-free TAFE places as well. So I won't accept any kind of—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: In fact, I am reminded that the former skills minister I think was unable to secure an agreement with the federal government at all. When I came to the role there was no agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Unley! Member for Florey! The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I will put it as simply as I can: four years, no agreement; 18 months, two agreement. Four year, no agreement; 18 month, two agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I cannot make that any simpler for you over there. Four year, no agreement; 18 month, two agreement.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, please be seated. The member for Morialta is making a spirited contribution. It is, however, contrary to the standing orders; he is warned for a final time. The minister has the call.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER: I think I will conclude my remarks there, thank you.

SKILLS TRAINING

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:34): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier expand for the house about how the Malinauskas Labor government is investing in skilling South Australians?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier, please be seated; there is a point of order. The member for Morialta on a point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Thank you, sir. Standing order 97: the framing of that question contained argument and purported fact.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There were a significant number of interjections; it was difficult to hear the question. I am going to give the member for Newland another opportunity.

Ms SAVVAS: My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house about how the Malinauskas Labor government is investing in skilling South Australians?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! It is a matter of fine judgement. There may be a—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hammond!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! However, I am going to turn to the member for Newland and give her an opportunity to recast the question. It may be possible to frame the question without introducing any argument or fact, just to reflect generally or ask a general question in relation to the same subject matter.

SKILLS TRAINING

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (14:36): Can the Premier update the house about how the government is investing in skilling?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am going to permit the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:36): I want to thank the member for Newland for her question. The member for Newland I know has spent a fair bit of time in her electorate talking to local businesses lately, and the member for Newland has made it clear to me that the questions that have been raised with her, the issues that have been elevated for her consideration amongst businesses in her community, are the same that we get everywhere we go on this side of the house around our great state.

We've got the lowest unemployment rate in South Australia that we have ever experienced in our history. Never before has the unemployment rate been lower than it is today. That is an outstanding statistic. It is an outstanding demonstration of how strong the South Australian labour market is, but for businesses in the member for Newland's electorate and elsewhere it means it is hard at the moment to find access to skilled labour.

We have an extraordinary pipeline of work coming our state's way in almost every sector, but it is particularly true when we think about just the big projects, for instance: whether it be the Women's and Children's Hospital, the completion of the north-south corridor or, of course, the naval shipbuilding work we have down at Osborne. There is a pipeline of demand for skilled labour in this state unlike anything we have ever seen, so now is the time that this government decides to make one of the biggest investments in skills we have ever seen in our past.

The Minister for Education, Training and Skills has been working overtime in recent time to land a historic agreement with the commonwealth that sets us up for the next five years—a \$2.5 billion investment in skills and training in our state, over \$400 million of which is brand-new money that this state government has contributed to more skills in the hospitality sector, more skills in the construction trades, more skills in renewable energy, more skills in advanced manufacturing. We are heeding the call of the employers who exist in Newland and in every other seat around the state.

We understand that right now in South Australia the biggest constraint to economic growth isn't a lack of demand but a lack of access to labour that is skilled. The only way we are going to address that is if we invest in it. We on this side of the house believe that you don't have to go to university to have a great job, you don't have to go to university to have a good life with an outstanding standard of living, but you can improve your standard of living through the acquisition of an

apprenticeship or a trade or some other degree of skill that is desperately in need out in the economy today.

So that's why we are so grateful to be able to partner with the commonwealth with this step change investment, but it's not the only one. This comes on top of the free TAFE places that this government has invested in. This is on top of our commitment to reinvest in trade schools and technical colleges in our high schools. This government is serious about investing in trade and skills.

These are the types of investments that can make a material difference, not just for employers but also for the individuals who acquire this knowledge through the state government's investments. These are life-changing policies for the people who are the beneficiaries of them; 150,000 young South Australians will be the beneficiaries of this \$2 billion agreement, of this record investment from our state, because we believe in our young people. We believe they deserve the opportunity for a good job in a growing economy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

NATIONAL SKILLS AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Will non-government training providers receive subsidies equivalent to those received by the government provider under the new skills agreement in return for delivering the same courses?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:40): I thank the member for Morialta for his question. I will have to take that on notice because, as I said in the answer to the member for Morialta's earlier question, we have the envelope of funding now: big uplift, 150,000 places, 50,000 over and above what we would have been delivering. We now do the work of the Skills Plan, where we work with all parts of the South Australian economy in terms of what we need in terms of new workers, particularly for those priority projects for South Australia. We will work with for-profit, not-for-profit as well as the public training provider, TAFE, in terms of what they believe they can deliver out of that envelope of 150,000 places.

In terms of the specific question around what subsidy will private providers attract compared to what, for instance, TAFE might attract or not-for-profit training providers might attract, I can't answer that off the top of my head. I am happy to find out. But I want to reject any insinuation—and I am not suggesting of course that the member for Morialta is doing this—that in some way we are taking a position that is anti-private providers, because we are not.

I can tell you that as the minister in the chair I pushed hard when we had the first twelve and a half thousand fee-free TAFE places or fee-free places—ten and a half thousand of which were TAFE, 2,000 of which were for-profit and not-for-profit. That is, TAFE didn't feel that it was able to deliver them all, then we should absolutely be making sure that they were available to other parts of the training sector as well, and I will maintain that philosophy.

I am not here to try to sew everything up in a nice bow for TAFE, but we are serious about rebuilding it. We have said that from the start and we are making that investment. I think it is important that we remember that in a comparatively smaller jurisdiction like ours with very big workforce targets in a number of key areas that we do need all parts of the training and skills sector to be working together if we are to be serious about getting on top of the demands that we have both now and into the future.

NATIONAL SKILLS AGREEMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary, sir: in relation to the 150,000 places the minister described, how many of them are going to be available next year and the year after? Is it 30,000 a year or some other breakup?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:43): We will look at that as part of the Skills Plan. It's 150,000 across the lifetime of the agreement, so the five-year agreement. We will look at what the phasing is of the position of the subsidised spots that

are available as part of this agreement. That again is probably something that I will want to sit down with the sector and talk about because it's not just about divvying them up and handing them out. We need to sit down and talk to all those providers—government and not-for-profit and for-profit—who hopefully will be a part of delivering the 150,000 around what their capacity actually is. That's an important question for all training providers including TAFE.

I am sure all training providers out there, whether they are public, private or not-for-profit, are very keen to access some of these, of course, but I need to have reassurance as the minister, as the Premier and Cabinet does, that they are able to actually deliver them within the lifetime of the agreement. That's part of the body of work that we need to do that will make up the Skills Plan in terms of who will access them, how many will be available in each year of the five years of the agreement, and then what the specific qualifications and courses might actually be where we make them available. We know, for instance, we have in my own portfolio areas our commitment for the introduction of preschool for three year olds. Royal commissioner Julia Gillard set out some very precise workforce numbers; we need to meet that.

We have it for AUKUS in terms of the facility that will actually build the subs, and then the workforce we need to build the subs themselves, and then things like hydrogen as well, not to mention existing demand in the construction and building industry. That is a piece of work that we will do over the next few months, and I will be very happy to come back to this place and provide both the member for Morialta and the rest of the members in this place with some more details as we go.

APPRENTICESHIPS AND TRAINEESHIPS

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is for the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Will the Malinauskas Labor government deliver an increase to commencements of apprentices and traineeships during this term compared with the last full year of the Liberal government?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:45): Of course, commencements are important in terms of what goes in the front end. I don't disagree with the member for Morialta there; we need to increase the number of South Australians in training. But what we know is that nationally we have an incredibly inefficient training and skills system. If you look at all forms of training and skills, whether it's a traineeship or an apprenticeship or other forms of training that Australians might be accessing, I think it is actually just below 50 per cent. So only around one in two people who actually start training actually finish it.

Of course, that is a bad result for the student, the trainee or the apprentice; it is a bad result for prospective employers, who are desperately crying out for more skilled workers; and it's also a really bad result for taxpayers, including the Australian taxpayers, because that is ultimately taxpayer money that is going towards offering the subsidy on that course.

We know that, although having more people come in and commence a course is certainly important, what we need to focus on to make our system more efficient and actually make sure we get better bang for buck for the South Australian and Australian taxpayers is a serious bit of work on completions. In South Australia, we have put our hand up to lead that piece of work, and we have started that process. I reported back to skills ministers recently, in Hobart, around the work that we had done there, and I am pleased to see that, in some of the most recent data that we have, we have a 4.8 per cent increase in completions, which I think is an important thing.

We know we need to do more in terms of the support that we wrap around young people in training, particularly. I think that in days gone by government viewed its role as one of providing the subsidy and then stepping away, but I think we know that there is a role for government to play beyond that now in terms of some of the mental health and wellbeing supports. All our employers, particularly those with apprentices, tell us they need to get someone through from the commencement to the completion. That is what we are up for as well, and that's why I suggested that South Australia be the state to lead that piece of completion work, which we are now doing.

MAJORS ROAD INTERCHANGE

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister inform the house of progress on the Majors Road interchange and of recent publicly expressed views on the project?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:47): It won't take long, it will hurt, but it will be okay in the end.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I'm sure you will recover. This is an important project—an important project. There has been a lot said about this project locally. In fact, a prominent local was out there, urging people to sign a petition—to sign a petition—to stop this project. Not only that, this prominent individual claimed that 80 per cent of people oppose this project. Eighty per cent of locals don't support this project, apparently.

This person went on to post this on Facebook and put some money behind it to promote it, to get it out there, to encourage people to sign this petition. I want to read some of the comments on this Facebook post. Will Cook wrote:

I live in this community and I definitely want it.

Well, not going as planned, one quote. Then, another person wrote:

As a ratepayer in the area, I welcome the ramps.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Simon Wills wrote:

I'm keen for it to happen as well and was happy when you were pushing for it as well. Politics is an interesting game at times.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Jesse—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Jesse made the comment, 'some double standards champ', and then posted a quote from the person who put this post up, who said:

This is my number one priority to deliver an on-off ramp for the Southern Expressway at O'Halloran Hill.

As Mr Speirs told his Facebook followers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Another person wrote, 'Hey, David, is this you?', with a copy of a link to a video of David driving along on the Southern Expressway.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Chaffey!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sarah Goldsmith said:

Maybe the people David is quizzing about the on-off ramp at Hallett Cove shops are not the demographic that need the on-off ramp addition to help us get home and to our families faster.

But I admire the conviction of the Leader of the Opposition. What do you do in the face of all this criticism? He stood firm. He pressed delete so quickly on that post. It's another example of the flip-flop.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of Government Business, order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I thought you wanted to have fun.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, order! Member for Florey!

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta under 134. I anticipate 127.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Standing order 98: the minister has moved from the substance.

The SPEAKER: That may be. As well, standing order 127 prevents personal reflections on members, or at least it is intended to. I bring the Leader of Government Business to the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is my favourite standing order, sir. It's the one that I abide by the most in this house.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The one I think about the most, yes. Majors Road is an important election commitment this government made. We made it because we believe it's important for the southern suburbs to have access to the Southern Expressway. We shared the views of the previous member for Black, who has undergone some serious alterations to policies since that time.

We believe it is important and it's good to have the backing of locals, who when they see their local member go out and say, 'Eighty per cent of people oppose this,' call him out on it. When they call him out on it, his response is not to double-down and show the evidence. His response is to delete the post. There are comments on that Facebook page about the way that the Leader of the Opposition's office was editing those comments by deleting them.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It was an ad, not a post.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have heard this before. He was for it before he was against it.

The SPEAKER: The minister's time has expired.

ROBE COMMUNITY PARAMEDICS

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health. Will the Robe community paramedics continue to be funded past their current contract? Mr Speaker, with your leave and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: I understand that the current contract for the Robe community paramedics is due at the end of December. These community paramedics cover an area as wide as Robe, Kingston, Beachport, Avenue and Lucindale. They treat patients in their own homes and their care helps prevent medical conditions from developing into situations that require urgent medical assistance.

Over the summer, the population in Robe swells from 1,500 to 15,000. Given the chronic doctor shortage in the town and surrounding towns, this service is vitally important. Robe paramedics need some surety of tenure that this service will continue to be funded on an ongoing basis.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:53): I thank the member for his question and his passion and care about health services in his region. It was great to visit the hospital recently in Kingston in the South-East with the member and to meet with the local health advisory council.

Clearly, Robe is an important community and, as the member says, particularly one which swells in numbers over the summer months and over holiday periods, etc., and for a number of years there has been an arrangement in place to have a community paramedic in place. This has been an arrangement that has been 50 per cent funded by the state government through a combination of SA Ambulance and the Limestone Coast Local Health Network and 50 per cent through the Country SA Primary Health Network, which is through the federal government.

From our perspective, we are very keen for this arrangement to continue. We think it has delivered benefit to the community and, of course, we are expanding similar roles across South Australia. As the member for Narungga knows, certainly we will be expanding a community paramedic in the Wallaroo community as well. As you, sir, know as well in terms of the member for MacKillop, obviously we have expanded paramedic roles through the arrangements in terms of bringing the Keith hospital into the public healthcare system as well.

We are in negotiations at the moment with the Country SA Primary Health Network. We are hopeful that that will be resolved to enable their funding to be able to continue, but certainly only today I had a discussion with Rob Elliott, the Chief Executive Officer of SA Ambulance Service, who has been having some of those discussions with the primary healthcare network. He is confident that this arrangement will continue past the end of the year, and we are hopeful that that will do so.

I might take the opportunity as well to note that, with respect to the discussion of Robe and its healthcare services, our thanks and the thanks of the whole house go to the incredible work of Dr David Senior in that community, who has been a bedrock of medical services in that community for many years, and I think this year is in fact his 30th year of providing services to that community. Thank you to him for really being the backbone of those services for so many, many years.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER CHILD PLACEMENT PRINCIPLE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Is the government committed to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle and, if so, what action will the government take to ensure its effective application? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: Commissioner April Lawrie's preliminary report observes at page 7, and I quote:

The ATSI CPP aims to enable systemic change to address the needs of Aboriginal children and families which are not being met within the current legislative and policy frameworks.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:56): Thank you to the member for the question. It is a very important question that I am very happy to answer. Can I first of all say thank you to Commissioner Lawrie and to her team for their extensive work and extensive engagement with community members over the past almost a year, and can I say thank you to her for her preliminary report that will, of course, be tabled in the parliament in due course and in the timeliness that is required as per the legislation, as per the report.

Can I say, just to give a little bit of background on our commitment on this side of the house to ensuring that the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle is advanced in every way that it can be, that during the course of the last parliament I moved amendments to legislation that was proposed by the then minister to strengthen the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle, but, sadly, those amendments were not supported by the then government, the then minister. That was a great pity because that was an opportunity to strengthen the principle's application, and I was very sad for community members when that was not supported.

What I can say also is that, as well as providing her contribution through the report, Commissioner Lawrie and her team also contributed to the comprehensive review that has been conducted of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act, a review that was tabled in this house some months ago. In her contribution to the review several suggestions were made about how we can strengthen, very importantly, the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle. So we have carefully considered that feedback. It is feedback that aligns with her comments around the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle—the comments that she has now made in her preliminary report.

I can absolutely assure the member, as I think I also assured him in a briefing that I gave him, that that is an issue that we are absolutely considering as we go through the process of drafting the Children and Young People (Safety) Act provisions. I look forward to the moment when we do introduce legislation into the house and have further debate about how we can work to strengthen the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle.

What I will also say is that, very importantly, alongside the work in the legislative space, we have also recently announced an investment of \$3.2 million into the establishment of a peak body for Aboriginal children and young people. The establishment of that peak body will play an incredibly important role in providing advice to us, guiding us, to make sure that we fulsomely apply that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle.

Alongside that, we also have invested \$13.4 million into additional family group conferencing, with particular focus on offering family group conferences to Aboriginal families. That, alongside the discussions in the legislative sense about the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle, will be incredibly important as we progress the intent of that very important principle.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER CHILD PLACEMENT PRINCIPLE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:00): My question again is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the Department for Child Protection have capacity to apply the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle effectively, and is the minister satisfied the DCP is appropriately accountable for its decision-making practices?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic and Family Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:00): As I think I have just elaborated at length, we are currently going through a process of drafting legislation following a comprehensive review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act.

The report of that review has been tabled in this house, and I would suggest to the member that he read that report because there is extensive discussion in that report about the need for us to consider how we strengthen the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle through a consideration of changes to the legislation. As I think I have just outlined at length, that is exactly what we are doing, and rightly so. It is also exactly what we tried to do from opposition, when we moved amendments to the then minister's piece of legislation.

We will keep working to improve, as I have said, and to strengthen the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle. We will work to improve it both through the legislative process and through the investment that we have made in additional Department for Child Protection staff, including the addition of 10 principal Aboriginal consultants, who play a vital role in providing advice to other staff about the application of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle.

So that is another area of focus to make improvements, but also, as I said, we will look forward to the establishment of the peak body for Aboriginal children and young people that I am very proud we have funded because, again, that will provide a really important consultation, a really important ongoing set of advice, from the Aboriginal community to myself as the minister and to the department about how we can strengthen that Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Child Placement Principle. I do hope that provides the member with some information about the areas that we are focusing on to strengthen the application of that principle.

PUBLIC HOUSING

Mr BROWN (Florey) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Human Services. Can the minister inform the house of any steps the government is taking to increase public and affordable housing in Blair Athol?

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services) (15:03): I thank the member for the question and appreciate their ongoing work to connect people in their local area with housing supports. Last week, I had the pleasure of visiting the Blair Athol neighbourhood. It is a renewal project that is being undertaken by the SA Housing Authority. The site used to be home to 50 public houses and, under the original project proposal approved under the previous Liberal government, this was to be replaced with 40 social homes, 75 affordable houses and additional homes for sale at market rates.

While the original project was adding to housing supply, it was reducing public housing for those who need it most. It did this because, under Liberal government policy, the project had to wash its own face without getting any subsidy or support by the government. Ultimately, this meant selling more homes at higher prices to balance the books.

Sadly, there is only so much you can achieve by cannibalising a system that is under strain, and our public housing system has not just been under strain because of increased demand: it has been under the pump because it has been whittled away under successive governments from both sides of politics. Most recently, the Liberals slashed more than \$20 million a year from the Housing SA budget and oversaw the reduction of around 200 staff. This cut public housing properties every year upon year while they were in government.

In contrast, I am very proud to stand here as a member of a government that knows social and affordable housing needs extra support. We have committed an extra \$232.7 million to public housing between 2022 and 2026. As I have told this chamber before, this will build an additional 564 new homes, upgrade 350 vacant properties so they can be homes again for people in need as well as invest in minor upgrades to 3,000 properties. The Blair Athol project is sharing in this extra investment so, instead of delivering 40 social houses and 75 affordable houses, it will now deliver 70 public houses and 95 affordable homes for purchase. This means we will increase public housing rather than losing it.

At Blair Athol also, we are delivering an extra 20 affordable homes for purchase. These are great opportunities for first-home buyers to access while also they can take advantage of our new stamp duty exemptions and loans through HomeStart. While visiting the site, we also announced the locations of 387 of our new public housing properties, linked to our 2022 election commitment. We promised 150 in regional areas, and I am thrilled to advise the house that we have exceeded that by four. We have now committed to 154.

Our building program, linked to our extra investment, is well underway, with 184 new homes already tendered, contracted, complete or under construction. At a time when parts of the building industry are doing it tough, this program is providing extra support to a critical part of our economy. More importantly, and something you cannot put a price on, these new homes mean that more families will have a safe, secure and affordable place to call home. All this work is in addition to recent federal funding that has seen South Australia secure an extra \$135.8 million for social housing and also the passage of the Housing Australia Future Fund legislation.

With both state and federal Labor governments working together, we have a reliable development pipeline for social and affordable housing stretching up to a decade into the future. Ronald Reagan once said the nine scariest words in the English language were: 'I'm from the government and I'm here to help.' But when families are facing a tight housing market and cost-of-living pressures, they are some of the most comforting words for people to hear.

Ministerial Statement

ABORIGINAL REMAINS, RIVERLEA PARK

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Climate,

Environment and Water (15:07): I table a ministerial statement from the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place.

Grievance Debate

STIRLING FIRE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:08): Last Sunday afternoon, in the middle of the afternoon at the centre of Stirling, a fire broke out. It emerged fairly quickly that the fire broke out inside Woolworths, which is part of a small mall right in the middle of the town. Over the course of the following minutes and then hours, the fire quickly spread to engulf that premises. I can tell the house that what we finished up experiencing at Stirling was the largest single incident in terms of a fire response by the Stirling brigade, who were the first there, in the brigade's history.

As has been reported in subsequent days, there have been property losses amounting to possibly more than \$20 million. This has been undoubtedly a huge hit on the local businesses affected: Woolworths and those small businesses that are operating in the mall and immediately outside—Carlo at Cibo and Simon at the Green Dispensary pharmacy—all of whom have been affected. That is undoubtedly going to be the subject of difficult work, of loss and of hardship for all those directly affected and for the whole community. To them all, we say: our hearts go out to you.

I rise here this afternoon to take the opportunity to thank particularly those members of local CFS brigades who attended within moments at first to apply defensive firefighting to that fire and then very soon to deploy offensive measures inside the burning structure to put that fire out and to bring an end to what could have been a fire emergency that spread far wider. As I look across the floor, I acknowledge the member for Waite, who was one of so many who attended and played her part as a member of one of those local brigades in the near vicinity.

Can I illustrate to members that the Stirling CFS brigade was the first on the scene. It was located within minutes of the location of the fire. Captain Tom Fairbrother, who will be well known to all of us through CFS circles, is a man of longstanding senior service. He arrived first with the Stirling brigade and began making the necessary calls to call in the necessary help to respond to the fire.

He will not mind me saying that he made a call to MFS somewhat sooner than might have been regulation. Two pumpers were sent up from Glen Osmond; each of them had four BA-equipped MFS officers. That meant a commander attended with them, and Commander Duncan Cochrane was on the scene from very early on as a result. Captain Fairbrother then directed traffic in what was to continue then for hours, until dark and overnight.

At approximately 4pm, CFS Deputy Chief Officer Cameron Devey arrived and took over the scene. We had the chance to catch up just now, a few moments ago. He provided what I witnessed to be what we have come to expect from CFS senior leadership: calm, professional, reassuring leadership in what were such difficult circumstances. The whole town was covered in smoke that was so thick and so enduring that it triggered an alarm at the library across the road.

I was fortunate to attend the Stirling brigade's debrief last night that ran for many hours. Apart from thanks to the minister for his information response and to the chief officer, I want to take the remaining time to just say thank you to those members of the Stirling brigade, including to Tom Fairbrother: to Michael Vickery; to Paul McLure; to Matthew Williams; to young Liam Kennedy, who was on the pump on the back of very little experience; to Justin Ranford; and to Michael Wilde. Just to take a couple of those who attended from other brigades, they included Angus Winwood—young Angus from Aldgate—and Dave Turner, the Bridgewater captain. There will be more to say about this in the time to come, but for the moment we thank you, we applaud you, heroes of the CFS, MFS and emergency response.

PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:13): September is Prostate Cancer Awareness Month. Currently, prostate cancer is the most diagnosed cancer in Australia, with over 25,000 men diagnosed annually. Five years ago, Alec Hamilton was one of those men. Since his diagnosis and initial treatment, Alec has been using his experience to inform men of the importance of regular prostate testing, as well as being a regular contributor to fundraising efforts.

In 2020, Alec raised over two and a half thousand by shaving his head and beard in an effort to raise funds for a much-needed prostate biopsy machine for the Limestone Coast. Last year, he initiated his Push for Prostate, this time to raise funds for cancer-treating laser equipment for the Mount Gambier hospital. This consisted of a team of 12, including his two sons, pushing Alec in a wheelchair from Mount Gambier to Adelaide and stopping at each of the major towns along the way to give a presentation highlighting the importance of men getting tested.

Recently, I chatted with Alec at the Big Aussie Barbie in Mount Gambier, a great annual fundraiser for prostate cancer that is hosted by our local federal member, Tony Pasin. What became apparent was Alec's passion for raising awareness of the importance of getting tested, particularly for men in rural areas, who often lack access to medical services that many of us take for granted. Since we spoke, Alec dropped a letter into my office detailing some of the initiatives he is trying to achieve. I would like to share that with you today:

Thank you to Troy Bell for being my spokesperson to present my platform on easing the burden of Prostate Cancer sufferers and their families.

The last figures show that Prostate Cancer holds the crown for being the second highest killer of men in Australia with: 70 men diagnosed daily; 25,487 diagnosed annually; 3,743 dying this year 2023; and 10 per day dying this year 2023, with little or no support from State or Federal Government in raising awareness.

Imagine if it were Road Fatalities.

Last year, on a fact finding mission, I was pushed in a wheelchair from Mount Gambier to Taillem Bend, meeting and talking to Men's Groups at major towns along the way.

When asked if they had heard of Prostate Cancer, the response was about 90%.

When asked how to get checked or even if it was necessary, the response was about 10%.

When I explained all that was required was to ask the GP for a simple blood test (PSA) the response was 'What Doctor'.

It was explained to me that the nearest doctor for Keith, Tintinara, Coonalpyn and Coomandook areas was Bordertown, Taillem Bend and Meningie with a 6-10 week wait being the norm.

What farmer, if he was not bleeding or in extreme pain will ever consider seeing a doctor.

The Medical Profession tell us to seek help if we suffer various symptoms, but history tells us if we wait for this it is too late.

I would like to suggest we upgrade the present system to save lives and following expenses in later treatment by diagnosing earlier, saving after care.

My own journey as a five-year survivor is costing many hundreds of dollars, both in specialist costs and travel expenses.

I was diagnosed early, but due to lack of Hospital facilities, surgery was performed late and I have various problems as a result. I am still having three-monthly tests to follow my cancer.

If a letter from the Federal Government can be sent to people reminding them they are due for a Covid Booster, or their Bowel Screen Kit is on the way, why not a letter suggesting a PSA Test?

Introduce a visiting Prostate Testing van and letter holders can be eligible for a Blood Test therefore by-passing the GP, freeing up the doctors' valuable time for other patients.

My other suggestion is lower the testing age from 50-60 years to 40 years. We have in our Group in Mount Gambier one member 43 years old, and he has a workmate only 33 years old who refuses to open up to anybody.

Give equal time to awareness advertising for Prostate Cancer as is provided to Bowel and Breast Cancer.

Please remember 3,743 deaths or 10 daily this year alone.

Help me save lives and then not have to travel my journey.

STURT HIGHWAY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:18): Today, I rise to make a contribution, with a petition that was presented to the parliament here today—12,436 signatures. South Australians have signed that petition to have the duplication of the Sturt Highway, particularly incorporating the bypass of Truro. This does speak volumes, and not only for people using the Sturt Highway. It is about safety and it is about saving lives.

There are 4,500 vehicles that travel through the main street of Truro every day, and it is increasing year on year. Thirty per cent of those vehicles are heavy commercial vehicles, including B-doubles and road trains—every day. Of those road trains and B-doubles, that equates to about 95,000 tonnes of freight.

Truro remains the chosen route for overwhelmingly the majority of Riverlanders travelling to Adelaide as well as people travelling out of Adelaide to explore the great regions of the Riverland and beyond. Delivering this project as a dual-lane bypass is essential, not only for safety, freight productivity and efficiency and for network reliability, but it is also dealing with the ever-increasing permit loads that are now travelling along the Sturt Highway heading west.

The Sturt Highway is ranked as South Australia's second deadliest road due to its high fatality rate, and we know that two out of three deaths on country roads are country people. Sadly, from 2018 to now, 40 people have lost their lives on the Sturt Highway in South Australia, so duplicating the Truro bypass project is a priority for the state. It is strongly supported by the community and local government—and it is evident by more than 12,436 signatures.

The opportunity to improve the safety of one of South Australia's most dangerous roads has never been more evident. This project has been on the books for more than a decade and yet we have governments that continue to ignore it. Remember that this bypass is a freight-route bypass. It will ensure that we have a bypass that will continue to address the safety issues and take the congestion out of the main street of Truro. I know that the local member of Schubert is very concerned about the traffic that flows through her electorate and the risk that it poses to the local Truro community, and it is overwhelmingly seen as one of the blackspots on the Sturt Highway.

Again, the productivity gain cannot be understated: reducing the carbon emissions, reducing the risk of losing life and reducing the cost of freight and/or travel. It is not just freight that I want to discuss. I want to talk about keeping our tourists safe, keeping commuters safe and keeping me safe—I currently travel almost 100,000 kilometres per year. Most of that travelling is done on the Sturt Highway, and I see on many occasions motorists behaving in a risky manner because they are frustrated trying to get past freight, trying to get past slower vehicles, and that is the reason that we have such a high fatality rate on the Sturt Highway.

We are currently witnessing the \$87.9 million safety upgrade of the Sturt Highway and that is addressing bridge upgrades, shoulders, overtaking lanes and rest stops. But we cannot stop there. If we look further afield to the eastern seaboard, we see many of those major arterial roads that have a duplication program in place. It does not have to be the whole highway all in one hit, but we do have to address those dark spots on our highway.

The Sturt Highway is a federal highway. It is part of South Australia's road network that continues to pose a risk to everyone who uses it. As I said, it is making sure that we upgrade a road to save lives, it is making sure that the \$202 million Truro freight bypass project goes ahead, it is making sure that this project does not fall on deaf ears again for another decade, it is making sure that the federal government must incorporate this piece of infrastructure into its 90-day review and it is making sure that it goes ahead. It is not a long-term plan, it is a plan for the future, and I implore the state government, the local government and the federal government to get on with the Truro freight bypass.

PBA-FM COMMUNITY RADIO

Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (15:24): It is a pleasure to rise to place on record my congratulations to the community radio station PBA-FM. This year marks the station's 40th anniversary on air. It was my pleasure to join the community in their day of celebration on 4 October.

Formed in 1978, PBA-FM conducted a successful test transmission in April 1981, with a full licence granted in November 1982 and broadcasting commencing the following year. It has been a mainstay of the north, and now more than ever, with the demise of the Messenger Press and the very regretful centralisation of the ABC to the eastern seaboard, we need stations like these to play an active role in telling our stories.

While any community-operated station can use some extra help, I am pleased to say that judging by the enthusiasm of the celebrations, PBA-FM is in great shape. Based in Salisbury, the station broadcasts over 60 diverse shows across the northern suburbs on FM band 89.7. This ranges from Prospect in the south to Redbanks in the north. It does an exceptional job, not only entertaining us with some great music but importantly caters to and gives a public voice to many diverse groups.

I place special emphasis on the station's vital link to our multicultural communities. This includes programming in 17 languages including Spanish, Polish, Croatian and Tagalog, just to name a few. PBA-FM is also a fantastic rallying point for Aboriginal Australians based in northern Adelaide, with successful programming such as *Feel Good Nunga Radio* and *Deadly Beats*.

The celebration at the Salisbury Institute was a great show with plenty of food, entertainment and many fascinating stories. It was fantastic to hear Gary Lockyer, a volunteer with the station for 35 years, tell of the early days with amusing beginnings from the original base at the Salisbury Teachers College and the broadcast tower from Para Hills. Raising the toast and cutting the cake was former Premier and local member Reverend Lynn Arnold, who 40 years earlier opened the station. We also had live music from Gawler's very own Yellow Door Street Band and Fyred Up, with fantastic collections of both old and new songs. Also joining me for the occasion was Playford Mayor Glenn Docherty, reinforcing the significance of PBA-FM to communities beyond Salisbury.

I mentioned earlier that while the station is in good shape, there is always more we can do as a community to ensure it thrives. If you are a business, community radio is an effective and affordable way of spreading your message. As a not-for-profit organisation, revenue raised by the Para Broadcasters Association is reinvested directly back into the station. This includes the significant investment made in its people, with fantastic training given to its legion of volunteers who have made the station the success story it has been for the last 40 years.

We should not lose sight of the fact that now more than ever stations like these are important places for anyone aspiring to a career in media to hone their skills. All PBA volunteers are financial members and contribute in many areas of the station including on-air presentation, program production, administration, technical, research, library, training and promotions. As you can see, there is a lot going on way behind the microphone to make things happen, noting that it all comes together thanks to the drive and commitment of the station's volunteers.

Before finishing, I take this opportunity to express specific thanks to station manager, Indi Wood, and secretary and presenter, Nick Brown, who both did an excellent job in organising the event. I am sure that there were many others involved, so please forgive me for leaving you out. Also, I give a special shout-out to Playford local Bruce Richmond, who does a fantastic job hosting *Living in the 70s*.

I am a big fan of PBA-FM and indeed community radio. They have been invaluable to my community and, with this in mind, I end by wishing them every success for the next 40 years.

RIVERLAND FLOOD RESPONSE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:28): I am going to read today an edited letter from a constituent of mine, Daniel Martin from Wall Flat on the River Murray, outlining the troubles farmers and irrigators are having with flood recovery many months after the event, as follows:

Dear Adrian

I am writing to you on behalf of the Wall Flat Private Irrigation District Trust to express our frustration and disappointment at the South Australian Government's handling of the flood emergency in the Lower Murray Irrigation District, the mishandling and subsequent delay of recovery efforts, and the ongoing delay in making decisions with regard to funding.

The farmers and landowners at Wall Flat have been in constant communication with various Government Departments, including DEW and PIRSA, prior to and following the Wall Flat levee failure on 2 January 2023.

We communicated that Wall Flat would be ready for dewatering at the end of February as we knew the depth of our breaks and the anticipated fall of river levels from upstream. We protected and conveyed that dewatering would take approximately 4-6 weeks and needed to be completed by early April 2023, in time for the crucial re-seeding of pastures before the winter months. Despite clearly communicating this timeline and the critical importance of it, we were extremely disappointed to be told in late February that pumps were 'still being sourced'.

This was unacceptable and left us with no choice but to investigate pump availability ourselves, which we did with a simple phone call to Coates Hire.

Who would have thought? The letter continues:

Thanks only to our proactive actions in locating available pumps, re-seeding commenced on 20 April 2023 and continued through until late May, only just within the crucial timeline outlined at the abovementioned January meeting. It is evident that if we had waited for the Government our window of opportunity to seed for optimum winter growth would have passed due to unnecessary inaction and delay, further impacting the recovery of our livelihoods.

We have, on numerous occasions, communicated to various Government representatives our concern about the method of repair and the repair materials proposed being the same materials used to sure up the levee prior to the flood reaching us in January which washed away completely on contact with the rising water.

The fact that the decision makers in Government proceeded to direct the use of these materials to repair the seven breaks at Wall Flat without sufficient protection at the river face, and that they are still unable to provide any guidance on how the full repairs will be completed, adds to our utter frustration with this entire process and again proves that local knowledge continues to be ignored by those making decisions in Government.

Whilst the permanent levee repairs are still high on our priority list, our primary focus has now shifted to the desilting of our infrastructure so that we can irrigate through the impending summer months.

When the Government owned levee failed, the misplaced sediment material washed into our channels and paddocks and settled there. We have, at our own cost, had to move some sediment to enable basic irrigation, however a significant amount of work is still required to clear our channels and is likely to cost thousands of dollars.

As this sediment is from Government infrastructure impacting our infrastructure, we do not believe this cost should be borne by us, however we have been informed that desilting is not considered part of the rehabilitation of the levee and so funding is not being provided at this time.

Another funding issue arises because the infrastructure is owned by the Trust so we have been unable to apply for any of the funding grants currently available. These are yet more failures of process which are impacting our recovery. It is imperative that the Government releases more funding for projects such as this, and makes funding available to Trusts, so that farmers and landowners impacted can adequately recover from this failure of Government owned infrastructure.

To further delay a funding decision or ignore this part of the ongoing recovery of the region is unacceptable and irresponsible. The above is only a very small sample of the frustrating decisions imposed on us over the course of the last 9 months.

That is from Daniel Martin, an irrigator at Wall Flat. It is a very eloquent exposé of what has not happened in the last nine months and the very reason there needs to be immediate funding so that people can desilt the area, desilt those channels, make sure they have access to water out of the river and then be able to get rid of it out of the channels once they have irrigated their blocks. This is absolutely vital as the summer heat hits us.

ADELAIDE ELECTORATE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:33): I rise to speak about a wonderful community event that I look forward to each year, the Walkerville Art Show. On Friday 6 October, I was able to attend the official opening of the art show with the Premier, who was able to do the honours in opening this wonderful community event. It really does get bigger and better each year. This year, we had more than 600 entries.

For over a decade it has been held at the St Andrew's School hall. It is organised and conducted by the Rotary Club of Walkerville. They do an absolutely tremendous job, both the art show committee and the Walkerville Rotary volunteers, who put on a really wonderful official opening night as well as do an amazing job running the art show, which ran from 6 October to 14 October. I also want to thank its major sponsors, the Town of Walkerville and of course St Andrew's.

A big thanks to judge Jo Harris, who had the incredibly difficult job of choosing the winners. Best in Show this year went to Sue Foutoulis for her painting *Pause & Reflect*. The Best Acrylic or Oil Painting went to Tina Barr for *Murray Reflections*. The Best Watercolour or Other Medium went to Roe Gartelmann for *Tide's Out Port Vincent*. The Best Photograph or Sculpture went to Jasmin Feneley for *Quiet Murray Morning*, a really beautiful photograph. The Picture Hangers Award went to Sue Mills for *The Bird & the Bee*.

Just by listening to some of the titles of some of the artworks you can see that it definitely has a South Australian flavour, and I think that is one of the strengths of the Walkerville Art Show. It

is a wonderful opportunity for South Australian artists to be able to showcase beautiful South Australian landscapes as well. Once again, congratulations to the Walkerville Art Show committee and the Rotary Club of Walkerville for another amazing event.

Recently, I was also able to celebrate another really wonderful day in our community, which was the official opening of my Prospect pocket park. This is delivering on an election commitment I made to our community at the 2022 election. There was a really ugly, unsightly dirt block on the corner of Main North Road and Da Costa Avenue. It was full of dilapidated buildings, graffiti and weeds and it really was an eyesore for the entry statement to Prospect, Medindie and Medindie Gardens.

I had a number of constituents raise this block with me. They previously raised it with the former member, but it had not gone anywhere, so I said, 'Why can't this block be something better than just an unsightly blight on our community or indeed probably the site of future development of some kind of high-rise?' So we changed that thinking and we said, 'Why can't this become a beautiful park with more open green space for the community to enjoy?' That is what we have delivered.

The other Sunday we were able to officially open the park. We had a beautiful Welcome to Country performed by Yungandalya Tamaru, my dearest brother, and we had many locals come out. Of course, I provided my free popcorn. We had free face painting and also various other activities for the community to enjoy. A big thank you to the Prospect Lions Club for their free barbecue as well.

This is really just an example of me wanting to green our neighbourhood, to provide increased tree canopy and to provide more open green spaces for the community to enjoy and not just the two-legged variety but the four-legged variety as well. It has been really wonderful driving past the new pocket park and seeing so many people enjoying it. Just the other night, I was coming home from a function at about 9pm and it was wonderful to see about three or four people there with a range of dogs running and enjoying the open green space and having a really wonderful time.

I am very proud to have been able to deliver on that election commitment for my community, but wait, there is more. I am delivering another pocket park just across the way on Churchill Road for the Ovingham community as well. The community recently held a permaculture workshop to look at ideas of what might end up going on that pocket park site as well. I am very proud to be greening my neighbourhood and delivering more open green spaces and tree canopy for our community.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:39): By leave, I move:

That Mr Brown be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. A. Piccolo (resigned).

Motion carried.

Bills

HYDROGEN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:39): In my concluding remarks, I thank the house for their contributions. I thank the shadow minister for his work. I look forward to a consultative and productive committee portion of the bill, and I look forward to its speedy passage.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr PATTERSON: How will this act recognise the long-established rights of landowners and pastoral lessees, and is there sufficient balance between the rights of landowners and pastoral lessees and the rights of the proposed renewable energy licensees?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: While I am getting some further advice I will just give you a quick personal view. I have been thinking long and hard about how we engage with pastoral leaseholders on this because it is a complicated area.

I am a passionate believer in multiple land use frameworks. Pastoral leases are issued on the basis of a certain activity being undertaken on a pastoral lease. It was never envisaged when pastoral leases were first implemented that a pastoral leaseholder would run also a generation facility on their lease. It has evolved. It was not what this parliament intended.

Governments of both persuasions have looked at what are state strategic issues when it comes to freehold land and lease land, whether it be through compulsory acquisition or through allowable access. I think that this act quite cleverly creates a framework that allows pastoral leaseholders who are operating a pastoral lease to continue to do so with other activity that will be occurring on their lease property. Ultimately, they are not the landowners; the Crown is, and that should never be forgotten.

The question then becomes: if we are the landowners collectively—and I say the Crown, us, the government on behalf of the people of South Australia—who owns the sun and wind rights? Is it the pastoral leaseholder? Are they paying a separate fee for that in their pastoral lease? No, they are not. They have a pastoral lease to run activities like cattle or sheep, not renewable resources.

The question then becomes: if we want gigawatt-scale generation on vast tracts of land that currently have pastoral leases over it, there are a couple of options a government could have. You could end the pastoral lease and say, 'We don't want that anymore,' or we could say, 'Hang on, we've already got existing applications where there are multiple land use frameworks in place.' There are mines in pastoral leases. There have been mines in pastoral leases. Where that has impacted on the pastoral leaseholder's activity, they are compensated for it. I think this legislation gets the right balance.

I am hoping in this first round of questions that the Chair can be a bit more liberal with the allocation of questions to the shadow minister, because I think it is an important issue that we would like to flesh out. I would really appreciate bipartisan support on this bill because I think it is important for long-term investor certainty in parts of the state that members opposite overwhelmingly represent. I say that with regard to the member for Giles, who covers large parts of South Australia, but Eyre Peninsula is going to be a key part of this and I know that the member for Flinders has a keen interest in this as well.

We are talking about billions of dollars worth of investment over decades, so there needs to be investor certainty here. If we are going to get foreign capital to invest billions of dollars in South Australia to build gigawatt-scale generation to produce hydrogen or ammonia or toluene or some other form of energy and export it, or if we are to beneficiate our magnetite to create green iron and export that, at our steelworks with our massive magnetite resources, there needs to be a social acceptance in this parliament in a bipartisan way.

I am prepared to listen to a lot of the concerns members opposite have, but also: think long term, because there are two things that could go on here while we have this debate. There is going to be the short-term political imperative of making sure that the opposition looks after its base—and I get that—and the long-term thinking of: we may not always be in government and it should not matter who is in government. Governments should lay down an investment framework that can outlast any government, and that is what I am attempting to do.

I am attempting to introduce a piece of legislation that will lay down an investment framework that is not about this government; it is about the state and the state's long-term interests, a lot like the indenture that Roger Goldsworthy negotiated with Olympic Dam to get that mine up. One of my party's great shames in this parliament is opposing the expansion of that mine, and it was done, I think, for short-term political interest rather than long-term economic investment in the state's history. So I want to try to avoid that.

I am not accusing the shadow minister of being small-minded or having short-term thinking. I understand that there are issues that members in this house will advocate for on behalf of pastoralists and farmers who own land freehold in areas that are suitable for renewable energy. But what I am trying to do is balance between the interests of the pastoral leaseholder—which is pastoral lease activities—freehold landowners and the state's interests to use renewable resources to reindustrialise and use our God-given commodities that are sitting there that are the best in the world. We have over a billion tonnes of magnetite resource sitting there in the Middleback Ranges, let alone what potentially is available on Eyre Peninsula—which is not as economic today, but it may become economic later.

Do I have the framework right? I think so. Some of the issues that were raised by pastoralists during the first stage of consultation were that they were supportive of the introduction of an orderly competitive process to determine access to pastoral land—and this is not a criticism of the previous government, because there was not a process in place. The process in place was that people made an application to do a bilateral agreement with a pastoral leaseholder, that was then sent to the Minister for Environment and Water or the Minister for Primary Industries, and they would sign an agreement and that would be it.

There was not an orderly process of identifying land that should be put out to the market. People would come in, bid on it and identify it as a good solar or wind resource. Lessees reported that the current system of liaising with multiple developers was costly and time intensive, and they welcomed a streamlined process. They indicated that they would like to have a prescribed consultation process in place to determine the release areas and granting of licences. Lessees have sought to ensure their existing rights are not compromised through the development of large-scale renewable energy and hydrogen projects and that the land is protected throughout the process.

We had a series of workshops in June of this year in Port Augusta for pastoral and farming communities. There were over 30 representatives at these, including well-known pastoralists and representatives from Livestock SA, the Arid Lands Landscape Board, the Pastoral Board, Rural Business Support and government. Attendees attended a number of Q&A sessions. I think, by and large, we have got that level of consultation right.

When it comes to freehold landowners, there is an existing regime in place for development of renewable energy. There is no compulsory acquisition in this act as there is in the Electricity Act or other acts, so the level of consultation has been slightly different because we are not compulsorily acquiring people's land. With pastoral leases, I say this again: it is no different from a mine operation. If a mine operation impacts a certain type of land that could be used productively for pastoral uses, they are compensated for that through a bilateral arrangement with the mining company, which we oversee. This would be no different.

Ultimately, Crown land is not owned by pastoral leaseholders. It is not: it is a lease. It is owned by the Crown. It is owned by the people of South Australia collectively and held in trust by us, and it is our responsibility to develop that land to the best economic use of that land. I think we can walk and chew gum at the same time. I think we can have this land still be productive pastoral lease land—and get good outcomes for the people of South Australia and those families who care for that pastoral lease for us on our behalf—and develop billion-dollar investments in gigawatt-scale renewable energy. I think we have it right, but I look forward to hearing where you think the gaps are and seeing if we can help bridge those gaps.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for that answer. You made the point around pastoral land, that a lot of the renewable energy resources in terms of sun and wind, the most prospective and coincident areas of the two, are on pastoral land. Certainly, you are right; I think there is bipartisan understanding of that resource and unlocking pastoral land.

Working with the pastoralists is important, but I think it is also acknowledged on both sides of the house that ultimately the Crown is the owner and it leases it to pastoralists, who, I think both of us will acknowledge, since European settlement have been very good custodians, developing the pastoral areas and also being their custodians in terms of maintaining them. As we go through the questions with that in mind, you are right; we will be collaborative to a large extent.

In terms of freehold land, we acknowledge that the main intention of the bill was to look at unlocking that Crown and pastoral land for these renewable energy projects. Maybe you could provide some commentary as to why the bill then went further and looked also to address freehold land and the considerations that you gave around that. I will pick it up a bit further after that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not sure if you heard the planning minister's remarks to the parliament, because I thought they were pertinent. I want this to be a start-to-finish piece of legislation that covers the entire state, and that is why freehold land is included. There can be disorderly investments made on private property that could interfere with the stability of the South Australian electricity grid or could be being done for the benefit of another jurisdiction rather than us, our jurisdiction. All development, no matter what it is, should not be unregulated.

My view is that as we are looking at this as a state government, if you take the 30,000-foot view of the state, you look around the state and you think to yourself, 'Where do we want to maximise our investments?' It could very well be strategically important to have freehold land in the mix in powers in this legislation to make sure that investors are aware of where we think the opportunities are.

The legislation maintains freehold landowners' existing rights to negotiate and agree terms with renewable energy developers regarding access to their land. These processes have been occurring for the last 15 or 20 years. If you drive up the Augusta Highway, you will see the developments of wind farms that have been done on a bilateral, negotiated process with freehold landowners. It is happening now. That is unchanged and the bill does not seek to alter that arrangement.

But let's be frank: there could be some developments that meet a very high threshold that could require access to freehold land. The north-south corridor is one. We have sat here and bipartisanly supported bills to compulsorily acquire people's homes to build a piece of state infrastructure. We apply the Road Traffic Act over freehold land; of course we do that, because it is in the state's strategic interest. So, technically, every house in South Australia is subject to that ability for compulsory acquisition if we want to build a road or a hospital. Indeed, this parliament at any time can legislate any head of power to do almost anything, so it is important that we have a comprehensive piece of legislation.

It does not change what freehold landowners' rights and processes will be, but it allows an orderly regulatory process to lay over the top of it that is consistent for investors, whether it is freehold land or pastoral lease land. I will give you an example. A freehold landowner, the farmer, could ask to be part of a special enterprise zone auction and say, 'I've got exceptional resources. I would like the government to manage this as part of an auction,' but they will still be negotiating bilaterally with them and, because it is freehold land, they will receive the economic benefit.

I think it makes sense to have one process to govern all of this, not two. The whole idea is to simplify investment—to make it easier and simpler to invest in the state—which is why it is important that there is now one minister in charge of this entire process rather than five. That is the argument. The advice I have received is that providing one consistent framework across the state provides investors certainty, economies of scale, efficient development and regulation of a growing sector. Those points that I have just been handed show what the government's thinking here is.

I hope that answers the shadow minister's question. If he is ever one day energy minister, the ability to regulate an entire sector with one rule book is very efficient. Having two different rule books is inefficient. The energy minister should have a say about every single energy development in the state, not just ones on Crown land. Every other development has a planning minister have a say on it. Why should not the energy minister, if it is a generator or a wind farm or a solar array or a solar thermal plant or a pumped hydro facility? I think it is a consistent framework to give investors certainty and give our constituents certainty about what the process is, but fundamentally the rights of freehold landowners are unchanged.

Mr PATTERSON: In regard to the hydrogen generation component of it, could the minister explain the different types of hydrogen, the generation methods to produce hydrogen, that this act would regulate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It would regulate the production of renewable energy. It would regulate the connections to distribution and transmission lines. It would regulate the building of ammonia plants and electrolyzers. This is a good point: importantly, we are not picking a technology; we are agnostic. We are not picking a winner. We are not saying everyone is going to be a PEM electrolyser. We are agnostic to the technology.

The legislation enables the market to determine the commercially viable, hydrogen projects-based developments and technology that is available to them, including green hydrogen—for electrolysis of water we use renewable energy—and blue hydrogen from the reformation of methane combined with carbon capture and storage.

All types of hydrogen generation will contribute to building necessary infrastructure required in the transition to the future clean hydrogen industry, and the role of other legislation is to determine how the state and country more broadly meet our decarbonisation goals. We are not here saying, 'This is the type of technology you will use to make hydrogen.' We let the market decide that. We are not picking and choosing here.

Mr PATTERSON: In terms of the amount of hydrogen that will be produced, has the department done some modelling around how much hydrogen would be expected to be produced over the coming decade and the types of hydrogen and specifically, I suppose, the amounts of green hydrogen, how much solar and wind farms will commensurately be built to generate that amount of hydrogen?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is a good question and it is difficult to answer. What that gets to is: what is the scale here? If you have 20 gigawatts of renewable energy, how much hydrogen do you produce? It is a chicken and egg question for us. For example, we will be relying with our electrolyser of 250 megawatts on the oversupply of South Australia's renewable production. What this act contemplates to regulate is the development of behind-the-meter renewable technologies, taking advantage of amazing wind and solar resources through an auction process, like a mining lease if you will, for a broader example.

I know the shadow knows this already, so I am not trying to preach to him like he does not know what it is. Basically, we identify an area, we go out to the market, people bid for that renewable energy zone and we look at their work plans and their capabilities and we make a decision based on what our thinking is of their ability to meet their work plan, which we can hold them to account to, like a mining lease or a petroleum licence.

They might say they want to build 300 megawatts and have a 10-megawatt electrolyser as a demonstrator. Remember, to the best of my knowledge, the largest electrolyser in the Southern Hemisphere is still the one at Tonsley, which is just over a megawatt. The next largest in the world would be the South Australian one in Whyalla, which is in competition with the one in Utah, which is 220 megawatts. So you have a race going on.

The question for the private capital that is coming into the state is: how big is their appetite for renewable resources, and how will that be staged? They might do 300 megawatts first, growing to 600 megawatts, growing to a gigawatt, growing to 1½ gigawatts, growing to two gigawatts, and exponentially growing, and then growing hydrogen production, so I cannot give the member a number.

If you look at the magnetite resources in the region—over a billion tonnes of known available resource—and you think to yourself that governments around the world, including our government and the former government, are in a race to see whether we can export hydrogen to places like Japan, South Korea, China or even Europe, the embedded inefficiency in doing that makes it very challenging. I am not saying it is impossible, but it makes it very challenging.

I think the world is looking at this and asking: is it better to use the hydrogen where it is made because we save all those transportation costs and inefficiencies? There is no future in the world where steel is not going to be a key component of building infrastructure over the next 100, 200, 300 years that I know of. Depending on who you believe, steel equates to between 9 per cent and 15 per cent of the world's carbon emissions, so that needs to be decarbonised.

I believe the reason we chose Whyalla for the site of our electrolyser is that it is alongside the world's best magnetite resources, next to an existing steel mill, next to an existing port and next to an existing workforce where, if the export of hydrogen took longer, ultimately as a first step we could add complexity to our economy and beneficiate our iron ore to green iron and export that to Nippon, to POSCO, to Krupp.

The European and Asian economies have a developed steel industry. I think that they ultimately know that if they import their hydrogen, because they cannot make it at the cost that we can without massive government subsidies—and, remember, we are doing this without government subsidy; this is what we are incentivising—if we can crack that magic \$2 per kilogram mark, it may be cheaper to upgrade and build steelworks here than it is to export the hydrogen to them.

Exporting iron pellet or briquette is an established form of transport. It is easy, it is well known, it is not difficult. Then, all of a sudden, you have arriving at European harbours or Asian harbours—whether there are carbon borders or abatement measures in place—a decarbonised iron product. The benefit is that we get the royalties for the iron ore out of the ground, we get the jobs for the value-add, we get the investment in renewable energy, we get the electric arc furnaces being built, we get the DRI plants being built and we start adding value rather than just exporting ore. That is the government's vision and plan for Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula on the basis of renewable energy.

The process started by the previous government at Port Bonython was, to be fair, a land sale and then there was an opportunity to think, 'Well, can we actually generate some investment in a hydrogen hub here?' The commonwealth government put \$70 million in, we put \$30 million in—that is what the previous government had committed to—with a \$40 million push from proponents for a tender process to get onto that land, and they are all looking at the ability of whether or not they can export hydrogen either from ammonia, toluene, or even freezing hydrogen to minus 253°, turning it into a liquefied state and sending it off.

That may occur, but my instincts are that what is more likely to occur is that we can decarbonise our iron ore here, and then that takes a big amount of emissions out in Korea, in Japan, in Germany and in the United States. That is the thinking that we have in place.

Mr TELFER: I have a follow-on to what the minister talked about with the pastoral lands in particular and the government needing to be involved in the bilateral agreement process with the pastoral leaseholder proponents and the government—I guess you would probably call it a trilateral. There is obviously the footprint of the generators themselves but, with the distance with the pastoral leases, there are going to be significant transmission lines and the like.

The impact of the footprint of the generators themselves is one thing for the pastoral leaseholders, but then there is the footprint of the transmission line. How does the minister envision that process looking as far as impact on existing business in a pastoral area like that, the additional movement of vehicles and that sort of thing that will need to be facilitated and the potential impact on existing business?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This might be cold comfort for some regional areas, but it is no different from a mine. So, if there is an area of mining that is occurring, a certain area for lack of a better word is sterilised for use of the mine. The farmer will say, 'I generated X amount from that per year,' or, 'The extra roads that you need yielded crops,' or, 'There is an extra maintenance fee on me now for looking after those roads.' So it will be a bilateral discussion about compensation and rent that will be negotiated with the pastoral leaseholder and the successful proponent of the auction process about that, and all of that will remain in place, no different than it would be on freehold land.

If you go to a mine anywhere that is on freehold land, the landowner, if they keep their land, will negotiate a rent on the basis of loss of income on what would have been farmed, it might be linked to crop prices, it might be linked to cattle or sheep prices. If there were extra roads and extra disturbance made, that is compensated for. It is no different. We would expect all these works to go underway as part of an agreement made between the pastoral leaseholder and the proponent, and the government would be involved as well.

But the difference between a freehold landowner and a pastoral leaseholder is that the freehold landowner would have in effect probably a higher ability to attract rent because they own

the land. The pastoral leaseholder has a lease from the government to conduct certain activities and, as far as those activities are disturbed, that is what they will be compensated for. It is no different from any other process.

I do not want to mislead the member. The pastoral leaseholders will not get the same level of actual income from a proposal because they do not own the land. The beneficiary is the state and the broader economic benefits. There are statutory funds like the Pastoral Land Management Fund, which obviously we would expect proponents to pay into to manage pastoral lease land. We would expect there to be no loss for a pastoral leaseholder. We would expect there to be some benefits, but for a freehold landowner those benefits are vastly different because they own the land freehold.

If we are compulsorily acquiring a house that is rented, we do not give the renter the capital value of the property, we give it to the owner. We compensate for what their loss is. So that is how it is going to work. I think it is a pretty well-established, well worked-out process that occurs. The difference here is that the government is laying out an orderly process with the work plans.

My biggest fear—and I will not name any companies. When we entered office, there were some European investment funds that had signed up agreements with pastoral leaseholders for vast tracts of South Australia that were approved by the previous government, and it is not a criticism. It is just that that was what was done in the hope that there would be an investment. There was no work plan, no guaranteed investment, no relinquishment if any work is not done.

We have land masses out there the size of some European countries that have remarkable wind and solar resources that are very close to excellent magnetite resources, excellent transmission lines that have been upgraded recently with existing infrastructure in place, close to ports that could be sat on. We cannot have that. Tyre kickers need not apply. That is what we are after.

I bet you as a former mayor and the current member, how many farmers have you met who have had someone knock on their door and say, 'You are sitting on a goldmine of iron ore. This is going to be developed,' and a decade and a half later nothing has happened? I am trying to avoid that. What I am trying to do is put a layer over the top, a regulated process, which has work plans in place, where the government can vet who is coming in and signing these agreements.

It is not just a bilateral arrangement that is done in isolation from the government, where we are at the end of the process just ticking off an agreement that has already been signed between a pastoral leaseholder and a proponent where there is no guarantee of any work being done—nor because the former government did not want there to be work to be done, but there was no regulatory framework for them to do it. There was no ability for them to say, 'Yes, we will agree to this program if you do X, Y and Z.' There just was not the process there. So what this is doing is putting that process in place.

We can hold these massive billion-dollar capital investment funds that are coming to Australia and attempting to lock up unbelievable resources, but look at what is going on in Victoria and New South Wales now about transmission line disputes and access to land for renewable technologies. Look at Europe, at the massive social upheaval because they cannot build renewable technologies. We have land with social permission, social licence, and unbelievable solar and wind resources coincident, and the government is not involved in the process. It is unsatisfactory and cannot continue.

We need to have an orderly, transparent, legislated, regulated process that people can look at, they can know what their rights are, they can know what their obligations are, they can know what their compensation is, and they can interact in a transparent way. I bet that there have been arrangements made between pastoral leaseholders and capital investment funds for exclusivity on pastoral leases that have been approved by the previous government, where that pastoral leaseholder may have, and the previous government may have, locked away some of the best wind and solar resources in the world, and that pastoral leaseholder is getting a fraction of what the state could expect in return if it were through a competitive process.

Let's face it, if you are running cattle or sheep on your pastoral lease, running your pastoral activities, and someone knocks on your door and says, 'I'll give you \$200,000 for exclusive rights to

build a solar farm, maybe in 20 years' time, on this vast piece of property,' you will sign and say yes. The minister agrees, and it is locked up and it has gone. We cannot have that anymore.

We need to have a regulated process where investors can have certainty, landowners can have certainty, pastoral leaseholders can have certainty, and the government can make sure that it is orderly and that we are actually saying, 'Alright, you want to build 300 megawatts. What's your time frame? How much are you spending each and every year? If you walk away, we want the IP. We want to know what the solar resource is and we want to know what the wind resource is after you have done that work.'

It is no different from a miner who drills a hole and then is required to give those cores to the core library so that we can keep them. It is no different from anyone, under the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act, who does any exploratory work and is required to make that available to the government so that we can commercialise it later if they walk away. None of that is in place. It is not a criticism; it is just that this was not envisaged.

This is like a new industry that we need to now start thinking about. It is not just about replacing our fixed generators but about re-industrialisation and behind-the-meter investments in large-scale renewable energy for a single purpose—not to input it into the grid, but if you want to build a 500-megawatt electrolyser you are going to need a two-gigawatt solar and wind array alongside it.

That needs to be regulated, it needs to be legislated, and there needs to be a core data process over the top of it, and if it impacts on pastoral leaseholders or freehold landowners they need to be able to know that there is a prescriptive policy and process that they can go through that gives them comfort and security.

Mr TEAGUE: I would like the opportunity to come back to this more specifically at the appropriate time. I have heard, sort of trailed in through the process, a couple of different propositions that might be contradictory. One is that you have a whole bunch of pastoral leaseholders out there, and maybe some freehold landowners, who are so unsophisticated that they are vulnerable to this sort of knock on the door and then are okay for the land to be handed over for a peppercorn, and the government is going to come to the rescue and make sure that not only are we going to rescue the possibility for investment—global or otherwise, billions or otherwise—but we are going to secure this to maximise the value.

Then, as a contradictory proposition, I have heard the minister say, 'The holder of a pastoral lease holds only a very limited bundle of rights, and what I am going to do is ensure that, so far as compensation is concerned or entitlement for some sort of receipts, the pastoral leaseholder, perhaps the Crown perpetual leaseholder and perhaps even the freeholder get a look-in, mining style, to the extent that someone is coming along and occupying the roadway or the sterilised section and so on.

It seems to be a pretty clear indication that we are moving to a situation, and quite deliberately, if I hear the minister correctly, where the best that pastoral leaseholders can really expect under this new regime is a reference to how much actual land is going to be taken by what is otherwise going to be basically compulsorily applied to them with the promise that we are going to somehow ensure that we achieve—and I say 'we'; the minister has been saying 'we' quite a lot of time meaning 'the government'—a benefit.

I presume on that analysis that the minister will not be willing to say that he can give a guarantee that no pastoralist will be worse off as a result of all this. What does the minister have to say, if anything, about the proposition that this is the imposition of a retrospective change on the terms of existing pastoral leases in circumstances where the minister has adverted to the fact that there has been the practice in place—and the minister might say without comprehensive government oversight and a process surrounding it—of individual pastoral leaseholders seeking the minister's permission, getting the minister's permission and making arrangements that suit what becomes then part of the mixture of what keeps a pastoral lease viable?

If I might add one further question, it is whether or not the government has given any consideration in those circumstances to saying, if you are going to apply this regime and you are

going to do something short of compulsory acquisition—because we all concede that the parliament can do pretty much anything including the compulsory acquisition side, although it is not being marketed along those lines—what consideration, if any, has the government given to applying this only to those pastoral leases upon renewal and not coming and superimposing this new regime on existing leases?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will answer the last question first. That would mean there would be no mining on any pastoral lease, given what the shadow attorney-general has just said. I assume that is not going to be a policy of yours?

Mr TEAGUE: I am asking the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are asking the questions now. I will assume it is going to be a policy of yours, given that you have advocated now for this. I would imagine you might apply it to the Mining Act.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Exactly. The shadow minister for mining knows how crazy that is.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You do all the time.

Mr TEAGUE: These are questions—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, thank you for your wise input.

Mr TEAGUE: Come on, just answer the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just sit quietly and let me answer the question.

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Are you finished?

Mr TEAGUE: Maybe. I have a few more questions to ask.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Have you? Have you read the bill?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You have read the bill?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He has, has he? Yes, sure he has. The bill prescribes only what an access agreement must contain at a minimum, which includes—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The CHAIR: The minister will finish answering the question and members on my left will give the minister the opportunity to answer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The bill prescribes only what an access agreement must contain at a minimum, including compensation and access by both parties to the area. The bill does not limit what can be agreed and pastoralists are free to negotiate with licensees on other matters as required to facilitate access. To be clear, no activities can commence until an access agreement is in place.

I have never said anything disparaging about pastoral leaseholders, as was implied by the shadow attorney-general. I have never said anything that implies they are not capable of negotiating these outcomes. That is me being verballed by the shadow attorney-general.

I would expect that in practice any access agreement discussions will encompass matters like, but not be limited to, stock movements, how will they impact on their stock movements, important events in the seasonal and stock cycles, such as breeding, lambing, calving, marking, shearing, protection of water sources, fencing, use, installation and maintenance, how this is managed and

remedied, access to roads, construction, maintenance and any regenerative practices and biosecurity measures that are required.

What the government basically is doing is choosing a proponent and then negotiating an access agreement with the pastoral leaseholder, which is pretty clear in the bill. We are not in any way being disparaging about pastoral leaseholders at all. In fact, we are trying to get them another benefit. We are trying actually to diversify their businesses, which could get an improvement for everyone.

It is like wind farms on freehold land in South Australia have droughtproofed a lot of families because of the revenue that those wind farms bring. There are some examples that I have seen where freehold landowning farmers are receiving up to \$15,000 to \$20,000 per turbine. If you have multiple turbines on your freehold land your farm and your family are now droughtproof. You are resilient to variations in stock prices and commodity prices.

It is not perfect but it is something, and there has been a benefit but there has to be broader community benefit as well. So the government is attempting to make sure that there is an orderly process here, which I think suits everyone and benefits everyone, rather than just having a deregulated approach where we just allow proponents to make out their own negotiations with landowners.

We are going to be having access arrangements agreed by the pastoral lessees and their proponents, and nothing can commence until that is agreed. So they have got to agree to all this. There are processes, a lot like mining. You need to agree access arrangements. You need to agree. It has got to be collaborative. It can break down sometimes but there are rules and procedures in place that allow people who follow a well-trodden, regulated path to be able to sort out these problems. Currently there is nothing—nothing.

A very large European capital investment fund signs an arrangement with a pastoral leaseholder. It is ratified by the minister. That is it. There are no requirements, no legal obligations on the proponent—nothing. What we are trying to do is give pastoral leaseholders, freehold landowners, a regulatory process, a legislative process they can follow and the benefit that we get is the investment. We get the investment. Gigawatt-scale renewable energy is billions of dollars. It is not cheap. It is cheaper than coal and gas but it is still very, very expensive.

I am not sure that answers the member's question because I think that the member's question was more political than it was information seeking but I will stand to be corrected. I think that the shadow minister has flagged a number of amendments that we have been looking at, and some we can agree to and some we cannot. We can have that dialogue between the houses as well, but by and large what I want from the end of this process is a piece of legislation that can withstand the test of time, that can actually see broad benefits brought to regional South Australia where most of this investment will be made.

This investment will not be made in the seat of West Torrens. This investment will be made in the seats of Flinders, Giles and Stuart and the large regional areas which are along transmission lines that have excellent resources and which are close also to commodities like iron ore, and obviously Flinders and Giles are the hotspot of this area.

If we did nothing here, if we walked out of this space, you would have the planning minister be the approver of renewable resources and you would have hydrogen facilities going through multiple different paths so that any proponent would have to go through a whole series of different avenues through government to get their proposal up, and after they have locked up these resources—if they do indeed lock up these resources on the promise of a development—the government has no ability to force that proponent's hand or move them on. So this is a way of offering that certainty. I think it is a very good piece of legislation that will stand the test of time.

Mr TEAGUE: Despite an emotive opening, the minister sort of got there a little bit, albeit by reference to the wind farms on freehold property and the sort of income that can droughtproof those properties, as happens. I listened carefully. I think the minister did not refer to such assets being applied as they currently are on pastoral leases, and I do not think I got an answer to the question of

whether or not the government can provide a promise to those pastoral leases and Crown perpetual leaseholders that they will be no worse off under this scheme.

Perhaps put it this way: if the government was embarking upon this A to Z all-encompassing approach with a view to it being an incentiviser for industry that is going to maximise value, then how is it that pastoral leaseholders, Crown perpetual leaseholders and others who might find these assets being applied to their land are not the ones beating down the government's door to say, 'Can you please implement this just as soon as possible, because we're embarking on this process, we're familiar with what's going on in the whole global investment environment and we would love it if you just applied all of this as quickly as you could because that would achieve better outcomes for us'?

We do not seem to be hearing that. I am glad if the minister will correct me. I just want to indicate that I certainly do not impute any intent on behalf of the minister to imply anything about the capacity of pastoral leaseholders. So I guess I repeat the question: will the minister provide an undertaking that those pastoral leaseholders and Crown perpetual leaseholders will be no worse off under the arrangements, and perhaps can the minister put into some context reasons why those landholders in particular might not be knocking down the government's door to try to get this done just as quickly as possible?

For those who are following along—because we have been on clause 1 for a little while—there might be quite a bit more to say about this by the time we get to part 4 of the bill, which deals in a number of divisions with the licensing process, including parties to it, access and so on and so forth.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Clause 79 of the bill—which we are not on yet, but for the purpose of the committee—provides, and this is for pastoral leases:

- (3) The amount of compensation may include an additional component to cover reasonable costs reasonably incurred by an owner of land in connection with any negotiation or dispute related to—
- (a) the licensee gaining access to the land; or
 - (b) the operations to be undertaken on the land; or
 - (c) the compensation to be paid under subsection (1).

Subclause (2) provides:

- (a) any damage caused to the land by the person undertaking the authorised operations;
- (b) any loss of productivity or profits as a result of the authorised operations;
- (c) any other relevant matters.

Mr Teague: Is that it?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Subclause (3) then provides: 'The amount of compensation may include an additional component to cover reasonable costs reasonably incurred,' and so on. If a pastoral leaseholder does not want any solar or mining activity or wind farm on their pastoral lease, if they—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not saying you asked that question. I am saying in terms of loss of their applications we have codified it in the bill so they know exactly what they will be compensated for. If someone refuses to allow this activity to occur because they do not want any other activity to occur on their pastoral lease, then that person may well feel as if they are worse off.

I do not think you can be worse off with those protections in the act, so I am comfortable in saying that they will not be worse off, but this is subjective. What I might think is not worse off—I do not think landowners will be worse off. That is my view. It is certainly the way the bill has been structured. Whether I can convince my colleagues opposite is another matter.

The advice I have is that landowners' rights have been enhanced under the bill to ensure the sustainable coexistence of industries into the future. The bill provides improved dispute resolution mechanisms, landowner support through the expansion of landowner information services and various access arrangements that will facilitate negotiation and conversation regarding collaborative

uses of the land. The release area process has been specifically designed to facilitate early engagement with landowners to identify areas.

As I said earlier, before any activity can begin, licensees need to enter into access arrangements with affected pastoralists. Access arrangements are structured to provide support to pastoralists when negotiating for access to their leases. Legislated time frames and ministerial mediation has been provided to attempt to assist in negotiations between landowners and developers.

DEM is also expanding the services of the Landowner Information Service's renewable energy activities. This is a service we have now that is available to people with access who have mining companies coming onto their properties. It is a free service. It is factual and it is impartial. It is information for landowners, farmers and community members who have inquiries. It takes technical information about the often complex technical and legal processes involved in gaining access and makes it easier to understand.

Ultimately, one of the amendments that the opposition is putting up is about access to legal fees. I might be wrong about this, but you are prescribing an amount of \$10,000 in your amendment. That could be larger. We do not want it capped. I think, absolutely, landowners should get access to legal services, and it should be negotiated through access agreements. We do not want anyone to be worse off, but it is a subjective question I cannot give a straight answer to.

I have seen it with farmers. Even though I can demonstrate that financially they are no worse off, they do not want anyone else on their land. Subjectively, they are worse off. They are not happy. It has impacted their way of life. Shake your head all you like; I am just saying that has been the experience that I have had. But in terms of, 'Are they financially worse off as an impact of this activity?' the answer is no, and it is in the bill.

Mr TEAGUE: It is good to have that on the record. Just to be clear, I completely take on board that there are plenty of important subjective views that are non-financial in relation to properties: pastoral leases, Crown perpetual leases, freehold farming land. We know that.

My question—and it might have been put in too general terms; I thought it was pretty clear—focused on the financial comparison between the current what might be described as an evolving ad hoc process and what now is going to be rolled out as described as this all-encompassing regime. It is good to have what the minister has just described on the record. There is no attempt here at a gotcha moment. I am just trying to understand clearly.

I heard the minister say, in terms of an opening overview, 'Well, hang on, your pastoral leases and Crown perpetual leaseholders and so on actually only hold a really limited bundle of rights.' What might have been interpreted from the minister's earlier answer is that these landholders, these leaseholders, to the extent that they are benefiting at the moment from arrangements that they are not entitled to—but what I have heard the minister say just now is that financially—and I accept that is what we are talking about, albeit with the possibility of being under some sort of obligation to participate in a program—financially the minister's expectation is they will not be any worse off and will be better off.

If that is the case, then truly the government will have achieved something in terms of promoting a win-win-win in all directions and benefits for the state and all the rest of it. In terms of the way that has been characterised by reference to clause 79—if the minister is going to go to clause 79 as a reference; we are not there, obviously—if it is by reference to those heads of compensation the subject of clause 79 only, then I would just say it is very well that there is what we have heard from the minister on the record now for pastoralists and Crown perpetual leaseholders to hang onto, to have some sort of assurance that what is otherwise something that we are told we are going to have to hear about in the regulations is going to be a regime under which they are no worse off. I give the opportunity to the minister if he has anything further to add, but that is otherwise useful to have on the record.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Currently, under the pastoral act the minister sets the amounts that pastoralists are entitled to. Under this bill, pastoralists get to negotiate it with the proponents for an access arrangement. That is the fundamental difference.

I also point out that when the previous government changed the compulsory acquisition rules for homes along the north-south corridor, that legislation did not prescribe the value that each person would be compensated for the taking of their home. That was done through a regulation afterwards, as it has to be. We set out principles in legislation and we want pastoralists to negotiate, and they are free to negotiate as much as they like. The current system is that the environment minister sets what they are entitled to and what they get through these arrangements. I think this is a better outcome, but we will see.

The thing about this legislation is that if it is not working, if we are not getting the investment and we are losing productivity, we change it. There is no benefit to the government to bring in a piece of legislation that finds pastoralists at war with developers who are wanting to develop renewable assets on their pastoral leases. It is of no benefit to me at all; I do not need that.

Same with mining—I need happy farmers and happy miners. When it does not work, it causes a lot of social unrest and it impacts the state's credibility to go out and sell its resources to other people, hence my decision on Bird in Hand. My view on this piece of legislation is that what we are doing is attempting to strengthen the rights of lease and landowners while at the same time giving certainty to investors that there is a prescribed process in place.

As to the subjective test about whether people will be better off on this, I have met farmers whose personal net worth is four or five or even 10 times bigger than the exploration company knocking on their door wanting to drill a hole. No level of agreement or access or financial compensation for loss of use on that farm—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know the member is saying it is not what he asked; I am just making a point. Things can be misinterpreted. When I say no-one is worse off, I mean financially for their current land use, because I thought I made it pretty clear in my opening remarks. But, subjectively, I have been in people's dining rooms where they do not want anyone else to have access to their land, regardless of the deposit they are sitting on. No level of financial compensation is going to make it better. If you ask them, 'Are you better or worse off?' they will say, 'We are worse off,' hence my hesitance. I do not want to be misunderstood.

In terms of their activities and their financial exposure, they cannot be worse off, otherwise this will not work. The government is never going to bring a piece of legislation to the parliament that makes a business deliberately worse off at the expense of someone else.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

Mr PATTERSON: Just following on from the discussions in the opening, there were comments made around the ability for the renewable energy infrastructure. The example given was wind turbines to help droughtproof freehold landowners and provide an ancillary income that smooths things out. Similarly, there is also the opportunity for this to happen—

The CHAIR: I am happy to be flexible, but we have to be somewhere close to the clause we are discussing—even the vicinity would be good.

Mr PATTERSON: This will be framed around talking about regulations and what timing they will come in with the commencement of the act.

The CHAIR: We will see how we go.

Mr PATTERSON: Just so that you do not get too concerned and pull me into line if need be. Certainly, the point being that the pastoralists do see opportunities from having renewable energy on their land, I think, overwhelmingly, but you are right, there might be some who do not want anything at all. They are just making sure, as the member for Heysen was saying, that they are no worse off.

In the consultation process (you have seen these pastoral workshops) they have raised their concerns. In the briefings I had with the department—which I thank the department for; they were very fulsome—a lot of the way those concerns will be addressed will be in the regulations as opposed

to the legislation. That is the contemporary way of legislating so you are not too prescriptive—I understand that—but I suppose some of their concerns they feel are so great that they want to have them explicitly in the bill. To give them comfort either way, as you noted, I flagged some amendments.

Could you maybe explain, in terms of the commencement of the bill, where that will fall in terms of when you expect that to be, but also in terms of regulations what the process will be in developing those regulations, the consultation process, to give some comfort specifically to, I suppose, landowners but also renewable energy companies as well, because they will be affected by these regulations.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is very hard to know how this bill will end up once it has been through both houses. Development of regs is very difficult until the bill is finalised, but we will have a six-week consultation period when we will provide information sheets to members of the public. We will do this consultation over a six-week period, and I want the bill to be operational in 2024.

That will depend entirely on what comes back from the upper house. I have no idea what our friends the Greens have planned for this legislation. I have no idea what will occur to this bill when it goes up there. I hope it is seen as an important piece of legislation that can maintain its integrity through both houses of parliament. Once that is completed, we will go out for a six-week period of consultation, we will draft the regs, go out and consult, and then we will obviously commence some time in 2024.

I undertake to keep the shadow minister completely informed in the process of this, not only once it has left the parliament and been assented to, but to make sure that he is one of the key people we are consulting with because my key ambition is that this legislation is so important to the state's future that it needs bipartisan support and certainty. The opposition's input into this is going to be very important. It is not something I am just going to try to crunch through, which is why I have been deliberating with my advisers about what amendments we accept and do not accept, because I think it is vitally important that this be a collective piece of work.

I suspect if we had not been successful at the last election, this legislation, or a form of this, would be here now anyway. This is how important I think this legislation is. That is the process. I know it is a more contemporary way of doing it and it does not ease people's concerns when they do not know what is being passed and there are heads of powers being given to regulations, and it makes it very difficult for people to know what is coming next, but we are trying to smooth that out as far as we can.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you. That certainly I think would give some comfort. Just to recap and then finish off with a question, you are right: they are taking a bit on trust that they will be consulted. Can I confirm that consultation process: will there be consultation first before draft regulations are put in and then further consultation post that? Also, will it be done all at once or will you do tranches of the regulations?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All at once, before the regs are drafted. The regs will be drafted and then we consult again on the regs after the draft. There will be consultation at the beginning, drafting and then consultation again; so there will be two rounds of consultation. The information sheet will be put out, we will get feedback, draft the regs, then go out and consult again on the final regs because we go out to consultation on them for a six-week period.

Mr TELFER: On that consultation, obviously it is easy to target pastoral leaseholders; it is a pretty known quantum. What is the process that is envisaged of consultation with freehold landowners? Are there going to be targeted representative groups? Are they going to be travelling roadshows, for want of a better term? It is that engagement with freehold landowners. As you were saying, there are more obvious places for projects in certain parts of the state. What is that process going to look like in particular for freehold landowners?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: All the professional representative bodies that incorporate regional communities, including the livestock association, Pastoral Board, pastoralists, local councils. It will be on the YourSAy website as well; I imagine we will be going out publicly there. This is a pretty comprehensive piece of consultation leading up to this. I expect it will be identical and the same

bodies will be consulted again. Obviously, we cannot knock on everyone's door, but bodies that represent regional communities and farmers will be consulted, including might I add their ultimate representatives: the people in this chamber.

Mr TELFER: On the commencement aspect, minister, you talked about existing arrangements in place, existing agreements with pastoral leaseholders. Will the commencement of this bill make null and void those arrangements that are already in place between proponents and pastoral leaseholders in particular?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you have already commenced work, you have progressed and things are being built, you stay under the existing framework. If nothing has occurred, those agreements are null and void.

Mr TELFER: For further clarity, who is going to be making the judgements on whether a project has commenced or not? It is easy when there is physical construction happening on the ground, there could be proponents who have initial scoping works.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: If you have applied under the development act and you have been given approval, that is deemed to have commenced.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Mr PATTERSON: In regard to the objects that spell out what the objects of the act are, I think wholeheartedly all the stakeholders I consulted with have endorsed clause 3(d), which provides:

- (d) to enable engagement with Aboriginal people to ensure the regulatory framework in this Act maximises beneficial economic, environmental and social impacts and minimises adverse cultural and heritage impacts on Aboriginal people;

One of the points made by stakeholders with interest in land is that they feel the objects would benefit from a similar objective being placed in the bill that takes into account the broader rural and regional communities. As you have said, you will not see these big developments happening in West Torrens, you will not be seeing them in Morphett, but where you will be seeing them of course is in those regional communities.

We talked about all those social licence issues that we are seeing in Victoria and New South Wales, principally on pretty prime agricultural land, so to get that social licence it is important that the rural and regional communities are made to feel that this is of benefit to them and it is not all about just providing energy to industry and metropolitan Adelaide. So, in terms of that, if you have some comments around trying to bring in regional and rural communities.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I know you are not speaking to your amendment, but I think you make a valid point. I think you make a valid point. The government is prepared to accept some amendments. We want to amend your amendment and we will file our own amendments, but by and large I agree. I do not want to see contagions spread from what is going on in New South Wales and Victoria. I think by and large that social licence question has been settled here. There are obviously pockets where it pops up and we need to deal with it. The Adelaide Hills is one prime example of that.

Yes, I agree with the opposition. I think there needs to be some work on this, so we are accepting a version of your amendment, which I would like to talk to you about. I am not sure if you want to do it tonight or if you want to do it tomorrow. It is up to you. It will give me some time to explain it to you and then the opposition can make a decision about whether they want to support it or not. But I agree—there have to be beneficial economic, environmental and social outcomes, and people have to be consulted appropriately, so I accept what the shadow minister is saying.

Mr PATTERSON: Just further, I think it is very important that with hydrogen the act does consider strongly public safety and managing those risks. Maybe the minister could explain what the department has advised are potentially those risks and how this bill will seek to regulate them.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

Mr PATTERSON: I have forgotten. These will not be the exact words, but it was along these lines. You will see clause 3 paragraph (g) talking about managing risks. Of course, with hydrogen and then also with renewable energy projects in general, maybe the minister could explain what those risks potentially are relating to the hydrogen and how this bill seeks to regulate them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Quite appropriately, the government wants to apply world best practice and standards for safety regulations around hydrogen. Hydrogen is a volatile, very light molecule that can escape easily and can combust, so we have to make sure it is appropriately regulated. Again, this is my point: we know that this industry is coming and we know that it is being incentivised by governments around the world. There are now proponents here in South Australia who have already received their own home country's subsidies to be here and develop hydrogen. We need to regulate it and make sure it is safe.

What are the concerns around? Is it storage, moving it in pipelines, making sure that the appropriate technology and suppression matters are put in place to make sure that there are no explosions and that things do not go bang when they should not? There are the usual protections we put in place, in the same way that we regulate LPG and regulate petroleum production at Cooper Basin and Moomba. It is no different.

Mr TELFER: Electricity management goes back a long way, and the bill that was formed at the time when the ETSA sale went through has basically formed the framework for the situation we are in now—and it is very different as far as generation goes. The scenario we are in now is changing the framework for what we are dealing with.

Minister, you well know the operation of the Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 1999. Through that bill, the owners of the land used for electricity generation in South Australia are paying significantly lower council rates compared with other businesses and residential ratepayers, as I am sure you would know. Is that something that the minister agrees with and has a perspective on?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The official government policy is that we do not support it because it would be applied to people's power bills. Privately, I see the benefit in it. I do. I see the benefit in it because I think a lot of these small councils, like the one the member for Flinders used to be the mayor of, do not have the rates base to do the work that they need to do. I have driven on some of those roads, and they are exceptionally well maintained with a very small rates base.

But things come along that are important, like jetties and like other pieces of community infrastructure, things that ratepayers would expect. There are people who are building renewable infrastructure that is on regional roads. They are using those community assets that everyone else is paying for and they are not contributing to the local council. So I do see a benefit in it. I think it makes comparative sense.

The question is: who is the first government to move to allow this to occur? I think this is an opportunity for us, potentially, where some regional councils could have a rates base on this, but we are going to have to work through that through the budget process—

An honourable member: Or the outback areas.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —or the outback areas, or whoever it might be. From reading the Auditor-General's Report today, there are a lot of unsealed roads that need maintaining, and a lot of sealed roads that need maintaining, in the regional areas. It is an asset base of over \$40 billion in replacement cost, and the unfunded backlog continues to grow, and those councils are no different.

I think it is a very good suggestion. Governments need a rates base, they need a revenue base, and local communities know how to spend it best. I have no real personal opposition to it. My perspective is that this was something that should have been done through the asset sale, but I suspect it was not put in, either through oversight or to maximise the sale price. Either way, I think it would be a good outcome, but it is a budget process.

Mr TELFER: To continue on from that, I am sure it probably was not envisioned because there were very few different footprints of electricity generation at that time. The footprint of electricity generation is widespread now across the state.

I am wondering, minister, if you received any advice from your department on the impact on rates revenue on South Australian councils that could occur as a result of this bill? By that, I mean that, if the aims of the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill are achieved and there is a significant increase in land that is used for electricity generation in South Australia and as a result councils cannot then raise rates on that land because it is exempt because it is under electricity generation based on its capital value, has the minister received advice as to what that estimated cost to South Australian councils might be of those rates forgone?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I imagine it would depend on whatever the council rate rate is because council rates are a very elegant form of taxation. Councils work out their expenditure for the year. They know what their rate base is, and they calculate the tax to collect it, so technically they should never be in deficit or surplus. Depending on the value of the rate—and there are billions of dollars' worth of investments going on in regional areas—it would be considerable millions of dollars that councils would be missing out on. I do not have a policy of rate capping. Do you expect council rates to then decrease or is this an increase in rates coming into councils? What would be done with these extra rates?

Personally, I would like to see them spent on community assets and infrastructure, the paying down of debt for local communities and local councils and providing services and amenities that they want. Others may want a reduction in rates. These are the debates and discussions we have to have because ultimately the people paying for all this will be Adelaide metropolitan people who might see their power bills increase.

Mr TELFER: To unpack it a little bit more and so the house understands—the nuances of the council rating system may interest some people, but the impacts actually interest most people around—if the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill's motivation, which is to encourage ongoing and further expanded investment into renewable energy installation in South Australia, means that the land it is now going onto is unable to be rated by councils, that will mean that the rate base, which councils have to have rise, is now from a smaller value so the cost of a potential loss of a rate base will then have to be spread onto the rest of the council ratepayers. Does the minister have any advice through his department on the estimated increase in council rates on existing ratepayers on the rest of the rate base if there are significant increases in energy generation projects that take the rate base down?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The part of the bill we are debating does not actually relate to council rates. I do not accept the premise that it will decrease the ratings base and therefore it will be a larger core per person. The argument I think the member should be making is that, if this is behind the meter technology and this is not connected to distribution lines for people to use at their homes, why should it not be rated? I think that is the more elegant argument that local communities should be making.

If you are building a gigawatt of renewable energy that is not connected to the NEM, which is all behind the meter going directly to an electrolyser and it is rated, the people who will pay those rates are the customers of the hydrogen or the customers of the iron ore, not other ratepayers or electricity consumers in South Australia.

Then the question is: well, why should they not be rated? I think the answer to that, which the member for Flinders and I would have if it was a Telfer-Koutsantonis government, would be that we would probably charge rates, but that is not how parliamentary democracy and representative government work. There is a cabinet process to go through and a parliamentary process to go through, but the behind-the-meter stuff is, I think, the most opportunistic opportunity for local government to be able to apply a rate because it will not impact on any other customers other than the end customers of the hydrogen, but be careful what you wish for.

I have seen councils in history give away their rates base on things like the steelworks, on large pieces of infrastructure, like in Pirie, and they have lived to regret it later. You can never re-impose it afterwards. I think this is an opportunity that we will work through.

Mr PATTERSON: I have a final question. I think in the discussions you did point out that the legislation is around providing a framework to exploit renewable energy resources and the potential for hydrogen as well. You are right: both governments—your government and the previous government—saw that as an opportunity for economic growth.

I sort of concur with what you are saying. Obviously this government won the election, but had the former government continued on there probably would have been a similar sort of piece of legislation around trying to exploit those. Having said that, we did talk a bit about modelling around what was expected in terms of hydrogen generation, and maybe I did not take the opportunity then but it is worth taking the opportunity now in terms of the objects.

Has the government done any modelling around the amount of percentage of energy projects that may be constructed on freehold land and the scale of those compared with what is expected on designated land? Principally, the main thrust of this legislation is around trying to develop that designated land, but can you give some insight to the committee about where you see it going?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No, we have not done any modelling like that, but you are right, and the main reason is that we will be going out on designated pastoral leases, on Crown land first. We are talking about upper South Australia and the renewable resources to the west of Port Augusta on Eyre Peninsula. That could take 20 to 30 years to develop at the gigawatt scale.

I know that the previous government was fond of saying that there were \$20 billion worth of renewable projects ready to go when Project EnergyConnect connects to New South Wales. Well, where are they? These things take a long, long time. My instincts are there will be probably half gigawatt developments—500 megawatts—with associated electrolysers. First things first: they probably will connect to the grid and then they will work plays to try to build infrastructure, to build their electrolysers and the like.

The interesting thing will be when salt caverns are properly discovered in South Australia. In Utah, for example, there is a project that has a 220-megawatt electrolyser operating on it, which is storing the hydrogen in salt caverns directly alongside it, providing vast amounts of hydrogen storage. South Australia is geologically very likely to have similar salt caverns. You could imagine a REZ being conducted in an area that could be quite useful for salt caverns.

We would have electrolyser generation on Eyre Peninsula somewhere connecting, and then you would have a form of a closed loop, as it were, of generation all behind the meter. I cannot give you numbers for scales. Our ambitions are massive, but this all requires the same amount of capital that everyone is chasing. The IRA in the United States is offering vast amounts of government subsidy for investment in hydrogen. The Canadians have responded with their own subsidy. We have Hydrogen Headstart, which is a \$2 billion fund, I think. You have the Japanese, the South Koreans and the Chinese with all their investments.

What we are offering people is something quite unique. We are not offering them subsidy, but what we are offering them are world-class resources that, with an ordinary investment, probably will produce hydrogen at a lower cost than you would somewhere else under a subsidy. That is the market we are targeting.

I cannot give you a number on how much will be built by when, but the possibilities are limitless: a billion tonnes of iron ore that we know of now, let alone what is undercover, let alone what has not been developed. If border abatement comes into play in Europe as it is meant to, and it will in Japan and South Korea, coking coal and traditional furnaces will not be able to be used in some of these jurisdictions, they will need to import a decarbonised green iron.

I am hoping and I am planning that it comes from South Australia. Our magnetite is best suited for DRI and electric arc furnaces. Arrium, acquired by GFG, has the largest scrap business in the country. There are a lot of things lining up for us, but it all starts with renewable energy, so I cannot give you a number. We have not done the modelling. What we have been working on is a regulatory framework and the legislation. How long is a piece of string? I cannot give you an accurate answer, sorry.

Mr TEAGUE: This might be nuts and bolts. I think paragraph (h) talks about facilitating appropriate consultation, and so that is going forward. I wonder, and the minister might need to take

it on notice, is it convenient to provide to the committee some sort of succinct ready reckoner about the consultation that has taken place already, locations and attendees?

I do not know that there was some sort of sign-in sheet that would permit it, but the number of owners as defined in clause 79, so pastoral leaseholders, etc., to give an indication as to—I understand there were steps along the way through the Mid North and then around, and there is some anecdotal indication as to who went to where and all that sort of thing, if there is a comprehensive ready reckoner, is that possible to provide?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Minister, I will just draw your attention to the fact that it is not actually possible for ministers to take questions on notice during the committee stage of a bill, but you could give an undertaking that you will return to the house with an answer later.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You are a fount of wisdom, sir. Thank you for your helpful unsolicited interjection.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): I aim to please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is one word for it.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He is outstanding. I have known him since he was a boy. There is a detailed record of the consultation that we have done which has been quite intensive, especially with First Nations people, pastoral leaseholders, and associated professional bodies and councils. We have a consultation report on the website that you can go to and have a look at, but I think you are asking us for the lists of names of everyone who attended?

Mr Teague: Not necessarily.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Not necessarily, okay. I suspect that there is a comprehensive report on the website that you can access. Between the houses, I am more than happy to give an undertaking that I will get you the information that you are seeking. But I have to say I think the consultation we have done on this bill is pretty much unprecedented. It has been very, very intense consultation, going back two, three, four times, talking to groups of people about this bill, so I can provide that if there is not everything you need on the departmental website.

Mr TEAGUE: I realise we are not talking yet about the amendment, (da), but perhaps just to address those objects, the minister might agree that it is somewhat of a notable absence, is it not, that you go down the list of objects of the bill and you have to get to paragraph (e) before you start hearing about facilitating economic prosperity and benefits for the state through the development of the industry.

Not that there is any magic in the order, but we get to paragraph (e) and we see that objective. We clearly do not see that there is an objective of the bill, adjacent that or anywhere else, that is to facilitate the economic prosperity of the owners, as defined for the purposes of clause 79 of the bill and so on, or the local region or anything else that might be particularly affected. That is what it is. The amendment might come in due course, but I just wonder: is there anything that might indicate why we get to paragraph (e) before we see that we are facilitating even the economic developments for the state? Is it an inadvertent omission to have not included some overt objective in terms of the interests of those owners and local areas?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I do not think it was an error, but like I said earlier, I think the shadow minister makes sense with his amendment. I have an amendment that I am going to file in a moment to propose to amend the amendment, which I think can give the government and the opposition some comfort, but I think the answer, in your own words, is that there is no magic ordering in the objects. We want local communities to benefit; of course, we do. I am happy to spell that out in our amendment, which I will show the shadow minister if we want to deal with it tonight or deal with it tomorrow.

It might be easier for us to have this all ready for tomorrow. That way, we can just go through it and get it done. I said there are some amendments that the shadow minister proposes that I will be supporting, so perhaps after the house rises at six the shadow minister and I can have a

discussion about what amendments we like and do not like and have a discussion about those. The ones we do not like, we can work on between the houses. The ones we do like, we might wish to make some amendments to and discuss those with the shadow minister. But there is no magic order in these. We do want local communities to benefit. We do want them to prosper as a result of it. That is why we are doing it.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Do you wish to move your amendment now, member for Morphett?

Mr PATTERSON: I might seek some wisdom from the Chair, given the big crescendo of support there from the minister.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Perhaps we will let you make one further contribution.

Mr PATTERSON: Through you, Chair, to the minister, I obviously want to move the amendment. To look to do it between the houses might delay further progression in the committee, and I do not want to do that. If we move this amendment now, how do we reconcile the fact that there is the potential for the minister to have an amendment? You would file it, and then we would have to discuss potentially—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): I have advice that may assist the house. There are options. The member may move the amendment and then have his amendment potentially amended by the minister, or the minister can just move his amendment instead. Perhaps the two members may wish to very briefly discuss the issue.

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Well, you can do that, member for Morphett, but an alternative is the minister can just move his version if you wish.

Mr PATTERSON: I am okay; I will move it, thank you. I move:

Amendment No 1 [Patterson-1]—

Page 7, after line 20—Insert:

(da) to enable engagement with rural and regional communities in relation to hydrogen and renewable energy projects to facilitate benefits to those communities;

Maybe if I preambule it by one of the questions I asked previously. The aim of this is, of course, that I think overwhelmingly the stakeholders involved, both the renewable energy companies and especially those with interest in the land, supported the objects there relating to:

(d) to enable engagement with Aboriginal people to ensure the regulatory framework in this act maximises beneficial economic, environmental and social impacts and minimises adverse cultural and heritage impacts on Aboriginal people;

Certainly, they support that. At the same time, they did query that if all this infrastructure is going to be in regional and rural communities, it would make those communities feel like they were going to be prioritised to a somewhat equal level with Aboriginal people—that was not their sole aim—to know that, in terms of considerations when we go through all these other clauses that we will go through and when the bill is enacted, they would be front and centre in terms of being recognised.

Of course, the intent would be for them to benefit broadly from the uplift that these massive investments could have in their communities, but at the same time they would also be protected from this. The reason, as we have alluded to before, is that we have seen the troubles in other states trying to get social licence from these regional communities, where they feel that the benefits are going off into other areas. I think this will really crystallise this amendment, that those regional and rural communities are front and centre in terms of consideration in this bill.

The amendment inserts into those objects a paragraph (da) to sit underneath the one I previously quoted, which would enable engagement with rural and regional communities in relation to hydrogen and renewable energy projects to facilitate benefits to those communities.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Thank you, member for Morphett. Minister, I understand—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The precedent set by the Acting Deputy Chair—precedence was given to the mover of the amendment rather than the mover of the bill. That is okay; it is a precedent now set. We will call it the Brown manoeuvre.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): To assist the house, the Chair gave precedence to the member for Morphett because his amendment had already been filed but, in fact, erroneously, the minister should have been given precedence because he is the minister with carriage of the bill.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It does not matter.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Minister, you seek to move an amendment?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I move an amendment to the amendment lodged by the shadow minister. I move:

to delete 'to facilitate benefits to those communities' and substitute 'for beneficial economic, environmental and social outcomes for those communities;'

I commend it to the house.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Does anyone wish to speak to either of the amendments currently before the Chair?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The amendment will read:

(da) to enable engagement with rural and regional communities in relation to hydrogen and renewable energy projects for beneficial economic, environmental and social outcomes for those communities;

So you are deleting 'to facilitate benefits to those communities' and inserting 'for beneficial economic, environmental and social outcomes for those communities'. That is it.

Mr TEAGUE: On the amendment, to understand it, the virtue of the amendment to the amendment is that it is then lining up (da) with the same objects of (d). So in respect to those rural and regional communities, you are achieving the same range of object benefits as you are for engagement with Aboriginal people in (d)?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

Amendment to amendment carried; amendment as amended carried; clause as amended passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT COMMITTEE ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

Government Business, Orders of the Day, No. 1: Report of the committee to be brought up:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:33): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Wednesday 18 October 2023 at 10:30.

*Estimates Replies***NON-GOVERNMENT TRAINING PROVIDERS**

In reply to the **Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

There are seven non-government training providers contracted by Skills SA that access TAFE SA infrastructure through various arrangements.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

Since 1 July 2022, no executive appointments were made.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

Since 1 July 2022, there were no executive positions abolished.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

No terminations of executive positions occurred at the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

The estimated total cost for engagement of consultants and contractors in 2023-24 is nil.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2023-24 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	52	53	55	55

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

The total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2023-24 and the forward estimates is nil.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that there is nil expenditure for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee.

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee:

The budgeted expenditure for remote work infrastructure for the financial year 2023-24, and for previous years 2021-22 and 2022-23 is as follows:

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Expenditure on remote work infrastructure	Nil	Nil	Nil

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

The Child Development Council did not have any executive appointments in 2022-23.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

Since 1 July 2022, there were no executive positions abolished.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

The Child Development Council:

- is not funded for any executive positions;
- does not have any executive positions; and
- did not terminate any executive positions in 2022-23.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2022-23 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies in due course.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2023-24 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	45,000	97,000	100,000	102,000

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

The total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2023-24 and the forward estimates is nil.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and budgeted expenditure for approved campaigns and are disclosed on the DPC website: <https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

The Child Development Council spent \$702 on an advertisement in *The Advertiser* newspaper in September 2022.

This expenditure was for a call by the Minister for Education, Training and Skills for expressions of interest in membership of the Child Development Council in accordance with the Minister's scheme approved under the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016 (section 46 (3)).

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that there is nil expenditure for the Child Development Council for the 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26 financial years—Controlled.

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Child Development Council:

The budgeted expenditure for remote work infrastructure for the financial year 2023-24, and for previous years 2021-22 and 2022-23 is nil.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board:

Since 1 July 2022, there has been one executive appointment made.

Individual executive total remuneration package values (TRPV) as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board:

No executive positions were abolished during the 2022-23 financial year.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board:

There were no executive position terminations during the 2022-23 financial year.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies in due course.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2023-24 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	1,527	1,553	1,592	1,631

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board

Table 1 shows the total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2023-24 and the forward estimates:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch		2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget	2026-27 Budget
Communication and promotion	FTE	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	\$m	0.094	0.095	0.097	0.098
TOTAL	FTE	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
	\$m	0.094	0.095	0.097	0.098

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

The Education Standards Board does not provide any grant programs or funds.

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the Education Standards Board:

There is no budgeted expenditure for remote work infrastructure for the financial year 2023-24 and no expenditure was budgeted for previous years 2021-22 and 2022-23.

The Education Standards Board leverages the Department for Education's ICT infrastructure and support services through a service level agreement.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA:

Since 1 July 2022, no executive appointments were made.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA:

Since 1 July 2022, there were no executive positions abolished.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA:

No terminations of executive positions occurred at the History Trust of SA between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2022-23 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies in due course.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2023-24 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	4,214	4,106	4,215	4,327

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA:

Table 1 shows the total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2023-24 and the forward estimates:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch		2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget	2026-27 Budget
Marketing	FTE	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	\$m	0.228	0.231	0.235	0.239

Unit/Branch		2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget	2026-27 Budget
TOTAL	FTE	2.0	2.0	2.0	2.0
	\$m	0.228	0.231	0.235.	0.239

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA:

As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and budgeted expenditure for approved campaigns and are disclosed on the DPC website: <https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>.

Nil to report for marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 for estimation for 2023-24.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that the History Trust of South Australia:

The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds under my responsibility for the 2023-24, 2024-25 and 2025-26 financial years—Administered:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2023-24 Estimate \$000	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000
Department for Education, History Trust of SA – Investing in Community History- Museum and Collections (MaC) Grant Program and South Australian History Fund (SAHF)	The History Trust of South Australia offer two annual community grant programs; the South Australian History Fund (SAHF) and Museums and Collections (MaC). SAHF supports community and individual projects, publications and research, while the MaC fund supports groups who participate in the MaC Development and Funding Program	399	409	419

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the History Trust of SA (HTSA):

The budgeted expenditure for remote work infrastructure for the financial year 2023-24, and for previous years 2021-22 and 2022-23 is as follows:

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Expenditure on remote work infrastructure (*)	49	73	22

(*) Please note the cost is not only for working from home e.g. the amount includes laptops that are used for remote and for office use. HTSA has a number of sites, so all staff are required to be able to work remotely. In 2022-23 all desktops were replaced by laptops to enable staff to work at any HTSA site and work from home.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the SACE Board of South Australia:

Since 1 July 2022, three executive appointments were made.

Individual executive total remuneration package values (TRPV) as detailed in schedule 2 of an executive employee's contract will not be disclosed as it is deemed to be unreasonable disclosure of personal affairs.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the SACE Board of South Australia:

Since 1 July 2022, there were no executive positions abolished.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the SACE Board of South Australia:

No terminations of executive positions occurred at the SACE Board of South Australia between 1 July 2022 and 30 June 2023.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies in due course.

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the SACE Board of South Australia:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2023-24 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2023-24	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Total goods and services	\$5,333	\$5,136	\$5,260	\$5,390

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the SACE Board of South Australia:

Table 1 shows the total budgeted FTE to provide communication and promotion activities for 2023-24 and the forward estimates:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch		2023-24 Budget	2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget	2026-27 Budget
Communications	FTE	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	\$m	\$0.611	\$0.625	\$0.638	\$0.647
TOTAL	FTE	5.0	5.0	5.0	5.0
	\$m	\$0.611	\$0.625	\$0.638	\$0.647

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised:

There are no applicable grant programs for the SACE Board of South Australia.

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (5 July 2023). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills): I have been advised that for the SACE Board of South Australia:

The budgeted expenditure for remote work infrastructure for the financial year 2023-24, and for previous years 2021-22 and 2022-23 is as follows:

	2021-22	2022-23	2023-24
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Expenditure on remote work infrastructure	Nil	Nil	Nil