HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 16 May 2024

The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell) took the chair at 11:00.

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

The SPEAKER read prayers.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE: WESTERN HOSPITAL AT HENLEY BEACH

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:01): I move:

That the report of the committee on House of Assembly petition No. 50 of 55/1, entitled Western Hospital at Henley Beach, be noted.

The Western Hospital at Henley Beach petition was signed by 11,134 residents of South Australia and tabled in the House of Assembly on 7 March 2024 by the member for Colton. In evidence before the committee, the member for Colton advised that, subsequent to the petition being tabled, additional community members have signed the petition, bringing the total number of signatures to well above 16,000. This number demonstrates the significance of the Western Hospital to South Australians.

The petition was referred to the Legislative Review Committee pursuant to section 16B of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Section 12(ba) of that act requires that the committee inquire into, consider and report to parliament on any eligible petition referred to it. I do note in passing that legislation was passed through this house yesterday that will require that petitions now be referred to the relevant standing committee, but under the old system it was referred to the Legislative Review Committee. The Western Hospital petition requested that the House of Assembly:

…urge the Government to ensure the future of the Western Hospital at Henley Beach, and in particular, ensure that the land on which the hospital sits remains zoned for health care services into the future.

The petition arose in response to the Western Hospital being placed into voluntary administration on 29 January 2024. The member for Colton advised the committee that the Western Hospital offers GP, cardiovascular, oncology, specialist, radiology, elective surgery and other important health services. The member for Colton also advised that these services support residents of the western suburbs as well as other regions across South Australia. He emphasised that in providing these services the Western Hospital has also supported and eased pressure on the strained public health system.

The committee heard evidence on 10 April 2024 from the member for Colton; Ms Colleen Billows OAM, who is an advocate for the Western Hospital; and Mr Angelo Piovesan, who is the Chairman of The Friends of Western Hospital Association Inc. This evidence supported the petitioners' claims that the Western Hospital is important to the community as well as to the public health system. The witnesses agreed that the government and relevant ministers are best placed to determine the most appropriate way of retaining the Western Hospital site for healthcare services into the future. As a result of the evidence heard, the committee has made the following recommendations:

1. That the Minister for Planning receive this report and consider the petitioners' request that the minister ensure the future of the Western Hospital and, in particular, ensure that the land on which the Western Hospital sits remains zoned for healthcare services into the future.

2. That the Minister for Health and Wellbeing receive this report and consider the impact on South Australia's healthcare system should the land on which the Western Hospital sits not remain zoned for healthcare services.

I would like to thank the other members of the Legislative Review Committee who were involved in this inquiry: in the Legislative Council the Hon. Reggie Martin MLC, who is the Presiding Member, the Hon. Connie Bonaros MLC and the Hon. Nicola Centofanti MLC; and in this place the member for Florey, the member for Flinders and previous committee member the member for Playford.

In addition, I would like to thank the committee secretary, Matt Balfour, and the research officer, Ms Maureen Affleck, for their assistance and their ongoing help. I would also like to express the committee's gratitude to the member for Colton for his contribution to the committee's inquiry into this petition. I commend the report the house.

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (11:05): I rise today to speak on the noting of the report before us from the Legislative Review Committee. I believe, and stand to be corrected, this is the first report that has passed through since the changes in legislation to permit the referral of a petition that garners more than 10,000 signatures to a relevant committee of the house, formerly to the Legislative Review Committee, on the back of changes that were passed through this chamber just yesterday.

To provide some updated context, the petition now is nearing 20,000 signatures, so it is certainly by no means slowing down. It emphasises the level of concern within my local community in regard to the future of the Western Hospital but also underlines the strength, belief and connection that the community has had with the Western Hospital over many, many years.

I would like to begin by thanking the members of the Legislative Review Committee for their time and thanking the government for the bipartisan nature with which they have undertaken this process to this point. Obviously, every petition is different. The purpose of this petition was to quickly raise awareness of the issue and to provide an understanding of the level of support for this hospital within my local community to the government, to the administrators who are undertaking the process of hopefully facilitating a sale of the hospital and also to any potential buyers.

It is clear that the western suburbs are passionate about retaining this facility as a hospital. It is clear that the people of the western suburbs understand the pressure that this hospital takes off of the broader public healthcare services in the western suburbs as well. I thank Angelo Piovesan, the Chairman of The Friends of Western Hospital Association, and also Colleen Billows, who provided evidence to the committee with me.

What is important now is a timely response from the relevant ministers to whom the recommendations of the committee have been moved forward. As we stand here today, we certainly hope and continue to hope that there are relevant parties that are interested in proceeding with a sale of the hospital and that the government will do everything within their power to facilitate that transition. That is the hope of my community, that is certainly my personal hope, and I certainly understand it to be the hope of everybody within this house as well.

Finally, in providing a couple of thoughts to the house this morning, can I thank the many, many local businesses, some of whom I have named in this house already, and the many people and local residents of the western suburbs who have come and collected pages of the petition to have signatures collected. It is an almighty effort in this house in today's day and age to collect 10,000 signatures; to be on the verge of being double that I think is one of the most significant petitions that we have had before this house, certainly within this term but more broadly probably across the last couple. Again, that speaks directly to the strength and the passion that the people of the western suburbs have for the Western Hospital. I am sure I will update the house as we continue to navigate this journey together in the hopes of ensuring the future of the Western Hospital at Henley Beach.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:09): I just want to again commend the report to the house and again thank the member for Colton for his contribution to this inquiry and his advocacy on behalf of his local community.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: REPORT INTO THE REFERRAL OF THE WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (CRYSTALLINE SILICA DUST) AMENDMENT BILL

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (11:11): I move:

That the first report of the committee for the Fifty-Fifth Parliament, entitled Report into the Referral of the Work Health and Safety (Crystalline Silica Dust) Amendment Bill, be noted.

On 15 June 2022, the Hon. Tammy Franks introduced a bill into the Legislative Council to amend the Work Health and Safety Act 2012. The bill would insert a new part 2A, section 34A and 34B into the act to define crystalline silica and subsequently ban all work exposing a person to crystalline silica dust.

On 1 December 2022 and pursuant to section 16 of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Legislative Council resolved to withdraw the amendment bill and refer it to our committee, the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, for inquiry and report, which led to a really interesting period of time for us as a committee over that next year as we heard from witnesses and looked into, of course, the long-lasting impacts of respirable crystalline silica dust.

The committee's inquiry into the crystalline silica dust amendment bill was referred in response to the rise in accelerated silicosis cases in Australia. I think it is really relevant to note here that in the 20 years since asbestos was, of course, banned in Australia, it was a really important time to look at and consider the long-term impacts of asbestos and what is unknown about silicosis with the increased number of silicosis cases in Australia in the last few years.

During the deliberations on the matter, the committee received 13 written submissions and heard from four witnesses. Witnesses who appeared before the committee included SafeWork SA, the Master Builders Association of South Australia, SA Unions, and Cosentino, a multinational manufacturer of engineered stone products to the Australian market.

Cosentino was a particularly interesting submission, I will say, because they are in many ways leaders in terms of changing the market with respect to the production of engineered stone benchtops, not just for importation here in Australia but overseas as well. They were actually in the process of producing a product with a much lower concentration of silica and were trying to, I guess, change the market share in terms of what is available and change the narrative in terms of what is an acceptable amount of silica in terms of the creation of an engineered stone benchtop. That was something that we really had to consider alongside all of the research that has been done and the work that was happening on a national scale at the same time.

These submissions were very comprehensive and detailed and provided a range of opinions and suggested recommendations in relation to the proposed amendment bill. I would like to thank all those who contributed to the inquiry through written submissions and by appearing before the committee. Throughout its inquiry, the committee examined the benefits, opportunities and challenges experienced by stakeholders relating to the bill's proposal to ban work exposing a person to crystalline silica dust. A common theme identified in both the submissions and oral evidence was concern at the bill's lack of exceptions to the proposed ban on all the work exposing a person to silica dust.

Of course, half the earth's crust is made up of silica and an unqualified or undefined ban could potentially have the consequence of halting work in the mining, quarrying, construction, roadwork, farming and manufacturing industries in Australia. There was a suggestion from one witness that an unqualified ban may accidentally ban South Australians from going outside in the sunlight. So it was very important for us to refine the scope and look at the potentially life-threatening impacts of silicosis and of exposure to respirable crystalline silica dust without stopping all mining in South Australia and other activities that may have some exposure to silica in the way that the original bill may have suggested.

The committee concluded that the primary purpose of the bill brought by the Hon. Ms Franks was to address those issues associated with respirable crystalline silica in the manufacturing, processing, manipulation and use of engineered stone in a construction and home renovation setting.

That is a really interesting one because, of course, we were not actually able to access engineered stone benchtops in South Australia until the early 2000s, I believe.

The function of an engineered stone benchtop is entirely aesthetic. There is no actual function to having such a product. It is an aesthetic thing that I am sure many people would have in their kitchens, having undertaken renovations or purchased new homes in the last 20-odd years. The impacts of that and the manufacturing of those benchtops over that period has seen such a huge increase in the number of silicosis cases in Australia since their introduction. As a result of that, Safe Work Australia found that engineered stone workers are dramatically over-represented amongst workers diagnosed with silicosis.

Further, whilst the content of submissions received did vary, the committee noted that every submission acknowledged that there were risks associated with exposure to respirable crystalline silica dust. The most pressing part for me as the Chair, and for other members of the committee hearing this evidence and doing our own research, is that so far there is no science that suggests that there is any safe level of exposure to crystalline silica dust. I think that is incredibly important, particularly when having conversations with manufacturers, as I suggested, who perhaps wanted to produce products with a lesser amount of silica in their product, that the research shows that there is still no confirmation that even a low level of inhalation or respiration of silica dust could be safe, particularly to a worker who is cutting that stone.

There was also wide support for a national approach to regulation and enforcement. The committee also relied on the decision regulation impact report provided by Safe Work Australia, called the 'Decision Regulation Impact Statement: Prohibition on the use of engineered stone'. That was published on 16 August. Throughout last year, we know that there were a number of national work, health and safety meetings of the ministers and we knew that there was likely going to be a national approach undertaken in response to that Decision Regulation Impact Statement.

I found it to be incredibly damning not only of the increase in cases in Australia but also the unsafe practices occurring with respect to that product. I found it really interesting when hearing from SafeWork South Australia that, when they went to undertake some investigation processes at the businesses in South Australia that were undertaking the production, the cutting or the installation of engineered stone, at one point there was not a single business that was compliant with the safety practices that were required to make sure that their workers were kept safe in the production or installation of that product—not a single business.

Of course, a lot of them were very amenable to increasing their safety practices, but I did find that incredibly interesting and incredibly concerning not knowing how long those businesses had been in operation without even knowing or being entirely aware, or perhaps some may have been negligent to the fact, that there is no safe level of exposure to such a dust.

The report made several recommendations and ultimately did determine that there is no scientific evidence to determine a safe threshold of crystalline silica in engineered stone and did advocate for a prohibition on all engineered stone products. The committee made one recommendation, and we put out our provisional report with that recommendation in the days leading up to a decision being made on a national basis. That recommendation was made for the consideration of the state government, supporting a continuing collaborative approach to the issue by working towards a national framework of legislation and accompanying regulations regarding the use of engineered stone.

In the days following our draft report there was a significant announcement: a national ban on engineered stone, one that I as the chair very much welcomed. Of course, there are provisions in place to allow those businesses the time to get rid of their products; there was a period of a year, I believe, given to those businesses. But I do think it was a really relevant and really important decision to be made on a national basis and one that really did need to be made on a national basis with respect to trade and construction here in Australia.

I would like to thank all of those who gave their time to assist the committee with the inquiry. We had members in the committee who all contributed in a really collaborative way from all sides of the parliament. The members of the committee at the time were the member for Colton, the member for King, the Hon. Reggie Martin, the Hon. Heidi Girolamo and of course the Hon. Tammy Franks,

who has been a strong advocate for work health and safety in her own right for many years. I do want to thank her for bringing this important issue before the parliament in the form of her proposed bill. I also think it is relevant to thank the committee's parliamentary staff, Mr Shane Hilton, Ms Jessica Watson and Ms Tonia Coulter for their assistance throughout the process.

On a personal note, I want to mention for the house just how important I think it was to be undertaking that work. For me it was a moment of real pride to see that we could actually be making some really important recommendations that will actually protect working people not just at the moment but for many years into the future.

Many of you would know and many of you would share a dear friend of the Labor Party who is still struggling with mesothelioma and contracted that as a result of undertaking home renovations, something that was not seen to be a leading cause of asbestos exposure in the past. He was successful in a case that went all the way to the High Court. I used to work with him, and we would refer to his case as a bit like *The Castle* at times. He took on a giant, took on James Hardie, and went to the High Court, and it was found that there was in fact a duty even to those home renovators who were renovating in that space.

After many years thinking that we had made such a huge decision on asbestos but not necessarily knowing the long-lasting impacts or just how far that would continue to impact regular people, not just people working with the product but people renovating their own homes, I think that said to us that the national ban here on engineered stone products and, of course, extreme preventative measures in terms of the inhalation of respirable crystalline silica dust were incredibly important and incredibly timely, and it was important that we did it before we were faced with an issue like with asbestos—before those long-lasting impacts became more and more prevalent.

I would like to also acknowledge all the individuals who are suffering with silicosis and particularly those who have been working in the engineered stone space for some years. I know that they will welcome the work that has been done on a national basis, and I am really proud that we have made proactive efforts, not just as a state Labor government here but as a federal Labor government and as a bunch of state Labor governments around the country as well, to protect working people, because that is, of course, at the core of what we do. Thank you, Mr Speaker. I am really proud to support this one.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: PORT ELLIOT GROWTH PROJECT

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:24): I move:

That the 68th report of the committee, entitled Port Elliot Growth Project, be noted.

The South Australian Water Corporation (SA Water) proposes to construct a new water main to support drinking water supply for growth and resilience in Port Elliot and neighbouring towns, including Middleton, Goolwa and Hindmarsh Island. Due to major developments in the area, SA Water's east south-coast water system has experienced strong growth in the number of new water connections over the last 20 years. The township of Port Elliot and its neighbouring towns are projected to continue growing over the next 30 years and, as such, SA Water has identified the need to augment the water supply to support this growth.

This project is a high priority for SA Water, to ensure the continued delivery of the regulated standards of water expected by customers. Currently, the system relies on a single water main and, due to its design capacity, there are limitations on the water supply to the townships in the Port Elliot area. Additionally, the system experiences further demand during the summer months due to an increased seasonal population and visitors, as well as the higher temperatures experienced. Future constraints on the system are expected, based on the projected population growth throughout the area.

The reliance of the system upon a single transfer main means that, in the event of service disruptions, there is likely to be a severe impact upon customers. Aiming to deliver key SA Water outcomes, the project will provide a safe and reliable water supply, while addressing current supply capacity constraints. This will allow for growth in Port Elliot and its surrounding areas, and improve

customer service levels by increasing the overall water pressure and reliability of service. The project proposes to construct 1.5 kilometres of an iron, concrete-lined water main pipe that will run along Waterport Road at Port Elliot between Victor Harbor Road and Port Elliot Road. This will be a duplication of the existing water main pipe and will run parallel along the northern carriageway of Waterport Road.

There will also be an additional 200 metres of water main constructed on Waterport Road to relocate the creek crossing to an accessible depth along the road carriageway, to improve accessibility for maintenance and to address health and safety concerns. This option was determined to be the most cost-effective and productive solution to address the project objectives. It will improve resilience in the system, as a duplicate water main allows redundancy in the event of failure and will provide delivery, operational and maintenance benefits. Construction has commenced, with final completion expected in the fourth quarter of 2025.

The delivery of this project is part of SA Water's Water North Framework program. The procurement process for establishing this framework has been conducted in accordance with SA Water's policies and procedures, conforming to all applicable Treasury and government policies. The project will be managed in accordance with SA Water's Corporate Project Management Methodology by a project manager from SA Water's capital planning and delivery group. The project manager will be responsible for the development and delivery of the overall project, the necessary approvals and management of contractors.

A business risk management policy and framework will apply over the course of the project. This will be undertaken on an ongoing basis to identify and assess risks, ensuring that management or mitigation measures are applied with mitigation strategies put in place for risks already identified. Firstly, environmental risks from construction or operational activities will be mitigated by the pipeline alignment, designed to avoid adverse impacts on native vegetation, native fauna and their habitat.

Secondly, there is a risk that pH residual in the concrete pipe could result in water quality issues, which will be mitigated by appropriate pipe handling procedures being implemented. Lastly, there is a risk of network isolation failures and loss of supply to customers during link-in activities. Detailed shutdown planning, coordination and impact assessments have been designed to minimise the likelihood of interruptions.

SA Water is committed to ensuring that impacts to the environment or heritage items associated with the proposed project are minimised. An environment and heritage expertise team has been involved in the project planning and development phases to provide advice for the alignment and construction methodologies, seeking to reduce adverse environmental impacts. Desktop and fieldwork studies have been undertaken to create an environmental impact assessment on flora and fauna, air and water quality, water and resource use, site contamination; and the social environment, such as access, noise and vibration.

A preliminary environmental management plan has been prepared to ensure that the project complies with the relevant legislation. An environment and heritage expertise team has reviewed the proposed project site and has advised that the project has no European heritage status and does not impact on any heritage items.

This project has been assessed by an Aboriginal heritage adviser, who determined that there is a medium risk of impacting or encountering heritage, as SA Water recognises that any ground-disturbing activity presents a risk of encountering Aboriginal objects or remains. The design and construct contractor will be required to comply with SA Water's standard operating procedure for the discovery of Aboriginal heritage during construction work, in the unlikely event that heritage is uncovered.

If any Aboriginal sites, objects or remains are found, work will cease immediately and an Aboriginal heritage and engagement adviser will be contacted. Native title obligations arising from this project have been reviewed and have been determined to be extinguished, provided that the pipeline alignment remains in the gazetted road reserve. If project works were to impact any land that may be subject to native title, SA Water states that native title holders and registered claimants will be notified.

SA Water affirms that ongoing engagement and consultation will occur throughout the project, with internal stakeholders and partner organisations to be kept informed throughout the project works via progress meetings. A detour is necessary, and communication with the local councils impacted by the works and traffic detours will occur over the course of the project. This will include the discussion and agreement of traffic management with the affected local councils of Alexandrina and the City of Victor Harbor. Consultation will also be ongoing with adjacent landowners to minimise the impact of construction works.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Port Elliot growth project. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Peter Seltsikas, Senior Manager Capital Delivery, SA Water, and Jasmine Rahmanzadeh Kabir, the Project Manager for SA Water. I thank witnesses for their time. Based upon the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public work.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:31): I rise to very much support this project. It is a very important project in my electorate. It is actually very close to my family in its location. The Basham family have been long-time residents of the Port Elliot area, in particular Waterport Road where this work is going on, so much so that my parents built a house about 20 years ago on the site of an old quarry on the property down there which was used to build Waterport Road. So the soil that is being dug up at this point in time was actually from under where my parents' house is now.

I have a strong connection to this area. We have seen significant change in water management over this area. I think back in the 1980s the water supply actually used to flow in the other direction. Currently, it comes from Myponga Reservoir through to Victor Harbor and flows down Waterport Road to Goolwa. Historically, it used to come out of Goolwa, out of the river, and flow the other way, and so we have seen a change in the way that water flows have gone.

As mentioned in the report, the growth in the area is significant and we are seeing a need for a significant upgrade to occur in this region to meet the needs of that growth. This is a very sensible solution, effectively duplicating the line between the header tanks that exist just off Waterport Road through to Port Elliot, to make sure that there is actually enough flow into the township of Port Elliot, allowing the other pipeline to continue to supply across to Middleton and Goolwa. It is giving a significant amount of extra capacity across that whole area by duplicating this section and removing Port Elliot and giving it its own dedicated pipeline into the township of Port Elliot.

It is a really important piece of infrastructure and I am really pleased that it is going ahead. As was mentioned in the report, that work has commenced. There have been some disruptions that have been quite significant to the community and which led to me engaging directly with the previous minister, the Deputy Premier's office, and now to a new minister responsible, to work through those issues. It was very much about the logistics of road closures and the management of work times to alleviate the pressure on the community.

Effectively, there are about five and a half thousand car movements a day down Waterport Road. They were cut off only during the day while the work was occurring. The initial work program was between 7am and 5pm, which caused enormous congestion in the township of Port Elliot, particularly around school pick-up time at 3.30 in the afternoon. That was a particular problem, but through working with the two ministers' offices over this time, we have seen a great outcome. They have readjusted the work times so they are now knocking off at 2.30 in the afternoon, an hour before school pick-up, which lets that happen uninterrupted, giving a significant improvement to the community down there and stopping the congestion that was occurring.

It was taking over half an hour to get from Port Elliot to Victor Harbor; you can walk faster than that. That is how bad the traffic congestion was getting. So it is pleasing that we have been able to work with SA Water and the government to achieve a much better outcome around the management of traffic. I very much thank the two ministers for the support from their offices and, pleasingly, for engaging now on a fortnightly basis directly with SA Water to make sure we keep things working smoothly.

I am really pleased to have such good working relationships on this project to make sure the community is not overly disadvantaged by those road closures. They have also put on extra crews so that the time line will not be stretched out. Effectively, by digging up in two locations at once, they can speed up the works, which will enable the road closure works to be finished by September as initially forecast. That is also very pleasing that they have been able to find that solution.

As I said, it is a very important piece of infrastructure for the community. Water is such an essential part of the fabric of townships being able to function. It is, as mentioned also in the report, one of those peculiarities of the population growth that occurs during the summer period. It is significant extra demand, and the high water use months are in summer, so it is a huge extra demand from the normal demand at this time of year. It is a challenge for infrastructure to be built to cope with that demand. To me, this is a really sensible solution to achieve a good outcome for those communities. With that, I commend the project.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:37): I want to take the opportunity to thank the member for Finniss for his contribution. As I have said before in this place, it is always good to hear from local members on their views about particular projects. I know the member for Finniss has certainly let us know what he thinks about things happening in his patch from time to time. I thank him for his contribution and I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW GOLDEN GROVE AMBULANCE STATION

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:38): I move:

That the 69th report of the committee, entitled New Golden Grove Ambulance Station, be noted.

The Department for Health and Wellbeing (SA Health) proposes to construct a new ambulance station at Golden Grove. This will provide modern, fit-for-purpose facilities to meet the South Australian Ambulance Service's operational needs and enable appropriate emergency provisions to Adelaide's northern suburbs and surrounding areas.

At the 2022 state election, the government pledged to improve the infrastructure of the South Australian Ambulance Service (SAAS) with a $70 million commitment to build four new ambulance stations, alongside the rebuilding of four existing stations in high-priority areas. This will provide a significant expansion of service delivery capabilities and capacity for SAAS to manage emergency responses across the Adelaide metropolitan area and surrounding regions. In addition to the new and rebuilt stations, the commitment includes the purchase of 36 new vehicles and recruitment of 350 additional staff.

The northern suburbs are the fastest growing region in metropolitan Adelaide by population, and forecasting shows that this trend is likely to continue for the foreseeable future. This new ambulance station will help address the emergency service provision for this growing population. Located on the intersection of The Grove Way and The Golden Way, the station will complement existing stations in Redwood Park and Parafield, as previous reviews of SAAS service delivery highlighted challenges in the response approach in and around the Golden Grove area. It will alleviate the demand on and support these existing stations, which will have a flow-on effect to servicing the surrounding areas.

Unlike some SAAS catchments, where hospitals are relatively central and can provide a secondary response location for ambulance crews, in the north-eastern suburbs, particularly Golden Grove, the hospitals are either south, with Modbury Hospital, or north, with the Lyell McEwin Hospital, with Golden Grove and neighbouring Greenwith in the middle. The planned ambulance station in Golden Grove will address this issue and be valuable for response patterns in this area.

The new ambulance station will include: a main garage for six ambulances, with supporting amenities; two undercover external car parks for light fleet vehicles; offices with workstations; a training room; a study room with workstations and supporting equipment; crew rest room, including kitchen and dining room, and four personal break rooms; ancillary supporting accommodation, including an ICT room, amenities and circulation spaces; and 16 staff and visitor car parking spaces.

Emergency vehicles will be able to exit the site and head both north and south on The Grove Way, with a second access point to the north allowing ambulance and light fleet vehicle entry and exit movements. The main garage will use a herringbone layout to maximise space, while also allowing for the required drive-through function for ambulances to enter and exit without restriction. A purpose-designed curved driveway from the garage allows for safe and quick traversing to exit the site for operations.

The capital cost of the project is $11.2 million, comprising $7 million for construction and $4.2 million for land acquisition. Construction has commenced, with expected completion by February 2025. The expected outcomes of the project are:

- improved ambulance response coverage for consumers in the outer northern and north-eastern suburbs;
- increased capacity for additional crews and vehicles in order to meet increasing demand;
- improved dispatch and turnaround times after an incident;
- enhanced consumer care to the community;
- additional and expanded SAAS crew training facilities; and
- opportunities for future expansion to meet growth if required.

One of the primary objectives of the SA Health Strategic Plan is for South Australians to experience the best health care in Australia, with this project achieving this objective by strengthening primary health care. It also enhances hospital care by providing services close to where people live. Furthermore, it aligns with the SAAS Strategic Plan and the state government's election commitment to improve infrastructure, increase staffing and provide additional resources for the South Australian Ambulance Service.

SA Health has incorporated sustainable development principles into the scope of the project. To help achieve these sustainable aspirations, several measures have been integrated into the design of the new station. These include the use of energy efficient heating, cooling and lighting that is fully electrified, a design that allows for high levels of daylight whilst mitigating solar glare, the use of water efficient sanitary and tapware fixtures, and the collection of rainwater for flushing and landscape irrigation. Additionally, incorporated design measures will increase adaptability and allow changes of use with minimal impact to ensure the building is futureproofed.

The project will follow best practice principles for project procurement and management, as advocated by the state government and construction industry authorities. Risk management will form an integral part of this process, identifying and assessing risk and ensuring appropriate management or mitigation measures are incorporated into the project delivery.

A key risk is ongoing capital pressures and supply chain delays, alongside the continued inflation of prices. Another risk is that the site is newly procured and there is limited knowledge and information available about the possibility of hazardous materials. Project teams have reviewed the site, as well as geotechnical data, and will conduct destructive tests and ground boreholes to identify any potential risks.

Engagement and consultation will be a key theme throughout the project. Consultation has occurred with various subject matter experts within SA Health and SAAS, including work health and safety, infection control and hygiene advisers, as well as industrial bodies. The local community has been consulted as part of an ongoing two-way process of engagement, which has included targeted letter drops to neighbours of the site and an evening information session held in September last year. The Central Archive in the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation has no record of Aboriginal sites within the project area. The site has no registered or identified non-Aboriginal heritage value.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the construction of the new Golden Grove ambulance station. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Tim Packer, Executive Director, Infrastructure, Department for Health and Wellbeing; John Harrison, Director, Building Projects, Department for Infrastructure and Transport; Rob Elliott, Chief Executive Officer,

South Australian Ambulance Service; and Paul Lemmer, Executive Director, South Australian Ambulance Service. I thank the witnesses for their time.

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

Mrs PEARCE (King) (11:45): I, too, rise to provide my support on this matter. Having an ambulance station in Golden Grove has been something my community has been longing for, for quite some time. SAAS has already announced this location and shared with us that we have seen prolonged response times in that community, and there was a real desire to do something about that.

When this location was chosen to build the station, it was certainly welcome news for the area. Once they heard this news, Cynthia and William from Golden Grove said to me that they had been waiting for quite some time. They want to know that an ambulance will come when they really need it, and we have taken that into serious consideration to make sure the location that this station will be situated at will have the optimum results and impact in my local community.

It is a good location to build, if I do say so myself. It is one that has direct access to major arterial roads in my local community, and it certainly is in a location that will help support other local stations that have been doing a lot of the heavy lifting, like Ridgehaven and Parafield Gardens. On that note, I would very much like to thank the amazing team at Parafield Gardens for currently hosting the 32 paramedics that we have also employed who will be based and situated at Golden Grove once the build is complete. We certainly appreciate you being so accommodating because having those paramedics already on the roads means we are already seeing benefits to my local community in terms of response times and receiving adequate health care in the area as well.

As I have said, we have certainly moved quickly on our pledge to be able to hire more ambulance officers and paramedics to be able to improve response times in our community, and we are moving incredibly fast to ensure that we are building the critical infrastructure that is needed for these crews to be able to deliver the high-quality care that is needed.

It is also great to see that some of the officers and paramedics who will be based at this station are locally grown. One of my favourite stories, which I like to share with the community, is the impact that it had on Sam, who was born, raised, grew up and is continuing to live in the north-east. He was actually a painter by trade, but when he heard the need was increasing in this space, it was something that he wanted to do, but it was that final push to go, 'I'm making the leap. I'm jumping into the space.' Now that he is fully qualified, he will be one of the very first paramedics who will be stationed at the Golden Grove station, servicing the community that has supported him as he has grown up, and one that he is still proud to be living in as well.

It was great to see how keen the community was, and the feedback provided, during the engagement sessions that were hosted last September. A lot of people were eager to hear more about what is happening and how that will support them. For those who have not been up to Golden Grove, and Greenwith in particular, we have a very interesting design where not everything is square in terms of the blocks, so it can get convoluted.

We are doing everything we can to ensure that there is direct access as much as possible to really service the area but also takes into consideration the growth that we are expecting in the area as well. Something that was reiterated by SAAS was that that was taken into consideration to ensure that this station will be able to continue to meet the needs of the community as it continues to grow in the years ahead.

I would also like to share a bit about the feedback I have had from others in the community about what this build means for them. Frank, a local resident who lives in Greenwith, is actually working for the company that will be helping to build the station. His company is responsible for building and putting up the walls at the centre, and he shared with me recently at a Little Athletics event that he is really proud that he gets to drive past this site every day on the way to school drop-off and share with his kids a bit about what he does for a living, but now he is able to share on top of that that he is doing something that will benefit the community that services them as well. With those few words, I would like to provide my support.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:49): I take this opportunity to thank the member for King for her contribution and for her sterling work as a member of the Public Works Committee. I also take this opportunity to express my support for this project and to thank the member for King for her praise for the hardworking staff at the Parafield Ambulance Station, which is in my electorate. With that, I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: INTERMEDIATE REMEDIATION OF THE LOWER MURRAY RECLAIMED IRRIGATION AREA LEVEES

Mr BROWN (Florey) (11:50): I move:

That the 70th report of the committee, entitled Intermediate Remediation of the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area Levees, be noted.

The Department for Environment and Water (DEW) proposed to deliver intermediate, non-engineered remediation works to damaged sections of government and privately owned levees in the Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation area. This is the second of four stages of the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area Levee Remediation and Resilience Program, which is part of the South Australian government's recovery response to the 2022-23 River Murray floods.

The Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation area is located between Mannum and Wellington and consists of 27 unique areas, protected by approximately 107 kilometres of agricultural levees. These serve as flood mitigation for essential infrastructure assets and play an important role in providing water security and environmental protection.

DEW maintains 10 of the 27 levees, which account for approximately 67 kilometres of the levee infrastructure. These levees are maintained to withstand water levels at least equivalent to those observed during the flood event of 1974. In addition to the government-owned levees, the remaining 17 levees account for a further 40 kilometres, which are privately owned. These are the responsibility of landowners and irrigation trusts.

Between November 2022 and February 2023, the River Murray experienced a flood event due to heavy rain and flooding interstate. The third highest flood ever recorded in South Australia, this flood event had a significant impact, with an unprecedented number of homes, shacks, businesses and infrastructure affected. As a result, 20 of the 27 levees were overtopped or breached, causing damage to the levees and inundating large areas of agricultural land. Of the 20 damaged levees, eight were owned by the government and 12 were in private hands.

In response, the South Australian government undertook short-term flood relief and recovery efforts, which included immediate stabilisation works and dewatering across the levee network. This was to enable landholders to access their land and recommence agricultural production and was stage 1 of the Lower Murray Reclaimed Irrigation Area Levee Remediation and Resilience Program.

This project represents stage 2 of this program. Its key aim is to mitigate flooding to the Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation area's agricultural lands and its essential infrastructure assets that are protected by the levees. These assets include water and power supply, wastewater and transport routes. The project is an interim measure against future high-flow events until longer term engineered approaches can be fully considered and realised.

Additionally, the mitigation of flooding of the area's agricultural lands will provide primary producers with the confidence to fully return to agricultural production. The project's intermediate remediation strategy will undertake an earthworks regime to temporarily repair damaged levee banks to remediate crest levels to their pre-flood level. These works will utilise or build upon existing levees where possible and will often require keying in the newly constructed levee into an existing one.

All works will be performed under supervision of a suitably qualified geotechnical engineer. These works are a measure against future floods or high-flow events in the short to medium term, where there is the potential for future damage to the levees and possible inundation. Therefore, these flood mitigation measures will avoid costs to government, businesses and communities that could be impacted by flooding and inundation of agricultural land. In doing this, the project also contributes to the building of a more resilient region.

The total estimated cost of the intermediate remediation works is $27.7 million. This builds on the set $3.7 million expenditure for the immediate stabilisation works carried out 2023. The department notes that work cannot be performed during the winter months because of the effects the wet weather has on clay soil, therefore construction is expected to take place over a 24-month time frame. Preparation works have commenced, including the testing of materials from quarry pits to determine suitability, with practical completion expected in June 2026.

Alongside the intermediate repair of the damaged levees, the project will also provide social, economic and environmental benefits. It will contribute to the protection of South Australia's drinking water through safeguarding SA Water infrastructure, including the Murray Bridge-Onkaparinga pipeline that supports the provision of drinking water for metropolitan Adelaide. It will contribute to ensuring the health of downstream aquatic environments, including assisting in the management of environmental water.

This project will minimise impacts to the Coorong and Lakes Alexandrina and Albert Ramsar site, through containing the River Murray within its main channel, preventing up to 70 gigalitres of additional evaporative losses each year, especially in a drying climate. It will provide public access to government-owned levees for recreational activities and opportunities for regional employment. Lastly, it will strengthen relationships between DEW and various stakeholders, including landholders, irrigation trusts, the Ngarrindjeri Aboriginal Corporation, and First Peoples of the River Murray and Mallee Region.

The works will be managed in accordance with the department's project management framework. The Department for Infrastructure and Transport will manage and implement the construction components, while DEW will have overarching coordination and management responsibility, including governance, communications, stakeholder engagement and management of the necessary approvals.

A coordinated systematic approach to identifying risks in accordance with the department's risk management policy and procedure will be implemented. Geotechnical investigations will be conducted and the best available technology will be used to ensure that the levee banks are adequately stabilised. To mitigate against weather-related delays, contingency plans will be developed, as well as the close monitoring of weather patterns, the establishment of buffer times in the program time line and work being conducted on several levees concurrently.

Safety risks for workers will be minimised by the creation of a comprehensive safety management plan and regular safety checks. To lessen environmental impacts, environmental management plans will be developed, encompassing erosion control measures, conditions for water-affecting activities, and the monitoring and management of construction site run-off. The budget and time line will be regularly monitored to minimise cost overruns.

An ecologically sustainable development report has been prepared by the department, outlining the sustainable objectives, principles and actions for the project. These include: work conducted within the footprint of the levees to minimise vegetation impact; work undertaken during business hours to limit noise impact on fauna; locally sourced and recycled materials used where possible; the development of a soil erosion and drainage management plan; and the use of non-potable and transported water, where possible, to avoid use of the River Murray water supply.

The levees are within the Ngarrindjeri and Others Native Title Determination (Part A) area and are subject to the Ngarrindjeri and Others Native Title Settlement (Part A) Indigenous Land Use Agreement, and the First Peoples of the River Murray and Mallee Region native title claim area. The department has initiated engagement with the traditional owners to ensure their views and priorities are included in the works going forward. Cultural heritage surveys will be completed to ensure compliance under the Aboriginal Heritage Act and a cultural heritage management plan will be developed, informed by the Aboriginal heritage database and cultural heritage surveys undertaken by traditional owners. To manage cultural heritage impacts, cultural heritage monitors will be on site for the duration of any ground disturbance works.

The project is not likely to impact any commonwealth or state non-Aboriginal heritage places. However, if heritage places are identified, works will not commence until heritage management plans are developed. As the Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation area community has been significantly

affected by the 2022-23 floods, early and effective ongoing community engagement is necessary, particularly in managing community expectations surrounding the intermediate remediation works and how these will differ from the proposed longer term engineered repairs.

Key stakeholders, such as individual landholders, irrigation trusts, local councils and industry groups, will be consulted. Tailored communication and engagement plans will be developed in consultation with Ngarrindjeri and the First Peoples of the River Murray and Mallee Region to meet their needs.

The committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the intermediate remediation of the Lower Murray reclaimed irrigation area levees. Witnesses who appeared before the committee were: Sue Hutchings, Acting Executive Director, Water and River Murray Division, Department for Environment and Water, and Brendan Cowie, Acting Manager, Levee Recovery, Department for Environment and Water. I thank the witnesses for their time. I would also like to thank the member for Hammond for his statement to the committee regarding the project in his electorate.

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

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:59): In the milliseconds I have left, I certainly support this work. I am disappointed that it has taken 18 months and we are only up to the second stage of the remediation works of the River Murray levees. However, it is welcomed by the community, and I hope that there is appropriate consultation with the community so that locally sourced items are used, including clay. That is a much needed measure to make sure that we do this in a cost-appropriate manner to get the best results for both stakeholders in the region and farmers. They have been frustrated by the time it has taken to get to this stage, but they do welcome this funding. I wish this project all speed.

Motion carried.

Bills

SUPREME COURT (DISTRIBUTION OF BUSINESS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 May 2024.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:00): I rise to continue my remarks, as it were, at the adjournment last evening. I propose to conclude my contribution to the second reading debate in terms of addressing the context in which the bill was introduced to the parliament and has reached the point of being considered in the second reading debate in this place, more or less exactly a year after it was introduced in another place.

I had reached the point yesterday of having highlighted what might serve most succinctly to illustrate concerns expressed in parallel, and in terms, in a way coinciding, from the point of view of time, expressed by the Law Society and by the Bar Association respectively. Those concerns, as far as I have zeroed in on them, are going, in their own words, firstly, in terms of the expression of the President of the Law Society, to what he describes as 'little information about any inefficiencies in case flow management that the amendment is intended to address'. That was on 25 August 2023. Also, about a week before that, by the President of the Bar Association, by a letter dated 17 August, which concludes in those rather more emphatic terms, but first highlighting, and I quote:

> No data, episode or example has been brought to our attention where the current arrangements in the act have led to inefficiencies or affected case flow management.

I was at pains, concluding at the point that we did yesterday, to note that the Chief Justice had been moved to write to the Attorney in the days following those two letters. While I didn't go so far as to characterise the Chief Justice's letter in terms of being a response to those letters, I think it is fair to describe the letter as responsive to the debate more broadly, because at least nothing much turns on that. The Chief Justice certainly refers to the 17 August letter of the President of the Bar

Association, reflecting in turn on a previous letter that had been sent the previous month to the Hon. Connie Bonaros and the Hon. Frank Pangallo, members of another place. The Chief Justice then goes on to address those matters that are raised in the letter.

For those who are following along, again I draw attention to the two pieces of work that the bill is addressing itself to. Let us be clear: on the one hand the introduction—and this is by reference to the government's explanation of clauses, which is about the clearest indication of what the government sees as being achieved by the bill. On the one hand we have the greater flexibility piece, as I am calling it—that is the first part, the greater flexibility piece—and on the other hand we have what is described in the explanation of clauses as the additional new power. So there is greater flexibility and new power.

Greater flexibility, let us bear in mind, is all about the addition of the capacity, in circumstances of agreement between the Chief Justice and the President, to take the appointment of a relevant judge into a new frame. At the moment, 47(1) provides for that appointment to be made for a specified period of time. What the greater flexibility piece does is to state 'or for a specified proceeding'. Bear that in mind as I get to the Chief Justice's observations about the experience that has been encountered. That's the greater flexibility piece: all in terms of consensus.

If the Chief Justice and the President agree that a judge or an acting judge in the general division act as a judge in the Court of Appeal, or vice versa—that is, a judge or acting judge in the Court of Appeal act as a judge in the general division—and the particular judge or acting judge agrees to undertake those acting duties, then the Chief Justice by instrument in writing authorises the judge to undertake such acting duties, under this amendment, for a specified proceeding or for a period specified in the instrument of appointment. I am not raising any particular difficulty with that. Mutuality leads, on the face of that amendment, to the capacity for either a specified proceeding or a specified period of time. Bear that in mind by reference to the explanation of clauses. That is the whole greater flexibility piece.

Separately, the addition of the new power, which is really very much the focus of the contributions from those learned stakeholders the Bar Association and the Law Society, gives the Chief Justice that unilateral capacity—certainly after consultation, certainly in the context of a protocol, but nonetheless the addition of a freshly articulated unilateral power—which is the source of the concern.

Let's bear in mind, by contrast to the 47(1) power as it stands at the moment, and by contrast to the (1b) power as it would be, this is a one-way process. It is a one-way process that provides for the unilateral power for the Chief Justice to direct traffic from the Court of Appeal back to the general division, and the criteria are different.

That is, in terms of (1b), we have mutuality as the key for an appointment-based descriptor and we have introduced flexibility about the scope of that appointment, the purpose, whereas the standalone power is of a different nature altogether, and apart from what I have described as the one-way aspect of it, it is premised also on notions of there being a requisite satisfaction on the Chief Justice's part in relation to the complexity of a specified proceeding—so we have sort of got an element of specified proceeding introduced there—and, secondly, the limited availability of judges in the general division. Alright, that might be said to more or less speak for itself.

So you have a nod to availability but you have then got this sort of question of complexity coming along as well. It is that which is the whole descriptor of that part, so it can be looked at in those two quite discrete ways. You can introduce greater flexibility on the one hand, as the explanation of clauses claims, and you can do that while retaining mutuality as the bill proves, and as the explanation of clauses sells—great. What you are left with is this sort of gaping chasm on the other hand about the addition of the new power.

I was at pains yesterday, as I was at pains a month ago, to talk about the reason why we are here talking about this in the parliament in terms of legislation, and the reason why we are not simply talking about some sort of oversight of something that might otherwise be wholly and solely the subject of a protocol that is dealt with among the judges of the court, because this is about the legislative structure of the two divisions of the court. As the Chief Justice rightly says—of course, he rightly says—there is one jurisdiction over which the Chief Justice presides.

I turn then, importantly because it is instructive and, at the moment, it is the only case that has been made for the whole bill, so I am really highlighting—and keep in mind folks, that clear distinction between those two elements of it: greater flexibility on the one hand; additional power on the other. What does the Chief Justice say to the Attorney? The Chief Justice is clearly alive to the debate and refers to the previous correspondence.

I am going to do my best to highlight it. The whole letter is in the public domain; it has been laid on the table in the other place. To the extent that I am editorialising it, that can be the subject of criticism. I am not doing so to slice and dice the Chief Justice's observations but simply to make some observations that arise from them. The Chief Justice addresses himself first to:

> …the SA Bar's contention that there is no interstate statutory provision or convention to the effect that the President of the Court of Appeal 'is removed' from decisions on the assignment of Appeal Judges to the General Division.

The Chief Justice goes on to say:

> The submission, so put, is calculated to avoid acknowledging that there is no statutory provision anywhere in Australia which requires the Chief Justice to obtain the consent of the President of the Court of Appeal to the assignment of an Appeal Judge to hear a trial in the General Division.

I will pause there. That may be so. We are of course dealing in circumstances where section 47(1) is a modern phenomenon in terms of a Court of Appeal having been established in recent times in this jurisdiction. The counter proposition might be put: if it is not so articulated anywhere else, then why is not the better proposition to simply delete 47(1) altogether and let the court do what the court would otherwise do, which, as many observers have said by reference to convention, is to not remove the president from the decision?

As I say, to my observation, the Chief Justice's submission there rises no higher than to say that this point is not articulated in the statute anywhere else. If that is a problem, then why isn't there some proposition to delete 47(1) altogether? Alright, we can navigate that. He goes on to say:

> The current provisions in the Supreme Court Act 1935 (SA) (the Act), requiring the consent of the President, which were introduced by the previous government with the support of the SA Bar, are unique in that respect.

Okay, so far, so good:

> No sound reason for the adoption of those peculiar provisions has ever been provided.

Okay, point taken:

> Indeed, when I have discussed the provision with Chief Justices and Justices of Appeal around Australia, they have expressed surprise at the inclusion of that provision.

Focus on the statutory aspect of that. It is articulated in the statute, okay. If that is a unique articulation of a principle, okay. I draw an analogy to the electorate fairness clause that we had in this state for the better part of the last 30-odd years. It was there as an articulation of a principle that we all hold to be true; that is, more or less, statewide fairness in terms of an electoral outcome.

If you have a majority of the electors in the state voting for a particular party, that ought to translate in that group having a majority on the floor of the parliament. That is a statement of principle which, uniquely in South Australia, because of the frustration of decades—both sides of parliament well and truly aware of it—led to such a response that you introduce some attempt to articulate that principle in statute. That was a unique attempt to articulate the principle.

For reasons to be debated at another time, there were some in the parliament who saw fit to remove those particular words from the statute. But the commission and those who have been moved to interpret the situation abiding since have not just said, 'Oh, well, that principle goes up in smoke.' On the contrary, they have said, 'Of course the principle abides, just not that attempt to articulate it in quite so slavish terms.' The same thing might be said about 47(1) as it is at the moment. It is an answer to the Chief Justice's observations.

If it is so unique that it is spelled out in 47(1) in those terms and if that is a cause of surprise by heads of jurisdiction around the place, alright, just have the argument in terms of whether 47(1) is there or not. The underlying point about the removal of the President from decisions about the

allocation of tasks from one division to the other is abiding. Nothing turns on that; it goes to what sits below it as a matter of practice. So far, so good. He goes on:

> In any event, contrary to the assertion, and as you know—

this is a letter addressed to the Attorney—

> the proposed amendment does not 'remove' the President from the process of making an assignment. In fact, the President's involvement will be legislatively protected. The proposed s 47(1) of the Act provides that the Chief Justice may only assign a judge of the Court of Appeal to hear a matter in the General Division 'after consultation with the President of the Court of Appeal'. Moreover, s 47(1a) of the Act provides that the consultation must take place in accordance with a protocol approved by the Judges at a Council of Judges held pursuant to s 16 of the Act.

These are all parts that we have traversed in the course of the debate. Of course, that is true as well. He continues:

> The SA Bar's letter ignores those provisions.

I will leave aside differences of view or observations about what is ignored, what is deliberate, what is intended and all the rest of it and just go to the facts in terms of the statute, because that is our job here in the parliament: to look at what is actually legislated. The Chief Justice goes on to say:

> It is incorrect to suggest that the proposed amendment 'has potential to undermine the operation and integrity of the Court of Appeal' when the protocol to which the Chief Justice must adhere is one under the control of all of the Judges of the Supreme Court.

That is the Chief Justice's view of the matter. He is entitled to his opinion. It goes on:

> The unspoken premise of SA Bar's letter is that the Court of Appeal and the Supreme Court are two distinct courts.

Here I disagree. I do not observe that to be the underlying premise of the letter, but nothing particularly turns on it. The Chief Justice takes the opportunity to make the point that there is only one Supreme Court that is recognised by the constitution; that is true. He continues:

> It is the Supreme Court which has a General Division and an Appeal Division, the principal judicial officer of which is the Chief Justice.

The Chief Justice then makes this observation. The Chief Justice says:

> It is not workable to allow the head of a division of any court to veto the rostering decisions of its principal judicial officer.

I have talked about the absence of empirical evidence, of data that would underpin or justify what is going on here. In the context of that observation, I just highlight that nobody, including the Chief Justice by this letter, has made any suggestion that any such thing has occurred. There is no suggestion that any such thing has occurred.

It is passing curious to say that it is not workable to allow the head of a division of any court to veto the rostering decisions of a principal judicial officer. It might beg the question, but there is certainly no suggestion that that has occurred, let alone any indication that the absence of the additional power is somehow causing some degree of difficulty. I am going to get to the flexibility point that is then addressed in the balance of the letter. The Chief Justice goes on to say:

> The President's letter claims that the SA Bar is not aware of difficulties faced by the Court in allocating a judge to hear a trial in the trial division. Pointing to examples when Appeal Judges have sat in the General Division when it has been convenient for them to do so does not prove that there have been no such difficulties.

Here is where there is an indication of events; it is about as much as what we have heard:

> Experience has demonstrated that the division of the Supreme Court has reduced flexibility in the assignment of judges and accordingly reduced the capacity of the Court to hear matters expeditiously.

That might be said to be harking back to something resembling the existential argument. As I have said, the Chief Justice has been clear about his opposition to the establishment of the division in the first place, but that is not what we are here debating. So what are we going to do about flexibility? What we are going to do about flexibility is provide for the terms upon which there may be movement from one division to another both ways following mutual agreement. It goes on:

> My request for this amendment [has been] made after experiencing substantial difficulty in 2022 in assigning a permanent judge of this Court to hear a long and complex matter in this Court. The statutory provisions were a substantial impediment in assigning a judge of this Court to hear the matter.

This goes to the flexibility point. If the substantial difficulty that was faced was about having to zero in on a period of time, then, great, let's add a provision that says once you have your mutuality—and vice versa, division to division—then, for the very circumstance that the Chief Justice talks about where you have a long and complex matter that might imply that the period of time involved in it cannot be described with certainty, it might be an improvement to talk about a specified proceeding. But, again, there is nothing raised about some need to overcome a lack of mutuality, far from the exercise of some veto that is even raised, yet there is this now superimposition of the standalone unilateral right one way for there to be this move.

So, as I have said a variety of times, the government is at pains to say this is not about some existential debate about the Court of Appeal. I do not read the Chief Justice to be rising any higher in his remarks than what he has actually set out on the page. What the Chief Justice has talked about is having a lack of flexibility. He has referred to the undesirability of being subject to some sort of hypothetical veto, but there has been no instance of it that has been adverted, there has been no indication in terms of the circumstances of the court in which there has been some sort of deadlock or difficulty, even anything at all that has been raised.

Insofar as there is this long and complex matter that has been referred to, that is readily answered, it would seem, by the specific addition of the capacity to identify such a proceeding. But we see the reference to complexity—as well as length—that finds voice only in the additional unilateral power criteria. You have to establish complexity to exercise the unilateral right. There is no such articulation in the mutuality provision, and so it should be, in my view, precisely for the reason that you do not want to limit the Chief Justice's capacity, together with the other judges, to make the calls that might be necessary in terms of the division of work within the court.

So we have this sort of intermingling of language in these passages of the letter in circumstances where it is important to be clear about what the bill is doing vis-a-vis greater flexibility on the one hand and the addition of a new power on the other. The Chief Justice then goes on. He describes the circumstances in which he had no choice in this particularly long and complex matter first to appoint auxiliary judges, and then there were problems with that—I am paraphrasing—and in the end the Chief Justice had to step in and it was less than ideal.

None of that turns on the addition of the unilateral power—none of it. At the very most, one might say the addition of subsection (1b) could have covered it all in a heartbeat, and otherwise the circumstances the Chief Justice there describes about this long and complex matter are very much the sorts of things that are a combination of learning from experience and, to the extent that human frailty is involved—if it was, in terms of the availability of individuals—then dealing with events as they occur, none of which are said to be capable of being overcome by the exercise of this standalone unilateral power. I am emphasising this because if there were such an issue then there has been absolutely ample opportunity for anybody to come out and say so. The Chief Justice then goes on to make this observation:

> My request for these amendments is strongly supported by the judges of this court.

We have that. I understand the reference to 'these amendments' to be to the whole lot, to the whole bill. That is just a statement of fact. Then the Chief Justice goes on:

> That support was given after substantial consideration and discussion. As a result of that discussion, all the judges of the court accepted they have an ethical duty to put the needs of the court as a whole as paramount.

Of course; nothing controversial about that either. After working through what we know about experience, what we have heard from the Chief Justice in terms of experience and how we are to understand the explanation of clauses, we are left in a situation where at least insofar as the insertion of the additional power is concerned, the unilateral power, the subject of (1) and (1a) to an extent, we have really nothing more than that one statement of fact from the Chief Justice:

> My request for these amendments is strongly supported by the judges of this court.

The Chief Justice requests it. We know that from the government: in the other place and in this place. And we know from the letter that the Chief Justice supports it and has spoken to circumstances, including a mingling of both aspects, both the flexibility point and the additional power point, and then has told the Attorney that these amendments are strongly supported by the judges of this court. The Chief Justice goes on:

> The proposed amendment carefully limits the Chief Justice's power to those occasions when the assignment of an appeal judge is necessary because of the unavailability of a judge in the general division. Only the Chief Justice sufficiently understands the needs of the court as a whole to be able to make that final decision.

Again, all of that might be taken as need not be controversial. One could have an argument about levels of understanding and so on. I submit that none of that takes away from the underlying importance of mutuality. As the Bar Association has put it, the desirability not to remove the President from the process and if the focus is to be on flexibility in terms of what those judges are capable of agreeing on and therefore the Chief Justice is empowered to authorise in terms of the undertaking of acting duties, so be it. But nothing greater really turns on that observation. The Chief Justice then says:

> Finally, as to the suggestion that debate on the bill should be adjourned until our consultation with stakeholders, it is my view this is unnecessary. Persons who best know the intricacies of listing matters in this court are the judges of this court.

So he is referring back to the statement of fact earlier in terms of the support of the judges of the court. The Chief Justice continues:

> Necessarily, the SA Bar can only have a limited understanding of the pressures of exigencies which apply in distributing the court's workload. The final responsibility in performing that task lies with me as Chief Justice.

He concludes:

> I do not have many years left to serve in the office of Chief Justice. I do not wish to leave to my successor statutory provisions which, in their current form, provide an unworkable division of responsibility, and cause of friction, in the important task of assigning Judges to attend to the work of the Court in a way which best serves the community.

Again, I might end in terms of a point of agreement with the Chief Justice. No-one would wish the Chief Justice to leave to whoever the successor might be a circumstance in which the division was unworkable or in which there was a particular resolvable cause of statutory friction, but there is no indication of such unworkability or friction that is somehow derived from the absence of a new 47(1) and (1a) regime.

There is extraordinary opportunity for that to come to light, really and truly, but there is no evidence of it. We all want to talk about the extraordinary legacy and the longstanding quality and productive capacity of all of our democratic institutions, but surely the court stands very much among those institutions in this state which we are and ought to be particularly protective of and proud of. We are not in circumstances that even remotely resemble what has been described in the conclusion.

I completely share the Chief Justice's sentiments: nobody would like to administer, let alone leave to a successor, circumstances of unworkability or resolvable causes of friction. No case has been made for this change. No case has been made for the change.

Here I am, sort of bumbling along, and I am not necessarily the most capable or incisive observer of every last element of what goes on, but I hope I have made myself sufficiently clear in this respect. We have two things going on in terms of the proposal that is before this parliament. The parliament has an obligation to interrogate the matter in terms of what it is willing to legislate, against evidence, and it is right and proper that the parliament take very seriously what is put by the court in doing so. But it is the responsibility of legislators to consider what is the case for legislating in circumstances where the court needs to be best able to go about undertaking its tasks and responsibilities, let alone broader administration and so on.

It is my submission that without more, 47(1) in particular is bad law and should not be passed by this parliament. To that end, it is a matter where if adjournment would facilitate that and if the government wishes to support an adjournment of the debate for that purpose, I would certainly welcome it, and, as I have always done, I will maintain my willingness to work towards improvement and supporting legislation to that end where that case has been properly established. Unfortunately,

as things stand in relation to this bill, and in particular the application of that second element—first, in terms of the order of the structure: new section 47(1)—that case has not been made and should not be supported.

The Hon. J.K. SZAKACS (Cheltenham—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Local Government, Minister for Veterans Affairs) (12:40): I thank the member for his contribution of nearly four hours, I think on last count, to this very short bill. I do note that we will support a short adjournment after seeking the support of this place on the second reading speech.

To sum up the member's closing remarks on seeking an adjournment once entering committee to a date to be determined in the coming days of sitting, we support that simply for the efficient and timely use of business in this place. We are not supporting an adjournment in a reconsideration of this bill or reconsideration of additional amendments.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

LOCAL NUISANCE AND LITTER CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 February 2024.)

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (12:42): I rise to speak on the Local Nuisance and Litter Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2024.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are not the lead speaker?

Mr BATTY: No, I am not. This bill makes various amendments to the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016 and also makes a number of amendments to the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. It has been quite a long lead-up to this bill being introduced into this house. It follows a review that was commenced by the former Liberal government into the operation of the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act; indeed, I think it was commenced by the now Leader of the Opposition in his capacity then as the Minister for the Environment to seek some feedback.

He released a discussion paper in 2019 about the operation of the act and to respond to some of the issues that had been raised with him at that time and also with the Environment Protection Authority about the operation and administration of the act since its commencement in 2017, and also to determine the scope of any future reforms.

I think it is fair to say there have been a number of issues that have been raised about the operation of the act. Even in my short time as a local member of parliament, you often rely on and refer to this act in dealing with a whole range of constituent inquiries and issues, whether they relate to litter in our local community or nuisances in our local community. It can often be a really effective and important tool to solve, resolve and prevent issues arising in the community.

I also think that whenever we are legislating on these sorts of issues we do need to be aware of the burden it places on businesses, particularly small businesses, and others in the community. While these can be really effective tools to try to solve issues in the community, sometimes I think we see vexatious claims being made under these sorts of acts. We always need to be a little bit wary that the complainant does not become a nuisance themselves to business, and particularly small business.

I think on this side of the house we are always very conscious and careful about red tape on small businesses, and we have seen numerous examples of that in recent times. As recently as a few weeks ago, we heard about the butcher who could not sell Christmas ham because they could not get their food accreditation licence in time from a government authority. I think we all accept the

need for really important and strong and stringent food regulations, but when they are just placing an undue burden on businesses and it takes a year to get a licence in practice then that is really not helping anyone.

In a similar example a few months earlier, we saw the AHA coming out and talking about new training regulations which required their chefs to take a couple of hours out of a busy lunch service to go and upload videos of themselves washing their hands. These are experienced chefs being forced to do this. Again, it is a pretty blunt instrument that does not really help anyone.

We are very, very aware of the thousands of small businesses right across South Australia that are burdened with filling out forms, with trying to get their heads around new industrial relations reforms, and with trying to get their heads around new ESG requirements, all things that take them away from whatever it is that they do best, which is, of course, running their business. Whenever we are legislating in this place, we want to be really conscious that we are not strangling small business with red tape, that we are unleashing them from red tape and letting them get on with what it is they do best.

I think we always ought to remember when we see examples of red tape in our statute books, or more often in our regulations, that at some time they were put there by some well-intended decision-maker to try to cure what they viewed as some sort of evil at that time, but I think what we see time and time again is it then entering the statute books or regulations and being forgotten or duplicated, or simply the practical implementation of it means it is placing an undue and unreasonable burden on small businesses. I think that is very important context as we consider any legislation that is putting a bit more red tape, potentially, or removing red tape on small businesses.

The amendment bill before the house does include a number of reforms across aspects of the act that were considered as part of the review process commenced by the former Liberal government. It covers a number of areas. One of them is a more efficient process for the assessment and issuing of exemptions. We see this in clause 6 of this bill, which introduces an ability for councils to waive the requirement to provide a site nuisance plan in certain circumstances. This is an example of actually removing a bit of red tape from businesses and people in our community and letting them get on with what it is they need to do.

Importantly, it only applies where the adverse effects from the activity are not reasonably able to be avoided and are of a limited nature. These are important protections for the community from whatever it is that people are proposing to do in that respect, striking the right balance rather than just applying a tick box exercise of a site nuisance plan in circumstances where it really might not, and ought not, apply.

Secondly, we see throughout the whole bill differing expiation amounts for bodies corporate and natural persons, to achieve greater deterrence for businesses that might otherwise absorb expiation fees into their costs of doing business. I am told that this is actually a reform that was proposed by and supported by the Small Business Commissioner. That might seem a little counterintuitive at first, but I am told that, more often than not, it is big businesses that are causing the nuisance to small businesses and then simply absorbing that penalty, that expiation cost, into their cost of doing business.

The obvious example is, perhaps, a big construction company that might be undertaking some work out the front of a strip of shops full of small businesses or cafes and restaurants, ignoring the nuisance act and wearing the penalty, wearing the expiation fee, but at a great loss to the small business, whether it be a restaurant or a retail shop, on that street. Again, I think this is another sensible reform that is actually helping small business in South Australia, with the penalties changing to better reflect and better deter the types of offences that this bill is trying to avoid.

Thirdly, we see the inclusion of an offence in clause 7 regarding the installation of an air conditioner or a light in a place where it causes a local nuisance. This is an example where it is obvious what sort of evil we are trying to cure. No-one wants to be living next door to a very noisy air conditioner or a light shining through their window, but perhaps this is another example where we ought be cautious of the obligations we are placing on the installers of those devices—in this case, probably a small business owner who might not be alive to what we are here legislating today, and might find themselves now shackled with this extra obligation and potentially exposing themselves

to extra liability as well. So we might explore, in due course, how that clause might work in practice and make sure there are appropriate protections there and education, perhaps, for small business owners installing an air conditioner or a light who are just trying to get on with their business.

Also in this bill, in clause 17, we see clarification regarding the disposal by councils of illegally dumped items and the application of the Unclaimed Goods Act 1987. In clause 9, we see the addition of a general duty for business owners to prevent or minimise litter resulting from their business, including stormwater management systems. We see improved cost recovery mechanisms for local government, and in schedule 1 we see those amendments that I mentioned to the Liquor Licensing Act and a better delineation between the responsibilities of councils on the one hand, and the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner on the other, when we are regulating nuisance that might be occurring on licensed premises.

Also—and perhaps most interestingly—in this bill, we see a number of provisions to try to improve the management and collection of abandoned shopping trolleys. I know this is a very big issue and a big problem in many of our local communities. I cannot step outside my own electorate office and walk around the streets without finding quite a number of abandoned shopping trolleys from Burnside Village. This does cause a real nuisance to residents living in that local community, as well as those who want to visit the shops. At worst, these trolleys littering our streets can cause a hazard to pedestrians, as well as a traffic hazard, perhaps, depending on where they are left. If not a hazard it is pretty ugly and destroys the visual amenity of our suburbs as well.

We see it right around, and certainly in my own community, whether that be in suburbs like Glenside and Toorak Gardens as well as suburbs surrounding the Burnside Village Coles, whether it be suburbs like Marryatville and Heathpool that surround the Marryatville supermarket and Woolworths there, or suburbs like Frewville, Glenunga or Eastwood, where I live, that surround the world's best supermarket, the Frewville Foodland. Quite often it is an issue raised with me by my own constituents in correspondence as well as at street-corner meetings in those local areas; they are really concerned about these abandoned shopping trolleys.

More often than not, when the issue is raised with me we are able to resolve it pretty quickly. We can call the supermarket or we can call the council, and in nearly every circumstance the trolley will be collected, because they are an asset for the supermarket, of course; they do not want people running off with their trolleys and leaving them on the street. It is an asset for the supermarket and it is worth something to them, so they will come and get it. So more often than not we can fix that problem.

However, it is not always the case, and I note some examples right across the state. There was one from the City of Marion in 2018 that reported collecting more than 230 shopping trolleys around the Westfield Marion and Castle Plaza shopping centres over just a four-day period. Another example comes from Port Augusta, again in 2018, when the local council there, alongside the major retailers, actually employed divers to survey an accumulation of shopping trolleys that had been dumped at the town wharf. When they did so they collected over 500 trolleys and removed them at a cost of $15,000.

It is certainly a problem that we recognise and want to try to solve. There are already provisions in the act that prohibit littering by the person doing the littering, the person who actually goes and takes the shopping trolley and irresponsibly leaves it on the street. They are in there, and they should be in there, because no-one should be running off with a shopping trolley—and certainly no-one should be running off and throwing it into bodies of water. However, these are clearly not working because the problem persists. It is quite a difficult thing to enforce, someone wandering off with a shopping trolley.

What this bill tries to do is provide a new obligation on the supermarket operator to collect shopping trolleys and to identify shopping trolleys. We see this in clause 14, which inserts a new section 24A requiring the identification of shopping trolleys. That is a reasonably easy thing to comply with; indeed, most supermarkets already carry some form of identification on their shopping trolleys, and the smaller ones that might not can comply with that obligation simply by putting a sticker on their existing trolleys, for example. That should not cause too much concern to the retailer, and it

certainly makes it easy for someone like me to be able to report the missing trolley and for the supermarket to retrieve the asset.

We also see section 24B being inserted into the act. This provides a new obligation on the supermarket to collect a shopping trolley when it is reported to them. They have to do so immediately in circumstances where that trolley is a hazard—and we might explore what that actually means—and, where it is not a hazard, they have to do so within three days of being notified. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Response to the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation referral into the Work Health and Safety (Crystalline Silica Dust) Amendment Bill 2023, Report

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: We have some visitors with us in the gallery today. We have students from East Torrens Primary School, who are the guests of the member for Hartley. Welcome to parliament. We also have students from Pulteney Grammar School, who are the guests of the member for Adelaide. I would like to welcome all of you here, particularly Tia Koutsantonis, because while your dad is the father of the house, having been in here for 27 years, he is also your father, and your sister's father, and we want to thank you for giving him the time to leave your family home and work hard on behalf of his constituents and the wider portfolios, which is why he is not here now. He is bitterly disappointed he is not here while you have come to visit, but we welcome you, Tia, and all of your classmates as well. We hope you have an enjoyable day, and you keep an eye on everyone, because when your dad is here they are always really well behaved, so let's see how they go today. He is the leader, he is the standout good performer, well-behaved member of parliament. Now we move to questions without notice, and I call the leader.

Question Time

ELECTRICITY PRICES

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I apologise to Tia for the deep embarrassment that has been inflicted on her by the house. My question is to the Deputy Premier: how will the state government's letter of cooperation with California bring down electricity prices for working South Australian families and small businesses? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: On his trip to the United States, the Premier signed a non-binding letter of cooperation with the Californian Air Resources Board Chair to advance the state's 'shared leadership in renewable energy and clean hydrogen technology'. According to the US Energy Information Administration, California has the second-highest cost of electricity in the United States of America.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (14:02): This is a great initiative that the Premier has been able to secure for South Australia because we have known globally now of California's reputation for very significant investments in accelerating their successful transition to renewable energy, and to pursuing not just renewable energy but pursuing innovations when it comes to industrial capacity and how to power

that industrial capacity. Given South Australia's global reputation, let alone national reputation for being a leader in making the transition to renewables—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I mean, to think, Mr Speaker, that all of those school students think that our main contributor to proceedings is the member for Morphett. Not only has California got that reputation for making very significant investments to secure a successful transition to renewable energy and the technologies that underpin that, but of course South Australia has a global reputation for that as well. I think we are more than two years—the Deputy Premier might know this figure better than me—potentially more, into a proud achievement for our state of more than 70 per cent of electricity consumed across our entire state generated from renewable sources. I can remember in my somewhat publicised travels to the United States early last year that—

An honourable member: Not well publicised enough for my liking.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The spotlight's off me now.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right. When I regaled that fact to representatives of the International Monetary Fund and the World Bank, they were absolutely gobsmacked. I think when international jurisdictions, particularly subnational jurisdictions like California and the state of South Australia, seek to align their efforts to share knowledge and wisdom about how to go about this successful transition, that's a really good thing. I think that we should try to find those opportunities as a government and as a state to learn from the undertakings if not the successes of those around the world who have got similar aims for their economies.

I think it is a good initiative for the state. We hope and expect that there will be something that our state can take away from the work that's underway in California. It's not a dissimilar endeavour to what the former Premier, the former member for Dunstan, would undertake in his frequent travels to San Francisco, for example, when he was trying to avail himself of knowledge advancements amongst—was it Blockchain? Beyond Minecraft, Blockchain has not quite succeeded here in Australia, but maybe one day it will.

ELECTRICITY SUPPLY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Deputy Premier. How will the state government's letter of cooperation with California increase the reliability of South Australia's electricity grid for working South Australian families and small business? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In 2022, Californians were asked to turn off their air conditioning and cease other electricity usage in the middle of summer to prevent stress on the state's electricity grid that could lead to rolling blackouts.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (14:07): As has been so well articulated by the Treasurer, the work that the Premier is doing in California in cooperating between our two states is done in the context of the recognition that climate change is real and requires decarbonising our economy, which requires amongst other things decarbonising our electricity system. Both our states have done this superbly. South Australia leads the world in its percentage of electricity generated by renewable sources that are intermittent.

The only places in the world that do better than us in the percentage of renewable electricity production do so also using hydro. We don't have mountains with rivers and the capacity to dam and a whole lot of rain falling. We don't have the major ingredients that hydro states have, so we have done it the hard way. We have done it with intermittent sources, being both wind and sun. We have done that in a way that has largely maintained the stability of the grid not least because we have been prepared to invest in different ways of doing storage.

With storage, one of those is the big battery that has helped stabilise the grid, and the next one is the production of hydrogen, which will enable us to take the surplus renewable energy that is produced by our relatively high production of wind and sun and relatively low demand during the day to store it and be able to firm more renewable electricity supplies. We have information, we have knowledge, we have experience that will be of use to California as much as the other way around. In fact, I had a similar experience when I went to—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir: I would ask that you bring the member for Hartley to order. He is constantly interrupting. It is a breach of—

The Hon. V.A. Tarzia: What number?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, if he was a competent Speaker, he would know that it was 131—but he didn't have long in the role, did he, sir.

The SPEAKER: Did you want to finish? I think they are all quiet over there now and they know that the students are watching them. There will be a report back to the father of the house.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I had a similar experience to the one that the Treasurer had on his travels when I went to COP in Egypt, in Sharm el-Sheikh. In talking about our record in renewable energy production, electricity production, people were amazed that we were able to hit such a high level. Of course, we have the ambition to reach 100 per cent by 2027. We know we need to do this in a way that maintains stability, hence the investment in the big battery and now the investment in the hydrogen plant, but we always have something more to learn from other jurisdictions. What is not able to be ignored, not able to be turned away from, is that we must decarbonise. Last year, 2023, was the hottest year on record. July was not only the hottest July since—

Mr Patterson: You might have to reduce those trips to Canberra.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Oh, wow. Not only was July the hottest July on record, which means to pre-industrial times, but it is likely it was the hottest July for 100,000 years. The reality of climate change is gripping the world, and that means that not only are all economies seeking to decarbonise for the sake of our future but they are also increasingly insisting on only purchasing products that have been produced from a decarbonised economy. If we don't keep pace, if we don't demonstrate our capacity to decarbonise, we will not only pay for it in our lack of contribution to addressing climate change, but crucially we will pay for it in not being able to continue to make exports, initially largely to Europe, but increasingly to other parts of the world. That's why we are being responsible, that's why we are bringing down our carbon emissions and it's also why the Premier is absolutely right to be learning from other jurisdictions about how they have done it.

NUCLEAR ENERGY

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Deputy Premier. Is the state government considering incorporating nuclear power into their energy policy? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The government has signed a letter of cooperation with California in relation to clean energy. Seventeen per cent of California's zero carbon electricity comes from the Diablo Canyon nuclear power plant.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (14:12): I am happy to answer this question. I could simply answer it by saying no, because that's well known to the opposition and to South Australia, but I am happy to expand a little on that. The Premier has articulated in this chamber very well and clearly the serious economic problems associated with any concept that nuclear power could form a serious part of South Australia's electricity production in the future. While there is much talk of small nuclear reactors, they in fact operate nowhere in the world in a commercial sense, and what we have seen in nuclear power stations that have been built recently is that they are immensely expensive, they

blow their budget and take decades to build. That is for jurisdictions that already have nuclear power and have a familiarity with how to generate nuclear power.

So while there is no ideological objection, at least from myself and the Premier and from our party—although there will be a variety of views, including here, that there is no economic rationale for incorporating nuclear power into our electricity network—where nuclear works is where there is very intense demand. That means high population and very high industrialisation.

In China, a nuclear power station, close to where there are large manufacturing and industrial precincts, can make sense. In South Australia, there is no room for it, no need for it. I can't help but think that the continual discussion—not necessarily by the Leader of the Opposition, who I believe fully appreciates the importance of climate change and of action—by some people in politics who continue to want to talk about nuclear power is not because they genuinely think that nuclear power is a serious option in South Australia and Australia, but that they don't want to talk about renewable electricity and they don't want to talk about climate change.

As I have mentioned, this is, in my view, beyond an ideological debate at this point. It may come as a surprise to some people given my very green history and, in fact, environmentally, my very green present, that I am not opposed ideologically to nuclear power. I was when I was younger. I was very involved in the environment movement, and I was one of the many people who protested against the idea of nuclear power being anything to do with the future of electricity in the world.

As I have understood climate change and the very serious threats that it poses and also, as we have seen, the increased capacity to undertake nuclear power in a safe way, I have let go of that ideological opposition. But if you test it on pure economics for South Australia and for Australia, it doesn't stack up. For that reason, as I suspect members know very well, it does not form a part of electricity production in South Australia's future.

MOUNT GAMBIER TAFE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Minister for Education, Training and Skills. Can the minister advise if the Mount Gambier TAFE has enough staff to train South-East electrical apprentices? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The opposition has been advised that Mount Gambier has a 0.6 electrical trades lecturer and that in March up to 20 local electrical apprentices had their final assessments, their capstone tests, postponed. Electrical apprentices cannot be licensed until they have passed their capstone test. To date, no rescheduling has been communicated to the affected apprentices.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:16): I thank the member for Morialta for the question. Yes, I am aware of this. TAFE in the South-East, not unlike many organisations at the moment, is finding it difficult to recruit staff. There are some vacancies there that TAFE is in the market to try to fill, and they include for those lecturing staff who would be undertaking the capstone exam, which is the final assessment which is undertaken by those students so they can finish their electrotechnology course. TAFE is working with those students in terms of being able to support them financially with travel so they can come to the Regency TAFE campus in the meantime to be able to complete their capstone exam and therefore complete their qualification.

Obviously, it is not an ideal situation, but we are of course in the midst of a national skills crisis, and no-one is immune from that. TAFE is not immune from that either, but we are doing what we can in terms of trying to fill the vacancies, which of course is the long-term solution. As I said, TAFE is in the market now to try to do that but also support those students who might be affected by virtue of not being able to undertake their capstone exam in the South-East to come to the metropolitan area and do it at one of the TAFE campuses here.

MOUNT GAMBIER TAFE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Given that the minister has said those apprentices will be supported to come to another campus, potentially in the metropolitan area, to do their capstone tests, but the opposition has been advised they haven't been advised of this yet, can the minister advise when those apprentices will be able to undertake those capstone tests? Can he guarantee that their apprenticeships will not need to be extended?

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:17): The advice I have is that that communication has begun. I will have to go back and check about whether what the member for Morialta is saying is correct or not in terms of students not being advised. When I heard about the vacancies that were present at the South-East campus, of course the question I asked was, 'What are we doing to make sure students aren't affected and to make sure that they don't have to have their apprenticeship extended?'

The advice I have been given so far is that it won't need to be extended, but I will go away and ask exactly what communication has taken place with the students who are affected at the South-East campus and how quickly they can be supported to get to, in this case, the Regency campus to make sure they can come and complete the capstone exam and complete their qualifications on time.

REGIONAL HOUSING

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:18): My question is to the Deputy Premier. What is the minister doing to assist developers with the clearance of native vegetation to enable housing developments in regional areas? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: I have been contacted by private developers who are attempting to address the housing shortage in our region by developing land that is zoned residential. Some of the blocks have native vegetation on them, but the cost to clear the land is economically unviable. These developers say the Native Vegetation Council are proposing unrealistic expectations regarding offsets and adding unnecessary restrictions. Responses I have received say that the minister is unable to intervene.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (14:19): Yes, I am happy to answer this question, although perhaps not entirely to the satisfaction of the member. To commence with where you ended, the minister doesn't have power of direction over the Native Vegetation Council. They operate under the act and they are entitled to make the decisions according to law. But that law is currently out for consultation.

I am proposing to bring in some amendments to the Native Vegetation Act which include various elements, one of which is to have a simpler approach to the way in which native vegetation is classified to make it easier for people to understand whether or not they are going to be able to undertake clearance. It is on YourSAy until 29 May. You are very welcome to participate in giving some feedback on that, and I am sure that your constituents who have contacted you might be interested in doing the same.

But I do want to put the context on this that the Native Vegetation Act, when it came in, did something very important, which was that it stopped the broadscale clearance that was occurring in South Australia. It was largely tapering off at that point anyway because so much had already been cleared, but it said, 'This is no longer how we want to treat the habitat for our wildlife.' In South Australia, although we have cleared much and we have an enormous amount of land under primary production, much of which has a healthy mix of native vegetation on it, we can't keep losing native vegetation and expect to keep a degree of healthy nature.

The young people in the audience listening to this will know that if they are to have a healthy future, they have to have a healthy planet. Part of that starts close to home. That can be challenging when you want to do something individually on a particular site, when what looks like a bit of scrub

appears to be an impediment. But the truth is, that bit of scrub is the habitat for birds, for reptiles and for mammals, and without those and without their interactions as an ecosystem then the likelihood of our continuing to be able to have healthy primary production and continuing to have healthy water flow, on which we depend, becomes more and more remote.

The Native Vegetation Act does something important. The Native Vegetation Council operates under that act, as it should. We are trying to at least have some simplification for people, and I invite you to participate in that.

LUNG CANCER NURSES

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister update the house on the government's recruitment of specialist lung cancer nurses in our metropolitan public hospitals?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:22): I thank the member for Torrens for her advocacy on this and a whole range of other important health matters. As the member would know, just this last Sunday we celebrated International Nurses Day, which was a great opportunity to thank all of our incredible nurses across South Australia.

Nurses play a number of key roles in our health system, and one of these roles that has been growing over the past few decades has been providing specialist support in areas of different cancer supports. This, of course, first started in relation to breast cancer and was extended to prostate cancer, etc. What we have identified is that there is a real scope for improving the care of people suffering cancer and going through their cancer treatment: having that contact with a nurse, being able to help coordinate that treatment.

One of the really devastating cancers that affects South Australians is lung cancer. Some 700 South Australian lives are lost each year and it costs the state economically near $50 million. It is obviously completely devastating in terms of the impact that it has and the lives that are lost. Up until now, we haven't had a network of cancer nurses dedicated to lung cancer in the same way that we have had for breast cancer and other types of cancers. So we made a commitment before the last election that we would establish a network of four nurses who would provide dedicated support in this area.

I am very happy to inform the house that those are now in place and operating across the state. This is an investment of $2.5 million over four years and it was part of our commitment that we made for 300 nurses across the state. This is a partnership that we have made with Lung Foundation Australia and it will fund those skilled practitioners becoming a consistent link between patients undergoing treatment and their treating teams. It is a vital link that aims to improve the journeys at an incredibly difficult time for both patients and their entire families. Sadly, lung cancer is the leading cause of cancer death in Australia and the fourth most cancer diagnosed in South Australia, so having that ongoing support is vital to making sure patients can rely on that nurse to advocate for them during their discussions about treatment options.

I would like to particularly thank Lorraine Tyler, who I had the pleasure of meeting a few years ago. She was somebody who went through a breast cancer journey and saw the support that was provided to her through that via the breast cancer nurses, and then sadly suffered lung cancer as well and could see the huge disparities in terms of the support that was available. She advocated very hard for us to put this in place. It is largely due to her advocacy that this has happened.

I am very sad to inform the house that in January this year Lorraine passed away. When we launched this program and launched the recruitment of these nurses a couple of months ago, we were very delighted to have her wife Kristen there with us, to say thank you to her for her advocacy that has allowed this to happen. She became such a huge advocate for the Lung Foundation. Now we have those three nurses who are working across our local health network: one in NALHN, one in CALHN and one in SALHN. In addition to that, the fourth one is a specialist respiratory care nurse, working across the Royal Adelaide Hospital and The Queen Elizabeth Hospital as well.

These are, of course, four of the 1,432 additional clinicians that we have hired, 691 additional nurses that we have hired across the two years we have been in government and this is making a

real difference now for South Australians across the state who are getting that awful diagnosis of lung cancer.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY FUND

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:26): My question is to the Treasurer; how much of the $20 million first round of the Economic Recovery Fund has been allocated and spent and how many businesses received funding? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr COWDREY: The cut-off for applications for round one of the Economic Recovery Fund was 15 December last year and to date it is unclear if funds remain unallocated.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (14:26): I thank the member for Colton for his question. The Economic Recovery Fund had its first call for submissions, as the member said, at the tail end of last year and there were two streams of bids sought from companies. One stream was for manufacturing companies and another stream was for tourism-related companies.

This has taken a little longer than what we anticipated. Part of the reason is because many of the bids which were submitted—we had 283 bids which were submitted, so a very strong response from businesses—many of the bids which came back were incomplete. When I say 'incomplete', a lot of the submissions which otherwise would have been quite quickly considered, there had to be further work done by Treasury with the proponents to secure, for example, the financial information about the company that was applying for the funds that had not originally been provided. A lot of that work has now been completed and I would anticipate the government will be in a position in the coming weeks to make an announcement about the successful recipients.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY FUND

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:28): My question is again to the Treasurer. Have any applicants sought clarification from your office, or the department, regarding the status of their ERF applications and, if so, how many?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (14:28): Yes, absolutely, quite a number have to both my office and also the department. Some are from organisations that were involved in that process that I mentioned before, where there was an indication that further information would need to be provided in order for the government to fully consider their application. Sometimes that has not just been one request for information; that has been iterative.

We have all manner of organisations that have applied for funds: some larger, well-established, well-respected companies operating already in South Australia, and some companies that are more at the beginning of their journey as participants in our economy. That has meant that perhaps while some companies are more familiar with the sort of information that would need to be provided for this process and are more readily capable of providing that information, there have been a lot of organisations that haven't.

I do recognise that when companies have put in an application for funding, either a loan or a grant, that application has been deemed to be compliant and they haven't heard, they would like to know if they're successful and there have also been some inquiries from those companies.

ECONOMIC RECOVERY FUND

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:30): My question is again to the Treasurer. Has any amount of money from the Economic Recovery Fund been awarded outside the standard grant application process and, if so, to whom and to what value?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (14:30): For these funding rounds, no. However, for other purposes, my recollection is yes in the past but I'm happy to take that away and get the details. We haven't yet allocated or disbursed any funds from the ERF in relation to the two funding rounds that we called for

manufacturing and tourism that I referred to in my earlier answers. I will check that and bring back some details to the house for the member.

REGIONAL NURSING TRAINING

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Can the minister let my community know any progress on the establishment of a nursing training facility in Port Pirie and the region? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have been lobbying with others for the establishment of a nursing training facility at Port Pirie for over six years now. The suggestion was first proposed to the Minister for Health in the previous state government. At that point, the proposal was for it to be established at the top of the existing hospital administration building. This proposal did not receive any consideration nor traction.

I now understand that this has been expanded by the local board to include training of not only nurses but also allied health, plus other medical services that would be a great asset to not only Port Pirie but also other associated health locations across the state. My community would like to know the progress and the location of this.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:31): Thank you to the member for Stuart, who is a tireless advocate for health care in his local community. As he said in his explanation, he has been lobbying very hard for this facility over many years, both to the previous government and to the current government.

As the member discussed, the proposition is that we obviously want to improve training of healthcare professionals of all sorts that happens in regional areas. The training of healthcare practitioners obviously involves two components: the academic component and a practical component. One of the limitations in terms of allowing that training to happen outside the city is whether that practical training can be based in regional areas.

The member has long been associated with the great work done by Uni Hub over many years in Upper Spencer Gulf, with more and more courses being delivered in regional areas, but they want to expand. They want to do more and provide more healthcare workers, and obviously we are very keen for that to happen.

To do that they need to be able to deliver the clinical training. In Port Pirie, in particular, and thanks to the Minister for Education and his team, they have been able to utilise the TAFE campus and their clinical simulation area. However, there are limits in terms of how much that can be used, given the other demands on the TAFE campus as well.

The proposition has been to establish a new clinical simulation lab: a lab that can allow the training of potential medical students, nursing students, and allied health students in a simulated environment similar to either a hospital ward or an aged-care home, so that that training can be conducted safely and appropriately to meet the course requirements.

This is something that we have been considering very closely. As the member said, originally the local health network was looking at a proposition of putting it in an area inside the hospital that is not used. However, I think it's fair to say that the ambition is now greater in terms of could we do even more? The current work that's underway is looking at a potential establishment of a modular build that could be based nearby the hospital. This would allow broadening of the facility to include allied health and medical, not just nursing, which was the original proposition. This could take potentially hundreds of students through that facility each year, which would obviously be of great benefit to the local area. So we are progressing this. The minister raises this with me on almost a daily basis. It is obviously something that we are considering in the context—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Sorry, the member for Stuart. He's like an emeritus minister. The member for Stuart raises this with me on an almost daily basis, and we are certainly in discussions with the Treasurer and the Premier about how this could be funded. But obviously, the government

has shown just in recent days in terms of the work that we're doing in terms of medical training how committed we are in terms of expanding what we can do in terms of training in regional areas, and this potentially could be another big step that we could take in that direction. So I thank the member for his advocacy. We continue to work with the local health network on developing these plans, and hopefully we will have some more news to give to the house shortly.

LOCAL HERITAGE AND CHARACTER PROTECTIONS

Ms O'HANLON (Dunstan) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister update the house on how the government is taking practical action to better preserve our state's heritage and character?

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:35): Thank you to the member for Dunstan for her question and her passion for local heritage. Of course, local heritage and character are very important to our state's built environment, and it is important to the amenity, aesthetics and wellbeing of local communities like those in the member for Dunstan's electorate. It is important that our planning system records and protects local heritage and character, and that's what we've been committed to since we've come to office.

One of the things we've done in the planning system is we've established an independent panel of experts to undertake a review of the implementation of the state's new planning system. Part of that review produced three recommendations that sought to empower local councils to make sure that the planning system appropriately protected heritage and character in local communities like the member for Dunstan's and provided, in particular, an upgrade of that heritage and character and, most importantly, demolition protections.

We've got a three-pronged approach to preserve local heritage local character. First of all we're supporting councils to undertake code amendments to elevate character areas into historic areas, and that allows for greater protection for those properties and, most importantly, demolition control. We've supported those councils to also undertake code amendments to review and update character area statements and historic area statements to address the gaps and deficiencies in the descriptions that help preserve the streetscape, in particular, of these areas. Thirdly, we're implementing tougher demolition controls by having a state-led code amendment that introduces a new assessment pathway that only allows for demolition of buildings in a character area overlay or historic area overlay once a replacement building has been approved.

All of those measures are very, very important. They are important to assist councils to make sure that local heritage issues, which are a local issue, and the councils and the communities who are best placed to be involved in them make sure that they are involved in listing local heritage places, elevating the character areas to historic areas and reviewing those statements. I wrote to the councils to encourage them to actively make those investigations, do those assessments on heritage and character policies, make sure the code amendments are being done, because that hadn't been done in previous years. Just a lot of councils, I guess, are banging on a closed door to protect heritage in their local areas.

I can update the house and tell you that numerous councils have actually begun that important work, and we've been assisting them in doing that. We've allocated $600,000 in funding to eight councils to lead the way to better protect local heritage, to better protect local streetscapes: Barunga West, the City of Prospect, the City of Adelaide, the City of Norwood Payneham & St Peter's and Alexandrina Council have all been offered $75,000 each to match their costs in producing these code amendments.

Importantly, these code amendments protect 93 local heritage places, 15 historic areas and 458 representative buildings. That is an important initiative by this government. We won't stop there, because the City of Onkaparinga, the District Council of Yankalilla and the Adelaide Plains Council are amongst other councils that are producing their own heritage-related code amendments and, if initiated, will also be offered $75,000 each to assist them with their costs. That will see a further 120 properties in those areas protected. This is a very important set of initiatives for local communities. I know the member for Dunstan, the member for Adelaide and many others on this side want to protect local heritage.

MOBILE PHONE DETECTION CAMERAS

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley) (14:40): My question is to the Minister for Police. Is the government planning to install additional mobile phone detection cameras and, if so, where are they and what is the time frame for installation? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Earlier this year, the government announced—

The Hon. J.K. Szakacs interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: You're not the minister anymore; just listen to the question. Earlier this year, the government announced five sites for the rollout of mobile phone detection cameras. In response to questions during the Budget and Finance Committee hearing on 12 February, the Department for Infrastructure and Transport indicated that a further two sites are being considered.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:40): I thank the member for Hartley for his question. As the house is aware, testing is underway on SA's first mobile phone detection cameras. They have been installed at key metropolitan corridors in a bid to reduce dangerous distraction behind the wheel. The member will be interested to know that the overhead cameras were commissioned at four busy locations and are being set up targeting drivers who use their mobile phones. Of course, in the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Of course—

Mr Whetstone: Easily distracted, aren't you?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: It was the comment prior to that that I think was in fact—

The SPEAKER: The minister will return to the answer. Minister, please ignore the interjections. Please continue with your answer.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Mr Speaker, I take offence. I ask that the statement be withdrawn and that there be an apology.

The SPEAKER: I did not hear the comment.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: It is beneath me to repeat it; however, I ask for the apology and the withdrawal before I do. The member for Chaffey would be well advised to do that.

The SPEAKER: Minister, which member are you referring to? Sorry, I cannot hear.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: The member for Chaffey.

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, do you have anything to say, anything to withdraw, anything to apologise for so we can play on?

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw to the temperamental minister.

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, you will withdraw that statement.

Mr WHETSTONE: I withdraw.

The SPEAKER: You will leave the chamber for the remainder of question time.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: What a scalp. On your way out. On your bike.

The SPEAKER: Member for Chaffey, if you do not leave immediately, you will be named.

The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. Sites now testing include South Road at Torrensville, with SA Police using that site as a particular testing location. Members will be aware that, of course, a profile has been obtained from that site, which is being used to ensure that the cameras that will be installed have a suitable reliability threshold. The shadow

minister will know that a report was earlier obtained and has been ventilated in the public square in relation to the reliability of these particular cameras.

I have been reassured that the human review process before an expiation notice is issued will be a process that we can have confidence in. Motorists in South Australia will know that if they do receive an infringement, it will have been human reviewed with respect to the infringement that comes their way.

An honourable member: Thousands a day.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Indeed, it is thousands a day, and the very purpose and intention behind this particular road safety policy is to change driver behaviour. As the shadow minister himself indicated on ABC radio, there must be bipartisan focus on ensuring that distraction is not at the heart of lives lost on South Australian roads. And the shadow minister—

The SPEAKER: Your time has expired, minister.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: —putting his phone away, will know that—

The SPEAKER: Your time has expired, minister. Please resume your seat.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: —117 lives were lost last year.

COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE FACILITIES

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Has the minister received a briefing on any CFS stations that are set to receive upgrades and/or new builds and, if so, will he release the list of stations?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:45): Not only have I received a briefing in relation to CFS stations, I have received a briefing in relation to all CFS assets. Our CFS community, of course, is more than 13,000 volunteers—13,500 volunteers, approximately. They are vital to our country firefighting operation and to the confidence that our country and peri-urban communities have at times of need, not only in responding to bushfires but also for road crash rescue or to assist in natural disasters of other types, that the CFS will be well-equipped in terms of what is inside the shed and that the facilities that they have access to will be also fit for purpose.

But the member will know that there are approximately 425 sites that the CFS is required to maintain and the member will also know that consideration is being given to an adequate audit of all of those sites to determine exactly the state of these assets. I was myself disappointed that in the life of the previous government certain requests—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: This is important context. This is very important context. Certain requests in relation to the upgrade of CFS assets, including in my own community, were not addressed, so this has been an issue that has been live in this state for quite some time.

Just this morning I had the opportunity to meet with the service chiefs, not just of course the CFS chief but also the SES chief and the Metropolitan Fire Service chief, and we examined this very issue. We examined a long schedule of works that are being progressed to ensure that the assets available for country firefighting, the assets available for metropolitan firefighting and also the assets available to ensure that the State Emergency Service volunteers are fit for purpose.

But as I say, there has been a degree of neglect, I think, in a certain period where there was a government that had a whole series of country members. Now, there were a number of concerns over the life of that government, and can I say a number of country members are now sitting in different seats, and can I suggest to you at least in relation to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will return to his answer and stop provoking those opposite.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Well, don't the facts just sting. Don't they just sting. I say, of course, that certain requests that I had were left unaddressed and it was the experience of a number

of country members. But just this morning early in the life of the portfolios that I am charged with progressing, we were meeting with the chiefs to examine this very issue. Now, the house might also be interested in some additional context. Since the commencement of this year, 100 per cent of the emergency services questions have come to me which means you asked none prior to my appointment. What an unbelievable record! Clearly, we have touched the hot spoke to the side of the shadow minister—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Time has expired, minister.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: —and he is up and about; finally up and about.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:49): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the MFS direct entry project? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PEDERICK: The MFS does not currently accept requests for lateral transfers from other states or territories within Australia, and applicants must go through the full selection process. The opposition understands that a process was underway during 2023, which would allow career firefighters from interstate services to seek direct entry to employment with the MFS; however, to date, this opportunity has not been realised.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Special Minister of State) (14:50): I thank the shadow minister for his question. As I indicated to the house in my previous answer, I was meeting with service chiefs just this morning, including Mr Chris Beattie, the SES chief, and we discussed at some length the transfer of staff between jurisdictions, not necessarily career staff but, of course, the spectrum or architecture—

Mr Pederick: This is about MFS.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: —of service staff right across Australia. So we discussed it, of course, with the SES chief. We discussed it at large with the other two service chiefs, including the MFS chief, how it is that different states have intergovernmental arrangements to share staff. I appreciate that the shadow minister's question is, as I understand it, slightly different. As I understand it, it is the transfer of career officers from one jurisdiction to another with respect to a particular agency. I would be certainly keen to examine the issue further and come back to the house with an answer on notice.

NATIVE VEGETATION

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Housing. Could the minister please inform the house what is the government doing to remove impediments to help address the state housing shortage? With the leave of the house, and the leave of you, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: Earlier today, we heard that there is a review on native vegetation. As I explained, I have taken a number of constituent inquiries about native vegetation impeding housing development, and I am just wondering whether the minister is going to make a submission to the Native Vegetation Act review.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION (Taylor—Minister for Trade and Investment, Minister for Housing and Urban Development, Minister for Housing Infrastructure, Minister for Planning) (14:52): I don't intend to make a submission, but I do think that as part of the regional plans—and at the moment we are preparing various regional plans; the State Planning Commission is working with local communities to do that—the first one that has gone out for public consultation is the plan

for Kangaroo Island, and I know the Speaker will be very interested in that. Some of these issues regarding native vegetation in townships will be addressed by those regional plans.

I think the most appropriate thing to do is if there is a conflict between zoning and native vegetation, then it might be a better approach to review the zoning than it is to—

Mr Telfer: It's not the zoning that is the issue; it's the legislation.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Well, that's your opinion. We don't deal with opinions.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Thanks for the interjection, but maybe you should listen.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: Maybe you should listen to my answer.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I am trying to answer the member for MacKillop's question, and you are just launching your own opinions across the chamber.

Mr Telfer: I am just trying to help.

The Hon. N.D. CHAMPION: I ask the Speaker for a bit of protection. The plans for regional areas will be undertaken. Local communities are involved in that in a very serious way. They all go out to consultation. It might be more appropriate to look at the boundaries of townships to provide additional housing supply rather than to have this conflict between native vegetation and housing supply. I think we need to look at what the local community needs, and make sure that the right infrastructure is in place and the right arrangements are in place while protecting native vegetation as well because, as the Deputy Premier outlined, that is very important, and particularly remnant vegetation for wildlife and the like.

I don't think there necessarily needs to be a conflict. What there does need to be is recognition in the planning system that (a) you need enough land for housing supply but (b) we often have native vegetation which is in these townships as well, which needs to be appropriately accommodated. In terms of developers having certainty, it would be better, I think, if native vegetation could not and should not be removed, to then look at the zoning, because what we do need to do is provide certainty to both towns and developers about which land can be appropriately developed for housing and which land can't.

COMMUNITY LANGUAGE SCHOOLS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Multicultural Affairs. Can the minister advise the house how the government is strengthening connections between young South Australians and their cultural heritage?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Tourism, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (14:55): I thank the member for Light for his question. Can I thank him for often repping me when needed for many, many years to go out to multicultural functions. This Saturday 18 May marks National Community Language Schools Day. Just to remind ourselves, community languages are open to students from all linguistic backgrounds outside of school hours. They are a safe space for our future leaders to engage with language and culture to maintain their cultural connections with their community and their family. Currently, we have 91 fully accredited teaching schools teaching 47 different languages to 8,389 students. I suspect some of the students, who are our guests today, may attend those community language schools often held on weekends.

National Community Language Schools Day commemorates the role that these schools play in social cohesion, bridging identities and keeping language, culture and tradition alive. The Malinauskas government shares this sentiment, which is why, upon coming to government, we committed to investing an additional $4 million over four years to better support community language schools in South Australia. Can I acknowledge the tremendous support from the Minister for Education, who has been supporting these schools and continues to do so. It has added an additional

funding with a multicultural lens, that we build the ecosystem around community language schools and support them to grow, develop and have strong governance within the protocols that they follow.

We have become quite a good example to both our state and territory counterparts. In fact, we held a national community language schools forum here, I think it was last year, and they were really thrilled to see some of the changes that we have been making. I want to put on the record my appreciation to Brett Shuttleworth. He is the Community Language Schools South Australia lead, and has shown great leadership and collaboration in this space.

Last year, with this additional investment, we strengthened governance and compliance and increased need-based funding. We are also supporting additional staff and personal development training for these school leaders while also topping up the funding to our host schools. I should point out that many of the people that are leaders in these community language schools are volunteers. They do it because they are very dedicated to continuing to keep their language, their culture and traditions alive and share them with the children and grandchildren of our migrant communities.

We are also supporting additional staff and personal development training. While we have been supporting these new priorities, we have also been looking at the future. We know if you speak more than one language your brain works more quickly, and particularly if you learn that second or third language when you are younger it's a great building block for you. We are looking at the provision of vocational and SACE pathways for secondary students who study a language at our community language schools. We often see a drop-off when kids start high school. They are not as interested in going to the Saturday classes, so we are trying to show them the pathways to do it through SACE and vocational.

I am very proud of the establishment and maintenance of community language learning hubs. We have one at Regency Park TAFE, Salisbury TAFE, and I am about to officially open one this weekend at Torrens University. These hubs enable four or five schools to come together. The volunteers support each other and they are able to learn together and build the continuance and governance and support of the capacity-building of these different schools. We are also developing a digital language learning hub for online learning and teaching resources.

PREMIER'S TASKFORCE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister commit to releasing the report and recommendations from the Premier's Taskforce to the public? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: At the Budget and Finance Committee meeting last week, the police commissioner indicated the police task force had its final meeting in March 2023, more than 14 months ago, and its work has been finalised.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:59): I thank the member for Flinders, the shadow minister, for the question. It was, as I have remarked earlier in this place, a commitment of the government to establish a task force that would examine those matters which had been left unexamined by the previous government.

It was necessary to take that step, not only because the Premier had a commitment to address these serious issues that were contemplated, of course, at the time, but that the then opposition was examining the work that had previously been done—or, more importantly, the work that had been left undone—and a commitment was made to ensure that there would be, chaired by chief executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, a task force to examine those issues that had been left unaddressed.

One important issue that had been left unaddressed was the recruitment of sworn officers, and the South Australian police force was left by you in a state that was an utter disgrace—an utter disgrace. Despite the obvious attrition that occurred, despite the lack of investment that had been made to date, despite the trends which were obvious, despite the need to invest not just in sworn officers but also in additional police security officers, very little was done.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: I missed you yesterday, but here I am. I'm back.

An honourable member: We were here.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: Were you? I'm not sure you were. In any case—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: No, no, no—I was at a police graduation where there were 25 additional officers sworn in to address the matters you had left unaddressed.

Grievance Debate

STATE ECONOMY

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:02): Unfortunately, today it was a double dose of bad news for our state, with fees and charges increasing for the third year running by the Malinauskas Labor government and, unfortunately, South Australia's unemployment rate rising by 0.3 per cent to 4.2 per cent, to again be the highest in the nation. If I first turn to fees and charges, it was today confirmed that the Malinauskas government will again add to the cost-of-living crisis in South Australia by upping fees and charges, like licence renewals and car registrations. This comes despite the average South Australian family being more than $20,000 a year worse off since this government was elected.

Over every source of expenditure in a household budget, it has only gone in one direction and that is up, and the Malinauskas government has just added to that again. Again, these fee increases come despite record taxation revenue. Whether that be payroll tax, stamp duty or GST, we are now talking about revenue increases in the billions. In fact, another significant revision with additional GST money was announced in the federal budget earlier this week, and all in the face of a treasurer who in his earliest days in the job committed publicly on radio that he would step in, that he would step away from the standard Treasury indexation rate system if South Australians really needed it. If South Australians were facing cost-of-living pressures, he would step in. What have we seen? Three consecutive years of fees and charges increases from this government. It is plain to see now that those were just words—plain, empty words.

To unemployment, sadly again it is the highest in the nation under Labor at 4.2 per cent. ABS data shows that over 30,000 full-time jobs have been lost in our state since June last year—30,000 full-time jobs wiped out. Clearly, the last Mullighan budget was not a budget that supported business and full-time job creation. It was not a full-time job creator; it was a full-time job eliminator. While the unemployment rate may have been lower across February and March during the festival season, the stark reality of the state of the business environment in the state became clear this month in April. I outlined to the house in my supply contribution the long and growing list of hospitality businesses sadly unable to keep their doors open. That crisis continues to worsen and continues to widen. It is not just hospitality businesses now, with FIVEaa reporting this morning that Vadoulis Garden Centre is set to close.

How do jobs get created? Jobs get created by supporting and providing business with the best environment possible. And what is this government doing? The complete opposite of that. They are raising costs for business. They have increased electricity prices for business. We have IR laws that the South Australian Business Chamber say small business does not even understand. They have been raising fees and charges. They have been keeping thresholds stable despite significant inflation. On top of this, it has been revealed this week in question time that we have small businesses in South Australia, those doing it the absolute toughest, who have been unable to access electricity rebates nearly a year after being announced by this government.

We have an Economic Recovery Fund and grants that are just in the slow lane. 'Recovery' implies that getting on and doing this quickly would be important. If it is a recovery grant, you would think the money would want to be out the door helping business, but instead it is revealed that they have been sitting, sitting, sitting. The Treasurer will not even tell us how many businesses have benefited from the fund. This government talks a big game, but when it comes to delivery, they are stuck in a Californian traffic jam.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Hurtle Vale, I would like to acknowledge the presence in the gallery of hardworking South Australian nurses and midwives and pass on our thanks for all the great work that you do. You are guests here today of the Minister for Health and the Minister for Human Services.

Grievance Debate

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

The Hon. N.F. COOK (Hurtle Vale—Minister for Human Services, Minister for Seniors and Ageing Well) (15:07): I do want to thank and welcome many of our closest friends that we have in the gallery today. The Minister for Health and I are happy to host you for an afternoon tea today to recognise the hard work and the excellent contribution of both midwives and nurses on the special days, held a week apart.

I would like to take the opportunity to acknowledge some people by name. I hope I have all of you: Dr Megan Cooper, Jennifer Hurley, Adjunct Associate Professor Elizabeth Dabars, Samantha Mead, Annette Cieslak, Nicole Kelly, Marrisha Singh, Elisa Gardiner, Pauline Connell, Professor Tiffany Conroy, Professor Rachael Vernon, Professor Jenny Fereday, Professor Tracy Humphrey—and we do we have some titles missing, sorry—Marion Eckert, Kim Gibson, Alice Steeb, Ketra Mtombeni, Meagan Connolly and Tracey Yeend. Welcome to parliament.

On International Nurses Day, the anniversary of Florence Nightingale's birth, we celebrate Nurses Day every year. This year's theme, the economic power of care, has significant meaning in terms of the drive to invest in nursing quality and quality care outcomes across the globe. When I was looking up some of the themes—as you know, I do not read speeches very well—it did talk about the ideal standard of ratio of nurses per head of population, which I understand is about 70 nurses to 10,000 people. Sadly, around three-quarters of the world does not actually meet that standard, so that means a poor outcome for people in the community, a lack of access to health care, and no doubt actually means acute care needing to be accessed by more people than is necessary, because, as we know, some of the best work done by nurses is done out in the community.

Now in parliament I have the absolute privilege of working with the Department of Human Services—and, more recently now, the Department of Ageing Well in the portfolio of seniors and ageing well—in order to bring together policies and health strategies with the Minister for Health in order to be able to strengthen our community and work alongside other global missions which are really well articulated through the sustainable goals. I have spoken about these before. If I look at the first three sustainable goals around zero poverty, zero hunger and good health and wellbeing, they sit really beautifully in the Department of Human Services and the Office for Ageing Well mission of connecting communities and bringing people closer together, alleviating poverty, making sure people are well fed, making sure that quality communities can get together, and trying to combat really challenging issues like loneliness.

Today I visited The Hut up in the Hills, in Aldgate. They are the recipients of a grant in order to investigate and work out some strategies to combat loneliness amongst men. That is a $40,000 Office for Ageing Well grant, and sits really well on the background of a study and a project that is already being undertaken up there in partnership with the UniSA and workers from the Rosemary Bryant Foundation, who are doing some really great work to dive deeply into the community and talk to people about what loneliness is, what it means, and how we can combat it.

If we learned anything during COVID, it was that loneliness is absolutely one of the most isolating and devastating experiences that we can have in our lives. I think, sadly, what happened was many people who were quite privileged and usually well off suddenly experienced loneliness for the first time. Really, their heads exploded and they thought, 'We'd better try to do something about this, because it's just awful,' whereas hundreds and thousands of people across our country, in our community, experience loneliness every single day. You do not have to be alone to be lonely.

There is obviously this great piece of work that is happening in dual partnerships up there in the community centres. I cannot wait to work with the community centres, with Minister Picton, and with our nurses across our community to really do something about some of these more community-based approaches that can actually make life easier and better in our community but also for our nurses and our midwives. Thank you very much.

MOUNT GAMBIER TAFE

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (15:12): Before I start, 30 years ago this year my wife and I certainly appreciated the work of the midwife for our firstborn after a 36-hour labour. You were there, and you remain there. Thank you very much. Today I want to speak about the situation in Mount Gambier at the Mount Gambier TAFE—which I don't think is isolated. Here is a letter from an employer to me. She wrote to me because I met her, as the Minister for Skills, a number of years ago:

> Please find below notification from Tafe regarding the cancellation of the Capstone unit—

this is the final exam for apprentices who are studying to be electricians. The letter continues:

> I have spoken with our apprentice this afternoon and he advises there are approximately 20 apprentices that were scheduled for the 25th March Capstone unit.

This notice from TAFE went out on 21 March, just four days before that test:

> Due to unforeseen circumstances we have to postpone the delivery of the unit EL0039 Design, install and verify compliance and functionality of general electrical installations (Capstone) at Mount Gambier campus scheduled (25/3/2024-5/4/2024).
>
> This unit will be rescheduled and a revised call up will be emailed as soon as the new dates are finalised.
>
> Please accept our apologies for any inconvenience caused.

To date, six weeks down the track, there has been no rescheduling. These apprentices are very concerned that they will not get completion, they will not get their licences and they will not be able to be paid as tradespeople after the four years of their apprenticeship. The letter goes on to say:

> As mentioned, our apprentices usually take 1-2 weeks of their own leave [off] immediately [before]…the Capstone [test to prepare]—

because it is such an important test. Here we have a situation where they have already foregone one to two weeks of their annual leave to study for this test and then they are told they cannot do it now. TAFE have not even bothered to get back to them to let them know when that test will be available to them in Mount Gambier. The letter goes on:

> This issue, together with no programme yet available from Tafe for the remainder of the year is [impeding] on scheduling [for] our interstate work.

This is the employer who pays the staff, these apprentices, who wants to plan their work schedule, who wants to ensure that their apprentices are getting the training that they need outside the workplace, and they cannot do that because next semester's schedule for the students' requirement to be at TAFE has not even been released. It has not even been released and it is only a month or so from the next semester. There is no excuse for this, no excuse whatsoever. The letter goes on:

> The person I spoke with from Tafe in Adelaide…not sure where he sits on the totem pole—

obviously she is expressing some frustration there and she hopes that this is enough information to try to get some action by the government on this issue.

There is no doubt that the government has put all its eggs in one basket when it comes to skills training. What was the result of the first 12 months of this government's new policy? In 2019, there were 8,630 commencements in South Australia. That was after the first year of the change of government and changes were starting to happen in the way in which employers are supported with their apprentices.

By 2021, just two years down the track, that figure had reached 14,260 commencements in a single year; so from 8,630 to 14,260. Then the following year, in June 2022, commencements had increased to 20,235. Then, in the first 12 months of the Malinauskas government, commencements for the June quarter were down to 9,595—exactly back to where we were when the Marshall

government was elected. All that work was undone. The policy is failing and what we are seeing in Mount Gambier and what we see in the NCVER figures is evidence of that.

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (15:17): I would also like to follow in the footsteps of the Minister for Human Services in thanking our nurses and midwives across South Australia. We have just had International Nurses Day, which followed a week after International Day of the Midwife. It is a very important time in the calendar when we thank our incredible nurses and midwives across South Australia for the work that they do.

There are some 38,000 nurses and midwives who work in South Australia, providing incredible support to so many people in a whole variety of different sectors, some 20,000 of whom work in SA Health. Obviously, there is a huge range of nurses and midwives who work in private hospitals, in community care, in aged care, in a whole range of different sectors, and the list goes on.

I will not acknowledge the whole list of people my colleague the Minister for Human Services has already done, but I will acknowledge Jenny Hurley, Chief Nurse and Midwifery Officer, who joins us today, and also Professor Elizabeth Dabars, the CEO of the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation, and thank them for their leadership of nurses and midwives across the state.

We are also really delighted that we are joined by a number of winners from the nursing and midwifery awards we had just a couple of weeks ago. It is a delight to be at those awards every year and see some of the excellent examples of nursing and midwifery that is happening across the state, the innovations that are happening in care delivery, the exceptional care that is happening by our nurses and midwives, the leaders who are going above and beyond, and some of the pioneering research and development that is happening through our nurses and midwives.

I was particularly excited that a number of the award winners were from regional South Australia. It just shows the strengths of our nurses and midwives not just here in the metro area but right across the state. I am also really delighted that while we have recruited a substantial number of nurses and midwives in the past two years—some 691 extra full-time nurses and midwives above attrition we now have working for SA Health—that has not just been in the city. Over 200 of them are from regional areas as well. That shows the depth in terms of the work that nurses and midwives do across the state.

Also, I am really delighted that of the graduates who are coming into the state we see a substantial number of them going into regional areas as well. In particular, there are 206 graduate nurses and midwives working across our six local health networks at the moment, the largest group of which is in the Limestone Coast network, with a record number of 49 nurses and eight midwives who are undertaking that training. Of course, the Central Adelaide Local Health Network usually has the biggest number, and this year they have had their biggest ever intake of 300 graduates coming in.

It is a timely reminder to thank the nurses and midwives not just for the work that they do but also for helping to train and pass on their skills to the next generation, which is vitally important. When people graduate with nursing degrees or midwifery degrees, to get to the standard which we will call the Nat Cook gold standard of nursing and midwifery obviously takes a lot of experience, working hands-on and having that wisdom passed down from other nurses and midwives working across the system.

I would very quickly like to acknowledge a couple of the people who won awards in the awards that we had just a couple of weeks ago. We had so many different awards. Obviously, I cannot list them all, but I would like to highlight the Excellence In Practice—Registered Nurse award. We had joint winners in this category, which showed the level of competition for that. They were Mary Young, from Central Adelaide Local Health Network, and Michael Fitzgerald, from Southern Adelaide Local Health Network.

Mary works at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and was awarded for her collaborative practice; it resulted in substantial improvements in the care of patients with respiratory conditions. Patients with chronic respiratory failure are now managed outside of the intensive care unit, reducing

morbidity and mortality. The Respiratory Rapid Access Service has been Mary's latest initiative, using her advanced clinical stills, and I have had the pleasure of seeing that in action.

Michael works at Flinders and has been recognised for spearheading a number of innovative cancer programs within SALHN, including individualised survivorship care plans, addressing patients' unique needs, contributing to better patient experiences and outcomes. That is just two examples of the tens of thousands of examples of nurses and midwives delivering incredible care across the state.

LIVE SHEEP EXPORTS

The SPEAKER: And now my good friend, the member for Chaffey. I missed you. Welcome.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:22): Thank you, Speaker, and it is great to be back. I would like to acknowledge the nurses and the midwifery visitors here today: an outstanding contribution to our society, and I thank all of you for the work you do.

On a different issue, I want to talk about live sheep exports. It is a very important industry, and it is an industry that is now under siege by a federal government that has done a deal with animal activists. It has done a deal that will put the livestock industry nationally, and particularly here in South Australia, at risk. The vulnerability cannot be expressed more than what I am about to talk about.

There are many parts to the live export trade, and I do declare that my father was a pioneer in the live shipping trade for many years. As a young fella I would go down to the ports and help load sheep onto those ships. Things have changed significantly since that time.

Ninety-seven per cent of sheep that are exported by sea are now exposed to vulnerability. Just recently I was over on Kangaroo Island visiting friends, and a very good sheep-farming friend asked me to go over there and undertake some work for him, and that was to shoot sheep. Sadly, we are seeing many sheep in truckloads coming out of the west. Only by the rumour mill—that is, that the federal government are going to ban live shipping of sheep.

We are now seeing sheep farmers shipping their sheep to the east landing on our areas of farm without feed, without the capacity to feed them, so those sheep on Kangaroo Island are now being shot. It is very expensive to get sheep off the island and have them moved to a marketplace only to realise that there is no return. That is very heart-wrenching. On the weekend, I visited Orroroo, speaking to a pastoralist with quite a large property. He is going out this week shooting sheep, shooting Merino rams. Can you believe that Merino rams are being shot through neglect of a government policy?

I must say that the industry has seen a major reform since the early days. Yes, in those early days we saw a lot of visual impact that many people would not accept—and I do not accept it—but in today's measure, there are many, many institutions, shipping lines, truck transporters and farmers that are better preparing their sheep, better readying their livestock. The shipping lines are now not converting car carriers into live animal export barges: they are now purpose built. We now have much more understanding of how we can better treat our animals, making sure that they are given a golden handshake as they leave our shores to go over to our global trading partners.

The sheep exports are due to cease on 1 May 2028. The closing of that industry is going to have a significant impact on the livestock trade overall. A few breeding stock will go into planes and be exported, but the majority of meat sheep that we see leave our shores will now stay on our shores. We cannot expect that we are going to value-add a sheep, a lamb or a piece of mutton that is going to be put into a box, frozen and then exported to our global trading partners. That just does not work. They do not have refrigeration. They will not buy those livestock if they do not have their religious beliefs upheld.

It is an absolute crime that what we are seeing now is an industry that has been a staple since the mid-sixties being shipped off into the sunset. We are going to see a large adjustment period. It will not be just the $117 million that the federal government want to put in place: it will be a generation of sheep breeders and livestock producers that will have to deal with this. There will be an impact on shearers, transport, the grain industry, the wool industry, the kill space at our processing

plants and the welfare of animals. Sadly, the improvements that we have achieved since the mid-sixties are all to no avail. It is a sad day for the livestock industry nationally and in South Australia.

NURSES AND MIDWIVES

Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:28): I, too, would like to take a moment to acknowledge the incredible work of nurses and midwives, obviously in recognition of International Day of the Midwife and International Nurses Day. Growing up, I was surrounded by a number of nurses and midwives. My uncle is in fact a mental health nurse, and he has done some really incredible work. I have two aunties who are nurses, Bianca and Catherine—who was a nurse—and my beautiful aunty Bec is a midwife, who has just, alongside a number of other midwives, finished up at the North Eastern Community Hospital.

While I am here today, I would like to acknowledge the work of all the incredible midwives at North Eastern Community, many of whom are moving on to other jobs, and also acknowledge the work that not just the midwives have done but all the staff have done in terms of bringing babies into the world not far from my community. I know that they have done incredible work there—I have gone to visit a number of beautiful babies at North Eastern Community—and my aunty Bec was one of them.

In my electorate, we have a number of wonderful nurses. My electorate is home to Modbury Hospital, so of course there are a number of nurses there, but we are also the electorate with the most aged-care and retirement care facilities in the state, so we have a number of nurses working in aged care and community care across my electorate. I would like to acknowledge the work of each and every one of those nurses in keeping our community safe, but also keeping our community dignified, particularly in those last years and months of individuals' lives.

This year and last year I ran a bit of a competition on social media to acknowledge nurses in my community, offering a Gorman set of scrubs to nurses, and the way that I did that was by asking for individuals from my community to name a nurse who means something to them, who has contributed to their life in some way. I think it is really important because it shows not only acknowledgement from myself, or other members of parliament, about the work of nurses, but it has given people in our community an opportunity to acknowledge someone in their life whom they know goes above and beyond.

The name of the winner of that competition last year was Emma, and Emma was a nurse who also started a gym for new mums. She had this wonderful gym in Golden Grove where mums could come and bring their babies and they would have a little creche sort of setup and she did tailored gym activities for new mums. There were many mums who came and nominated Emma, not just for her work as a nurse but of course for this environment that she provided to many of them who perhaps did not have friends or connections or other relatives with babies and what that meant for them in the early days of motherhood. I would really like to acknowledge Emma and her incredible work at Nourish & Flourish Fitness I believe it is called.

This year the winner of our Gorman scrub is Meghan Connelly, who I believe joins us here today, and she was nominated by her family members. She is a nursing student who has just entered the Golden Key Society for her top result, so of course will be contributing to nursing in our state. Obviously, as a student she is already contributing, and will be continuing to contribute as she finishes her studies. I got chatting to Meghan's relatives at netball earlier this week about the incredible work that she does and they just spoke about how proud they are of you, Meghan, and all of the incredible work that you are doing, so shout-out to you.

I would like to also mention a few of the others and there were a huge number of nurses who were listed in both last year's competition and this year's, but some really wonderful stories, and I think again it goes to the quality of the people that we have in the profession here in our state. One that I thought was really beautiful was a story of Nakeita Snell. She was tagged by her twin sister and she works with children and has lived experience having been a child who grew up in hospital as a sick child herself, and I thought the way that she has decided to give back was really important.

There was the story of Tamara Taylor, who is a PICU nurse, and many of us of course will have known babies in the NICU, the PICU and the SCBU, and I know just what that service provides

to families who are going through some of the most difficult days of their lives. I would really like to acknowledge, of course, the work of our nurses and midwives caring for little babies in there when there are some really difficult moments for families.

There was Kirsten Naseby, who was named as the only nurse able to give flu shots to a whole group of children and I thought that was really special as well, having that connection with someone who perhaps does not want to go in and get an injection. It says a lot about all of the different roles that a nurse has to take on and often it might be just to make an experience more comfortable for someone who is obviously going through something tough. I just want to acknowledge all the work of the nurses and midwives in my community and across the state today.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:33): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 4 June 2024 at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

LOCAL NUISANCE AND LITTER CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:34): I also rise to speak in support of the Local Nuisance and Litter Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. As many across this chamber would be aware, the dumping of trolleys can present a significant concern among members of our community while also presenting a considerable challenge to our local councils who often have the task of investigating the dumping and facilitating their removal when they are dumped.

When trolleys are left or abandoned in our community, they are often found to be a nuisance. They block our paths, they sit at the bottom of our waterways and they can present traffic hazards around our roads as well. But to help address the matter and to ensure that there is a fair balance to strike between the owners of shopping trolleys, local governments and also the community, this bill has made its way to this house following extensive consultation consisting of a discussion paper informing stakeholders on the breadth of reforms throughout 2019 and then a second stage of engagement which took place from October 2022 through to February 2023 which consulted on the draft bill as well as two sets of draft regulations.

As part of this consultation, I understand there was significant appetite amongst councils to improve their ability to deal with the dumping of trolleys within their respective areas. While the act currently makes it an offence to dump trolleys, local governments have advised the government that they believe there is more that could be done to effectively address the abandoned trolleys.

We know, therefore, that there has been a considerable appetite among local government to have tools at their disposal which will help to reduce the presence of dumped trolleys within their jurisdictions. I certainly know that in my electorate there is overwhelming support for the issue to be tackled. I have had conversations with constituents across my electorate and heard from people such as Lesley who has reported that the trolleys from nearby precincts have found their way into the otherwise absolutely lovely waterways of Cobbler Creek and at other times they have been spotted at the Little Para River as well.

While these areas are great places to get out and enjoy a walk, to play and be active for those who love to make the most of our wonderful area, the sides of roads, footpaths and waterways are not an ideal place to drop your trolley. The best place for a trolley is of course always going to be at the trolley bay because when they escape the parking lot or local shops to be found littered across our lovely neighbourhood, they can create an eyesore in amongst an otherwise very lovely and enjoyable area.

I do understand that some councils across the state have until this point held back from developing their own by-laws to be able to deal with this matter. However, the Marion council in the past had developed their own by-law which was later disallowed in 2021 on the advice of the Legislative Review Committee as it allowed fines to be issued to retailers should their trolleys be dumped by members of the public.

In helping to address this matter and provide the tools to our local councils so that they handle abandoned trolleys on their streets, it is not our intention here today with this bill to punish retailers for the actions of their customers who willingly dispose of their trolleys with complete disregard for their business and the community who must put up with the eyesore and dangers that they then present.

Having listened to the stakeholders as part of this bill, the intentions here are to balance the views of all parties to be able to deliver an outcome that benefits both local government and retailers, allowing greater cooperation between them that will ultimately see fewer abandoned trolleys on our streets and, where it does occur, ensuring those trolleys can be hastily returned to where their journey began.

The bill proposes a sensible path forward providing clarity to all involved on what is expected and what can be done to address dumping of trolleys. Retailers have engaged with the consultation on the bill. They include Target, Aldi, Woolworths, Kmart, Cheap as Chips, Ikea, Officeworks, Bunnings and Mitre 10, as well as retail associations including SA Independent Retailers, National Retail Association, and Australian Retailers Association.

With extensive consultation undertaken across the community, retailers and retail associations and local government, I understand the reforms we have before us have secured support from stakeholders all around.

To ensure that we have balance, some ideas proposed throughout the engagement period included mandating coin locks on trolleys and geofencing all retailers' trolleys, which were rejected due to the prohibitive nature of such requirements in addition to the reasonableness of requiring retailers to enact such requirements where the issue of trolley abandonment is otherwise not an issue.

Additionally, the bill contains no penalties for owners of trolleys that get abandoned as it is considered littering, which under the act remains applicable to individuals who abandon their trolleys. By adding shopping trolleys specifically to the definition of general litter, these reforms before us will strengthen the penalties, which currently sit at about $210. Penalties are, however, applicable for noncompliance. Such a case may be where a retailer's abandoned trolley is reported to them. They will have a reasonable time frame to be able to go to collect them, generally three business days, or immediately if the trolley presents a hazard. Where a retailer is presenting a significant trolley abandonment issue, these reforms will allow for litter abatement notices to be issued to develop a plan of action that will prevent or minimise the abandonment issue.

These reforms strike an even balance between stakeholders, providing the tools and a cohesive system across South Australia to be able to deal with the issues of trolley abandonment, ensuring that retailers are not unreasonably punished for the actions of individuals who abandon trolleys across our neighbourhoods, while also ensuring that the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act, which is an act primarily for local government, is up-to-date with the world outside of this place, and provides local government with the tools they need to address such matters in their own respective areas.

Additionally, this bill will also make amendment to the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 to provide clarity to the understanding of nuisance which emanates from licensed premises, as it currently can be taken to mean all forms of nuisance. Due to this, I understand that local councils have referred complaints, such as noisy air conditioners, to the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, which itself has no relationship with the service of alcohol or provision of entertainment. This amendment makes clear that nuisance from licensed premises to which the Liquor Licensing Act applies is limited to the noise or behaviour related to patrons making their way to or from a licensed venue or from entertainment at the venue.

I am very proud of my neighbourhood, and I share the frustration of constituents such as Lesley who rightly has pointed out that our creeks, roads and footpaths are not the places for trolleys to be left, and that is why I am proud to be supporting this bill.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:41): I rise to make a contribution to the Local Nuisance and Litter Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2024. I note that two of the main amendments in this bill are impacting on the management of shopping trolleys, and the installation of air conditioners and exterior lights. I might comment on the exterior lights and air conditioners in the first instance. Urbanisation: from a country member and someone who lives far too close to a highway—it is 800 metres—I can deal with concrete for so long, but then I need to go home.

I think we have to worry about some of the impacts of this bill. I understand what it is trying to do, but certainly in urban areas and towns—towns like Murray Bridge, Gawler, Mount Barker—the infill that is happening now is not the old quarter acre block. Developers are maximising the potential of housing, and what we are seeing more and more, and I see it—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Sorry to interrupt. Are you the lead speaker for the opposition?

Mr PEDERICK: No.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Okay.

Mr PEDERICK: What happens now is that, instead of having the quarter acre block, you get these generally four-bedroom houses still and they are built end on and they are jammed up against each other. My sister lives in Gawler in one of them, out in Gawler East. There is no yard, and a lot of people do not want a yard because they are too busy to deal with it, but it certainly becomes very congested housing. In these areas where we are seeing more infill, whether it is town infill or urban infill, essentially we are going to have more people living on top of each other. In Mount Barker, on the developments as you follow up on the Wistow road towards Strathalbyn you can just go from roof to roof—you would not need a ladder to go up each one–and clean each other's gutter out. In fact, on the hill slopes it almost looks like the eaves are overlapping each other.

The point I am getting to is that, with a bill around the noise of air conditioners, people's houses—even in an urban environment, and I know that they have always been pretty close—are getting closer. Some people would say it is nearly impossible. Well, it is possible, as I just described. We have to have a bit of reality. The beauty of living in the country is that you do not have to worry about this.

For instance, I have a 1200-watt sound system at home, and my two boys believe in only two volumes: nothing or flat out. The beauty of living in the country is that you do not upset anyone. It is loud. We lent it out to a couple of their friends for their 21st. I got home from one a couple of years ago and I could not hear the song but from three kilometres away I could hear it thumping from the shearing shed. That still did not bother anyone. Obviously, you are not going to have that level of sound in an urban environment because it would be clamped down, and I understand that.

In the operation of air conditioners, I know there is better engineering and better operation techniques going into them so that they can keep them quieter. They are better than the old rattlers from years ago, especially the old evaporatives and that sort of thing, but they still make noise. We have to be pretty careful about how we regulate this because people are used to being comfortable, they are used to the nice things in life, if they can afford to switch their reverse-cycle air conditioner on. They want to be comfortable. It is just how people are.

As I said, there is a lot of urban infill. We see the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan coming up. Certainly in my community, I am happy to work with the government on the plans that are in place to expand Murray Bridge. There is the opportunity for many thousands of blocks, and developers are literally knocking down the doors to get in there and utilise what will be a great expansion, managed appropriately, between Murray Bridge and Callington. A lot of work needs to be done before all of that happens, but we will progress that and, as I said, work on getting the right outcomes from the start.

Then you get exterior lights as well. Nowadays, you have a lot of lights on the outside of houses. I have one on my farmhouse at Coomandook that is quite handy. You walk up to the door

and a couple of lights come on, and you find your way to unlock the door and that sort of thing. It is very handy. These days, with phones with lights on them, you can put that in your pocket and light your way up the path as you leave the garage. You probably do not have to do that so much in an urban environment, but it does help get you there. Certainly in the city or towns there are streetlights, but again there would have to be some serious looks at how lights are angled, whether it is impacting on someone and that kind of thing. Sometimes, it is just in the eye of the beholder, whether they are affronted by the light or not.

I remember in my first term in this place, between 2006 to 2010, working with Terramin and the Strathalbyn lead mine, that the lights were a bit bright and shining out from the mine site more than they had to be. I went to the minister, the Hon. Paul Holloway, and said, 'Can we tone this down a bit?' We managed to get a great outcome that suited the community better. It still suited the mine site for their 24-hour mining program and milling program, and that is what can happen. That is far better than just being the heavy hand of regulation and coming in and going, bang, 'You're not complying with something', but working with authorities to get a mutual outcome that benefits not just the miner but the whole community.

Then we get to shopping trolleys. We have not had a lot of complaint from constituents mainly from Murray Bridge in regard to shopping trolleys, but we have had a few. One of the subjects of contention when I met with the local council recently was about shopping trolleys and how we manage that issue. I think it is just too simple. I do a lot of my shopping at Drakes. I do shop at all the others—Coles, Woolworths and Aldi at times—and we have a great range. The IGA is in town as well. I do not think it is that hard to put the shopping trolleys back in their little corral and move on.

We also have a Big W and a Woolworths, and a bit of a shopping mall in Murray Bridge that has been there for what must be getting close to 15 years. Instead of parking in some of the very extensive parking underneath, some people decide to go across the road next to the newsagent. There is a new bargain shop across the road that was the old Mitre 10. People decide to go across the road, and it is simpler for them to abandon their trolleys. That is not good enough, especially for the newsagent, the Pergolini family—a great operator for many years in the Murray Bridge area—as they have to deal with it. So there has to be some way of making sure these trolleys go back.

Some in the retail sector do not think it should be their body that will face charges or offences and penalties. They think it should be a bit like a theft or an abandonment thing where you can get hold of the individual. I do not think it is not a very easy policy to implement, whichever way it goes, and I know we will be looking at this in committee to go through some of the projected outcomes of where this legislation is going.

In regard to the bill, as we have heard already we had quite a bit of public consultation last year, and the EPA had done a report previously as well. That included recommendations on what to do with the act to get better outcomes. Some principal issues in this bill include the management of shopping trolleys, the installation of air conditioners and exterior lights.

In regard to the installation of air conditioners and external lights, the bill creates an offence in circumstances where a person installs a designated device, an air conditioner or an external light, which results in a local nuisance. This offence is designed to capture the companies and individuals who install the devices who are expected to understand the appropriate placement of them.

It is in the ears or the eyes of the beholder whether people think something is a nuisance so it will be interesting, if this bill becomes law, to see how that is reflected in the community. As I have indicated, not so much in the rural sector but certainly in an urban or town environment, that is where you will have the issues over fences: for instance, where a fence is and whether it needs replacing. This is where someone will be worried about whether that light is overshadowing their property or that air conditioner is making too much noise.

There are defences to the offence of causing a local nuisance, which is good to see; for example, if the person did not foresee and could not reasonably be expected to have foreseen that installation of the device would, when operated, result in local nuisance. I am pleased to see that there is a defence instilled in the legislation, but, again, it is in the eye of the beholder whether it is actually a local nuisance.

There is some concern that the offence may disproportionally impact small businesses and employees. As I indicated, as we experience increasing urban infill—and it is not just urban in the city like Adelaide; it is the town-fill that we get in other towns right across the state—we will certainly be exploring this during the committee stage and will note with interest the discussion as it goes to the committee stage in this house and then goes for more debate in the other place.

In relation to clauses 14 and 15 in regard to the management of shopping trolleys, the most substantive change to the act is the creation of an offence relating to the littering of shopping trolleys. There are various amendments required to create the relevant provisions, along with inserting new provisions which are summarised here: firstly, defining a shopping trolley as litter; secondly, inserting a new section 24A, which will require a retailer—for example, a supermarket, a hardware store, a fruit and veg shop—to mark their trolleys with an identification system such as a label so that the owner of the trolley can be identified.

The insertion of new section 24B creates an obligation on retailers to collect shopping trolleys which have strayed beyond the premises of their business. That is not by their own doing. It is by shoppers who have just decided, 'Oh, well, we will walk home and we will wheel the trolley'—500 metres, a kilometre, however far; it is amazing where you can find these at times. Where causing a hazard, a trolley must be collected immediately after receiving a notification, with a penalty of $10,000 or an expiation fee of $1,000. If a trolley is not creating a hazard, the trolley must be collected within three business days after being notified or becoming aware of the location of the trolley, with a penalty of $5,000 and an expiation fee of $500.

Also as part of the legislative framework in the bill, it creates a framework for councils, under section 30 of the act, to issue a nuisance and litter abatement notice to retailers in relation to the management of shopping trolleys. If a litter abatement notice is issued, the bill is prescriptive about the matters which may be set out in the abatement notice, including that if a geographic area needs to be identified, it will apply to shopping trolleys within one kilometre of the business.

As I said before, the amendments are creating a framework which would penalise the retailer, and this is something that obviously has caused some angst amongst some retailers, whether they be a supermarket, a hardware shop or a fruit and veg shop: the removal of a shopping trolley from the premises of their business by a consumer. That is the sticking point for some owners of businesses, whether they be small, medium or large businesses across South Australia: people are being made liable for individuals who shop at their premises and are extremely loose with the management of a shopping trolley.

The South Australian Independent Retailers have raised concerns about this approach, which sees a trolley defined as litter, noting that they would prefer an approach which sees this behaviour managed as theft of private property. There have been alternative options described here today which would be less heavy-handed, for example, the development of a model by-law that could be used by councils where relevant. There was also talk about the possibility of geofencing, but I understand that would be pretty expensive as well.

The reforms have been prepared in consultation with several councils across the board, with a Local Government Association working group that included representation from a number of councils: Salisbury, Gawler, Norwood Payneham & St Peters, Mitcham, West Torrens, Marion, Playford, and Port Adelaide Enfield—all metropolitan.

As I have said multiple times in my speech here today, the most contentious aspect of this bill is the management of shopping trolleys as litter. I think we have to be very careful how we manage this through the debate. I think the Environment Protection Authority indicated that Coles was the only supermarket that provided formal feedback during the consultation process, and they indicated that they would accept the changes proposed. In contrast, the South Australian Independent Retailers have raised concerns about the impact of the changes relating to shopping trolleys, in particular the precedent that it would set to penalise the owner of the trolley for the littering of the trolley.

For some people it may seem a simple proposition just to put the onus of blame on the retailers. I am not saying someone needs to be held accountable, but I believe the customers should be held accountable as well. I am not sure quite how you would do that, because shopping trolleys

just get abandoned. We have had them abandoned in the driveway of my office in Murray Bridge; abandoned anywhere around the place. Thankfully, I have not seen too many.

I would have thought that shopping centres and hardware stores, etc. would be keen to get their trolleys back, because I understand they are at least about $400 each to produce and you do not have to lose too many shopping trolleys to add up to a significant amount of money. But I can see the retailers will have to have trolley hustlers ready to get out there with a ute and trailer ready to tour the streets of the council areas to retrieve these—and that might be the best outcome for everyone, but it still comes at a cost and the consumer will pay one way or the other.

Certainly, as part of the legislation that we need to look at through the committee debate and in the other place is the so-called nuisance around external lights and air conditioners to make sure that we get the right outcome for the citizens of our state.

Time expired.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

Parliamentary Committees

JOINT PARLIAMENTARY SERVICE COMMITTEE

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Child Protection, Minister for Women and the Prevention of Domestic, Family and Sexual Violence, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (16:03): I move:

That pursuant to section 5(4)(b)(ii) of the Parliament (Joint Services) Act 1985 Mr Batty be appointed the alternate member to the Hon. D.G. Pisoni on the Joint Parliamentary Service Committee in place of Mrs Hurn (resigned).

Motion carried.

Bills

LOCAL NUISANCE AND LITTER CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (16:04): I am pleased to rise to speak on this bill, as I hope it will have a positive impact on my community. The location of my office, right next to Westfield Marion, does mean that I can see out of my office window and there are invariably abandoned trolleys nearby. Unfortunately, if they have been there a long time, they turn into rubbish bins, which nobody wants to touch. Recently, I have been doorknocking in Oaklands Park and the amount of trolleys dumped along the train line is extraordinary. In fact, I was speaking to one woman who counted 42 abandoned trolleys on her walk back to her house one day.

This bill will introduce sensible measures to ensure timely collection and clear identification of trolleys. The changes will benefit the retailer, customer and our general community. The retailer should likely lose fewer trolleys, the customer hopefully have cleaner trolleys and the general community will have an environment free of plastic or metal pollution. The dumping of shopping trolleys is a considerable issue for a number of councils and an issue not unique to South Australia. However, it is timely that we update our laws to remove trolleys from our streets, parks and unfortunately from our waterways.

I note, too, that this bill will apply not only to major supermarkets but to any retail premises that provide them to customers as part of their business. You will often see trolleys provided by hardware stores, liquor stores, office suppliers, pet suppliers and even discount stores. As the minister outlined in her second reading explanation previously, the City of Marion reported collecting more than 230 shopping trolleys around the Westfield Marion and Castle Plaza shopping centres in just four days—a considerable issue to be managed.

This bill strikes a balance between the needs of the retailer and the needs of the community by not placing unreasonable expectations or penalties on retailers, particularly for small business,

while also seeing trolleys removed from the environment in a timely manner, not the significant delay that we often see in some areas.

It can sometimes be hard to identify who is the responsible owner of the trolley, therefore this bill will require a business that provides shopping trolleys to ensure that they are marked or have securely attached to them the trading name of the business, a contact telephone number, email address or QR code that can be used for the reporting of trolleys left in a place outside the business premises.

This provision will require minimal change by retailers, as many do have the trading name on the trolleys and may just need to add contact details so the trolley can be returned if it is abandoned. For existing stocks of trolleys, a weatherproof sticker containing the required information will be sufficient, and for new stock, the information can be incorporated into the branding on the trolley or through the application of such weatherproof stickers.

This bill requires trolleys that are causing a hazard to be collected immediately and the collection of abandoned trolleys that are not causing a safety hazard within three days, this being three business days in recognition of some traders not working seven days a week. For one-site retailers and limited site retailers, such as office suppliers or large liquor retailers, it is easy to identify the source of the trolley. However, for supermarkets and other multisite retailers, the origin of the trolley can be unclear, so the nearest store will be responsible for the removal of the trolley.

Recently, a resident contacted my office about plastic debris from a factory blowing onto a footpath and into the adjacent waterway. While I have been out park running on a Saturday morning along the Sturt River, I have, unfortunately, seen trolleys at the bottom of the river. This bill will hopefully reduce this.

The bill also addresses particular areas of local nuisance, being the installation of an air conditioning unit or an external light. Whilst most properties will have these items installed, they should not affect neighbouring properties. You do not need the hum of an air conditioning unit or the blinding light from a neighbour's security light keeping you awake at night. The sound of an air conditioning unit can provide great stress on people and also, if it is interrupting your sleep, have a great impact on the productiveness of the next day for you.

The bill places the responsibility now on installers of air conditioners and external lights to give due consideration as to the placement of this equipment so that it does not cause local nuisance. Prevention is indeed better than cure. Additionally, this bill inserts a new section 30A, which will allow councils to register a nuisance abatement notice to land. These notices apply controls regarding local nuisance that are caused by fixed equipment such as noisy air conditioners, pool pumps or external lights and will ensure they are applied to new owners of property given the source of the nuisance transcends ownership. This is currently not possible.

I am pleased to see the introduction of a general duty to prevent or minimise litter generated from a business. This duty may be reasonably met through the provision of adequate bins for customers, reduced packaging, or signage advising customers to dispose of their waste properly where litter from customers or product is concerned. We are pleased to hear this. With more business development occurring in the electorate and particularly as we see more small service stations and small fast food retailers coming into our community, we find them at the end of residential streets, and the impact of litter on those can be very detrimental.

Additionally, currently the installation of stormwater management systems such as gross pollutant traps and oil plate separators is often a requirement of development approvals; however, there is no obligation upon businesses to maintain them. That changes under this bill, again protecting our waterways and oceans.

A definition of 'property' will be added in this bill to ensure that bill posting or flyering provisions can be accessed by the owners of car parks where flyers are being posted on vehicles within the car park without the permission of the owner of the car park. Currently the owner of a car park, where much of the litter can end up, has no recourse to stop the practice from occurring.

Councils will, additionally, gain an avenue through this bill to recover costs in situations where they clean up litter because it is a hazard to the community before the identity of the alleged offender

is known and, at a later date, the alleged offender is identified. The current act only allows cost recovery where councils clean up following noncompliance with a litter abatement notice, which provides unnecessary delay if a hazard exists.

Lastly, this bill delivers more efficient processes for assessment and issuing of exemptions and differing expiation amounts for body corporates and natural persons to achieve greater deterrence for businesses that may otherwise absorb expiation fees into the cost of doing business. This bill will put measures in place to improve our environment and public realm, and I commend it to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (16:12): I was deep in conversation on another matter over here, so this will be certainly an ad-libbed one. I rise to support this amendment legislation. It is good that the consultation process that was gone through leading to these amendments was an extensive one. I believe it occurred over a three-month period, and during that time the Local Government Association was heavily involved, as was the EPA, and there was a thorough thrashing out of many of the issues.

As a local member, you are often confronted with some of the issues that have been raised here. I will get onto trolleys later. It is actually in Brocky's electorate—the member for Stuart's electorate—where trolleys central exists. But we share Port Augusta, and whatever happens in the seat of Stuart in Port Augusta has an impact on the seat of Giles in Port Augusta. These are two areas that work well together, and when we have a problem it is a problem shared, so we do try to work to address it. I will get onto trolleys later.

One of the good things about the amendments is that there has been a clear delineation between the Liquor Licensing Act and the responsibilities that come under that act and what it is that local government needs to do. Under the Liquor Licensing Act it is those issues that are to do with alcohol, patronage and entertainment, and the noise arising quite rightly comes under that particular act, while the other nuisance issues that might be generated by hotels come under this bill, making it clear it is the local council that is essentially responsible.

When we look at the amendment bill, a number of things are covered. There are reforms across numerous aspects of the act, and that is good because it did need a bit of an overhaul. There are more efficient processes for the assessment and issuing of exemptions, increased expiation fees to improve deterrence and the inclusion of an offence to install an air conditioner or light in a place where it causes a local nuisance. I have on occasions had to address some of these issues as a member.

There is a general duty for business owners to prevent or minimise litter resulting from their business, including from stormwater management systems, and I think that is something incredibly important. There are improved cost recovery mechanisms for local government because they should not be out of pocket for some of the things that they have to do. There is improved delineation of the responsibility between councils and the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner for the regulation of different types of nuisance occurring on premises licensed under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, and there are provisions to improve the management and collection of abandoned shopping trolleys.

The approach being taken is to find compromises and not be overly heavy-handed when it comes to the issuing of fines and the more heavy-duty punitive approaches. It is about working through some of the issues to find a better solution. On that issue about air conditioning and lighting, as time goes on and, as it says in the consultation paper, as peak bodies and others are consulted and as the information feeds down, there will be more awareness and sensitivity about where you put an air conditioner, especially a large system, and where you put lighting.

I have some pet issues when it comes to lighting, so I will warn you I am going off on a tangent here. This is not covered by this bill; it is a tangent, and it is about lighting in general in urban areas. It can be a nuisance if not properly designed. A lot of the lighting we now have in urban areas is wasted. It just spills over. It is not appropriately directed. We do have the technology when it comes to streetlights and other ways of doing stuff at the moment to address some of these problems.

One of the impacts of not addressing these problems across urban areas is that kids these days—I know when I was kid when we first came out to Australia, we used to be out there on the lawn because we had no air conditioning, and we used to be able to watch the firmament above us,

the Milky Way. It was just amazing. How many people were turned into cosmologists because of that experience I do not know, but it always left you with a sense of amazement.

Back in those days, I know in Whyalla—I am not sure about in other communities—at about 1 o'clock in the morning, all the streetlights would be turned off, so the exposure to the stars and the Milky Way was even greater. When I was on council, I raised this as an issue. Maybe we could go back to those days when people talked about policing, offending and what have you (I did say this was a tangent). In the data I saw, there was very little difference in offending between areas with streetlighting in place and areas with the streetlighting turned off. As I said, that is a tangent, but I think we do need to take into account light pollution and the way it impacts our appreciation of this vast universe that we live in.

This is one of my pet issues: I went around Whyalla a couple of years ago, taking pictures of trolleys in all sorts of locations. I had a chat to the supermarkets and the council about the issue at the time. There are some sensible changes here when it comes to trolleys. The big operators already identify their trolleys, usually across the handle. I know that both Coles and Woolworths in the communities I represent do so.

I guess what is being done here is that we have exempted the smaller businesses. We put some responsibility back on to the big businesses but done in a way that is not overly onerous. So if a shopping trolley is deemed to be hazardous—and I think it has already been said, 'Well, what is the definition around what is deemed to be hazardous?' It is often the application of common sense, in my view. If there is a trolley on a road or it could be another location, that has to be removed within 24 hours. For trolleys that are not in that position, there are up to three days to remove that trolley.

I was up in Alice Springs a couple of years ago, driving from there onto the APY lands. While in Alice Springs, I had the opportunity to go to a supermarket and my car was not parked in the car park. I put some stuff in the trolley for this trip and I went to push it out beyond the car park and the wheels locked up. It would be good to see the big operators over time move to geofencing and some have GPS trackers on trolleys. But that whole approach to geofencing I think makes some sense. Admittedly, it is a more expensive system, but the loss of trolleys adds up to a lot of money, time, energy and cash if you do not retrieve them, or if you do get them back they might be in a damaged state.

It is good to see that we are moving in the right direction. As I said, up in Port Augusta, it was a particular set of circumstances because you had the shopping district, the main street, you had Big W and you had Woolworths all very close to the historic wharf area. The wharf is closed off, disappointingly, at the moment because it needs a lot of money spent on it to get it safely back in place, and it is important that that is ultimately done because it is an important part of the community's heritage and it is also potentially a very important recreational and other resource for that community.

Having said that, because the shopping areas in the main were very close to the wharf, a lot of people would wander over to the wharf, get their gear—I am not quite sure why they were doing this—and then over the trolley would go. People have referred to the fact that they had to get divers in at a cost of $15,000 just to recover these trolleys. I think there were 500 trolleys in total. I do not know whether in time that would have turned into a great snapper drop. I doubt it. There are plenty of snapper drops through the gulf. But this was a real loss and it was a particular set of circumstances that led to that particular outcome.

Now, whether this bill is going to address that—because there are some very particular sets of circumstances in Port Augusta that in combination with a number of factors lead to these trolleys being taken and dumped, not just in the sea but all around the community. Indeed, we get that in Whyalla as well. You look at the trolleys and they are nearly always trolleys from Woolies and Coles and from the one-stop shopping centre. The Foodland in the eastern part has very few of their trolleys go missing, so that is a good thing for them and the community around about.

As to some of the costings that have been done, especially interstate where a far more punitive approach has now been taken to supermarkets because of costs, we are talking about in the millions of dollars. I think one figure was that the cost in New South Wales that was imposed upon councils as a result of trolleys going awry was something like $17 million. So we are not talking about a minor amount of money here when it comes to, obviously, a far bigger city, when it comes

to looking at places like Sydney and other big centres in New South Wales. We do need to move to address and diminish as much as we can the issue in this state.

The other one that has come up and has been an issue on and off—and I like to see development in our cities; it is good to have development—is that sometimes on those sites there is waste, there is litter that has been generated, often by the companies on those sites, which is disappointing. So it is good that this is also addressed in this bill.

I know in Port Augusta, and to a greater degree in Whyalla, once again because of a number of particular factors, a lot of litter is being generated in a number of areas. Sometimes that is because groups of people are sleeping rough, and unfortunately the households nearby then cop all of this rubbish, some of it of a disturbing nature. I just had a meeting at lunchtime today about some of these issues in Whyalla and Port Augusta that as a community we need to be on top of so that they do not become normalised.

This is, I think, a worthwhile series of amendments to the bill. It is always good to get the feedback from the Local Government Association. They gave good marks for the consultation process and, indeed, there were a whole bunch of individuals who also responded. I do not have the number in front of me—I think there might have been 47 submissions or thereabouts, so not a bad effort. A lot of them came from the metropolitan area, but I do notice that the Whyalla city council, which has a few issues, as I said, responded, and I think the Port Augusta council, which has even more issues, also responded. It is a step forward and, like any legislation, you watch to see what the real world impact is going to be.

I think it was the member for Bragg who spoke about sometimes regulatory overload on small businesses. I am sometimes a fan of regulation. I think it is incredibly important for a well ordered and civilised society that wants to have good outcomes, but sometimes we do need to review the nature of the regulatory approaches that might well have been in place for quite a few years for a particular reason but have outlived their usefulness.

I think there always needs to be that degree of common sense applied, especially when we are looking at small businesses when it comes to the regulatory environment. You do not want to overload companies. I do have some small businesses come to me where I think some of the regulations and some of the elements of acts have failed the commonsense test, where a small business is expected to undertake activities that large businesses have people employed specifically to do that.

I had one example the other day—and once again this is a bit of a tangent, but it is about regulatory environments—of a mechanic who has operated his business for 35 years without any incident. He does not employ anyone; he is self-employed, and the audit that he had done the other day is totally stressing him out, and the series of fines and needing to replace equipment that has worked well for many years are just the sorts of things that could send a small business to the wall. I think in that particular instance, common sense has not been applied. However, in relation to this bill, overall it is a good bill. It reflects the consultation that occurred and I hope that it does lead to some improvements.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (16:29): I, too, rise in support of the Local Nuisance and Litter Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2024, a piece of legislation that I know will be well received in my electorate of Davenport. I say that because the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act is a piece of legislation that I hear referred to by its full name when I am out and about in my community, which does not happen very often.

I am fortunate to live in and represent a South Australian community that encompasses the best of the Adelaide Hills whilst being just 20 minutes from the city. With walking trails and wineries, we have beautiful views of the CBD across the Happy Valley Reservoir. Just down the road, we have residents in Seacombe Heights and Darlington living just minutes from the beach. We are lucky to live where we live and, overwhelmingly, the people who live where I live work to protect what we have because they know how good it is.

But the saying tells us that one bad apple can spoil a bunch. In order to protect what we have worked so hard to build and maintain, we need laws that draw a clear line in the sand. These changes

to the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act do just that. Thankfully, they are changes already endorsed by South Australians. We know that because South Australians have spoken up across what was an extensive consultation period, so thank you to all those who participated.

What do these changes look like? This bill's reforms are wide-reaching and will deliver more efficient assessments and exemptions, a new expiation scheme designed to deter businesses from incurring penalties as a cost of doing trade, and clarification for councils where disposal of illegally dumped goods is concerned, and more. Let's start with trolleys, though. Living in proximity to the Aberfoyle Hub Shopping Centre, trolleys have proven a significant and longstanding pain point for my community. I know they have been the bane of the City of Onkaparinga for some time as well.

My electorate also encompasses pockets of the City of Marion, which has long grappled with trolley dumping in suburbs surrounding the Westfield shopping centre. It should come as no surprise, then, that it is not just individuals calling for change but councils too. In fact, trolley reforms were unanimously supported in council submissions during the two-stage community consultation period, resulting in the proposed insertion of new sections 24A and 24B into the act. Clearly, then, efforts to improve trolley owner identification engagement with retailers, including Coles, Woolworths, Bunnings, IGA and more, are a step in the right direction.

These new sections stipulate that an abandoned trolley must be collected within 72 hours, with responsibility for collection resting with the owner's nearest store. Abandoned trolleys that present a safety hazard, on the other hand, must be collected immediately. As I mentioned earlier, while abandoned trolleys present a serious frustration to local government, our councils are genuinely proactive in this space, and I would like to thank them for their efforts. I know they receive hundreds of calls weekly about abandoned trolleys, and they then have to take on that challenge to ensure that they find their home.

While we are talking about shopping trolleys and shopping centres, it would be remiss of me not to mention the Aberfoyle Hub Shopping Centre. As I mentioned, this bill seeks to clamp down on body corporates that view penalties as a cost of doing business. These are businesses that cast aside their corporate responsibilities and instead choose to pay a fine because to them that is easier than implementing long-term community-centric solutions. It is lazy, it is irresponsible, and while it is a vast minority of businesses that display these behaviours it just cannot be tolerated any longer. That is why amendments in section 18 of the act propose increased penalties for body corporates operating in breach of the legislation.

The Aberfoyle Hub Shopping Centre is home to several small local businesses. There is Michael at the Hub shoe repairs, John at the award-winning Hub Fruit Bowl, the Roka family at The Hub Tandoor, and there is a Hub cafe and so many others. Each of these businesses takes immense pride in their work and in their community and they deserve a centre owner that shares this commitment to its customers. Unfortunately, though, that is not always the case.

In 2024, the Aberfoyle Hub Shopping Centre does not have a recycling bin. Instead, it has four industrial rubbish bins. Despite my advocacy and that of many members of my community, management will not facilitate the removal of just one of those skip bins and have it replaced with a recycling bin. Instead, what we see is business owners searching desperately for alternatives or begrudgingly disposing of easily recyclable materials in a bin that is headed for landfill. This is plainly unacceptable, but protests to date have unfortunately fallen on deaf ears. It is not the only problem either. Bins around the centre can at times be spied overflowing, impacting on the nearby Happy Valley Sports Park and walking trails along Happy Valley Drive and in Sauerbier Creek.

With regard to the creek, I would like to also point out we have an OTR and a high school next door, and most of the kids will frequent the OTR after school for a slushy. Those slushy cups are everywhere around my community, and we have regular people who work hard to collect rubbish and try to keep our community clean. You could go any day of the week to Sauerbier Creek and find slushy cups and trolleys, in fact, becoming their own filtration in the creek, because there is just so much waste that you cannot get on top of it.

That is exactly why this bill provides a general duty for owners to prevent or minimise any litter resulting directly from their operations. New section 21A establishes a general duty to prevent or minimise litter generated from a business. This duty can be upheld through the provision of

adequate bins for customers—it is not that difficult—reduced packaging or signage advising of where waste can be properly disposed of. These are simple and easy things that businesses can do to prevent unnecessary waste in our community and unnecessary waste going to landfill. It is not a tall order and, if you are not willing to meet reasonable community expectations, you can expect this government to take appropriate action.

Alongside new section 21A, the new section 22A provides councils an avenue to recover costs for clearing litter that presents a hazard to the community, because ratepayers should not take the hit when a business fails to uphold its social and environmental responsibilities. To the vast majority of businesses and families living in my electorate and right across the state, thank you; your efforts do not go unnoticed, and we will not allow the uncompliant minority to drag you down.

It is my hope that the new and improved definitions, more appropriately weighted penalties and the streamlining of dated processes will see our environment and our suburbs thrive. We have so much to be thankful for, living here in South Australia, and this legislation will protect all that makes our state such a wonder. I commend this bill to the house.

Mr BROWN (Florey) (16:36): The Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act addresses an area of law that may not immediately seem particularly exciting to many people in our community, but each of the various matters that are the subject of its provisions can have a significant impact on people's lives and daily experiences as well as on our environment and ecosystems. Indeed, they can create financial impacts in various ways.

When you get into the substance of this legislation, I think most South Australians would find that in fact there is a lot that bears relevance to their daily lives and their concerns, and that herein there is actually a good deal to care about. The act, which passed the parliament in 2016 and commenced in full on 1 July 2017, aimed to modernise nuisance and litter laws in our state as well as to resolve confusion within our community about the distribution of state and local government responsibilities, and a differentiation of roles in relation to local nuisance and littering issues.

Following a full year of operation, a review of the legislation was initiated. The Environment Protection Authority identified refinements and improvements that they suggested would better enable the act to support councils to deliver on the act's objectives. A discussion paper was prepared in collaboration with the Local Government Association of South Australia and was released in July 2019 for a three-month consultation period during which 47 submissions were received.

Following the consideration of all submissions, the consultation report was published on the Environment Protection Authority website in February 2021 and includes several recommendations to improve the legislation. Among those recommendations were:

- to clearly delineate that the regulation of nuisance under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 on licensed premises is limited to nuisances associated with the service of alcohol, including patron and entertainment noise, and that all other nuisances from these premises, such as noisy air conditioners, are regulated by the local Nuisance and Litter Control Act;
- to ensure that the act applies to the construction stage of developments approved under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016;
- to include light as an agent of local nuisance;
- to clarify the application of the act to tenanted properties; and
- my personal favourite recommendation: to add shopping trolleys to the definition of general litter and provide councils with strengthened powers to address trolley abandonment, whether through improvements to litter abatement notices or by other means.

Between October 2022 and February 2023 a draft amendment bill and two sets of draft regulations were released, along with an explanatory report. These were open for a consultation period lasting four months. The program of consultation was promoted widely and incorporated a public meeting, which stakeholders, who had been previously engaged on these matters, were directly invited to

attend, as well as a meeting with local government representatives which was hosted by the Local Government Association.

A total of 38 submissions were received during the consultation phase. Consideration of those submissions is now complete and the responses to the submissions made during the consultation on the draft amendment bill and draft regulations have been compiled into a report that is listed on the EPA's website. I understand that the EPA engaged with the local government association throughout the review process to ensure the needs and views of councils were heard, given their primary role in its administration. The CEO of the Local Government Association, Clinton Jury, was complimentary of the extent of the South Australian's government engagement with the local government sector and its peak body during the review, as well as the development of the proposed reforms.

The amendment bill now before us offers reforms across a number of aspects of the act, including streamlined processes for the assessment and issuing of exemptions; increased expiation fees to strengthen deterrence; a new offence of installing an air conditioner or a light in a place where it causes local nuisance; the addition of a general duty on the part of business owners to prevent or minimise litter arising from their undertakings; improved cost-recovery mechanisms for local government; clearer delineation of responsibility between local government entities and the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner for the regulation of different types of nuisances that occur on premises that are licensed under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997; and improvements in the provisions for the management and collection of abandoned shopping trolleys.

I note again that this last aspect of reform may hold particular interest for many members, but I know it has particular interest in my electorate and I regard these reforms as the most substantive among those that are included in the amendment bill. Just as an aside, having a significant shopping centre near residential areas in my electorate does mean that shopping trolleys are a regular hazard. Anyone who has spent a significant amount of time in my community of Mawson Lakes knows that shopping trolleys are routinely left either in our streets or near the creek that runs through the area, and they are often uncovered during our regular Clean Up Day in Mawson Lakes we hold annually.

Abandoned trolleys may present a safety hazard for pedestrians when they block footpaths, whether that is around shopping centres or around the broader residential areas of the community. These hazards can have a disproportionate impact on the elderly; persons with mobility challenges and people who are, for example, manoeuvring prams or mobility scooters as they move about their communities. Abandoned shopping trolleys impact upon local amenity, both as an obstacle to be avoided and as a significant eyesore, particularly when we see them dumped in our local parks and our waterways.

All varieties of litter can potentially affect our daily experiences in these ways, but shopping trolleys create a particular impact, both visually and practically because of their size. They are a very visually significant form of litter and their environmental impact can also be quite considerable. Recovering abandoned and dumped trolleys can also be a costly exercise.

This is by no means a phenomenon limited to my electorate, or even to Adelaide's northern suburbs. We know that it happens right across the nation and I think most probably the practice of dumping trolleys can be observed, albeit with greatly varying frequency, in every part of the nation wherein people have access to shopping trolleys. Unfortunately, however, it is the typical experience of people in my community that abandoned shopping trolleys are quite ubiquitous in our part of the world. The strengthening of laws in this area that leads to effective mitigation of the practice has the potential to make a real difference to the communities in my electorate.

Indeed, this issue is consistently raised with me by members of the community as an area that would benefit from greater intervention by government in terms of strengthened mechanisms in our laws to address and mitigate the phenomenon. It is advantageous that the local government sector in South Australia quite reasonably shares the state government's desire to improve legislation that aims to reduce the practice of dumping shopping trolleys. In fact, so great is the interest of local government that we saw a shopping trolley summit event hosted by the City of Marion in July 2018.

Engagement during the process of reviewing the act and developing the amendments now before us was high and consistent across many councils, and that level of engagement was helpful and needs to be commended. The Malinauskas Labor government has listened to the concerns put forward by local government, and importantly has also considered the views put forward by retailers in these matters. We take the position that the proposed reforms included in this amendment bill are balanced in their approach and support local government's activities in this area, whilst also not penalising retailers for the actions of their customers. In fact, it is true to say that the reforms aim to support cooperation between local government and retailers to reduce the practice of abandoning shopping trolleys and to facilitate easier recovery of dumped trolleys.

It is important that the mechanisms for such an effort come from legislation at the state government level. As per the consultation feedback summary in the EPA's consultation report on the review of the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016, our local government sector broadly agrees:

> The majority of councils consider the current provisions for the management of abandoned trolleys in the LNLC Act are ineffective and statewide provisions were preferable to implementing council bylaws.

If councils were each to undertake their own individual efforts through the making of by-laws that would apply and operate across their respective council areas, it would have the effect of creating a patchwork of different requirements and practices across the state. So it is greatly preferable to have a single, consistent framework that is enshrined in law at the state level.

Other states and territories across the nation, all of whom experience this issue, have laws in place to address it. It is worth considering what elements they incorporate. Local laws similar to the South Australian by-laws in Victoria, Western Australia and Queensland include: offences for a retailer to allow shopping trolleys outside designated precincts unless they have a trolley containment system in place, such as coin lock or geofencing; powers to impound shopping trolleys and charge a fee to retailers for their release; and an offence for failing to recover an abandoned shopping trolley within 24 hours of being notified.

The Australian Capital Territory has a scheme in place to manage abandoned shopping trolleys, but it must be clarified that the ACT government itself provides all services that are otherwise within the remit of local government. There are no local councils in the ACT. In any other jurisdiction, the programs that are in place would instead be administered by local government. It should be noted, however, that the ACT scheme includes:

- offences for the removal of trolleys from shopping centres;
- requirements for signage;
- requirements for the identification of shopping trolleys;
- requirements for retailers to keep shopping trolleys on the premises, with an exemption from this requirement where a trolley containment system is in place, such as a coin lock or geofencing; and
- impoundment of abandoned shopping trolleys, with a payment of fees for their release.

In New South Wales, the Public Spaces (Unattended Property) Act 2021 includes:

- an offence for the abandonment of shopping trolleys;
- provisions to allow councils to impound shopping trolleys found in public places, with a fee to be paid by retailers for their release; and
- provisions that councils may require shopping trolleys to be collected by retailers within a period of no less than 14 days, and failure to do so is an offence.

Local Government NSW estimates that, prior to the current laws being introduced in late 2021, the collection of abandoned shopping trolleys was costing local councils $17 million per year, and these costs were of course passed on to ratepayers. The analogous cost figure in South Australia is naturally a lesser sum, but it is certainly the case that for among the larger metropolitan councils there are significant costs incurred—and they, too, are passed along to ratepayers.

The amendments that are before us aim to provide councils with sensible tools that can only be applied to retailers on a case-by-case basis where there is an issue, as opposed to a blanket requirement for all retailers. The provisions of these amendments will enable local councils to work collaboratively with retailers to reduce the practice through improved and strengthened management practices, rather than to set out a direct punitive approach wherein we see retailers being fined for the actions of their customers.

It is well worth mentioning that engagement with major retailers, including Foodland, Woolworths, Coles and the Australian Retailers Association, as well as with smaller retailers, was undertaken during the consultation on the draft amendment bill. I think it is an accurate representation to say that the proposed amendments are broadly considered by retailers to offer a reasonable compromise position.

In line with views put forward by the Small Business Commissioner, a threshold of 20 shopping trolleys has been included, which will mean that councils will not be able to require the development of a management plan by retailers under this threshold.

Most of the proposed amendments will serve to strengthen clarity on the application of the act to shopping trolleys. For example, while shopping trolleys fall within the definition of general litter under the existing act, the amendment bill will specifically include shopping trolleys under the definition. By way of another example, the legislation's provisions in relation to litter abatement can already be applied to retailers regarding shopping trolley abandonment but will now include better guidance on how they can be applied to trolleys.

New provisions will require the identification of shopping trolleys, as well as for them to be collected in a timely fashion once the retailers to whom they belong have been notified. It is the case that many retailers already meet the identification requirement with branding of their trolleys, but for those that do not this could be simply achieved by updating, for example, the branding element on shopping trolley handles.

Expiation sums in relation to trolley-related issues are proposed to differ for body corporates and individuals, and are proposed to achieve greater deterrence for businesses that may otherwise absorb expiation fees into the cost of doing business. This reform was proposed by the Small Business Commissioner.

There are a range of other provisions, thoroughly outlined by the Deputy Premier in her second reading contribution as the responsible minister, that together aim to strengthen arrangements in relation to the powers and abilities of local councils and promote clarity in the responsibilities of both retailers and councils in relation to trolleys. This is along with a number of other elements aimed at improving the clarity, scope and effectiveness of our laws in relation to various types of nuisance as well as various types of litter.

To echo an observation of the Deputy Premier in her second reading contribution, the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act is ultimately an act for local government. It is therefore appropriate that local government was engaged and consulted very substantially in the development of these amendments. It is also notable that little of the substance of these amendments represents a dramatic change to the act as it now stands. It is more the case that modest improvements to the legislation have been identified and broadly agreed, with the aim of offering better potential for local councils to be effective in their efforts in relation to the management of nuisance and litter.

I commend all who were willing to engage in consultation, including the EPA, local councils, retailers and other stakeholders. It is the government's intention that these reforms effectively address genuine identified needs, and that once in operation these amendments will have the intended effects and make many matters easier and better for local councils and for our community. I commend the bill to the house.

Ms CLANCY (Elder) (16:51): I rise today to support the Local Nuisance and Litter Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2024, which seeks to amend the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act 2016 and the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. As you can tell, I am pretty excited. It is a very, very good piece of legislation.

Introduced by the previous state Labor government, the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act modernised our nuisance and litter laws, supporting local government to address matters of nuisance and litter. Eight years on, the bill before us today seeks to introduce further reform to ensure these laws continue to best serve our communities.

One of the most popular reforms proposed contained herein is the inclusion of light as an agent of local nuisance. Like many in this place, my electorate is experiencing high levels of development and growth in both the residential housing and commercial business sectors, with large family blocks frequently being subdivided into two, three, or sometimes even four new residences. This is obviously great news for those looking to move into our community, and while we know that more housing supply will make housing more accessible for more South Australians, we must also ensure that growth and development supports our established communities.

Ideally, new development would provide a mix of single family homes, townhouses and units for our increasingly diverse communities. Young families, those who wish to age in place, and those who rent all form the social mix we think about when considering how our suburbs will change to accommodate our ever-increasing community needs.

Along with residential development, my electorate is also seeing an increase in commercial investment, and new childcare centres have begun popping up throughout our suburbs. These new developments are partly due to changes within the South Australian planning code and partly due to an increasing willingness by local councils to approve planning applications for childcare centres within residential areas. These new childcare centre developments of course need lighting, and developers rarely consider how lighting placement will impact nearby neighbours.

Last year, I was contacted by local residents whose lives had been interrupted by the placement of a high-wattage security light attached to the facade of a childcare centre in my electorate. The lights switched on at the slightest movement, 24 hours a day, and shone directly into their homes, both across the street and directly next door. One of those neighbours was a midwife, among other shift workers, who deserved and needed a good sleep in between shifts.

To be clear, this is not an ordinary light; this is the kind of light that streams through the tiny gaps surrounding blockout shutters and momentarily blinds drivers backing out of their driveways. Businesses and centres can have security that does not reduce the ability of neighbours to enjoy their own premises and safely exit their driveways in vehicles.

When I contacted the local council to see what could be done, I was informed that light nuisance is not an offence and the best they could do was ask the childcare centre to redirect it away from adjoining properties. So I contacted the childcare centre. When I contacted them, I was frustratingly advised that the lighting system was controlled by head office in Brisbane and that all staff could do was continue to make requests that the light be redirected. This back and forth went on for months and months.

Lighting can and does become a problem amongst residential neighbours as well. I have been contacted many times regarding the positioning of a neighbour's security cameras, an issue for SA Police in most instances, when people feel their privacy is violated by the direction of video recording equipment. This can be a particularly emotive issue for parents with young children, who rightly worry about the privacy of their families.

I have also witnessed security camera set-ups that include motion sensor lighting, lighting that is bright enough that people cannot leave their windows open at night or sleep due to the glare. I have spoken to residents who cannot reverse safely out of their own driveways due to a neighbour's motion sensor lighting system. I have spoken to a woman who has the entire side of her house lit up 24 hours a day due to her neighbour's high-wattage security lighting system.

As we live and work in closer proximity to one another, and as we see more and more commercial enterprises entering our suburbs, councils need to have options open to them to define and issue abatement notices for light nuisance. Up until now, all councils and SA Police have been able to do in these extreme instances of light nuisance is ask politely that the offending light be redirected. I, and so many in my community, are happy these reforms will change that.

Our government, in cooperation with the Environment Protection Authority, has spent a considerable amount of time identifying how our Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act can be improved to provide better outcomes for our community. A total of 47 submissions were received on the proposed amendments. I would particularly like to thank the City of Mitcham, that represents a large proportion of my electorate, for putting in one of those submissions.

I do not think that council staff will mind me sharing their forthcomingness with me in their desire to have light, in particular, included in the list of local nuisances, over which local government has jurisdiction to investigate and enforce. As a result of feedback received by both local governments and members of the public, light is proposed to be introduced as an agent of local nuisance. The intent of this amendment is to allow local government to deal with issues of light nuisance that may be reasonably avoided.

The Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act defines light as causing a nuisance where the light travels from one place to another and an authorised officer determines that the nature, colour, location, direction or extent of light is such as to constitute an unreasonable interference with the enjoyment of neighbouring premises by persons occupying those premises. Councils are already expending their resources in administration and investigation costs. This inclusion will allow council staff to issue a nuisance abatement notice and expiation fee for light nuisance, which will go some way to cover their own costs and act as a future deterrent.

The amendment of section 18 of the act amends the term 'natural person' to 'individual' and provides consistency with the Legislation Interpretation Act 2021 and amends the expiation fee to $1,000 in the case of a body corporate and $500 in the case of an individual. This reflects reforms across legislation to have higher expiations for bodies corporate in order to provide a greater level of deterrence from offending and to reduce the prevalence of the practice of bodies corporate just absorbing expiations into the cost of doing business.

A commercial childcare company based interstate, with minimal motivation to work productively with neighbouring residents on light nuisance issues, may indeed find a way to make sure their lighting is compliant when the expiation fees from council arrive in their inbox.

Additionally, it is proposed that the insertion of new section 30A will allow councils to register a nuisance abatement notice to land rather than the property owner. Councils have identified that the change of ownership of a property with a problematic light fixture or other nuisance device within an abatement notice is not able to be transferred to the new owner of the property and therefore a new regulatory process would need to be undertaken. This amendment ensures nuisance abatement notices that apply to controls regarding local nuisance caused by fixed equipment, such as light towers, are applied to new owners of the property, given the source of the nuisance transcends ownership. The registration of these notices will also ensure that the controls in place are made transparent through the land transaction process.

In a practical sense this means, for example, that when a residential or commercial property owner is issued with a nuisance abatement notice for excessive light it is not just the individual that must comply with the notice. Rather, the notice is attached to the land, and compliance is the responsibility of whoever is the owner at that particular time. My constituents currently living adjacent to and opposite the childcare centre I spoke of earlier will not have to worry about going through the nuisance abatement notice process repeatedly with council if and when the childcare business changes hands in the future.

The inclusion of light as an agent of local nuisance may sound like an esoteric addition to the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act, but from experience in my electorate I know that it will make a positive difference in our community by clearly defining what is acceptable when it comes to residential and commercial spaces. This amendment will give residents and councils a clear pathway forward to navigate what is becoming a more common problem across our suburbs.

The bill before us today also seeks to address the considerable issue of the dumping of shopping trolleys, which my community, particularly surrounding Castle Plaza shopping centre, is not immune to. These reforms include a new clause which sets out the obligation for identification of trolleys, a necessary step to ensure that members of the public and councils can identify and therefore contact the business that has supplied the trolley for their customers' usage. I would say

that most large retailers already do this, and I do not see the new obligation as necessarily onerous for smaller businesses: a small weatherproof sticker is all that is required.

More importantly, however, is the new clause that sets out the requirement for timely collection of abandoned trolleys. You may be surprised to hear that my office was recently contacted about a collection of 19 abandoned Aldi trolleys behind Southern Sleep on South Road. The person who called my office had contacted both the Clovelly Park Aldi and Marion council; however, over the previous few months nothing had been done to remove the pile.

When my office called Southern Sleep on Monday to check if the trolleys had been collected yet, we learned from staff that there are now 20 trolleys dumped behind the shop. As yet, Aldi has not responded to my email requesting the removal of the trolleys. I sincerely believe that subsections (1) and (2) of 24B will go a long way to improve the time taken by retailers to collect their dumped property.

The collection of trolleys not causing a hazard within three business days is entirely reasonable, especially for large retailers who already have strategies in place to manage large numbers of trolleys on their premises. With regard to Clovelly Park Aldi, I hope they can manage to collect the 20 abandoned trolleys from behind the Southern Sleep business prior to the amendment taking effect, or they will risk a maximum expiation fee of $5,000.

I know that many in my community will be excited by the changes in this bill to the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act, and I am genuinely really excited to commend this to the house.

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (17:03): I rise to speak in support of this bill. The reforms contained in this bill have been in the works for many years. Since its commencement in 2017 we have gathered information and feedback from members of our local communities and stakeholders across the state. The Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act clearly defines state and local government roles and responsibilities regarding local nuisance concerns and littering issues. This legislation determines that the local council is the principal authority.

The act was first reviewed in 2019, and a discussion paper was released with the aim to seek feedback on the operation of the legislation. The Minister for Environment and the relevant agency, the Environment Protection Authority, were seeking this feedback to determine the scope for any future reforms. Upon reviewing the legislation, the Environment Protection Authority identified ways in which the act and regulations could be adjusted to further assist councils regarding nuisance and littering matters.

With assistance from the Local Government Association, the discussion paper was released for consultation for a three-month period, and a total of 47 submissions were received. These submissions were collated by the Environment Protection Authority, and several recommendations were put forward for consideration. These recommendations included:

- clearly define the regulation of nuisance related to the service of alcohol on licensed premises under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997 and all other nuisance regulated by the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act;
- ensure that the act applies to the construction stage of developments approved under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016;
- include light as an agent of local nuisance;
- add shopping trolleys to the definition of 'general litter' and provide councils with further powers to reduce excessive trolley abandonment, whether through improvements to litter abatement notices or by other means; and
- clarify the application of the act to tenanted properties.

These recommendations assisted in shaping the draft bill and two sets of draft regulations during 2022 and 2023. The consultation program for the bill and regulations was thorough and extensive. There was a meeting hosted by the Local Government Association for local government representatives and a public meeting with previously engaged stakeholders. I understand the stakeholders the Environment Protection Authority reached out to included Target, Big W and Kmart;

IKEA; Coles, Woolworths and Aldi; IGA, Foodland and Drakes; Cheap as Chips; Bunnings and Mitre 10; Officeworks; and SA Independent Retailers, the National Retail Association and the Australian Retailers Association.

Consultation advertising also took place in *The Advertiser*, on the EPA website, social media, talkback radio and in community newspapers. In this round of consultation, 38 submissions were received, which I understand largely related to shopping trolley reforms. I know shopping trolley reforms are something local communities across our state have been pushing for. They can really be an extensive nuisance in our local communities. I know there is one particular abandoned trolley that has almost become a permanent fixture near a local school in my community, so I am looking forward to seeing less of that in the future thanks to this legislation.

This legislation truly covers so many aspects of our day-to-day lives. In my community, with the arrival of many more apartment blocks in the city, local residents are now faced with ground floor mixed-used space—for instance, a cafe or restaurant on the bottom floor of their apartment building—and with that can come challenges. Obviously, these kinds of mixed-use developments add increased vibrancy to an area. They improve access to services, cafes or restaurants for locals, but they also have some other challenges that come with them, whether that is through noise, odour or strata corporation dealings.

It is great to see that these reforms are aimed at clearly defining the responsibility between councils and the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner when it comes to regulating the different types of nuisances that may come up in matters relating to apartment building scenarios and how it can float between the two. This amendment bill also seeks to reform the act by including improved cost recovery mechanisms for local government, more efficient processes for the assessment and issuing of exemptions and the addition of a general duty for business owners to prevent or minimise litter from their business.

Further reforms include provisions to improve the management of and collection of shopping trolleys that are abandoned, clarifications around the application of the Unclaimed Goods Act and the disposal of illegally dumped items, and the inclusion of installing an air conditioner or light as an offence if it causes a local nuisance as defined in the act. By a reform proposed by the Small Business Commissioner, this legislation also seeks a greater deterrence for businesses by offering different expiation amounts for body corporates and regular people. Businesses may otherwise absorb expiation fees into the cost of running their business and take no notice.

I would like to acknowledge all the efforts of the Deputy Premier and the Environment Protection Authority in getting these reforms to the house. I also want to take this opportunity to thank my local council, the City of Prospect, in relation to a matter that is in many ways a little bit similar to the aims of this act, and that is in regard to two abandoned Caltex service stations that we had in our community on Main North Road and North East Road. I understand they were previously service stations that had been closed down and then left. There were flimsy fences that were always falling down, weeds were piling up and there was graffiti.

At one point a local resident contacted me to say that he had strangers jumping up on top of the abandoned building and peering into their yard. So I want to thank the work of our local council. We were able to appeal to the companies to do something about those sites and we are really pleased now to see construction underway to dismantle and remediate those two sites that really were eyesores on our local community and were able to potentially attract antisocial behaviour. At the very least, they looked terrible.

We do know that our local councils do a lot of work in our community to clean up our community, to make our communities as wonderful as they are, and in this particular instance I do want to thank the City of Prospect for working with me on this particular issue to see these sites dismantled. They will hopefully go up for sale to be sold and have something much better on the sites. With those comments, I commend this bill to the house.

Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (17:10): I rise in support of the Local Nuisance and Litter Control (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. I thank everybody who has been involved in the extensive consultation. It is so important that we do all we can to try to make sure that there is not just stuff lying around the place. The fact that trolleys can just be dumped and nobody seems to want to take

responsibility really needs to be addressed. It is against the act to litter but we do not see the penalties being strong enough and so there is not much of a deterrent.

The amendment bill that we are here today to discuss includes reforms across numerous aspects of the act. These include:

- more efficient processes for the assessment and issuing of exemptions;
- increased expiation fees to improve deterrence;
- the inclusion of an offence to install an air conditioner or a light in a place where it causes local nuisance;
- the addition of a general duty for business owners to prevent or minimise litter resulting from their business, including in stormwater management systems;
- improved cost recovery mechanisms for local government;
- improved delineation of responsibility between councils and the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner for the regulation of different types of nuisance occurring on premises licensed under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997; and
- provisions to improve the management and collection of abandoned shopping trolleys.

In my electorate this last point is not so bad. We have five shopping precincts and all have at least one major retailer. We have two Woolworths, a Drakes, a Coles, an Aldi and a Foodland. Some of these retailers have pretty good trolley collection or trolley laws.

I want to make a special shout-out to Travis and his team at Drakes where you are not actually allowed to take your trolley outside of the store. You have to get all your groceries, take them to the cash register and then the young men and women who work there have a sack truck trolley and they take all of your shopping, walk you to your car and pack your car for you. It really makes a big difference when you have had a long day. I appreciate the fact that they continue to do that, because they are a really great employer. They also do not have electronic serve-yourself check-outs. They are there for our community and they serve our community well.

Our local Aldi has a $2 coin token—I do not know whether that is a deterrent but they never seem to have their shopping trolleys in our area lying around the place; $2 means a lot to some people—or you can have a token. Either way, you always feel like you need to take that $2 back, so it is a way to collect shopping trolleys.

So it is not a huge issue in my area that I can see. Every now and then there are shopping trolleys lying around and sometimes we have had to call the supermarket and ask them to come to collect them. But it is good to know that this bill will increase people to do the right thing.

I have heard from a member of the public who lives just outside of my electorate—in fact, the member for Elder also mentioned the same community member. Quite clearly, he has a lot of concerns around the dumping of shopping trolleys. He came to us to talk about these shopping trolleys that were dumped at the back of Sleepeasy and, in fact, Sleepeasy rang us to talk about his concerns. So we have all tried to work together to get these trolleys collected, yet they may still be there. Hopefully, now that they are able to be collected within quite a quick time frame, we will see them removed.

It is good to know that there will now be tougher regulations. It is the case that the Local Nuisance and Litter Control Act already makes it an offence to abandon a shopping trolley. However, local government consider that offence to be largely ineffective, and have communicated this to our government. Penalties are only proposed to be applied for basic foundational elements of the reforms, being the identification of trolleys and their collection in a reasonable time frame where they are identified as belonging to the retailer. The bill requires owners of these shopping trolleys to now identify their shopping trolleys so that we know exactly where they have come from. This will aid in their collection and will allow them to be reported.

These will need to be collected within a reasonable time frame, as I said, generally within three business days, unless, of course, they create a hazard, and sometimes they do. They can be

dumped on footpaths, they can be dumped in local areas where people are trying to get through, which is a bit of a hazard, so it is good that they will be collected. Penalties will be applicable for noncompliance.

They are a pollutant, and they can also be a health and safety issue. They do tend to degrade, and they can get into our waterways and into all sorts of places. It does happen everywhere and it is difficult to catch the offenders, as I said. The abandonment of trolleys is considered littering under the act already, and it is applicable only to the person who abandons the trolley. The offence this time will be strengthened by these reforms through adding shopping trolleys specifically to the definition of 'general litter', and the penalty will be $210.

The amendment bill that is before us provides consistent obligations regarding the identification of these shopping trolleys. It also aims to provide councils with sensible tools that can only be applied to retailers on a case-by-case basis where there is an issue, as opposed to a blanket requirement for all retailers. The provisions will enable councils to work with retailers in problematic areas to reduce the issue through improved management practices, rather than provide a direct punitive approach whereby retailers are fined for the actions of their customers.

This year, and in the last two years, I have assisted the local Blackwood Action Group with Clean Up Australia Day. We form groups and we walk through Blackwood picking up all the rubbish. There is always a sigh and a moan from the group that gets the local fast food joint because they know it is going to be a big job. But they are not alone. There are other restaurants in my area that have more rubbish than their bins can accept, with very little effort to recycle in some cases. I know this firsthand because we have had a resident come to see us about it.

The amendment bill introduces a general duty for these businesses to prevent litter caused by or related to their business, including obligations upon relevant businesses to maintain existing stormwater management systems, so that these systems remain functional. Currently, the installation of stormwater management systems, such as gross pollutant traps or oil plate separators, is often a requirement in development approvals; however, there is no obligation upon businesses to maintain them.

That is where the problem starts, especially for a constituent of mine who lives right behind a couple of small restaurants—not quite fast food, but in the middle. She had a lot of trouble with the grease traps—they were literally in her backyard—which were continually overflowing. This caused a lot of problems as the grease itself would seep under her fence into her backyard. She had a dog, and that poor dog had to trounce around in her backyard, which was full of grease and disgusting, smelly and revolting things.

We worked hard with council, and council worked with the owners of the restaurants and the owners of the property to try to get it fixed. It took a really long time. In the end, the owners had to put in a gutter almost, as well as install new bins and clean out the traps. It was a lot of work. Another couple of businesses in my area have bins that are not sufficient to look after the rubbish that they have. Business owners need to be responsible. They need to also understand that they need the capacity to take on their rubbish.

Greater clarity will be provided to councils on the clean-up and disposal of illegally dumped items, especially when environmental health and physical hazards are created, exactly like my constituent. It was very unfortunate for her dog. She, in fact, ended up having to keep it inside. The other thing that that constituent has is a big floodlight right in her backyard, which shines right into her bedroom over the fence. We have tried for a long time to get the business to either put a shelter on it or point it downwards so that it is not going into her backyard. A new offence that is being discussed today is for the installation of air conditioners or light sources where they cause a local nuisance, so I am hoping for my constituent that we will be able to rectify that and find some peace for her.

Another member of my community had a new neighbour build next door. They installed a massive air conditioner that made the most ridiculous amount of noise. Council went backwards and forwards with her, with sound recording meters, all sorts of things like that, but it continues to be a problem for her. This new offence proposed for the installation of an air conditioner or light source in a location where it causes local nuisance is to ensure that installers give due consideration to the

siting of equipment before they put them in rather than once they have been put in. Often, local nuisance associated with these devices is as a result of poor locations. There is a cost to relocate a device, so it is much better to do it before it is installed.

The implementation of this reform will include communication with trade associations, and it is expected that word-of-mouth will also help with educating installers. The consequential amendments also proposed for the Liquor Licensing Act will provide greater delineation between nuisance matters covered by each act, limiting the Liquor Licensing Act to noise from patrons and entertainment. This amendment has been sought by local councils and the liquor and gaming commission. It is the case that sometimes fun spills out onto the footpath after a night out, so it is important that we have these regulations in place.

I encourage everybody to always take your shopping trolley back to the shopping trolley bay; that way you do not have to worry about whether or not you have done the wrong thing. I encourage our businesses to clearly label their shopping trolleys to make sure that people know they are theirs and so that they can be returned to them. I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Odenwalder.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 May 2024.)

Mr ODENWALDER: Sir, I draw your attention reluctantly to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:24): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to commence my remarks on the Construction Industry Training Fund (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. I am the lead speaker for the opposition. I indicate that the opposition is still consulting on this bill. It is a substantial reform, and I have no concerns about the government's approach in this matter. They have provided a briefing.

I understand that there is not an intention to complete the debate this afternoon—in the six minutes remaining—so I will commence my remarks, propose to seek leave in a little while, and then the opposition will continue its consultations over the next three weeks, and hopefully we can resolve the matter before the budget. I understand from the minister that the government is eager to resolve the bill through the house prior to the winter break if possible, and I am sure that the opposition will be able to work with government to achieve that end.

For all of the industry bodies that have so far provided their feedback to the opposition, I express my thanks but indicate that, given that we were briefed in the middle of last week and I sent out letters the following day, I certainly have not expected responses by now. I am expecting that we will get a lot more feedback by the end of the month.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Brown): Members, the member for Morialta will be heard in silence. If people wish to be somewhere else, then please feel free to go there.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I do not anticipate any divisions imminent, if that helps. Quorums are a matter for the government if they want to call them, but I think we will be okay. I think we will all be friends for the next few minutes. I anticipate there will be some positives in the reforms that we will be able to make clear that the opposition supports, and I anticipate that there will be some issues that we will take with the bill.

I highlight that the government has chosen a very different approach when it comes to their proposed composition of the Construction Industry Training Board. When it comes to such boards, the Liberal Party has favoured over an extended period of time having a very strong skills base to the board and obviously a relevant and appropriate representation of various people with expertise in particular industries as necessary.

The government—it is a Labor government; the Labor Party being the political wing of the union movement—the Labor Party tends to favour boards that have union membership on them. I do not say that to be provocative. It is just a statement of fact, and this bill proposes to quadruple the number of union members on the board. I am not sure that the Liberal Party will agree that that is a step that is necessary. I highlight that that is an area where we are likely to have further conversations. I doubt that will come as a galloping shock or surprise to the minister or anyone else.

I want to take this unique and special opportunity I have been given this afternoon to particularly thank those members of the Construction Industry Training Board, who currently serve the CITB, and place on the record the thanks of the Liberal Party to those members. I make no particular comment on any of the individuals. Some of them have been members for an extended period of time, some of them are more recent additions, but I recognise John Chapman, the Presiding Member; Andrew Clarke, who is not only on this board but also the CEO of the Master Plumbers South Australia and does an outstanding job representing that organisation; Cassie Manser; Gary Henderson; John Adley; Mardi Conduit; Maree Wauchope; Rebecca Pickering; Stephen Knight; and Will Frogley.

Many of these are people with whom the chamber would be more than familiar, because in many cases they represent significant industry bodies, some of them unions. I guess I want to highlight with this opportunity the elevated status that the Construction Industry Training Board plays in both the construction industry and the training sector. These reforms are substantial. They merit our serious consideration, and I am pleased that the government has indicated that we are likely to have a little bit more time to give them our full consideration.

Nevertheless, what I expect over the next two to three weeks is that we will hear that more fulsome feedback from those stakeholders, because, when it comes to the operations of the Construction Industry Training Board, in my experience I think what the industry most wants to have certain is the strategic approach towards ensuring there is a trained workforce that has the skills base that they need.

I think that sometimes people in associations can get caught up in a project and can get caught up in something with a badge on it. Some of those projects are very worthy, but what we need from this board going forward is a healthy interaction with both government and industry to ensure that the application of their funds towards training outcomes is getting great bang for buck for the industry—the industry, of course, which spends a lot of money that is then expended by the CITB.

Those stakeholders will be taken very seriously by the Liberal Party, and I look forward to those contributions in the coming weeks. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:30 the house adjourned until Tuesday 4 June 2024 at 11:00.