

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 15 October 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.

Members

MEMBER FOR MOUNT GAMBIER, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT

The **SPEAKER** (11:02): I have been advised by the Director of Public Prosecutions that, on 26 September 2024, Mr Troy Bell was found guilty of 20 counts of theft, contrary to section 134(1) of the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935, and five counts of aggravated dishonest dealings with documents, contrary to section 140 of the same act. Mr Bell is yet to be sentenced for this offending.

Each of the 25 counts of which Mr Bell was found guilty were indictable offences within the meaning of section 5 of the Criminal Procedures Act 1921. I have also been informed by the Director of Public Prosecutions that a notice of appeal was served on his office by Mr Bell. Section 31 of the Constitution Act 1934 provides for the vacation of a seat in the House of Assembly in the event that the member is convicted of an indictable offence.

I have also communicated with Mr Bell, inviting him to provide me with any information that he wishes the house to consider in determining the question of the vacancy of his seat. I now table correspondence I received from Mr Bell via his lawyers, Patsouris and Associates, dated 14 October 2024; copies of correspondence I received from the Director of Public Prosecutions dated 9 October 2024 which included a copy of the information and related record of outcome and notice of appeal and dated 15 October 2024 advising of the nature of the offences of which Mr Bell was found guilty; and the letter I sent to Mr Bell dated 10 October 2024.

It is now open to the house to consider the question of the vacancy of Mr Bell's seat as arising by operation of section 31 of the Constitution Act 1934.

Bills

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

(Continued from 26 September 2024.)

Clause 1.

Mr PEDERICK: In terms of this bill regarding climate change and greenhouse emissions reduction, obviously we have a state with plentiful renewable energy. Apart from thousands of acres of solar farms, those either installed or about to be developed, and a similar thing with wind farms, in regard to emissions reduction, when all this hardware, including batteries, gets to its use-by date, how does the government intend to dispose of the spent products?

The **Hon. S.E. CLOSE**: The question of what happens with the hardware is a question, obviously, that applies to all sorts of infrastructure and industrial hardware, not just to that which is used for the generation of renewable energy. While this piece of legislation does not naturally address the question of recycling of materials, I am able to provide some advice for the chamber that has come from the Department for Energy and Mining.

They are currently working on an energy white paper, which will include consideration of what happens with the recyclability of those materials and their end use and their end destination. They have also provided this advice for me to share:

The government supports, obviously, sustainable practices and end-of-life strategies in the context of the energy sector—

and I would add, of course, across the economy, as I am sure we all do. They continue:

Already, South Australia is a world leader in waste management, recycling and resource recovery, with more than 80% of the state's waste diverted from landfill. The Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act 2023—

which has been passed by this place—

provides a framework for ecologically sustainable development and regulation of renewable energy infrastructure over its entire life cycle, including what happens to it when the infrastructure is decommissioned. Some of the options to be considered in managing renewable energy waste include ensuring large-scale renewable energy project planning considers end-of-life decommissioning to maximise circular economy outcomes and minimise embodied carbon, mechanisms to support effective recycling, re-use and repurposing of materials and fostering longer lasting and more sustainable products.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, minister, for that approach, but my understanding is that with most if not all of the photovoltaic cells that are used there is real difficulty in regard to battery disposal and currently wind farm blades are buried. In the event that that is the action needed by 2050, when we need to reach net zero, how is the government proposing to offset the emissions of the waste generated by this renewable energy?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The question that the member asks, of course, is relevant, not just to renewable energy infrastructure but to all infrastructure, so the question really is how is the government proposing to reach net zero by 2050, which includes all of the emissions that occur as a result of all of the activity that we undertake. This legislation gives not only that target but also pathways towards that target that the government of the day is required to take, including plans, five-yearly updates on targets, including proposals for adaptation and including having a statewide strategy for the achievement of the targets. The kind of detail that the member is referring to, which refers to, as I say, all infrastructure, all materials, not just those associated with renewable electricity generation, will be addressed through those policies, including particularly, as I have mentioned, the strategy for achieving the targets.

Mr PEDERICK: People involved in agriculture have a concern not just in regard to reaching carbon targets, or climate reduction targets, whatever you want to call them, but in regard to farming practices. I have raised this in this house quite a few times. We have had leading-edge farming practices for at least 30 years and longer. When I talk about 30 to 40 years, it is about the zero till practices with sowing crops with one pass. It is very effective and you only have to look at what has happened this year. I can assure you that if this year—which is the worst year in more than living memory, probably at least 100 years for agriculture in this state—was 40 years ago, we would have seen massive areas blowing in the breeze because of the farming techniques used back then.

It is certainly a concern, with all the measurements across all the industries and all the departments, as you are well aware, about where the baseline is for agriculture that these measurements will be read from, because the amount of carbon that is returned to the soil with this single-pass farming is phenomenal and farmers need to be recognised for that, because they have been doing this groundbreaking work for decades. My concern—and I have raised it in estimates—is that we have the appropriate baseline so that we can move into the future with those sustainable farming practices that farmers have introduced over many decades.

As I said, if these practices had not been in place now we would have seen thousands upon hundreds of thousands of acres of land blowing in the breeze with barely a leaf on them. We have essentially got a green drought, with just the success of getting plants emerging on little to no moisture, and certainly not much since seeding time. So my concern is how the government is going to work the baseline for agriculture so that it is realistic, noting the improvements not just over the last 30 years but with what has happened over the last century with improvements to farming practices right across the state.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Much of what the member has said I completely agree with. It is a terrible year and it is one of those years that is likely to be repeated over this century, as we understand the trends that scientists are telling us about, and I also completely agree with the recognition of the improvement of practices in farming. In fact, I think I gave quite a bit of my maiden speech time, 12 long years ago, to talking about the way in which our primary producers are so important in the way in which our environment is treated and that the best farmers are the most environmentally responsive farmers, so all of that is true.

On the question of baseline, the way in which baseline is measured for 2030 is on 2005 levels of carbon emissions and the way in which they are measured for 2050 is, of course, that there be no net production of carbon, so there is no baseline in that sense.

What we have seen is there has been a drop-off in carbon emissions in agriculture since 2005. That has contributed to a reduction in carbon emissions, not as substantially as the electricity sector, which has had a dramatic change in how electricity is produced, but there has nonetheless been a drop-off. Equally, what we have seen is a very large increase in the land use and the amount of greenery that has been grown across the state, which has significantly contributed to our current level of carbon emissions being at about 56 per cent below the 2005 base level.

While agricultural emissions have only dropped slightly, all primary producers are nonetheless part of that contribution in the measurement of the increase of carbon uptake that has occurred. I am grateful, as I am sure we all are, for their diligence in how they look after their land and how they make sure that they are growing as much as they can to hold soil together, as the member has said, but also to contribute to carbon and to biodiversity.

I anticipate there will be in the world and in Australia an increasing, escalating demand for carbon and biodiversity offsets. The world will not hit the Paris Agreement targets without significant offsets. In my judgement—and I am but one human making an observation—the world is unlikely to reach net zero by 2050 simply by stopping emitting. It is going to have to do it by also purchasing a growth of green offsets, particularly biodiverse plantings, and also through blue carbon in wetlands associated with the sea.

Given that, landholders are likely to be well positioned in South Australia to include as part of their primary production practices the growing of carbon-hungry plantings to assist in the achievement of the global targets that the vast majority of countries have signed up to.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): I understand there are amendments filed on this clause, so it is appropriate that I do this now. I rule that the proposed amendments of the member for Morphett on schedule 1, excluding amendment No. 2, are outside the scope of the bill and are therefore out of order. The proposed amendments that I have ruled out of order relate to electricity pricing and grid reliability and are not relevant to the principal act, being the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act, in dealing with the reduction of greenhouse gas emissions. An amendment not relevant to the objects of the bill or not within the scope of the bill may not be moved.

Standing order 250 provides that an amendment may be moved to any part of a bill if the amendment is within the title or relevant to the subject matter of the bill. If the title of the bill is not restricted to a particular purpose, an amendment dealing with a matter not in the bill but which is relevant to the principal act or to the objects of the bill as stated in its title may be moved even though the clauses have limited purpose.

Mr PATTERSON: My first question will relate, and I will make some comments around that. I will seek advice from the Clerk in regard to that, because it is outrageous that you are saying that prices that South Australians are paying here in South Australia—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): You will not reflect on the Chair's ruling. If you object to the Chair's ruling, there is a mechanism through which you may do so. You may provide me with an objection in writing, and it will be dealt with by the Speaker. Otherwise, proceed.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you, Acting Chair. I will go straight to the question, not wanting to tread on those grounds.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): I just point out you can move amendment No. 2, if you wish.

Mr PATTERSON: Why, minister, is there no mention of power prices and power reliability in this bill, when we know that the energy trilemma that faces South Australians is tied up with emissions reduction but also prices that South Australians pay for their energy bills and the reliability for their energy bills that then impacts on other emissions areas, such as agriculture, industrial processes and transport? Can the minister explain why there is no mention in this bill of those measures?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will explain why there is not. If I intrude on the matter that has been ruled on by the Chair, I am sure you will let me know. The reason that there is no reference to electricity prices is that this is not a bill that addresses electricity pricing. The purpose of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act is to provide for measures that address climate change, to set a target to reduce greenhouse gas emissions and to promote the use of renewable sources of energy.

The electricity system has its own legislation. It is covered by a comprehensive regulatory framework through the National Electricity Law and Rules, which establish the National Electricity Market that ultimately determines prices and reliability for customers. The Australian Energy Regulator establishes the default market offer, which is the maximum price that retailers can charge for smaller electricity customers and standing offer contractors. ESCOSA also plays a role, and the Essential Services Commission Act 2002 regulates prices and conditions relating to prices and price fixing factors. It is therefore not appropriate for this legislation to intrude into a legislative area well governed by other acts.

Mr ELLIS: I have a quick question about the institution of these targets in theory. If we take, for example, the first target—which would be 2030, I understand—what will happen if the government, despite its best endeavours to reach the target it has set itself, fails to meet that 2030 target? Is there some sort of punitive measure that it will then impose upon itself? Is there some sort of extraordinary action that will need to be taken in order to meet it pre-emptively? Obviously, there would be the public indignation of not having met the target that one has set, but would there be any sort of punitive measure that would have to be imposed upon itself by virtue of the fact it has missed that target?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: No, there is no punitive element to that. There would not be an extraordinary measure that would be undertaken at the last minute to achieve any targets. They are designed to set the direction of the state, and their strength lies in guiding the exercise of other powers and obligations under the act. For example, there is a link in the proposal to introduce a requirement to develop a statewide emissions reduction plan that must be released. So the consequence of setting the target is that there need to be plans to give confidence to the state that there is a view by parliament that this is the pathway we need to take.

Mr ELLIS: I respectfully put that the contents of this bill are essentially superfluous, then. There is no need for this to be legislated. We could well publish something in the public realm that would make clear the goals of the government and its attempt to reach a certain target. We could publish something like that annually without having to legislate this. Putting aside the merits of the goals entirely, if there is no punitive measure, no punishment, nothing that results from a missed target—or, I assume by inference, nothing gained from meeting the target—what benefit do we have from adding this to the statute books? It is just a feel-good, fluffy piece of legislation that we could otherwise put out in a press release, probably.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: First of all, this is updating an existing piece of legislation that had targets that have been surpassed. We are updating, otherwise we have a piece of legislation that is out of date on the statute books. It also has some elements in common with a piece of legislation that was introduced by the previous Liberal government and again by the Liberal opposition in this place in this term of government, although ours has more substance to it.

The contemplation by the previous Liberal government and by the opposition in this place in this term was simply to update the targets. What we have proposed is not only to update the targets and to make them slightly tougher for 2030, given how well we are tracking already as a state, but to make sure that what we are doing is setting a trajectory by the updating of the targets every five years by being required to produce a plan.

There are many forms of legislation. The member has a law degree and I do not, so forgive me for appearing to lecture the member on the way in which law works; I am certain that he has no need of that. But, for the record, there are laws that stop people from doing things, there are laws that enable activity to occur, and there are laws that require activity to occur. What we are doing in this piece of legislation is requiring that there be action taken, in concert with the community, to set plans to achieve the targets that exist in the legislation. That could be done in policy while this government is in place.

By putting it into legislation we have parliament saying that that is something that ought to take place over a period of time. While legislation can of course change, it does give more sense of stability, certainty and predictability. What that does is signal to businesses that need to pay attention to their investment over a period of time, and also to voters who increasingly are very concerned about the impacts of climate change, and also how we are going to get our economy ready for a low-carbon international market, that this parliament accepts that that is necessary and expects the government of the day to continue to work towards that.

My view is that that is an exercise worth undertaking in that it creates a sense of predictability that this state could well use and, in fact, has long had, given that we had the original piece of legislation many years ago and were the first jurisdiction in Australia to do so. As we proceed to do things like bid for COP in a couple of years' time, and as we proceed to market South Australia as a destination for companies wishing to invest in renewable energy production, in hydrogen, as we do that, giving confidence for that investment economically through legislation can only be helpful.

Given that both sides of parliament to date have been supportive of these targets, there is no reason not to enshrine them in legislation, and it does give that economic investment security that is so often looked for and which only legislation can give, as opposed to what could be transitory government policy.

Mr McBRIDE: Minister, could you help explain to me and the house in regard to amendments in point No. 2 about the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007? First of all, you gave a really great answer to the member Narungga which is appreciated, but what information do we have around meeting these targets? What information and data does the government have around the cost of living and what the impediment or connection is to the way that South Australia goes about its daily life—and that is everything from a beautiful newborn, through the education system, through being tertiary educated, going into the workplace to meet workplace arrangements, whether you are in a bureaucracy, whether you are a teacher, whether you are an exporter, whether you are a retiree and you are looking for health and security?

What data does the government have around meeting these targets? Is there any cost that the government can foreshadow or has foreseen, or can they give assurance that by meeting these targets we are going to be better off by 2030, 2040—as I see mentioned here—or 2045?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Thank you very much for the question. There are a few elements to that. One was how we are going to measure this, and that is taken care of through the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory, which is done under the rules that are agreed internationally about how we measure carbon emissions. That has been in place for some time, although the methodology has been refined over time as we get better at doing it. Where we are able—particularly when it comes to the carbon storage that happens with the plantings and that level of detail—to take better photography of what we have in South Australia and across Australia, as that gets better, we are able to refine how we do that.

That is the one that has given us this figure of a bit under 60 per cent reduction since 2005 for the most recent reporting period. It looks at each of the sectors of the economy, including that land use carbon sink side, which has given a lot of the contribution to reaching not far off 60 per cent. That is the methodology that is used and, with refinements, will continue to be used.

The member has raised the question of the impact on cost of living, and I completely understand that, particularly right now in how people are feeling about their day-to-day living expenses. What I would suggest though is that we need to situate this policy trajectory in understanding what is happening across the world and across Australia. I believe that even the federal Coalition has agreed to net zero by 2050. Yes, it has been confirmed that they have. That is both sides of politics at an Australian government level that have agreed to net zero by 2050. The world has agreed to net zero by 2050.

Also, just by the by, the planet desperately needs us to get to net zero by 2050 because breaching some of the tipping points and the warming levels will have economic consequences that dwarf the current challenge of inflation. In fact, I was at a conference recently where they said that climate change will affect us in so many ways, including that by the end of the century people will have about half the economic power that they have now. So the idea of a massive recession caused by climate change, not least because of all the extreme weather events that cost so much, that interrupt primary production and that are wreaking havoc with our insurance industry and the cost of insurance—not least that, just as a way of understanding why that could be.

Recognising that net zero by 2050 is something that the world has accepted, that both sides of politics in Australia have accepted and that we as South Australians have accepted across the chamber, we need to work out how to do that in the best way. Clearly, doing it in a way that causes least economic harm and maximum economic opportunity is what any government would seek to do. Part of what we are in the process of doing is making it clear to the rest of the world that South Australia is a place where you can buy products and where you can invest in a way that will not be interrupted by this change of decarbonising the international economy.

There will be a lot of money looking for the safe haven of stable democracies that are decarbonising, and we have enormous early mover advantage already, given our renewable electricity record and the fact that we already have some legislation. Firming this up will help that to occur. There is no intention for this to cause economic hardship for South Australians, quite the reverse. As I said right at the beginning, we do not get to sit climate change out because we achieve our targets. What we get to do is have the kind of economy that will prosper because the rest of the world is doing the same thing. That is the context in which I think it is best to look at these targets.

Mr McBRIDE: Minister, first of all, thank you for that brilliant answer that you have just given me, it is appreciated. This is not politically motivated. I would not care if the opposition shadow minister was on your side of the chamber, I would be asking the same questions. One of the things I find fascinating, to give you some explanation, is that we have at least two sectors in Australian terms, but not in South Australian terms, like forestry and wool as export commodities, and it is not even rated on the carbon chain yet beyond one cycle of a tree. It is not even rated that you can buy a woollen suit that will last 50 years and will lock up carbon. No-one is even talking about this yet.

You did explain that beautifully by saying, 'This is evolving, the rules are changing, and we are working out how we are going to get there.' This is why I am asking these questions. Not only do I want the opposition to hear it but I want the government to understand that when you are first out of the ranks—and you are talking about a new climate conference coming to South Australia, which may absolutely be brilliant for all the people it will bring to South Australia and will put Adelaide on the world map—one of the things about being first is you are actually almost like the guinea pig. You are the canary in the coalmine. You are the first one to taste all this.

We are going to see the ramifications of rolling out what could be the most renewable energy efficient state, but what I do not want to see is a barren landscape in economic terms because we have killed off our businesses and investments in the pursuit of being first. One of the things we have learnt to survive 100 years in agriculture is never actually be first, unless you are absolutely damn sure, but be an early adopter. Early adopters are people who see and watch what the rest of the world is doing, assess whether it would work in South Australia and then say, 'Yes, that's going to fit here, because there's its bit, there's its niche, and I can see that they have done this. Oh, we could even do it better? Fantastic.'

But when you go out there and are the first down the race, running the fastest speed to be the most environmentally friendly state in Australia or it could even be the world, but the landscape

is dead, you would ask: 'What for?' The question then, too, is in regard to internationally we know that South Australia has mining, we have a lot of exports, we depend on exports and then we are also selling to countries that are not even interested in these targets.

I will give it to you clearly and say it out loud: China is not going to fall into line on some of these targets that the rest of the Western world is considering or the European economies and the like. Yet we know that a lot of our iron ore ends up in China. We do not have a lot of coal in South Australia but there is certainly in the Eastern States. I know that 80 per cent of the product that we are supposed to be good at, although we are struggling with it—producing wool—ends up in China, and they are not participating on these targets like the rest of the world is.

One thing that I hope for from this government and any jurisdiction around Australia and perhaps even federally—I do not care about the colour or the politics—is to recognise that when they put these targets in place there are two things happening. One is that the industries with the deepest pockets are having the biggest buy-in at the moment. We are seeing air travel—Boeing and aeroplanes—buying into this area to see how they can survive in whatever the world of 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045 looks like in terms of targets and trying to buy into putting biofuel into their fuel mix and reducing their emissions. We are seeing the petroleum companies also trying to buy in to see how they can extend whatever they are doing now right through these targets. Some of the smaller industries, as I have already mentioned, like forestry and a natural wool fibre like wool, have no traction in these billion-dollar industries right now.

My question to you is: as we head down this journey of zero targets—2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, as I have seen in these amendments—what assurance do we as South Australians have that this government is not going blindly and meeting targets at the expense of what are really important export industries?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I agree and disagree with the member in his summary. Where I agree is the amount of complexity going on around the world right now on carbon. You can draw a picture that makes you feel quite hopeful, and you can draw a picture that makes it look like no-one is ever going to do anything that is enough. I land on that differently on different days, but in the end humans are pretty smart. We can collectively do some pretty crazy things on the way—it is not like everything has gone perfectly in the history of humanity—but we are good survivors.

It is recognised globally, including in China, that climate change is real. That is recognised, because the science in the end has become unarguable and the human experience of it is now becoming unarguable. In that context, there is a kind of push and pull internationally. There is a 'Yes, we should do something, everyone, collectively' and then 'How does my country get advantaged through this?'

The vast majority of countries have signed up to the Paris Agreement, which requires achievement by 2050. China is currently starting to push into the market of the kind of renewable generation of electricity, cars as well as solar panels and so on, so they can effectively be the winners out of that transition. The United States, the biggest economy in the world, has their strangely named Inflation Reduction Act (IRA) that is actually a lot about attracting the money for investment in those kinds of technologies so their economy can capitalise on this big shift. So those very, very large economies, while there is a lot of political debate about it, are rushing to get into the technology that is going to help all of us decarbonise.

When we talk about South Australia being a leader, we have to be careful about exactly what it is we are claiming. We are not leading the world in climate change; we are leading the world in the production of intermittently generated renewable electricity. No-one does it better with wind and sun than we do percentage-wise. Not in volume, of course, because we have a very small population, but percentage-wise we have done something quite extraordinary that we should be very proud of.

What that does is put us ahead of the other states that are still dependent very heavily on coal. When you think about Australia and you think about Australia being very coal-rich you say, 'But what is going on in South Australia and how might we have a relationship with that state?' That is the basis on which we are saying that, if Australia is going to get COP31, it should be here because they should be proud of what we have done.

So there is that way in which we are better, but the truth is that most of the other states have targets. Australia has targets. Some of the other states have legislation. Some of the other states' legislation is tougher again than this is. Victoria has legislation that says they will get to net zero by 2045. New South Wales has worked on a piece of legislation.

So it is not, as the member might be concerned about, that we are so far ahead that we risk making the first moves mistakes and that the early adopters following us will be able to avoid them, which is an absolutely legitimate way of thinking about the way technology operates, it is that we have first-mover advantage within Australia on some elements and are an early adopter in very many other elements and we do not have coal. The feature of not having coal is that it makes us look different to the rest of the mainland states and that can be of enormous advantage when we are chasing after that international capital.

With the example that the member used of the fabric used to produce clothes, all of that is increasingly being measured as we start to really understand what it means to respond to climate change. As an example, when we were sitting a couple of weeks ago, in response to a question from the member for Morphett, I mentioned the dairy industry, which is busily working out how to track each dairy product that is produced for its carbon input in South Australia. That can create enormous economic advantage for us if we are able to do that well. There is some premium in green products at times, but I can tell you what there definitely is and that is trade barriers if they are not green. The trade barrier, particularly for Europe, if we do not demonstrate that, is going to really hurt us.

Getting ready for that is an economic decision we need to make. Making a virtue of our response to climate change is, as well as a good thing to do, an economically smart thing to do. What we have to do is recognise just how fast the rest of the world is changing, not uniformly, often not in language, but in action increasingly, and I have to say that, the more I read about what is happening in climate change, I cling on to my optimism about human ingenuity and resilience because on the current trajectory of warming the year 2023 was off-the-record hot.

I have watched *Clarkson's Farm* season 3. Ridiculously, I am a big fan of Jeremy Clarkson. He is not politically someone that most people would expect me to enjoy, but he makes good television and he surrounds himself with people who call him out for some of his behaviour, and I enjoy it. I have watched my way through *Clarkson's Farm*. In season 3, he is trying to farm in the Northern Hemisphere through 2023. Every single month was doing exactly the opposite of what the farmers need. It was a catastrophic year.

Across the world, 2023 was 1.5° warmer than pre-industrial times. Yet, one of the NASA scientists commented in *Quarterly Essay*, 'Highway to hell', about 2023 that on the current trajectory it will be one of the cooler years we have this century. We cannot have that. We cannot have primary production if that happens.

We cannot produce the food that we need in that environment, because our farming depends on a degree of predictability of rain coming when it is helpful, and climate change will take that away. I am not the only person to notice this. We are not the only people to notice this. The world is aware of that. It is just that the way of expressing how it responds to it can seem frustrating at times.

Mr PATTERSON: Going to this clause as well, I ask the question around power prices—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): I indicate to you that you do need to formally move amendment No. 2 if you wish to proceed with it.

Mr PATTERSON: Sure, but I am still doing questions at the moment.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Okay. Go ahead.

Mr PATTERSON: I have only asked the one question. We have heard the commentary around the targets and the concerns from others that while South Australia's emissions might be going down we have other countries and other regions where by far they are continuing to go up; you would probably say they are accelerating as well.

As I mentioned previously, at the same time that this bill was put into the house we also had ESCOSA release their retail electricity prices report that showed that the average household electricity bill between 1 July 2023 and 30 June 2024 went up by \$411. There was a massive

increase, and in fact the last three ESCOSA reports that have come down during this government's term of office have shown that the average household electricity bill has risen by \$798. So there have been massive increases, over 44 per cent increases, in electricity bills for households.

For small businesses, the pain is just as real. In the year from 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, the average electricity bill for small businesses rose by a staggering \$791. Overall, the three ESCOSA reports that have been handed down under this term of the government have seen power bills jump by \$1,685, an increase of \$45. You can see why there is significant concern among some members of this house around the power bills that people are experiencing and that small businesses are experiencing.

Yes, as a state, we are seeking to reduce our emissions, but at the same time we need to consider not only emissions reductions but the impacts that come with doing that, from an economic point of view. That boils down at brass tacks to the prices that people pay for their power bills, because if you look at where these emissions reductions have come from, principally they have come from the energy industries.

All the other sectors that are reported on by the state governments, that actually produce things, have seen their emissions stay stable. You can understand why there is significant attention placed on not only emissions reductions in the energy industries but also prices. While other jurisdictions are seeing their emissions increase and ours are coming down, our bills are going up.

The opposition certainly has been trying to work with that, and did that in government to make sure that power bills came down. They came down—according to ESCOSA, the ESCOSA bills handed down during the former Liberal government—by \$421. So you can see that it is possible and it was great attention. It just makes perfect sense to not only worry about emissions targets but also have a mindful approach to prices and, in fact, put in place targets around electricity prices. It seems absolutely staggering that the government is not even prepared to consider that and debate that. They want to shut that debate down around putting in prices, but that is nonetheless—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): Member for Morphet! Here we go again. Please do not dispute the Chair's ruling. It was a process that—

Mr PATTERSON: I am not; I am just saying—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Brown): No. I made the ruling, not the government. You will not dispute my ruling. Go ahead.

Mr PATTERSON: —that we will not have a power price target. My question, then, becomes: if the government of the day has small businesses being crushed by power bills and households not able to pay their power bills, is the government of the day able to prioritise cheaper power bills and reliability of that electricity over emissions reductions, if emissions reductions are not obtained and met in the targets because the government of the day is seeking to do things in a considered manner and is looking at the global impact of climate change, which you yourself have said that South Australia itself cannot directly control, of course, being responsible for only 0.04 per cent of global emissions? Is it within the government's power? How able is a government, should these laws be enacted, to prioritise those facets irrespective of the impact on emissions reductions?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As I responded to a question from the member for Narungga, the non-meeting of the targets has no legal requirement to take sudden and serious action. I would like to make a couple of corrections, one of mine and one to something I think I understood the member to say. With mine, I indicated to the member for MacKillop that Victoria had enshrined in legislation net zero by 2045. They have a policy for net zero by 2045; their legislation is the same as ours—by 2050—so that is just to clarify that point. The other point that I think I heard the member for Morphet say was that the other states' emissions are going up while we are driving ours down; in fact, most states' emissions are dropping, they are just dropping in different ways and through different activities.

Mr PATTERSON: I have talked about electricity, but let's talk about something that is obviously very important to the population of South Australia, and that is being able to have its own autonomy to be able to feed and clothe the population. Of course, that goes to the heart of agriculture and how important that is to the state, and the ability of food producers and fibre producers to be

able to produce their goods economically and efficiently. I think other members and yourself as well acknowledged the important role that agriculture can play in terms of actually helping South Australia in terms of its emissions targets, especially in light of the practices of food producers here in South Australia compared to other parts of the world. They are doing, you would say, world's best practice.

In terms of their ability to continue to produce food affordably and make sure that there is actually availability of food for the population here, specifically within South Australia but also to be able to export domestically to other states as well, how will these targets that are put in place impact on the ability of the agricultural sector to be able to provide food that is economic, cheap, affordable and highly available—obviously, you have seasonality around that—when we have to trade off against emissions reductions?

We know that there has not been significant movement in the emissions profile of the agricultural sector. What will the impacts be of setting this legislation in place and on future governments to be able to prioritise food availability and affordability when there are targets in place around emissions reductions? How will that impact and force food producers to be able to continue to provide what is fantastic produce here in South Australia affordably and then compare it to effectively what is going on in other countries as well? If their emissions are significantly increasing, as has been reported by the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, how would this legislation allow our food producers here in South Australia to (a) feed South Australians and (b) remain competitive?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: A lot of the answer that I give will essentially be similar to ones I have given previously. If I can first of all conclude the anecdote I was starting about watching Jeremy Clarkson. I was so distracted by admitting that I liked Jeremy Clarkson that I forgot to tell you the end of the story which was that towards the end of 2023, when it was such a disastrous year for primary producers in the Northern Hemisphere, he said—and he knows the role that he has played over the years in trying to suggest that climate change is rubbish, and hooning around in his magnificent vehicles—the climate is awful and someone should really say something about it. That is Jeremy Clarkson. I noted that.

The reason I give you the end of that anecdote is that the counterfactual of doing nothing across the world is that primary production becomes like that all the time: something possible—so we know we have to do something collectively as a world. The questions, really, are coming from 'yes, but can we not do too much here that would hurt us because we are such a small part?' I understand that, which is why we have to do it economically sensibly.

Now, we have very good farmers in this country. One thing I did notice in *Clarkson's Farm* is just how reliant they are on subsidies. We would have no concept of needing subsidies like that with primary production in Australia. We are so much more efficient, so much more economically reliable. Because of that, what we are seeing are increasing groups of primary producers for the different areas very sensibly preparing to market their products across the world, particularly to Europe, in the context of having to demonstrate what they do about carbon. They know it is just built in to part of how they are going to have to do it. They are going to have to do it for biodiversity as well, and they are going to have to do it for water.

So in that very sensible preparation they have a partner on this side of the chamber and, I suspect—despite some of the tone of the questions—on the other side of the chamber, that governments in South Australia over the years as we get to 2050 are going to work alongside all elements of the economy, including agriculture and primary production, to work out together how we do this well. One way is that, as I mentioned earlier, we will get a lot of money if we play our cards right and do this smart from companies that need to offset their emissions.

There will be a hunt for places to put that money that can be guaranteed to be reliable over a period of time and therefore pass the increasingly stringent tests of reporting that are required by long-term capital investors, by insurers and by markets. These three categories are not greenies. These are 'we can see what's coming; we are only interested in putting in our money in a place that's going to be secure over the long term', and primary production is wise to that, is aware of that, is sensible about that.

In terms of the detail of the consequences of getting to the 2030 target, when you think that we are about 57 per cent, not far off 60 per cent now, the 2030 target will be achieved by all of the indicators that we have now. What we need to do as we head to 2030 and beyond is tilt ourselves at an angle that gets us to 2050 without a sudden panic at the end. That is why the legislation matters, it is why the statewide strategy matters, because it helps us do that in a way, in a pathway, that is gentle and achievable rather than dramatic and suddenly there is nowhere we can sell our products because the trade walls have gone up. That is why the detail of the question that has been asked will sit largely in the first statewide strategy, the second statewide strategy, the third, which we prepare in consultation with the sectors of the community and the economy which are affected.

Mr McBRIDE: This will probably be my last question, and I thank the minister for her answers so far; they have been very good. As I said, it would not matter what colour the politics here—I do not care if I was talking about Western Australia or Queensland, but we are here talking about South Australia—one of the things that I think is really nerve-racking for private investors, people who are out in the private sector, is where government are setting the rules and the standard.

Potentially, as the minister has clearly identified, these are world standards, this is a world movement, and I appreciate that. I am going to highlight what I have to tell the chamber, so that the government can feel and see why I think with this new legislation, from what I am feeling and seeing, you are giving confidence for a movement and transition into renewable energy, targets around 2030, 2035, 2040, 2045, perhaps even 2050, as the minister has alluded to—and I understand it.

The apprehension and the concern I want the government—not just the minister but the government, and perhaps even the opposition, and even the shadow minister for energy and mining—to note is when governments take control of something, first of all it is never based on economic private investment and private operations. In other words, it belongs to a sector that perhaps lacks a lot of reality. Sometimes it lacks connection to the way that we actually function as a society and use other people's money. I will leave that without trying to run down anyone in particular, or any sector, or any specialty that we see in either South Australia, Australia or in the world.

There are three points that I want to make to the minister. Right now if I want to go out and trade in carbon, I am being told that I need to set aside 14 kilos of carbon per kilo of beef. If I grow a kilo of wool based on Meat and Livestock Australia (MLA), they are talking 24 kilos of carbon for a kilo of wool that I am going to wear for 10 to 20 years. These are the current charts they are looking at, and these are world standards. These are not South Australian standards. These are not something that the Malinauskas government put in place, and neither did the Marshall government, neither did the Morrison government, and neither did the Albanese government.

The other thing I will add to this, and you made mention of this minister, is about the tough climatic conditions we see ourselves in. It is dry. I can tell you that in my neck of the woods, the Limestone Coast, I believe that most agricultural businesses for the financial year of 2023-24 made a loss. I think what we are seeing now in 2024, going into the 2025 financial year, is greater extensive losses out there because of the seasonal conditions.

Yes, you were talking about a warming climate. We have to be responsible. We are adaptive. We have moved to climate change as a species—and I love your terminology—and we are a clever species, and we do adapt, and we do think things through. My concern is then—and one of the things I saw down in my neck of the woods was a really passionate meeting in a local government where the ratepayers are concerned about the rates going up in local government in the financial year of 2023-24, and the local government is going to make more money out of their land than what the owner is going to because they are making losses.

What happens here is that we normally get taxed and levied basically on the fact that we are making profits, and if you do make a profit you have to pay your fair share to the government so that the government can function and look after everything that government is responsible for. This is going to suffer the same problem. In other words, there is not going to be any conductivity around price of production, the world market, the table I have talked about: the 14 kilos of carbon per kilo of beef and the 24 kilos of carbon for a kilo of wool.

Obviously, we would love to see the opportunities around soil carbon, capturing carbon, being able to sell off carbon, but we cannot even do this because we might need to capture it all for ourselves just to survive whatever the new paradigm is, what the new benchmark will be, not based on South Australian rules, based on maybe EU rules or maybe a Western world-type philosophy. It certainly does not cover the Third World; the Third World is just looking and saying, 'Holy hell, how do we get there?'

What I would say to you, minister, and to any government, is I love to share, I love to work, and we divulge more than we should as a business, not to tell anyone how to suck eggs but actually so we can learn as a business. We benchmark with other businesses. We love to compare because we want to see where our strengths are and we want to see where our weaknesses are. I am hoping you, minister, and your government, have the same sort of foresight or capacity to say, 'Righto, we are going to put these targets in place.' I accept. I know why you are putting these targets in place—I accept. I know that other jurisdictions, like Victoria and other states, are putting these same sorts of targets in place—I accept.

Then there is the federal government and whatever they might look at as well. I do not care the colour of politics, it has not been that well done, otherwise why have we seen the problems we have around energy, gas prices and electricity prices on a national scale, let alone a South Australian scale? Minister, what ability do you have as a minister representing the Malinauskas state Labor government to protect, to feel, to see or to monitor the impost that potentially could be out there that we do not all fall by the wayside and say, 'Well, the government killed us. We didn't have a chance?'

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think that's largely comment rather than a question but I also take it as a bit of a plea to make sure that conversation and a sense of shared responsibility rather than 'That's your problem: go fix it' should prevail, and I completely agree with you. I not only think that that would be true on this side, but I think that would be true across the parliament.

What is happening with climate change is awful—I nearly swore, but I didn't. It is awful and it is going to shape much of the politics and the economics of the next 50 years. I wish it were not that way. When I look at my kids and when I look at the Hon. Ms Stinson's beautiful little one, I wish it were not that way because it is going to be painful across the world. It is already painful, people are already dying from weather events that are directly connected to the increased energy in the system that we have chosen to put there by making the greenhouse effect thicker.

It calls to mind a sense of what our obligations are to the future because we should not do to future generations what has been done to us by the past. Back when we had the Industrial Revolution, it was not unknown what the interaction between carbon and the atmosphere was. It was not like the average person had a sense of 'This is going to ruin the world in 200 years' time', but scientists knew that there was an interaction. Knowing how fast it would happen, knowing the speed of the impact and what the impact would be like, of course would have been very difficult to predict.

What did not happen as the Industrial Revolution unleashed all that energy from the sun that was stored in fossil fuels, when the Industrial Revolution decided 'We will release this in a big hurry and become immensely wealthy and immensely powerful through this' there was not a decision to say 'But because there is a negative consequence that will be borne out at some point in the future, we are going to immediately move to find alternatives; we are going to use all this power and wealth that we are getting to find alternatives', that did not happen. So here we are.

If it had happened, we would not even know to thank them, because we just would not have climate change. So the moral of the story is that we do have to clean up the mess that was created by the way in which the world harnessed the power of fossil fuels without appreciating the consequences, but let's not do it to future generations in other forms of harm that we can foresee. But having had that impact, we must react collectively. We have to.

We are not particularly good at that beyond a few people around us, but we have to. At the very least as a state we must do that. That is why we have an emphasis on consultation as we develop the strategic planning that comes out of this. It is why I have immense sympathy, particularly as you mentioned, in primary producers who are copping the impact of climate change first and are also going to have to make shifts economically that will be challenging. I think water and climate are

going to be very big elements of our conversation in the next few years, and that we must do that as much as possible, not from partisan perspectives but from: how do we do this collectively?

Mr PATTERSON: I move amendment No. 1 in my name.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): No, it has been ruled out of order.

Mr PATTERSON: But I had not even moved it beforehand, so I am moving it now.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): No, it has been filed and it has been ruled out of order by the previous Acting Chair.

Mr PATTERSON: What did he rule out of order? Did he foreshadow that that would happen?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Shall we read out his ruling again?

Mr PATTERSON: I am still moving amendment No. 1.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Are you happy to just rule that it is out of order?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Yes, it has been ruled already. I am happy to read out the details of that ruling and repeat it if you like.

Mr PATTERSON: Yes, because I want to move this. I think it is important for South Australians who are struggling under massive high electricity bills and this is—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): There are mechanisms—

Mr PATTERSON: —a way to help them.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Member for Morphett! There are mechanisms to disagree with the Chair's ruling. If you would like to avail yourself of those mechanisms, you can. But you cannot move that amendment. You can move amendment No. 2, and I suggest you do so.

Mr PATTERSON: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Patterson-1]—

Page 3, after line 12—After subclause (7) insert:

- (8) Section 3(2)—after paragraph (c) insert:
 - (d) recognition should be given to the importance of the agricultural industry to South Australia and it should be acknowledged that there is a fluctuation of greenhouse gas emissions in relation to the agricultural industry.

The reason for doing this is noting, as I have said in my questions before, and looking for support from all members of this house, that agriculture is vital for South Australia. It is vital that we have a fully functioning agricultural industry that is able to affordably feed South Australians and have high availability so when people need food it is available and provided by our own agricultural industry here in South Australia. Now, of course, the emissions profile for that agriculture sector, the make-up of those emissions, as reported by government, are that there has not been a significant change in that profile the whole way along.

We need to make sure in going forward—because this bill talks around enacting plans and policies throughout all the Public Service and throughout all of private industry—that at least those agricultural sectors are able to be protected and worked with and acknowledged, because, as I have said, they also are very important to emissions in South Australia. They are world's best practice. This amendment recognises part of the objects of the act, with the provision:

- (d) recognition should be given to the importance of the agricultural industry to South Australia and it should be acknowledged that there is a fluctuation of greenhouse gas emissions in relation to the agricultural industry.

By that it means seasonality depending on the growing conditions. If there is good growing, there may well be more emissions, but that is a good thing because that means supply and demand, there is more food in the market, availability increases to South Australians, and there is affordability, and certainly costs come down, so you have affordable food sources there. As part of that, of course, there may well be greenhouse gas emissions that go in relativity to that high-yield season.

We need to make sure that the agricultural sector is not penalised and an impost not put on them unfairly. They are competing against worldwide markets. We need to make sure that they can compete properly and that we are not going to, in effect, enable other countries to come in and provide food that is cheaper while at the same time have their emissions profile drastically increasing, as we have seen in Asia. They are not having their emissions go up, without giving as much consideration that we here in South Australia give to emissions, but then that has a flow-on effect to agriculture. We do not want to see that.

This amendment at least allows this object to be put into the act. We on this side of the house—and I think everyone in this house, I would hope—are in support of this amendment, which would give recognition to the importance of the agriculture industry.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am inclined to support this amendment. There were some questions about it. The ESD principles are accepted around the world and are articulated in a certain way, so it is not exactly adding a principle to the ESD principles. But because the content of what is stated is something that I support, I am therefore happy to agree to the amendment. We may have a look between the houses at whether it fits somewhere else, but I suspect not; I suspect that we will just stick with supporting it.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 3.

Mr PATTERSON: We are talking about the interpretation of meanings here. After 'Australian jurisdiction' it talks about climate change adaptation and climate change mitigation as well. We have covered some of this ground, but I think it is worth going through it and seeking some answers to help clarify the intention of these interpretations.

Previously we talked about South Australia's emissions making up, as of 2019—I use that because it references that it coincides with the latest Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, their sixth assessment report, and certainly there will be a new one coming out so we will be able to move along. As of lining up those years, the emissions for South Australia's profile at the time was 24 megatonnes and it since then has been reduced further. At the time, the global emissions were 59,000 megatonnes, so that put South Australia's emissions at 0.04 per cent.

When we are looking at mitigation and mitigating emissions here in South Australia, is it fair to say that, at best, South Australia's ability to directly mitigate climate change as it happens here in South Australia and keep temperatures below 2° from pre-industrial times—noting that there was some conversation about the industrial revolution, so that refers to before that occurred—would be 0.04 per cent and that the remaining 99.96 per cent of mitigation relies on the rest of Australia, of course, but principally global efforts to reduce emissions?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I did not quite understand that as a question on the clause.

Mr PATTERSON: We are talking about climate change mitigation, but when policies and plans are being formulated they will be able to have an understanding via the interpretation—what the minister means by 'climate change mitigation'. In terms of that mitigation, when we think about our policy, like being able to clarify to those policymakers—mindful of our impacts here in South Australia directly on global emissions and mindful of how that will mitigate to prevent climate change—is it the fact that our efforts will effectively have a 0.04 impact and therefore what Australia does, what the rest of global emissions do, the remaining 99.96 per cent will have an impact on the South Australian climate?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I think we have extensively canvassed the rationale for why we ought to seek to reduce our greenhouse gas emissions. The purpose of having these definitions of 'adaptation' and 'mitigation' is, to be clear, that they are not the same thing. I hear them, quite often, used interchangeably, and it is important we understand that there is adaptation, which is saying, 'As the climate changes, we need to do what we can to adapt to that,' and mitigation is what we do to reduce emissions.

So this is a definitional question, and even people who are reasonably well versed I hear occasionally swap those around. The importance of having this in the interpretation is that we are

clear that there are two elements to climate change: one is how we reduce carbon emissions and the other is how we adapt to the warming that is occurring.

Mr PATTERSON: I agree with what you are saying: they are two separate elements of climate change and how it affects South Australia. The question was more honing in on the climate change mitigation aspect of those, but I do acknowledge what you are saying around adaptation and for clarifying that. So the adaptation is around dealing with the effects of it, and the mitigation is reducing emissions.

In terms of that climate change mitigation, as we go through this act, if we in South Australia are successful in meeting not only the 2030 target but the interim targets along the way—ultimately the principal goal is reaching net zero by 2050—South Australia does its job but the global emissions continue the trajectory that they are currently on, will South Australia's climate be less than 2° independent of the climate of the rest of the world?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Before the minister answers, I will just point out that clause 3 is simply about interpretation of other references within the bill. I will leave it up to the minister to answer as she sees fit, but it seems to me that these questions might be better suited to other clauses. I will leave it in the minister's hands.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Acting Chair, I agree with you and also we have had these discussions previously. The impression I have, and the member may well clarify that this is not the case, is that the member is very intent on indicating how little contribution to climate change South Australia makes through its emissions production. Not only have I freely accepted that—because maths—but also it is something that I have said in public and the member asked me about whether I had said that in public at estimates last year if not the year before—because maths. We do not produce that much carbon, therefore we, in turning off all of our carbon, do not stop climate change and we do not sit out climate change. These are expressions that I use all the time in speeches.

I think we are rehashing the ground of understanding that, because climate change is real and is happening across the world and requires emissions reduction, we would be at risk of having many stranded assets in our economy and many stranded industries that would be unable to get insurance, get capital investment or find markets if we did not do what the rest of the world is in the process of doing, which is to decarbonise. So we are doing what we need to do for our economy.

I will, at a certain point, feel that I am repeating myself to the point of being boring for the future readers of our *Hansard*—and I am sure there will be many—that that is the overriding necessity for us on the mitigation side, that we must get our economy in the best possible position, and we do that by decarbonising and therefore having access to capital markets, to insurance, and to markets where we sell our products.

We also do it by making sure that the rest of the world knows that we are of that ilk. Australia's reputation comes and goes because of various shenanigans in federal parliament, largely, and as a result of those shenanigans the absence of investment in changing our electricity production in other states. So trying to—with a single voice, if possible—be very proud of South Australia's shifts where we have made them is part of that economic positioning for us. The emissions reduction is utterly necessary for the future of our economy. As the Acting Chair has stated, we have extensively canvassed that in the discussion of the targets. We are now on the question of interpretation and I am unlikely to want to continue to repeat that particular set of facts.

The opposition may try to use it in some way—I am struggling to see how—to say, 'We might as well keep emitting carbon because it is not going to stop climate change.' Surely the opposition understands not only that everyone already knows that, because we are a pretty small population, but also that we are sensibly positioning ourselves economically, because it is not just the government saying it, it is many sectors of industry, including many sectors of the agricultural industry, that are saying, 'Damn it, we are going to have to do this, and we are going to have to make a virtue of how we are doing it as part of our marketing and as part of our investment attraction capability.'

Clause passed.

Clause 4.

Mr PATTERSON: As to clause 4, talking around the actual targets themselves, this has been canvassed in some way before, but just to help reinforce. In terms of these targets once set up, and the interim targets as well, are the targets enforceable and what happens if these targets and interim targets are not met?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I have answered that question to the member for Narungga at clause 1, so I probably will not repeat myself.

Mr PATTERSON: Has there been modelling undertaken around what the anticipated costs are to South Australia to achieve the interim target that is put in place at 2030 and ultimately towards the principal final target of net zero by 2050, and if there has been can the minister outline what the costs are and the feasibility for each of the emissions sectors?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We are well on track to achieve the target for 2030. As I have stated before, we are not far off 60 per cent now. It does rely on how land use goes and the carbon sinks. A huge fire could do damage, for example, but let's hope that does not occur. Nonetheless, we have every expectation of achieving the 2030 target under the current settings. As I was explaining earlier, what is important is that we are not just saying, 'We don't have to do anything until 2030,' because the more gentle the slope can be to 2050, the easier it will be, rather than deferring until the last minute.

There has been some analysis of the economic benefit to the state overall of having a low-carbon economy in the future, so there is excellent evidence that that will be of benefit to the state. However, the question the member is asking, quite legitimately, is: what might be the impact on individual sectors or businesses as a result of any individual policies that they undertake or that the government undertakes in order to start to further drive down emissions? That properly belongs in the statewide strategy discussion which is required to occur.

We will have interim targets, and we will have strategies to get there. While the 2030 target is not one that requires us to have detailed economic or cost-to-business modelling given how well we have done to date, we will, as part of developing statewide strategies over time, be looking at different costs of different approaches that different industries might be taking.

Mr PATTERSON: For clarification, what you are saying is that there is no specific modelling at the moment around costs, but there is around what the economic opportunities are for the 2030 target, and then going forward, of course, there will be plans put in place. Certainly, when you are talking about the short-term targets, we have one here around 100 per cent net renewable electricity generation by 31 December 2027. Could this target be achieved without an interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales being in place?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The 2027 target had been, I think, set by government policy for 2030 previously. It was brought forward to 2027 a little while ago by the Premier and the Minister for Energy and Mining on the basis that the expectation was that we were going to achieve that on current trajectory. AEMO has us getting to 90 per cent by 2025-26, so the current trajectory for net renewable electricity production is well on track to achieve by 2027. In regard to the specific question about the role of the interconnector, either of them, we do not have advice on that, because we are reliant obviously on a different portfolio, but we can provide that between the houses.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

Mr PATTERSON: In regard to the functions of the minister and the functions that can be put in place, the minister has declared a climate emergency. When we look at the emissions reductions that have gone on in South Australia, in 2005 they were 36 megatonnes, and by 2018 the emissions profile for South Australia was 25 megatonnes, and then by 2022 they had been reduced further to 16 megatonnes. So there has been substantial reduction already, as reported there.

Sixty per cent of the 36 megatonnes, going against the 2005 levels, sees overall the emissions of greenhouse gas equivalent at 14.5 megatonnes. So to achieve the target that has been put in place for 2030, it requires 1.5 megatonnes of further reduction over what was in place by 2022. If you look at the trajectory over the last 17 years, it has been a reduction of 20 megatonnes, from

36 through to 16. That is about 1.2 megatonnes per year on average. In the last four years, as I said, it went from 25 megatonnes down to 16 megatonnes. That is a nine-megatonne reduction over those four years, just over two, $2\frac{1}{4}$, megatonnes per year. That is the trajectory it is on. The remaining eight years have a reduction of 1.5 megatonnes.

If you look at the trajectory, it is significantly slower than the historical average and certainly slower than the recent years. When you hear about a climate emergency, that has connotations of effectively a higher priority than would ordinarily have been in place previously. Certainly, if you look at the impact that messaging has on different demographics, it can cause anxiety. It can cause thoughts of urgent action, yet here we do not have a target that you would have to say, in terms of looking at its trajectory, correlates with that sort of language. I am interested to understand, bearing in mind there was a climate emergency declared by the minister, how that is played out in terms of these targets.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Again, for the life of me—

Mr Patterson: A function of the minister.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): If you will let me finish my ruling, again, I will let the minister answer if she chooses, but I fail to see how it is relevant to that particular clause. I will leave it up to the minister.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is very kind of you. I suspect you are absolutely right technically, but I understand why the question is being asked. The correction I would make for the member, though, is that I did not declare a climate emergency: parliament did. I presented a motion and parliament agreed to it, this chamber agreed to it, as happens with many motions. That is not a function of the minister: that is a motion that has been supported by this parliament. It is curious for me to hear the member saying maybe we should have a tougher target because there is a climate emergency, having just spent—

Mr Patterson interjecting:

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The question of if, in fact, we have this climate emergency or the government believes there is a climate emergency, why would we not have a faster rate between now and 2030, as we have had previously? I have a few answers to that, but one is the irony of having listened to so many of the questions being based on the fact that nothing we do will make any difference. To then say we should go from 1.5 megatonnes to a higher average per year, as we have had previously, appears to me to put back in the question that how fast we go actually stops the climate emergency. I thought we kind of addressed the science of that.

Let us have a look at why it is the government has proposed—and we have already passed that section—a target of 60 per cent by 2030 when we are at about 57 per cent now. We may well overshoot. At the current trajectory, we ought to overshoot, in which case, excellent, because it gets us closer to the 2050 target earlier, which means that the trajectory is easier on everybody. If we overshoot, that is excellent.

The nervousness I have is the degree to which we are still reliant on the carbon sink element of the Greenhouse Gas Inventory. There are emissions that we produce every year and they have come down substantially in electricity production and, in a relatively small, but nonetheless important way, in other sectors, and some have gone up a bit and so on, over time. Where we have seen significant change is in that land use and carbon sequestration effort that is undertaken by growing things across the state.

The way that that is measured has altered over time and has indicated that there has been more effort there than we had thought previously, with the process that is used, the methodology that is used by the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory office. But, equally, as I mentioned in a previous answer, the kinds of fires that occurred in New South Wales in that 2019-20 summer—we had devastating fires here—took out huge amounts of land and generated a lot of carbon in doing that. Similarly, the fires in Canada over recent years have generated a huge amount of carbon.

Assuming that successful trajectory that we have had will just continue without any additional effort, and that we could safely say that we will achieve, without recognising the volatility of that part

of the measurement, I think would be unwise. Therefore, we have proposed this target hoping that we will be able to overshoot it, both because there has not been that kind of devastating impact and because we will be able to achieve even more in the other sectors because people are moving fast. Sometimes you go on a slow trajectory and then there is a technological breakthrough and it makes a sudden big change—and we very much hope for that—but that is the reason.

Why did I bring to this parliament a climate emergency motion that people voted for? Because the people outside of here know that it is a climate emergency, and for us to continue to deny it by refusing to bring it in, where it has been passed by many councils across the country who recognise it, would be to deny to the people who know that we are in the middle of an emergency in this world—known even to Jeremy Clarkson, what he has seen and experienced—which is that we are in a climate emergency. To acknowledge that is important—to acknowledge it to the young people who we are giving this heating, drying globe to because they need to know that we understand that.

We then need to take sensible action. The face of the climate emergency requires all of us to reduce our carbon emissions, of course, around the world, but it also requires us to prepare, and the adaptation side of this is very important because we are already experiencing it and we will experience it more severely over time.

Mr PATTERSON: If we could pick up on the land use and clearing and forestry, yes, I concur in terms that a lot of the reductions have come in that sector. As you have seen over time, in terms of the emissions reporting, since 2005 there have been periods of course where it has approached the levels that have been reported, certainly in 2020-21, and there have been other years where there have been similar effectively equivalent reductions compared to the 2005 levels, and 2021-22 was the most that has been reported on since 2005.

The minister talked about different reporting mechanisms, and I am hoping that the minister can provide a breakdown of how those 2021 and 2022 reductions were arrived at specifically. In 2021 it was down to about six or seven megatonnes in terms of reduction on 2005 levels, and then in 2021-22 it was about 10 megatonnes.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We are straying into very interesting territory but away from the legislation, particularly from the clause. What I will do is offer a briefing to the member as to how the National Greenhouse Gas Inventory works—obviously he has quite a lot of familiarity with it—but also some of the changes in methodology over recent times, and the way in which the carbon sink element of it has been measured over time. That might be useful anyway, and it would certainly answer the question that has just been asked.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): Are there any more questions on clause 5?

Mr PATTERSON: A clarification question around that. Maybe if we do not go into that specific detail around the land use, but in terms of the risks going forward, you have said potentially if there is a fire. Are there other instances where there are opportunities for it to be further reduced? Or, alternatively—I am just asking questions based—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Odenwalder): You have not heard my ruling yet. I was going to congratulate you on the strength of your question. No, I was not really. Your clarification relates to the minister's answer, presumably, in which she said that the line of questioning was irrelevant to the clause and that she offered you a briefing. Unless you have a further question on this clause, I think it is time to move on. So no further questions?

Mr PATTERSON: No.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

Mr PATTERSON: Clause 6 talks about two-yearly reports around the targets that have been set in place. There will be two-yearly reports, even though we have the 2030 interim targets. I am assuming there will be reports coming out two years hence from this in terms of the reports that are there. Will those reports detail not only the reductions that have taken place but the economic impact of those reductions pertaining to the costs, the opportunities, as you have outlined, in terms of

industry as well, and how will they be broken down specifically? We already have reports on different breakdowns of emissions sources in terms of agriculture, industrial processes, etc.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: To be clear, the two-yearly reports exist already. They go on the website every two years. These amendments under the section called 'Two-yearly reports' are just to have consequential amendments to some of the language that is slightly different, to change 'renewable electricity target' and say 'targets set under section 5', which is the renewable electricity target, and to insert after the word 'energy' the word 'sources'. This amendment itself does not create those two-yearly reports, the act that has been in operation since 2007 has certain requirements and we meet those obligations.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

Mr PATTERSON: This clause talks about the Climate Change Council and the costs associated with climate change mitigation and climate change adaptation. It looks at putting in some requirements for the Climate Change Council to consider. Specifically, does that then infer that the Climate Change Council will consider power prices for South Australians, both households and small businesses, and also the reliability of that power?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Again, what we are dealing with here are some consequential amendments in terms of language that has previously been agreed to. The current act already talks about costs associated with limiting climate change and greenhouse gas emissions, and this is to include the adaptation, and there is a bit of other language that is used. So it is already an existing part of the functions of the council; it is just refining the language to reflect the changes in the legislation that we have agreed to.

Mr PATTERSON: Further to that, it does outline around the costs; with respect to the Climate Change Council it gives further directives in terms of what costs they look at, such as climate change mitigation, climate change adaptation and mitigating those affects. So the costs for agriculture in terms of food production and the like: can the minister outline how this change will give direction to the climate council and ensure that in their deliberations they are considering costs to the agricultural sector, and also, in terms of their planning, how you expect them to work alongside the plans around reducing emissions in the agricultural sector?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am just re-reading the original bill. The language change is quite minute, when I re-read it. This is a function for the council that it is able to provide advice to the minister on these issues, should the minister ask or should they choose to provide it. It is not the same as the two-yearly report, which has certain requirements for reporting. So they are able to do that should they choose to. As I say, the only amendment we are really making is to very slightly change the way that the function is expressed.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

Mr PATTERSON: If we look through here there are some questions around policy. The questions afforded to me probably have been asked in other areas. In terms of the policies, it now looks to also allow for plans to be put in place as well. In terms of this, on reading it, it does not seem to me that there is mention around consideration in these policies and plans to take into account the cost of power prices and reliability of power prices. If I could clarify that and ask: whereabouts in this amendment does it ensure that the policies and plans will take into account power prices and reliability? Particularly noting that the opposition were trying to afford the ability for that to be considered explicitly through amendments by putting in targets around power prices, where in this now will power prices and reliability be able to be taken into account?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Where South Australia is almost unique—and I should acknowledge that Tasmania is at about 100 per cent net renewable electricity production; it is just that it does it with hydro, which is controversial in its own way. But South Australia is very, very close to achieving net zero renewable electricity production—well, 100 per cent renewable electricity production and

net zero carbon. So the idea that talking about reducing carbon emissions and having plans over the next 10, 20 years to do that will have an interaction with electricity prices misunderstands that for the purposes of this act we are almost there and will be there very soon under AEMO's predictions. So therefore it would be unusual for it to have to specifically deal with the issues that are being raised by the member.

Mr PATTERSON: So, in terms of these policies and plans, if it is not going to explicitly state that, as the minister answered then, how will these policies look into the effect of the different jurisdictions that have different emissions profiles? We have South Australian businesses operating in South Australia with the emissions profiles there. What directions are in here about policies to protect and to assist manufacturing businesses here in South Australia to make sure they can manufacture here and produce products that are not only low emission but are competitively priced compared to potentially imported product where the emissions from other countries may have a higher profile?

Are there any explicit directions in here to ensure that, when plans are put in place and policies are put in place, it does take into account the fact that South Australian businesses—manufacturing businesses specifically for the point of this question—are producing in South Australian energy environments and to guard against effectively offshoring emissions whereby we might reduce our emissions here in South Australia but actually globally they are not reduced because effectively there is a replacement?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The member touches on an interesting challenge that is being addressed at the commonwealth level about how to deal with industries that are affected by import competition and by difficulty in exporting. This is an issue that is rightfully being looked at by the commonwealth and is being done so through their powers and also what is occurring through AEMO. This legislation is not the legislation that interacts with the National Electricity Market (NEM). That is why there was a ruling, as I understand it, that the amendments were out of order, that this is not that legislation and having multiple bits of legislation trying to do the same thing at the same time is unhelpful.

That said, the broader question of how do we understand the impact on various segments when we construct these plans, including importantly of course manufacturing, as well as, as we have extensively canvassed, agriculture, is that these plans are required to be consulted on and to be worked through so that the best possible policies are being approached, considered and adopted in concert with industry, in concert with the South Australian community and also recognising the kind of issues that have been raised by the member but that are addressed through that national discussion about what to do with the safeguard mechanism and how the safeguard mechanism interacts with vulnerability to exports and imports.

You should recall that what is happening in Europe is that they are increasingly using that very mechanism as a means of putting up trade barriers so you cannot export to Europe if you are not doing the same things they are requiring of their people. That is not the rest of the world yet, but it may well become so.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

CONVERSION PRACTICES PROHIBITION BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CASINO (PENALTIES) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CONSTRUCTION INDUSTRY TRAINING FUND (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ABORIGINAL HERITAGE (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

PORTABLE LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Auditor-General—

Report 9 of 2024—Annual Report 2023-24—

Part A: Executive Summary

Part B: Controls Opinion

Part C: Agency Audit Reports

Report 10 of 2024—Update to the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2024

[Ordered to be published]

Annual Reports 2023-24—

Inspector, Office of the

Ombudsman SA [Ordered to be published]

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

Regulation made under the following Act—

Freedom of Information—General—Prescribed Body

Rules made under the following Acts—

Environment, Resources and Development Court—

Native Title—Reinstated

Reinstated

First Nations Voice—Reinstated

Supreme Court Act 1935, District Court Act 1991, Youth Court Act 1993,

Magistrates Court—Uniform Civil—No. 12

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

Annual Reports 2023-24—

Co-Management Board—

Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park

Witjira National Park

Yumbarra Conservation Park

Heritage Council, South Australian

Pastoral Board

Stormwater Management Authority

StudyAdelaide

Regulation made under the following Act—
Crown Land Management—General

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Rule made under the following Act—
Mining—Reinstated

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

Primary Industries and Regions, Department of—Annual Report 2023-24

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

Coroners Act 1993—Coroner's Finding into the death of Jennifer Ann Collins—SA Health's
Response to Report on Response to July 2024
Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner—Annual Report 2023-24

By the Minister for Local Government (Hon. J.K. Szakacs)—

Local Council By-Laws—

District Council of Loxton Waikerie—

- No. 1—Permits and Penalties
- No. 2—Local Government Land
- No. 3—Roads
- No. 4—Moveable Signs
- No. 5—Dogs
- No. 6—Cats
- No. 7—Camping and Mooring

District Council of Yankalilla—

- No. 5—Dogs
- No. 7—Cats

Question Time

GENERAL PRACTITIONER PAYROLL TAX

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Has the cost of seeing a GP at the Hallett Cove Corner Surgery increased or decreased since the election of the of the Malinauskas Labor government and, if so, why?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (14:07): I am not a patient of that Hallett Cove medical practice, but what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, you have asked your question; please listen to the answer.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: What I am familiar with, though, is that according to the most recent data that I have been able to access, approximately 76 per cent, I think it is, of GP consultations in South Australia for the most recent quarter were bulk-billed. A bulk-billed GP consultation means that there is no gap fee charged by a general practitioner or the practice to the patient when they are in receipt of that consultation. That, of course, is a good thing and something that the current federal government is trying to foster improvements to.

As the Minister for Health has previously advised the house, the current Albanese federal Labor government has tripled the bulk-billing incentive for GPs in an effort to improve remuneration to GPs because under the 10 years of the previous federal Coalition government the payment made by Medicare to GPs was frozen, so there had been no increase for 10 years under the federal Coalition government, and that regime was commenced by the current leader of the federal opposition, Peter Dutton. He was the first one to freeze this.

However, if approximately 76 per cent of consultations with GPs across South Australia are bulk-billed and there is no gap fee, then of course, commensurately, that must mean that there are 24 per cent or a bit less than one quarter of all consultations where a gap fee has been charged, and that represents a gap fee that has been charged for a long period of time.

I am also familiar with the fact that on 1 July each year, GPs who charge a gap fee will increase that gap fee year on year representing, of course, the increased cost of service delivery particularly in a high-inflation environment where, as we have seen from COVID onwards, for example, the cost of medical supplies—after 10 years of stagnation—and labour costs are recovering and people are getting wage increases.

So it's natural that GPs on 1 July each year in recent years have increased their gap fee, for those GPs who choose to charge a gap fee. The good news is that, despite the fact that GPs across the nation (other than Western Australia) have been liable for payroll tax since 2009, this government has introduced a tax cut for GPs to make sure that GPs are not obliged to pay payroll tax on the wages earned in providing those 76 per cent of GP consultations.

Despite how those opposite, including the former shadow treasurer, tried to misrepresent this issue before he lost his portfolio under the unpleasantness we have seen in recent months in the Liberal ranks, before that and the misrepresentations by those opposite, maybe with this new portfolio he might get a question. Who knows? Maybe the member for Colton might get on the scoreboard. We will see; of course, if he hasn't threatened to resign.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I just remind everyone on both sides to keep the noise levels down. Interjections are unparliamentary.

GENERAL PRACTITIONER PAYROLL TAX

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will Labor's patient tax grab increase the cost of seeing a GP at the Hallett Cove Corner Surgery? With your leave, sir, and that of the house—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: standing order 98. I would ask him to rephrase his question in line with standing orders.

The SPEAKER: Maybe have another go.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: Thank you, sir, I will do my level best. My question is to the Premier. Will the recent changes to GP taxation rules increase the cost of seeing a GP at the Hallett Cove Corner Surgery? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: On 1 July Labor's changes came into effect increasing the cost of GP visits by anywhere between \$10 to \$20 per visit.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:12): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question because his question obviously specifically mentions Hallett Cove, and Hallett Cove is clearly a suburb that's going to get a lot of attention over the next few weeks or so. I was chatting to a Hallett Cove resident just the other day, a gentleman by the name of Alex Dighton.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta! I have warned everyone. Don't interject.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Alex Dighton is a Hallett Cove resident. He lives in Hallett Cove with his wife and his son. He has lived there for some time, and he knows a lot about Hallett Cove. I am sure he can introduce some members opposite to Hallett Cove at some point in the not too distant future.

Alex Dighton, the Labor candidate for the seat of Hallett Cove, was talking to me about just how many residents in that local community are conscious of the effort that this government is undertaking to address healthcare service delivery in conjunction, I might add, with the federal Labor government of course.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Morialta—final warning.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The Leader of the Opposition in his question referenced 1 July. As the Treasurer I think quite appropriately drew the opposition's attention to earlier, this government has in actual fact facilitated formally, as a matter of fact, a tax reduction in the way that payroll tax is operated by creating a brand-new regime around the application of payroll tax that indeed exempts payroll tax from those practices or those consults that relate to bulk-billing services—and bulk-billing is important. Bulk-billing is particularly important for residents in Hallett Cove who, like the rest of so many other families in metropolitan Adelaide and throughout the state, are grappling with a higher cost environment. We are determined to make sure that we contemplate any initiative that is available to the state government that could be reasonably accommodated that will make a difference to the cost-of-living pressures experienced by those in Hallett Cove.

While on one level I sympathise with the Leader of the Opposition, who doesn't have a direct conduit into Hallett Cove, who has to make their way to Hallett Cove via Glenelg South, we will continue to engage directly, we will talk to people on the ground and we will make sure we remain connected to the concerns of those residents in Hallett Cove via a high-quality representative or Labor candidate in the form of Alex Dighton.

HEALTHCARE SYSTEM CAMPAIGN

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question again is to the Premier. Will the government's \$1.9 million recent advertising campaign help to reduce the cost of seeing a GP at the Hallett Cove Corner Surgery? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The South Australian government recently launched a \$1.9 million advertising campaign boasting about the health system.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:15): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. The campaign that the government is running at the moment is actually important for a couple of reasons. The first is this: at its most basic South Australians are entitled to have a degree of familiarity with a \$7-plus billion investment that we are making in the healthcare system. That's obvious. It goes without saying.

The other two elements are important as well. The first one goes to the fact that as a result of this government's commitment to increase the capacity and make a bigger health system we are employing a lot more people within the health system and we need South Australians—particularly younger South Australians who might be contemplating a career or a profession in healthcare service delivery through the state government—to know that there are lots of options available in that regard and we want people to be aware of it.

It is a competitive labour market, we have the lowest unemployment rate in the country, which means, as a significant employer in SA Health which now employs I think over 50,000 people, we need to compete in a tight labour market.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Excuse me Premier, the member for Morialta can leave until the end of question time.

The honourable member for Morialta having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The third element is making sure that the community writ large has a degree of awareness of the options that are available to them when it comes to being treated in a timely way, not just through emergency departments but we want to make sure that people are aware of all the alternatives that this government is investing in in terms of access to health care.

The Leader of the Opposition draws the house's attention to the \$1.9 million investment that the government is making in this campaign. He is aware of that because the government has disclosed it proactively, which is a completely different approach, I might add, from what those opposite applied when they were in government not too long ago. We never got those numbers upfront. We, as a government, have sought to provide those numbers transparently, which I think is a good thing because we do not shy away from the investments we are making.

One number that the Leader of the Opposition and those opposite weren't keen to put out there upfront was the cost of their own campaigns when they were in government, including the Building What Matters campaign, which wasn't \$1.9 million, that is true, it was \$2.3 million. Of course, the contrast is stark. They were running around talking about infrastructure projects such as GlobeLink and the like, but we as a government are only seeking to communicate to the people of South Australia about the actual projects we are delivering, and the size of the investment to increase the capacity of our health system is very substantial indeed.

Only on the weekend, I was with the health minister at The Queen Elizabeth Hospital where we could see firsthand how the bright Woodville facility is operating. This is an alternative pathway, an ED avoidance measure that, from memory, has already seen over a thousand people in the short time it has been open. It's making a difference and we are very grateful for the hard work that is being applied there.

Of course, it is these types of initiatives that in their own way have contributed to a 41 per cent reduction in ramping hours that we saw in the last month. I say that figure in the context of the fact that we know there is a long, long way to go. We are not being presumptuous about this, we are not celebrating prematurely, we are not claiming victory but what we are doing is delivering the big investments, the new infrastructure, the greater number of personnel to make a difference in health care service delivery and we are pleased with recent results.

HEALTHCARE SYSTEM CAMPAIGN

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question again is to the Premier. Will this advertising campaign fix the ramping crisis for residents in Trott Park and, if so, how? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. V.A. TARZIA: The South Australian government recently launched the \$1.9 million advertising campaign boasting about the health system.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:20): The residents of Trott Park I think would be heartened once they get a degree of familiarity with the contrast between this government's policy investment in health in the southern suburbs versus the previous policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition, you are on your final warning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition can leave the chamber until the end of question time. I just said you were on your final warning, you defied the Chair, you kept yelling out, we'll see you after the end of question time.

The honourable member for Hartley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: And members on my right, if you can be quiet as well, thank you.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: The previous policy was to cut the Ambulance Service, and to make nurses redundant in a global pandemic. This policy is very different indeed. What we are doing is methodically going about the task of dramatically increasing the capacity of the health system. In the southern suburbs alone we are investing in Noarlunga, we are investing in the Flinders Medical Centre, we are investing in the Repat and we are investing in our ambulance services. Like I said in my previous answer, in the last month we have seen some of that come to fruition.

I guess the most heartening thing for residents in Trott Park would actually be the results of the new beds that we have been able to open in the northern suburbs. What we saw recently were the beds that were opened up at the Lyell McEwin Hospital—and I am looking to the Minister for Health—I think it was 48 that we opened up at the Lyell McEwin in the last month. As soon as we opened those beds up we saw that bed block and transfer of care—that is to say, ramping—reduced dramatically in our northern suburbs facilities.

Why would that matter to someone in Trott Park? That matters to someone in Trott Park because there are more beds coming online in the southern suburbs too, whether it be at Noarlunga or at the Flinders Medical Centre. We are working as hard as we can to make sure we do not just open up beds around Trott Park or the Lyell McEwin, but throughout the entirety of the state. It is a government policy that we have to increase the capacity of the system to accommodate a growing population, because it is more desirable to live in South Australia now than in comparison to other jurisdictions in a number of ways. We have a growing population but also an ageing population.

This is going to take time, and we said that from the outset. But we are delivering the additional beds and the people to service them. There is hope, on the back of the degree of evidence, that the policy may yet be making a difference. I cannot stress enough, and I emphasise this for all members within the parliament—MPs, media, the public, anybody caring to listen—that while we see some good results in September we are not prematurely assuming that that translates to better results in the next month and the month after that.

We have to watch this very carefully, but every effort is being put in, and where we see evidence of something not working we seek to change the policy. If we see evidence of things that are working we seek to double-down on it. That is a concerted effort. Just this morning the health minister and I met with the new elected leadership of the AEA and they were able to provide yet another fresh perspective on the issues that are confronting the Ambulance Service, notwithstanding the record investment we are making there as well.

The residents in Trott Park deserve to know about the services that are being invested in in and around the southern suburbs. We maintain that effort and we are utterly committed to making sure that people are well informed about their options to get good care around where they reside.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call on the member for MacKillop, I would like to welcome to parliament today students from Thebarton Senior College, who are guests of the member for West Torrens, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Great to have you here. I hope you enjoy what you see. I hope that members are going to be a little bit better behaved than they have been in the first 17 minutes.

Question Time

BORDERTOWN HIGH SCHOOL

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:24): My question is to Minister for Education. When will the government make needed disability upgrades to Bordertown High School? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: The school has been advocating for improvements since the beginning of the year, when a student in a wheelchair was enrolled. Staff are being forced to carry a heavy portable ramp around so that the student can access classrooms and buildings. The disability bathroom/change room is also inadequate.

The Hon. B.I. BOYER (Wright—Minister for Education, Training and Skills) (14:24): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and his advocacy for Bordertown High School, which is a school I had the pleasure of visiting towards the end of last year, when we had country cabinet down that way. I went along and had a tour of the school and met with the principal, Alicia, and the deputy principal, Lauren. I met some of the students there as well, who I have to say are doing some

pretty impressive work there. It was made very clear to me then, as it has been in this question today from the member for MacKillop, about the inadequate disability resources that are provided at Bordertown High School.

I don't think it will come as a surprise to people in this place that it has been and, in some places, continues to be a struggle for us to have the same high-quality provision of access to disability services in our school settings in all places in the state, particularly in rural, regional and remote parts of South Australia, where sometimes we haven't traditionally had the infrastructure there, where sometimes, because of lower population numbers, the number of students who are seeking that kind of education and care aren't as high as they might be in metropolitan areas, which of course can make it a bit more complicated in the delivery as well.

But none of those things is an excuse for us not fixing it. I made the commitment to Lauren and Alicia at Bordertown on that day, just like the commitment we made in the same country cabinet, when the principal at Naracoorte got up and asked a very similar question around the need to improve access to disability services on site at schools for students in country areas. I said that we are committed to fixing it. I acknowledge it has been slower to occur than it should have at Bordertown. The situation described by the member for MacKillop of a student carting a ramp around is not acceptable.

But I do have an update for the member for MacKillop, which I think and hope will be welcomed. It is that the significant works that we are going to be undertaking at the school to make sure the scenario described by the member is a thing of the past is now out to tender. We anticipate that, once that tender is complete and a builder is chosen through that process, those upgrades will commence in the coming school holiday period, which is not too far away given we have just started term 4. We have decided to do it across the break between the 2024 and 2025 school years so there is the least amount of disruption to classes as we can possibly ensure.

I can tell the member that these major upgrades will mean that all those kinds of facilities and infrastructure that are needed that aren't there now will be provided to make sure that what Bordertown can provide for students who have a disability who are at the school now is what you would expect no matter where you went to school in South Australia and that exactly the same will be able to be said for future generations of young people who will go to Bordertown High School as well.

I really appreciate the member's advocacy on issues around disability at schools in his area. I am quite frank about this: we haven't been as fast as I think we needed to be in terms of upgrading these kinds of facilities. We are thankfully in a day and age now where those regional communities particularly are putting their hand up and saying, 'We are not going to accept or tolerate this anymore,' and I agree with them. But I am also pleased that the department is prioritising these works through the infrastructure budget that it has, so when we go out there and talk about our schools being high-class and consistently accessible no matter where you choose to go to school, we can actually say that with our hand on our heart.

SOCIAL MEDIA SUMMIT

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on the Malinauskas and Minns governments' Social Media Summit held in Sydney and Adelaide last week?

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:28): I am very happy to, and I thank the member for Adelaide for her question. The member for Adelaide knows, as basically everyone in this place knows, that social media is a challenge for young people. We had a Social Media Summit held across Sydney and Adelaide across two days. It was the state government hosting it along with the New South Wales government, and it was compelling.

There were a range of guest speakers from a variety of fields—academics; parents; young people; legal officers; we had Mike Burgess, who of course is the director of ASIO in Australia—all giving speeches about the challenges that social media is presenting, given the fact that it is entirely unregulated. Every other major form of mass communication in this country has a form of regulation.

That regulation necessarily should be light touch in many respects in terms of the content that is disseminated, but there is a form of regulation to protect the public, and particularly young people.

Even movies are classified. Even movies that are MA or R-rated can't be seen by people under the age of 15 or 18, but on social media all of that content is disseminated in a way that is completely unregulated. It is quite astonishing when you think about it that we as a society have allowed that just to transpire. But we have now got to an end game where we know that something has to happen, and this state government, in conjunction with the federal government and also other state governments around the country, are determined to act.

The evidence that was brought forward across those two days—and I know there were a lot of people in this chamber present for the summit, particularly for the first session, and I want to thank all those who were there. I understand people are busy here so not everyone was able to stay for the second half of the day, but the second half of the summit day was probably far more compelling than the first half, with no disrespect to the presenters, including myself. The second half was absolutely compelling and I think it really speaks to the need for action.

One of the things I am heartened by is that there is a degree of bipartisanship here. At a federal level, we have seen the Prime Minister show leadership here and Peter Dutton back it in, and that is something that we certainly welcome. I was, however, slightly alarmed when it was drawn to my attention around the time of the summit that there is a voice who is agitating against these reforms. There is a bloke who I hadn't heard of until just recently by the name of Avi Yemini, who is a far right political activist in—

The Hon. S.E. Close: Yemini.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: How do you say his name?

The Hon. S.E. Close: Yemini.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: Yemini. He is a far right political activist. A couple of years ago he was denied entry into New Zealand because of a 2019 criminal conviction for assaulting his wife. He is on the record as saying he believes Islam is a barbaric ideology, Muslim countries are Islamic (swear words). He is obviously an anti-vaxxer—blah, blah, blah. We know these types. He was hosting a podcast the other day with none other than Senator Antic, who then went on the record to espouse why he is opposed to this type of social media regulation, which then undermines the bipartisanship. The problem with Mr Antic, of course, is that he is the patron now of so many of those opposite—

The SPEAKER: Premier, your time has expired.

The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS: —which begs the question it's now time for: who—someone in the Liberal Party—will show some leadership?

The SPEAKER: Premier, your time has expired.

POLITICAL DONATION REFORM

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:33): My question is to the Special Minister of State. Does the minister stand by his statement on 13 June 2024? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TEAGUE: On 13 June 2024, the minister said, 'No political donor should be able to buy a favourable political outcome in our state by donating to parties or candidates.' It has been reported today that 'the entire state cabinet will attend a \$500 a head cabinet exchange forum' hosted by a group that has donated millions to the state branch of the Labor Party, including four closed-room policy briefings.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:34): I do, and I add this: until a reform is introduced into this parliament, which this government has committed to, which will limit the amount

of influence that people can disproportionately have over politics, then both major parties will engage in the type of arms race which we have seen in this state for many decades.

Of course, in the room that the shadow attorney-general refers to will have been many donors over time, I imagine, to the Liberal Party, but what has occurred in recent times is that they see less favour in contributing to one particular party as against the other. But this illustrates the difficulty in our democracy. It is a problem that has become endemic in Western democracies all around the globe, and it is the fear that people have in the quietness of their hearts that, as individual electors, their voice may not be as strong as others.

Fortunately, in South Australia we have a regime where political expenditure is capped. We have been leaders in developing that legislation. I observe that the commonwealth government, the present government of the day, is contemplating making changes that would bring it into line with some of the changes that we made in a reasonably bipartisan fashion on an earlier occasion. But it is necessary in our democracy, as it is in others, to encourage donations to political parties because there is not a series of regulations that require a, in my view, fairer, better, clearer and, may I say, more refined system that will allow for the type of democracy that I myself believe in.

So I am looking forward to the legislation that this government is drafting coming before this chamber. I look forward to the contribution that you may make and others may make in terms of the formulation of that scheme. But it has been a commitment of the Premier, and it has been a commitment of this government, to bring forward legislation that would make it unnecessary to engage in, as I say, the type of political arms race that we have seen in Western democracies for a long, long time.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN: If you repeat that, member for Chaffey, I will deal with that remark, but in the meantime I will continue my contribution. The difficulty we also see, of course, in other jurisdictions is a breakdown in what I would say is the political compact. An element of trust is necessary between the electorate and political representatives, and the amount of rancour and discord and the lack of trust that is evident in jurisdictions that we observe going through their own political processes puts us in mind of the type of reforms that might be necessary in our own community.

As the shadow minister knows, South Australia has been an absolute outright leader without qualification in a whole range of democratic reforms over the years. One of those reforms, of course, is commemorated behind the shadow minister, where the other right-wing members of his party exist, and some of those reforms are otherwise recorded in the parliamentary library and in other forums. But as I say, this is well known to members. What I hope to bring forward to this parliament, and what the government hopes to bring forward, is a set of nation-leading reforms. Until that time, every political party will continue to raise money.

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen. We will see if it is a supplementary.

POLITICAL DONATION REFORM

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:38): Will the minister attend the event?

The SPEAKER: That is a separate question.

Mr TEAGUE: It is arising from—

The SPEAKER: No, it is not. It is a separate question. You could have worked that one out during the lunch break. Minister.

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:38): No.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO TRADE

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:38): Thank you, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

Mr BATTY: My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs.

The SPEAKER: Sorry, member for Bragg, can you start again? The members on my right were being far too rowdy. I will give them all a blanket warning.

Mr BATTY: My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs. Are 200 illegal tobacco stores operating in South Australia and, if so, why have they been allowed to continue to operate?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:39): I thank the member for the question. We do have a serious issue around the country with illegal tobacco and vapes being supplied, particularly to our young people, and that is why the Malinauskas government contributed \$16 million in the last state budget to allocate to Consumer and Business Services for a new task force to target this. We have had over 20 people be recruited to that area. We have undertaken a number of inspections and raids, not only CBS but also jointly with SAPOL, Border Force and other federal agencies and state agencies.

We are very much keen on seeing a reduction in the supply of illegal vapes and tobacco, not only for the health reasons, but as the member is aware there is a significant criminal element involved in the trade of illegal vapes and tobacco. We have, since 1 July, in only a matter of months, been able to take almost \$2 million of illegal product off the market through CBS raids. That is a substantial amount. Those raids and inspections are continuing; that work between CBS and SAPOL is continuing. I want to thank the Minister for Police for his support of that work and the commissioner.

Of course, significant work needs to continue to be done. It is a substantial problem in our community. We certainly are seeing illegal product coming off the market. We obviously have a bill before the parliament which substantially increases the penalties that we can impose on these criminals but it also gives me the power to shut down stores, these shops as well, and Magistrates Court orders being able to be sought. That is going through the parliament, so I won't discuss that any further, but obviously we are very keen to see illegal vapes and tobacco coming off our streets and having these stores shut down and making sure those criminal elements cease infiltrating these stores in our community.

The SPEAKER: The member for Narungga?

Mr BATTY: A supplementary, sir?

The SPEAKER: We will see if it's a supplementary.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO TRADE

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:41): In reference to the new enforcement task force that the minister mentioned, how many charges have been laid since the creation of that task force?

The SPEAKER: That is a supplementary.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:41): As the member may or may not be aware, CBS has the power to undertake prosecution, so prosecution briefs are being prepared. CBS does not have the power to arrest or charge people.

CENTRE STATE FOOD SERVICE

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Climate, Environment and Water. Is the minister confident that regional business was provided sufficient support during the transition and the removal of the last tranche of single-use plastics? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: Centre State Food Service distributors, in my electorate, were initially advised that they could complete selling products that had been ordered prior to the phase-out date, but that

advice was then reversed and they were left with five to six pallets worth of materials that they cannot sell. They were also advised that some products were to be phased out, only for that advice to be reversed and now they are back available for sale.

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) (14:42): I thank the member for the question—an issue he has raised at some length with me in a piece of correspondence fairly recently. I think we need to deal a little bit with the Centre State Food question. More generally, am I satisfied with the extent of correspondence and information that has been provided? I have no reason not to be.

Green Industries South Australia (GISA) has demonstrated the extent to which they have consulted with not only the representative bodies but also they have carefully curated a list of contacts of food businesses across the state that they have used. As I say, I have no reason to think that that form of information hasn't been useful and to the point.

However, the member has raised an issue that has been raised with him, as he should do, with a local business, Centre State Food Service, which I think is a subsidiary of Galipo Foods, which I am not sure is just South Australian or a larger entity but it is larger than Centre State Food Service. Centre State Food Service is on the mailing list; they have been for a number of years and in that sense received the information that was being provided over time, none of which said that you could hold on to stock and use it after the deadline; all of which said, unless I am presented with an alternative, that once the deadline is reached, that's the end.

I think there is some question about whether Centre State Food Service always looked at their email. The department has spoken immediately on receiving the letter and reached out to that organisation and a particular person who has responsibility made sure that her contact details are now specifically on the list given that the general email wasn't always being looked at, as we understand it.

Whatever the rights and wrongs of the communications, that has left this organisation with some pallets of packaging that they are currently not able to use. That is a challenge for them. Once we have a ban, we can't simply allow for some businesses to use some products and some others. We have to have some consistency. This has been coming for a couple of years, this ban date. They are able to contact their supplier and perhaps get a refund. It is possible, given that not all states are doing exactly what we are doing, that they will be able to use those pallets elsewhere. I believe we have given that advice, but I also give it via you.

There is a question about whether there has been a reversal of a decision. There was a slight reversal of a decision based on customer and food provider experience, which was that we allowed the square plastic PET to continue to be used for now—clear, because that's what can be recycled—for hot soup. They prefer to use a round bowl rather than a square but the round bowl of the compostable material for very hot food and soup is not suitable so we have now allowed an exemption for hot soup.

Yes, there has been a slight change, responding to a concern that was raised with us. We are always willing and prepared to do that. Similarly, an exemption has been granted for hot gravy, which I believe is a KFC product. I shocked some of my colleagues by being pretty ignorant about that, but apparently it is potato and gravy and so we have made sure there is an exemption. We are all trying get to a place where we are providing the most green, the least wasteful products, but we are also not here to provide dangerous products for people to use.

BRIGHTON ROAD-EDWARD STREET TRAFFIC LIGHTS

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on the Brighton Road-Edward Street intersection upgrade and any alternative views on the upgrade?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46): I want to thank the member for her ongoing support for the people using Brighton Road and what they have been suffering through. It was interesting to know the benefit this intersection upgrade has been for the people of the southern

suburbs, and especially the local community represented by the member for Gibson, which includes residents of South Brighton, Seacliff, Kingston Park and surrounds who travel along Brighton Road daily.

In fact, there was a time when this upgrade enjoyed a lot of bipartisan support. It received a lot of support from both sides of parliament, including the now former member for Black, David Speirs.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I remember him. He said on 20 August:

The Edward Street-Brighton Road traffic lights are now operational, making this dreaded intersection a lot safer!

'Dreaded intersection a lot safer'. He goes on to say:

I'm pleased to have been able to secure this funding back in 2021 and while the work took a while to complete, it's finally done!

That is the sound of a relieved member of parliament. That is the sound of a member of parliament who thinks this is good work for the constituents that he serves. It's a stark contrast to Glenelg's mayor, Amanda Wilson, probably because she doesn't live nearby and doesn't know the area very well. This is what Amanda Wilson had to say about the very same intersection:

I am concerned about the economy and the wasteful spending. Just recently, the lights on Brighton Road at Edward Street were put in for \$30 million and the people are shocked that the government would spend \$30 million on a set of traffic lights.

She goes on to say:

I know what pressure feels like, to have the bills mounting up and families under stress, yet all this spending is going on on unrelated things like \$30 million on lights on Brighton Road.

This is the same mayor of Glenelg who increased rates by 7.1 per cent. Do you remember that?

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: The member for Morphett knows.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: He does, yes.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is fair to say that the member for Morphett is about to become famous in the electorate of Black. His words are going to be everywhere. This is the problem with the mayor of Glenelg's comments: the lights didn't cost \$30 million, they cost \$6 million.

Ms Clancy: Don't let facts get in the way of a good story.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. Not only did they choose a candidate who doesn't live in the electorate—and, in fact, nowhere near it—they chose a candidate who can't count. Now, \$30 million versus \$6 million is a big difference. I have to say, this was a bipartisan commitment made by the Morrison government, re-endorsed by the Albanese government, supported by the Marshall government and supported by the Malinauskas government, and now the Glenelg mayor thinks that this is a waste of money. You have to ask yourself: who is briefing this person before she goes on radio and says such stupid things about an area she knows nothing about? Luckily, the member for Gibson does know her local area and understands the issues and concerns of her local constituency, as does Alex Dighton, who lives in Hallett Cove. He doesn't just visit there and get his photograph taken.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: They can yell all they like. This by-election has been brought about because of the actions of members opposite.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What?

Time expired.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO TRADE

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs. How many prosecutions have been commenced since the government announced its new enforcement measures on illegal tobacco?

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (14:51): As I said earlier, those prosecution briefs are being prepared. It takes some time to prepare prosecution briefs. Those prosecution briefs are being prepared and that work is being undertaken as quickly as possible. We are three or four months into this. Certainly, by having almost \$2 million worth of product taken off the street, having over 200 inspections and raids undertaken in a matter of months and being able to actually stand up an entire team within CBS that is completely new, the team at CBS has done a remarkable job in a matter of months. That work will continue.

It is critically important that we get this under control. Nobody wants to see what has happened in Victoria flow over the border to South Australia. That's why we're taking action. We are not deluded as to how significant this task is, but that is why CBS is acting and why we are working with SAPOL and Border Force to get this under control.

ILLEGAL TOBACCO TRADE

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Police. Has the minister sought a briefing about Victoria's illegal tobacco trade and, if so, when did he first seek that briefing?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:52): The issue of illegal tobacco and the associated involvement of crime groups in South Australia is a very serious one and it's a matter that both myself and the Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs have been receiving additional and important information on regularly. However, much of that information relates, at least with respect to the police portfolio, to aspects of police intelligence.

Just yesterday, I received additional information from the Commissioner in relation to the substantial efforts that are being made under Operation Eclipse in South Australia to address this problem. Every effort is being made by South Australia Police to ensure that the groups that are involved in the criminal activity that we are observing are the subject of significant enforcement action, and that will continue. In terms of Taskforce Lunar, the operation in Victoria, I have also been briefed that South Australia Police are receiving intelligence from Victoria and that there is a very good, ongoing, cooperative relationship between Victoria Police and South Australia Police, and I expect that that will continue, too.

But let me emphasise this to the shadow minister: there has been an immediate and direct injection of funds from this government to ensure that this issue has the resources that it needs in terms of Consumer and Business Services and also of course, as I indicated, police are continuing their actions. The amount of \$16 million is a substantial sum. It is necessary to ensure that in another portfolio, which of course I am not responsible for discharging activities in relation to but I work very closely with, officers have the appropriate resources to deal with this very significant issue.

It will be the case that there will be ongoing enforcement action. Of course, the steps that police are taking in terms of their operational investigations are operational matters which are understandably, as the shadow minister is aware, matters that South Australia Police have complete agency and independence over.

OPERATION ECLIPSE

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:55): My question again is to the Minister for Police. What, if any, additional resourcing has the minister provided to SAPOL's Operation Eclipse, and is the minister satisfied this operation is sufficiently resourced?

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State) (14:55): I am satisfied that this operation is, for the moment, resourced appropriately. That is the advice that I have.

NARACOORTE HOSPITAL

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Health. As part of the Naracoorte Hospital upgrades, will the government include a dialysis unit at the hospital? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr McBRIDE: It is my understanding that a review was undertaken to assist in developing the statewide renal dialysis plan 2022-32. However, patients in Padthaway, Naracoorte and surrounding areas needing renal dialysis still have to travel well over an hour to Mount Gambier hospital several times a week. This is obviously time consuming and stressful for patients and their carers.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:56): I thank the member for MacKillop for his question and his genuine interest in improving the healthcare outcomes for the people of his electorate in the Limestone Coast. In particular, in terms of Naracoorte Hospital, this government made an election commitment that we are delivering on which was about cancelling the \$662 million city basketball stadium and investing that money into health care, of which we said at least \$100 million of that would go into regional hospitals and health care, and \$8 million was specifically allocated to the Naracoorte Hospital.

We have worked with the local health network and the local health advisory council and, of course, the member himself in terms of delivery of that funding. We have recently made an announcement down at Naracoorte of where that's going, particularly highlighting upgrades to the emergency department, which is in dire need of upgrades, as well as addressing some really critical issues in terms of the upgrade of the hospital, such as the world's slowest lift that's in operation at Naracoorte Hospital. Those are critical upgrades that need to happen.

We are also very careful and very clear that we regarded this as stage 1 of future upgrades that need to happen at Naracoorte. This is not the end of the journey. This is the second biggest hospital in the region and services a very wide catchment of people. We also need to do the proper planning for what the future stages of the upgrade will be and also service delivery across the Limestone Coast.

Not in the most recent budget but the budget before that the Treasurer and the Premier made a further commitment that was very welcomed by the community for an additional \$1 million, which is going into that future planning for Naracoorte but also in terms of clinical service planning for the broader regional area as well. And, as the member says, we do know that we are going to need more dialysis units and chairs across the state.

There is no doubt that we are seeing, unfortunately, an increasing demand in terms of renal failure and the associated impacts in terms of dialysis treatment that is a life-saving treatment that people need to receive. So that work and that planning is continuing, and clearly that will be part of the planning in terms of not only the next stage of upgrades at Naracoorte Hospital but also the clinical services planning across the region.

There is currently, of course, dialysis that happens at Mount Gambier. We understand that that is a journey that people from Naracoorte have to undertake. There is also a mobile dialysis unit that is run by the Rural Support Service, which is the remnants of the old Country Health SA. I understand the Limestone Coast Local Health Network is exploring options to improve dialysis for residents in Naracoorte, many of whom, of course, go to Mount Gambier for that treatment, and that will be a priority in terms of that future planning. Volunteers support that transportation for people to make sure that they can attend those appointments in Mount Gambier, but we do recognise that it can be stressful and time consuming for patients who need that transport.

Obviously, when patients do need to travel, the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme provides financial support. Of course, we have doubled the fuel subsidy that's available for people to do that. In addition, on a broader point, we are looking at as many opportunities as we can in terms of adding dialysis chairs across the network. We have recently added some in southern Adelaide and there are more to come in northern Adelaide. There have been a number of areas in terms of regional areas already we have been able to identify to add some additional chairs. I believe Victor

Harbor is one region where we are looking to do so and we will keep looking for those further opportunities.

COST OF LIVING

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (15:00): My question is to the Treasurer. How is the Malinauskas government helping South Australians with their cost-of-living pressures and is he aware of any alternate approaches?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (15:00): I am grateful to the member for Elizabeth for that question because I know that he, like the rest of the government, is acutely aware of the cost-of-living pressures that South Australian households and businesses are under after 13 successive interest rate increases.

I am pleased to remind the house that each of our three budgets has included significant cost-of-living relief, more than \$800 million of measures over three budgets to deliver significant cost-of-living relief to those people in our community who need it the most. We have increased the Cost of Living Concession, we have doubled it for tenants, and we have paid additional bonus Cost of Living Concession payments. We have provided energy rebates, school fee reductions, we have doubled the Sports Voucher scheme, and are providing free public transport for seniors. We are trying to find ways, every way we can, to provide meaningful cost-of-living relief to South Australians who need it the most. We have also, of course, maintained our commitment not to introduce new taxes or tax increases.

What doesn't help a government that is trying to ease cost-of-living pressures is when councils are jacking up council rate increases well above inflation. Would you believe, Mr Speaker, this year, City of Holdfast Bay ratepayers are being slugged a 7.1 per cent increase in their rates, a charge led by Glenelg's mayor, Amanda Wilson. Amanda Wilson is championing this increase, claiming, bogusly, that it's only a \$40 increase to ratepayers when, of course, the true increase this year to ratepayers in the City of Holdfast Bay is an average \$126—a huge increase in council rates.

Even worse, this is not the only time that is going to happen. Amanda Wilson, Glenelg's mayor, has made it clear that this is going to be the first big increase of three increases—three increases: year after year after year of huge increases. And the reason why? Because the City of Holdfast Bay wants ratepayers to pay for a massive upgrade of Jetty Road.

Fortunately, the local member, the member for Morphett, was quick to call out this outrageous behaviour by the City of Holdfast Bay—the outrageous behaviour by the City of Holdfast Bay. In fact, those opposite told Amanda Wilson to pull her head in. But after asking her to pull her head in, they've now got her to put her hand up—unbelievable. The former Green, as of Friday now Liberal, charging ratepayers an outrageous increase in council rates for yet another unaffordable project in the City of Holdfast Bay.

But the member for Morphett doesn't get off scot-free because we remember that, when he was mayor, he wanted to spend \$40 million upgrading the jetty. He had some sort of Nucky Thompson Boardwalk Empire-type fantasy for the jetty at Glenelg. The truth is: you can't trust the Liberals on cost of living even when they were just Greens.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:04): My question is to the Premier. Is South Australia drought ready? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr TELFER: It was reported on 13 October that one of the worst droughts in memory is set to strip billions of dollars from the state economy and some grain producers will go without an income for two years because their crops are so bad.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries) (15:04): I thank the member for his question, because as a member representing a regional rural community he is acutely aware, like some of his colleagues who also represent regional communities, of the extraordinary impact that primary producers in those communities are suffering

and, as a result, many other people in their community whose livelihoods are so closely related to the land.

The member for Flinders asks: are primary producers drought ready? He would know this better than me, but I'm not sure anyone can ever truly be drought ready. I don't know whether anyone can be ready for a drought because they are so deleterious, they are so impactful on primary producers and the communities in which they live. What we can do, though, is we can be ready to respond to the needs of those communities by trying to identify ways of providing additional support to them through these difficult times. Of course, unfortunately, no-one can make it rain, but what we can try to do is find ways which will make a meaningful difference in the support that can be provided to primary producers as they go through these difficult times.

I have been asked previously in this place, I think by the member for Flinders and maybe the member for Chaffey as well, about what impacts the government is aware of. It's not just drought; I think also frost conditions have exacerbated these circumstances that many primary producers are experiencing. We had already made it clear that the very first port of call that the government can provide for primary producers suffering under these very difficult conditions is to provide them with better direct support, so those on-farm and in-community counselling services, to make sure that in the first instance primary producers can get direct support and also be made aware of other supports that are available to them, which, at the very least, is the first step that the state government can take.

We are also, of course, making sure that that Department of Primary Industries and Regions is not only speaking directly to primary producers and their representatives across South Australia, but liaising closely with the commonwealth government as well to make sure that not just state government supports can be considered and deployed as quickly as possible but also we can make the case that the federal government is able to make those supports available.

I know that my colleague in the other place, the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, is dealing with this on a daily basis and, as far as I am aware, she and the rest of the government are grateful to those members, including those members opposite, who have raised the concerns of their local communities and made those representations on behalf of primary producers within their electorates. Really importantly, for the benefit of the government—and I don't just mean the elected government but also the Public Service—they have been able to particularise exactly how those conditions are being experienced by primary producers. That puts us in a better position to be able to respond more meaningfully when we understand not only what the impacts are but the needs that are generated by those impacts.

So the member for Hammond, the member for Finniss, the member for Chaffey, the member for Flinders and others, they are not the only ones who have raised this. The government is very grateful for their advocacy; it is making an impact and the government will have more to say about this in the not too distant future.

Grievance Debate

ROCK LOBSTER INDUSTRY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:09): I rise today to make comment on the announcement last week by the Prime Minister that the trade ban on rock lobster will be lifted by the end of the year. I know that the Premier has also made commentary about the lifting of this ban, as has the trade minister, but what really does make me wonder is that I met with the federal trade minister this time last year, and he said that the ban on rock lobster would be lifted by Christmas—he did not tell me which year—but what we are seeing currently is that the PM has announced it.

The rock lobster industry is in a state of confusion. At the moment, there is a ban that is going to be lifted by the end of the year. What does that mean? Let's unpack what it means to an industry that has been on its knees for four years. That represents about 70 per cent of the lobster fishing businesses. They are family-owned. Each of those families has lost between \$1½ million to \$1.8 million, and that is an industry loss of around \$400 million of gross state product.

The confusion is around the timing of when this ban will be lifted. We have a federal government and state government that are happy to jump on the bandwagon and take the credit for

it. We know that recently the trade minister was denied a meeting with the Chinese Premier. They did not want to talk about lobster—they wanted to talk about pandas—yet today we are looking at an industry that is now wondering where their destiny lies. There is no agreed timetable.

We have to understand that this is a national issue; it is not just a South Australian issue. What it means to many of those fishing families is incredibly important—to understand the timetable, to understand when that ban will be lifted so that they can actually utilise their best fishing times, utilise their individual quota. If we take a look back over those four years, the ban was put on that industry for heavy metal detection within those fish and yet we have no idea what the details will be on testing of that product, whether it is on shore here or whether it is on wharf when it reaches its destination.

I have met with a number of southern rock lobster fisherman, as I have with the western zone fishermen. They are all asking the pertinent questions about the future of this season: what does it mean to them? How long will it all roll out? Will biosecurity measures be put into place? Where is the compliance? Of course, SafeFish accreditation must be used to give the industry the certainty. As I asked, will the lobster be checked here, or will it be a surprise when they get over to the Chinese wharves and have those fish checked? It is a very uncertain future for the lobster fishermen.

I spoke to a number of fishermen over in the western zone. They are currently wondering whether they continue fishing this season, because they are still not guaranteed that the ban will be lifted. They have had political-speak that has not really given them the surety that they need in making sure that they can get on with earning a living and making sure that their industry is viable.

We also have to remember that the Chinese New Year festival kicks off on 29 January next year. We need to better understand when we get lobster onto a plane. We need to understand how much lobster can be booked into those planes. We have to remember that there are limited numbers of planes going to China. Western Australia are the largest lobster producer, and they are now wondering whether they book the planes and pay the money, and it will come at a cost. Here in South Australia we, too, want to put our rock lobster into bellies of planes, get it into China and make sure that we can put some of the world's best rock lobster on the plates and tables of our Chinese customers.

The premium price will be realised. Currently, the price for rock lobster is around \$61. That premium into China will see an additional \$10 to \$15 a kilo. That is make or break for these lobster fishermen. It is critically important that we make sure that the industry is given the transparency they need to make these big decisions, because over the last four years they have seen a continual loss of revenue that is affecting the fleet and it is affecting those fishermen.

What I am worried about is that the government at the moment are playing Pied Piper to the lobster industry. They are pointing all boats, all planes to China with rock lobster, and yet over the four-year period what have we seen with the diversity of rock lobster? What are we seeing to give surety that we do not put all the eggs into the China basket and see what we have just seen over the last four years?

GROWING FOR GOLD PROGRAM

Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:14): As we return to parliament this week, so do the many students returning to school, much to the elation of many families across our state. Fortunately for many across the north and the north-east, families had the holidays sorted thanks to the Growing for Gold program. This program was first initiated in 1999 thanks to the City of Salisbury, and the program is designed to introduce participants to a wide range of sport and recreation opportunities to help them to discover their passions in an inclusive, fun environment, and of course absolutely free of charge.

We know how expensive sport can be and we all know how indecisive our little ones can be. They want to try everything all at once and that can place an incredible burden on families and parents who want their kid to find what is exactly right for them. This program is a really fantastic way of encouraging kids to get out there and explore their interests while also helping to alleviate some of the burdens that are faced by parents.

This program was open to all young people, regardless of their ability, their cultural background, their socio-economic background and so on, and all received support to ensure that

they continue to be active through being provided a \$50 Intersport voucher and a SHANX Mini Golf family voucher. I am very appreciative to both for getting behind and backing this program. Of course, next year families would then also be able to receive further support from the state government with the doubling of the school Sports Vouchers. They can spend all \$200 at once or they can split it to spend it in two goes, across seasons or across sporting activities.

Since its inception, this program has grown to partner with the City of Playford, the City of Tea Tree Gully and the City of Port Adelaide Enfield. Last year, just in the City of Salisbury alone, there were over 700 children who benefited from this program, so I am really excited to see the impact that it has had this year across all those local government regions.

The aim of the program does include providing an avenue through which local sports and recreation clubs can promote the programs and services that they are providing in our communities, providing young people with an opportunity to participate in sport and recreation-based programs that provide them with a positive experience, and of course increasing the number of young people who are actively involved in long-term community-based physical activity programs.

The Growing for Gold program aims to encourage young people to try a variety of different activities in recreation and sport so that they can then hopefully take that next step and join a club of their choice. It was really pleasing to see that this year over 73 clubs participated. I was fortunate to be able to pop in to a few of the different activities across different clubs in the area, and it was really phenomenal to see the impact that it was having on young people and their families.

We know that supporting young people to live healthy and active lives through sport provides so many benefits, and it goes far beyond the physical. It is good for their mental health and wellbeing, and it is critically important to helping them to develop a certain amount of skills that serve them so well into their adult years. Learning how to win, how to lose, how to problem solve, how to resolve conflict, how to persevere, how to build friendships—the list goes on, but they are all incredibly beneficial skills to take with you throughout life.

With all that in mind, I would very much like to thank the City of Salisbury, the City of Tea Tree Gully, the City of Playford, the City of Port Adelaide Enfield and of course all the participating clubs for their incredible support over the last two weeks. I know it is a huge effort. I would also like to provide a very special shout out to some of the local clubs in my electorate that participated, those being the Golden Grove Cricket Club, the North East Hockey Club, the Pegasus Pony Club and the Australian World Taekwondo/Oriental Sports Academy in Greenwith.

We also had some amazing clubs just outside my electorate that I know so many from my community adore that I would also like to thank, including Tea Tree Gully Gymsports, Tea Tree Gully Little Athletics, Modbury Bowling Club, Hope Valley Netball Club and the Modbury Tennis Club. Our clubs are already doing such an amazing job to help enrich our local communities, but those that participated in this program went that extra step over the holidays to make something really truly special.

On behalf of all who participated, I thank them very much for all their hard work and their efforts. They are very much helping to enrich the lives of young people in our community and I know it is going to have a tremendous benefit for all, so thank you.

DROUGHT

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:19): I rise today to talk about the, I think, bigger than once-in-a-lifetime drought; in fact, I think it is probably the biggest drought and frost experience combined that we have had for over a hundred years. I say that because in one farm's reading from 1914 for the whole year their rainfall was 230 millimetres, and to date this year they have only received 140 millimetres. It is just shocking what is happening right across the state, right across to the Western Australian border, cutting through all parts of the West Coast on Eyre Peninsula, through the Upper North and the Mid North. They are really struggling up there.

I noted in the paper on the weekend that there was a bloke I went to school with, Andrew Kitto, talking about the effect at Gladstone where he is dealing with not only the effect of drought on his property but the fact that he will only contract harvest for five farmers instead of 20, which will be a huge income loss for him towards the end of the year. People are seeing the effects of this day by

day as there is no rain and there is no feed for stock. As I said, this is right across the state: the Mid North, around central South Australia, through the upper South-East, through the Mallee, the northern Mallee, the southern Mallee and down to the South-East. Even Naracoorte has had a hay run recently to support growers in that area.

They are just appalling conditions that have happened. As I indicated earlier today, if it was not for the modern farming methods, we would not be seeing the green drought that we are seeing now: we would have seen sand blocking the Mallee highways and blocking other highways throughout the state. People are having to make some terrible decisions. They are having to quit breeding stock, whether that be cattle or sheep, stock that they have bred up over many years using bulls and rams, heifers and ewes, to get their breeding stock to a certain level.

They have to work out, 'Do we keep quitting more lambs or do we sell their mothers, which we will never get back because they are essentially going to the abattoirs?' Some very tough decisions are being made. It is not only that but trying to get access to feed. It is not just the ability to access feed but it is what you have to pay for feed. I note there is another hay run coming with Aussie Hay Runners around my electorate and into parts of MacKillop as well, around Taillem Bend, Murray Bridge, Callington, Mannum and surrounding districts. That will certainly be welcome. To see the damage around the place, and certainly I have mentioned it here before, and at my place—I have never seen stem frost damage like it.

When the bloke who leases my farm puts 80 feet of wheat into a row, you can barely see what is in that row. It was the only way he could do it. If he cut it with a mower and he went to rake it, he would probably lose it out of the mower. There has not been enough growth to get any substantial crop. So some farmers have let the sheep in on the crops. Some people have bean crops and lentil crops they will barely be able to get the header front under to get whatever pods are there to harvest. I know one local farmer has cut about 1,100 acres of canola for hay. They are baling that pretty well as we speak. It is just unbelievable what has been happening.

I just want to comment on the community support, where people are getting together so they can have that mental health support. I note there was one recently in the Mid North and there would be others around the state that I am not aware of. These are vital—vital for men and women who essentially can feel very isolated at times. They need to get together to acknowledge that everyone is in the same boat.

The banks need to step up. I note the government sound keen to step up, and we are very interested to see their response, but the banks need to show massive support for a lot of farmers who did not get much of an income, if any income, last year. This year, they are going to go backwards, and they are going to need to borrow a heck of a lot of money next year and increase overdrafts to keep going. They have closed the chequebooks; it is having a huge effect on other companies like machinery dealers, for a start, and then right through the community.

I just want to acknowledge Daniel and Emily Morgan. This Saturday night they are having a get-together for local farmers out the back of Peake and from my understanding there will be about 150 farmers there and myself and Mayor Paul Simmons, who will be there to give that moral support, so that we can literally keep people going.

ADELAIDE ELECTORATE

Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (15:24): I rise to talk about an incredibly busy couple of weeks in my community. Just a couple of weeks ago, we launched the incredible Chihuly exhibition at the Adelaide Botanic Garden. This is a free event for locals, for South Australians, for families. I am quite obsessed with this exhibition. It is absolutely breathtaking. I went along to the launch, which was in the evening, but just the other day I took my two children along and it was amazing to see the Adelaide Botanic Garden packed to the brim. There were families everywhere, grandparents, children, there were lines at the cafeteria, it was so wonderful seeing so many people across South Australia coming to the Adelaide Botanic Garden for this free special event. It is on until April, so I cannot recommend highly enough to get along to see this amazing exhibition.

In the arts space, I was also very fortunate to officially open the Walkerville Art Show. This is an amazing local community-run art show by Walkerville Rotary. They do an incredible job. We

have over 600 pieces of art work at St Andrew's hall, with funds going to really important projects and causes both locally and abroad. I just want to say a huge shout-out to the Walkerville Rotary for the incredible work they do each year with the Walkerville Art Show. It really does get bigger and better every year.

Our Social Media Summit at the Adelaide Convention Centre was a real eye-opener. It is very sobering, and our Premier has been leading the charge in looking at ways we can better protect children, including pushing for bans for social media for children under 14. We have also been banning mobile phones in schools. We have obviously made the announcement as well to look at teaching high school students around the dangers of social media. That was a fantastic summit to attend.

On Sunday I enjoyed a beautiful bike ride through my community to the upgrade to the entry statement to Hutt Street. This is one of my \$3 million commitments to my community and it was wonderful to see the project complete; that is, new shared paths, new trees, new art work, a new Parklands trail crossing, and also some footpaths made out of recycled car tyres. It was wonderful to get on the bike and enjoy seeing that election commitment delivered and seeing people enjoying it. I saw other families on their bikes, I saw parents pushing prams, it was really wonderful to see how we can better bring people and draw people in to our beautiful Hutt Street, our main street.

That brings me to another beloved main street in my community: Melbourne Street. I have a \$1 million commitment there to revitalise that main street, the heart of that main street where our small businesses are. We have been undertaking those upgrades over recent months, with new planter boxes, new greenery, new banners, we have a lighting project out at the moment for small businesses to apply for festoon lighting and really just creating a more vibrant, welcoming and positive place in Melbourne Street.

It is quite disappointing actually to see some councillors from the City of Adelaide play politics with that funding last week when it came to the question of wombat crossings. Over four years ago, a councillor had actually moved a motion to have council look at installing a wombat crossing on Melbourne Street and in four years the City of Adelaide have done absolutely nothing. So to try to play politics with my money that I had advocated for, worked hard for—I secured that funding and now am delivering on that commitment to revitalise our main street to support our small businesses—was incredibly disappointing. I would actually like to offer some free advice to those City of Adelaide councillors: maybe you should do the work, secure the funding and actually deliver what you promise.

I would also like to inform the house that with great sadness last week I learnt of the passing of an incredible local in our community, Tony Pederick OAM, a passionate member of the Lions Club of Adelaide and a beloved past district governor. My sincere condolences to his beloved wife, Marilyn; daughter, Petrea; son, Richard; son-in-law, Andrew; daughter-in-law, Katie; grandchildren, Indiana, Addison, Emily and Lachlan; his extended family; and, importantly, the Lions family. He leaves behind an incredible legacy, and I want to share with you his Lions mantra: 'Together we are united, hear us roar.' Vale Tony Pederick OAM.

GRUNDY, MR K.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:29):

Today, I would like to reflect on the life of a significant South Australian educator, Mr Keith Grundy AM, who passed away peacefully on 2 October at the age of 95. I offer my condolences to his family, in particular his beloved Margaret, his partner in all of his efforts and his achievements. They met first 78 years ago and were married for 72. I had the privilege of talking with Margaret earlier today. It was important for me to let her know of the significant positive impact that Mr Grundy—he will forever be Mr Grundy in my mind—had on my life, but in this chamber I want to also comment on the broader impact that he had on the South Australian community.

Like so many others, Mr Grundy began his teaching career in the country, first for 2½ years at what was then the Kingscote Area School and then 3½ years at Karoonda, during which time he and Margaret began their married life. In 1956, they moved back to Adelaide, and for the next 36 years Mr Grundy taught at Pulteney Grammar, most notably including extended service as head of the junior school, then known as the preparatory school. He continued working at Pulteney in that and other roles through to the late 1990s.

In 1987, Mr Grundy was made a Member of the Order of Australia. His AM was awarded for many services to the community, but in particular to SPELD. For those unfamiliar with SPELD, it is a not-for-profit that provides advocacy, advice and direct support services to children and adults who have specific learning difficulties. They advocate for evidence-based approaches to literacy and an understanding of the science of learning.

Various staff and volunteers associated with SPELD provided me with a great deal of policy advice as shadow education minister ahead of the 2018 election that led to the Literacy Guarantee suite of policy objectives, including the creation of the Literacy Guarantee Unit in the education department, the introduction of the phonics screening check, and the provision of decodable readers in our public schools.

Mr Grundy was one of the founding committee members of SPELD in South Australia, including Remington Pyne in that list. Mr Grundy also served for 25 years on that committee, including two three-year terms as its president. His direct impact on thousands of students and hundreds of teachers during his career can certainly be further amplified by the dramatic positive impact that his role in helping establish SPELD has had in the years since and will continue to have into the future for generations of South Australians.

At school, I recall Mr Grundy as a substantial figure of authority. Firm and disciplined in his approach, he did not suffer fools lightly, nor any foolishness from children. Poor behaviour led to detention, but hard work was celebrated. There were elements of the school rules that were of their time, but by and large Mr Grundy created an extremely happy school environment where students were stretched to achieve their potential. He was ahead of his time in particular when it came to inclusion. He had high expectations when it came to how the school was able to and expected to meaningfully support the achievements of students with disability.

I got to know Mr Grundy in a slightly different light between 2013 and 2018, when a redistribution put part of the suburb of Dernancourt into my seat of Morialta. I met with him a few times and we corresponded. It was interesting looking through my email archive earlier today. In 2013, we corresponded about utility costs and associated charges. We talked about education, understandably. In 2017, he and Margaret wrote me a joint letter of encouragement, which included the following advice:

It is imperative that you remain positive throughout the campaign, focussing on your policies. The general public is...demanding a future permeated with purpose and integrity.

Given his key role in establishing SPELD SA many years earlier, I was very proud to be able to share with him the Literacy Guarantee I described earlier. The last email I have from Mr Grundy was on 20 March 2018, an important day. He wrote,

Dear John,

Margaret and I write to congratulate you on your re-election and the overall performance of the Liberal Party. Naturally, we are disappointed that we are no longer in your electorate.

While being in opposition is demanding the really hard work comes to the fore now you are governing. It is our hope that you will all govern as statesmen and women.

Please pass on our good wishes to your mother.

With best wishes,

Margaret and Keith Grundy AM.

I am equally disappointed they ceased to be in my electorate and I am sorry that we did not have any further opportunities to interact. I hope that our service in government—through some difficult times—met expectations, and I did pass on their good wishes to my mum.

I offer my most sincere condolences to Mr Grundy's family: to Margaret, his partner in all his endeavours, and to his daughters, Dianne and Alison, and their families, including three grandchildren and three great-grandchildren, Theo, Nina and Remi. I hope they will grow up proud of their great-pa and have a strong understanding of all he achieved.

HEARTKIDS SA

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:34): On Sunday morning, I represented the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the member for Kaurna, joining a few hundred children and adults for the HeartKids SA Two Feet & A Heartbeat Walk to raise awareness of childhood-onset heart disease and funding for this wonderful organisation established here in South Australia back in 1987. Since that time, HeartKids SA has evolved into an organisation supporting and advocating for those impacted by childhood heart disease.

Two Feet & A Heartbeat is a four-kilometre walk held in honour of the four lives lost to childhood-onset heart disease every week across Australia. Those keen to take on a great challenge can choose to walk the course twice and tackle eight kilometres in recognition of the eight babies born every day in Australia with a heart defect.

Childhood-onset heart disease is a collective term for the spectrum of heart conditions that affect the heart's ability to work efficiently. Heart defects and conditions experienced from birth are known as congenital heart diseases. In South Australia, around 200 babies are born every year with congenital heart disease. In Australia each year, between 2,400 and 3,000 Australian babies are born with a form of congenital heart disease. It is, in fact, the most common congenital disorder in newborns, affecting up to one in 100 births.

Acquired heart disease refers to conditions that arise later in childhood, commonly because of infections or exposures. Often when we think of acquired heart disease we think of it occurring in adults, but that is not always the case, with some of the more common heart conditions acquired during childhood being Kawasaki disease and rheumatic heart disease. Along with congenital heart disease—a chronic condition that, for many, requires complex lifelong specialist care—growing up with a heart condition presents a variety of challenges for children and young people and their families.

Today, HeartKids is a national not-for-profit organisation whose support and advocacy helps give those with childhood heart disease a fighting chance to live a long, healthy and fulfilling life. I am proud to be a member of the Malinauskas Labor government supporting HeartKids SA with \$1 million of funding over four years for groundbreaking pilot programs focused on the critical areas of early intervention for childhood-onset heart disease: in early childhood intervention, ensuring early detection and intervention; in mental health support for teens and adults; and in extending vital resources and support to families in regional and remote areas of South Australia, ensuring that no child is left without the care they need.

The goal is to explore how these pilot programs can be scaled nationally, ensuring that children across Australia benefit from the innovations and supports proudly developed here in South Australia and extending vital resources and support to families to make sure that all children in remote areas receive the care they need. Over many years, the Women's and Children's Health Network has been working collaboratively with HeartKids through Dr Gavin Wheaton, cardiologist and the patron of HeartKids here in South Australia.

HeartKids has five awareness and fundraising events each year: Sweetheart for HeartKids, Race to Remember, Two Feet & A Heartbeat, Hop for HeartKids and Hero for HeartKids. I want to make mention here of the member for King and the member for Newland, who earlier this year dressed up as superheroes for HeartKids; I think they were Supergirl and Batgirl.

Sunday's HeartKids SA's Two Feet & A Heartbeat Walk was a fun-filled family event with superheroes, HeartKids flags and hats, face painting, exercise workouts and, importantly to some at 9am on a Sunday morning, a coffee van. I want to thank Chief Support, Services and Impact with HeartKids SA, Tania Potts, who walked with me on Sunday, sharing with me the work being carried out by HeartKids here in South Australia.

Finally, I want to acknowledge each of the Heart Angels, and their families, who were recognised on Sunday by the lighting of a candle and a time of reflection.

*Matter of Privilege***MATTER OF PRIVILEGE, SPEAKER'S STATEMENT**

The SPEAKER (15:40): Before I call the member for Morialta, I refer to the matter of privilege raised by the member for Morialta on Thursday 26 September concerning the Treasurer and the subsequent personal explanation provided to the house by the Treasurer on the same day.

I advise the house that I am satisfied that the matter of privilege raised by the member for Morialta can now be discharged. I thank the member for Morialta for the discussions we had a little bit earlier and for raising the point in the first place. As a reward, I call you to give a personal statement. You probably would have done it anyway.

*Private Members' Statements***PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:40): I am pleased today to be able to talk about Playgroup SA and the significant work that they have done over the last 50 years, and the celebrations of what they are going to achieve in the time ahead. It was a pleasure to join with the member for Heysen, Josh Teague, and the Hon. Heidi Girolamo MLC a couple of weeks ago, and many others, in the celebration of 50 years of playgroups at Government House, hosted by Her Excellency the Governor Frances Adamson AC.

Playgroup SA is a community-based not-for-profit organisation representing many playgroups around South Australia. Their board, chaired by Trish Strachan, Deputy Chair Dr Sally Brinkman, Treasurer Quentin Crombie and directors Ben Birch, Mel Watson, Thomas Veale, Russel Schrale, Noreen Byrne and Wiebke Billows are to be commended as are their staff, led by Chief Executive Officer Craig Bradbrook.

The opportunity at Government House to celebrate those achievements over the last 50 years was profound. It was during the time that I was Minister for Education. In our last year in government, in 2021, we developed a \$50 million Early Learning Strategy, which had a number of elements to it. In particular, it recognised the significant role of playgroups in supporting our very littlest learners, our very youngest children, and—most importantly I think in terms of playgroups also—their parents, to have positive outcomes in life.

We identified that—and Dr Sally Brinkman was particularly important in this—too many of our young people are reaching school age, or preschool age even, with developmental vulnerabilities and playgroups have a particularly important role in reducing those vulnerabilities. We are proud to have invested in them. I am pleased to see that investment continue. I look forward all that playgroups will achieve in the years ahead. Happy 50th birthday.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hughes): Member for Badcoe: we get two for the price of one.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:42): Nobody puts baby in a corner, especially this baby—and he has been here with me making a little history today. Quinn and I have become the first mum-and-bub combo to breastfeed in this place, and that has been made possible by recent changes to the standing orders. I hope this moment serves as an opportunity to further normalise breastfeeding in the workplace and in public spaces, and to highlight the benefits of breastfeeding. Breastfeeding is natural, normal and miraculous but in Australia only 39 per cent of infants are exclusively breastfed by three months—a lot lower than the global rate of 44 per cent.

According to the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, breastfed babies have a lower risk of asthma, obesity, type 1 diabetes, SIDS, ear infections and stomach bugs. The World Health Organization also states that breastfed children perform better on intelligence tests and school attendance, and women who breastfeed have a reduced risk of breast and ovarian cancers. It is also a truly wonderful way for mother and baby to bond. As American journalist Florence Williams said, 'Human milk is like ice cream, penicillin and ecstasy all wrapped up in two pretty packages.'

There are certainly good reasons why some mums and babies cannot breastfeed but a lack of public acceptance, support and amenity is a factor, and that is something that we can change. Providing quiet, calm places and comfy chairs goes a long way; and encouragement rather than

judgement from strangers in public places would not hurt either. As Kourtney Kardashian said, 'Don't look if you don't like it.'

As important as breastfeeding is, it can be tiring, painful and difficult and it is easy to feel like you have been reduced to no more than meals on wheels. So the best and easiest thing that we can all do is to support and encourage breastfeeding mums in our lives.

Mr BATTY (Bragg) (15:44): I rise to speak about the concerning escalation in South Australia's tobacco wars over the last fortnight, with our streets having to endure nearly nightly firebombings, one of the most recent of which was in my own electorate in Stonyfell. I have raised residents' concerns about this store in Stonyfell on a number of occasions. I have also raised their concerns directly with the minister for nearly a year now. I refer in particular to my letters to the minister on 9 November 2023, 5 March 2024, 21 June 2024 and 16 July 2024, all concerning this tobacco store in Stonyfell.

We have not seen any action and then on the weekend residents and small businesses were left terrified as Molotov cocktails seemingly started flying around Stonyfell. The minister's response in question time was that the government is doing everything they can. But if we learn that there have been no prosecutions, we learn that 200 of these illegal tobacco stores continue to operate and we see our streets and suburbs enduring nearly nightly firebombings, clearly this action is not enough. What we need to snuff out illegal tobacco is prosecutions not press conferences.

S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:46): I would like to rise today to acknowledge the opening of the sailing season for this summer. On Saturday, I had the privilege of attending the opening days of both the Somerton Yacht Club and the Brighton and Seacliff Yacht Club. It is fantastic to see tradition continue. I was absolutely privileged to be on the yacht for the sail past at Brighton and Seacliff Yacht Club.

It is a lovely tradition where the entire fleet, no matter what class of boat, comes past and all give three cheers to the commodore, vice commodore and junior commodores on the boat. Some traditions are absolutely well worth maintaining and I think that is one of them. Sailing is one of those sports that all generations can enjoy. I saw seven year olds out on the Opties on the weekend and I saw 80 year olds out on Lasers. It is a fabulous sport that everyone can enjoy.

I used to go sailing with my dad. We used to sail a Catamaran in the Milang-Goolwa race every year. I used to spend my teenage years hanging out at the Brighton and Seacliff Yacht Club because my best friend's dad was a sailor with the RL24s. I spent my time collecting cans on the front lawn and going down to the deli to trade them in for a packet of chips. That is my lifetime at the Brighton and Seacliff Yacht Club. I wish all sailors well for the season ahead.

Bills

CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10.

Mr PATTERSON: Clause 10 talks to plans prepared by the public sector agencies. Obviously lots of different agencies cover a full gamut of services provided to South Australians. Of course, one very important agency deals with the population growth of the state and also with the commensurate housing as well. In summary, in terms of the interim target for 2030, but then also the plans prepared by those agencies, what population growth targets are the targets within this bill associated with?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The short answer is that the risk assessment plans and the targets that we have previously discussed are not based on any particular population target. In fact, the state does not have a population target. Plus the planning and land use services, part of the super ministry of housing that the Minister for Housing is responsible for, does do projections based on expectations

of population growth. They do not represent targets so much as recognising what is likely to happen in order to prepare for them and, presumably, in that sense, would be a feature of the future as we scan what is happening and what risks exist. But this is not a population target, nor essentially a population-dependent policy approach that we are taking.

Mr PATTERSON: We have just had released an update to the 30-year housing plan around how we are going to do that. That is looking at projected population growth. This is the balance between overall emissions and then maybe per capita emissions, because, of course, the population in South Australia in 2005 was different from the population now, and obviously different from the population in 2030 and from that in 2050. How do the plans relating to housing population and emissions reductions interact, in terms of giving us a bit of a guide? Is there something that takes precedence—and this is similar to the questions I asked around power prices and similar to the questions asked around the provision of food? But in this case, of course, it is making sure that the population is housed and making sure that we can grow, or is there an alternative where emissions reduction takes priority over potential population growth?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: One of the terrific things about South Australia is that we have detached population growth from carbon emissions growth and we have detached economic growth from carbon emissions growth. So we have seen a drop in carbon emissions, a very substantial drop, and we have seen a growth both in the size of the economy and in the population. I am not sure that the interaction is quite the way that it might be understood by someone listening to the question that has been raised.

This piece of legislation is designed to recognise that it is economically extremely sensible for us to drop our carbon emissions and to reach a net zero contribution. In doing so and in putting it in legislation we have a strategic approach to how that occurs and we are also constantly monitoring risk associated with climate change, both in adaptation and in mitigation. These will be adaptable processes to the assessments to make sure that we are keeping on top of what is changing in the world and what is changing in South Australia.

One of many factors, of course, that changes is our population, but I do not actually see that as being a particularly significant one. Once you have renewable electricity supply, as long as you have enough electricity for the population, you are not adding to the carbon emissions from that population, just to use that as an example.

Mr PATTERSON: Adjacent to that in terms of the plans provided, as carbon accounting progresses—there is now scope 1, scope 2, scope 3 emissions—and in terms of the public sector agency responsible for the exports here in South Australia, some of what we export have emissions generated here in Australia. Yes, you make the point around decoupling the economic from the actual emissions, which I suppose would be necessary really for this to continue in a sustainable manner in terms of emissions going down and the possibility for economic growth. But also the plans with regard to scope 3 emissions—emissions generated overseas—how do you see that relating to our emissions profile? Is that something that these plans will have to consider? Will emissions, while generated overseas, be accounted for here in South Australia, or is that not something that needs to be considered?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The question of scope 3 emissions is interesting. As I understand it, scope 3 is we buy a product from, say, China, Vietnam, France. It has been made there, and we have brought it here and are using it here. Are we responsible for the emissions that were produced in that other place to create that item? If we are having a manufacturing sector, the company is building something here, but components come from overseas. Is the carbon from those components counted as theirs, and is it counted as South Australia's?

At present, scope 3 emissions are not counted for geographic entities, whether that is South Australia or Australia. Those emissions happened overseas so they belong to that country, just as our emissions from our manufacturing happen here, so they belong to us. The one thing is we must not try to double-count carbon, because that leads to poor choices.

However, it is true that companies, particularly big corporates, are increasingly interested in scope 3, because what they want to do is to drive different behaviour from their suppliers, so that when they buy a product it is low carbon, so the component that comes in is low carbon. As I say,

that is not something that currently affects the way in which jurisdictions account. So it is conceivable but I do not think likely in the near term that a debate could start where there was a question about how scope 3 was accounted by a subnational jurisdiction like South Australia. There might then be a question in the climate risk assessment about whether we needed to understand how exposed our industry was to those kinds of components.

Although I do not know if that particular one would come up, I think it is a reasonable example of why it is important to have a climate risk assessment so that we are looking forward to what is changing, what technology is coming up and what opportunities, what are the risks, how are trade barriers being deployed and what is the economic landscape that we are operating in? It could well be that the treatment of scope 3 emissions could become part of that landscape and would be worth contemplation in the risk assessment.

Clause passed.

Clause 11.

Mr PATTERSON: In terms of sector agreements, this clause talks about coming up with agreements with individual sectors or even particular enterprises and industries. We have talked a little bit about agriculture broadly producing food. One of the key areas identified in regard to emissions in the agricultural industry is animal methane emissions. The methane obviously has a carbon dioxide equivalent. In fact, proportionally to carbon dioxide, it is significantly more.

We have protein animals, animals for meat, and also dairy animals in South Australia. In terms of the sector agreements, are there issues that need to be worked through? How will issues be worked through with this particular industry subsector of the agricultural industry overall? For the 2030 target and also the 2050 target, is any modelling being undertaken or are we able to provide to them indications around the sustainability of the number of protein animals and the number of dairy animals, or is there going to be the ability for that to be increased in line with economic growth and with feeding and exports? Or is there the risk on the other side that there will need to be a reduction in the number of protein animals and dairy animals here in South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The amendment that is being made here, for the purpose of clarity of the clause, is that we currently have sector agreements in the legislation. They are voluntary agreements that can be entered into. What we are proposing is to make it explicit that they can be both about adaptation as well as mitigation. If we go back to those initial definitions, it may have been interpreted that they were only about emissions reduction, so mitigation, whereas we want to make it clear that they can also be about adaptation. I personally think that is going to become more and more a topic in some regional areas sooner than others where they are going to want to be prepared for the heatwaves, the droughts, the fires, the risk to infrastructure and so on that are likely to come.

We already have some sector agreements. They tend to be with regional groupings. There has been one in the past with, I think, SA Water and one with the city council. They are a voluntary mechanism by which the government can have an arrangement. The member has asked pretty detailed questions about animal protein in the state that may or may not one day be voluntarily something that that sector wants to work on in the form of the sector agreement. It is a challenge for emissions reduction.

It is a challenge that will be met both through emissions reduction in the way in which the animals are managed, because there is that technology—I do not know if you can call seaweed a technology, but a change in diet that dramatically changes the methane output, and also through offsets. I say again that I think South Australia stands to be the big winner in offsets as time goes on. They are looking for places with stable democracy, a commitment to responding to climate change and a legal environment where you can invest in a bit of land and know that that is going to be looked after safely and legally.

We may well find, as time goes on, when big corporations like McDonald's want to make sure that they can sell their burgers as being climate and biodiversity neutral, they might well want to invest in our landscape, and that will be great. It is hard sitting here right now identifying all of the changes that are likely to occur between now and 2050 and beyond, but I do not think it is as bleak

as the member might be thinking in terms of head of cattle permitted and any kind of establishment of a cap. I do not think that is how these things will unfold.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for that answer. Along that vein, that it would also provide a benefit, I think, for the agricultural sector, one of the other major emissions sources that is very beneficial to agriculture is fertiliser and making sure that the industry here in South Australia has access to fertiliser that is affordable and at the quantities required. Of course, in our environment it is obviously very useful to have fertiliser at the best of times but also, with our soils, it really does help along those lines.

Maybe you can make some further comments around the effect of fertiliser, too, and adjoining that, the ability of fertiliser to be produced here in South Australia as opposed to potentially importing it, where the emissions have been released externally to South Australia but then the use is here. We want to make sure that there is encouragement for fertiliser to be used here but also to be produced here. How do you see sector agreements playing out to facilitate that?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We are stretching somewhat the question on this particular clause given how minor the amendment is to the existing act, but just in the spirit of continuing to have useful conversations about climate change, I do not represent myself as an expert in agriculture nor in fertiliser, but I am certain that the approach that is being taken by the bodies that represent people who are primary producers in South Australia and across Australia is carefully working towards ways in which they will continue to have market access to those jurisdictions that will insist on knowing what the carbon consequences of their product are.

There will be numerous ways in which they will be managed, including the ways in which fertiliser, and what is known as green fertiliser, is used. This will transpire over a period of time. What is important is that, as the world sees the impacts of climate change and starts to respond, we are well positioned and not caught short.

Clause passed.

Clause 12.

Mr PATTERSON: This clause talks about the status and effect of the policies and plans. I am just interested to get an understanding of that. Previously, we have had questions around whether the targets are enforceable and what is the impact should they not be. That is certainly one area around targets, if they may or may not be met.

The other aspect to that is for individual enterprises, for people themselves, sectors, who wish to undertake activities that could well cause emissions to a lesser or greater extent. Can the minister give some clarity around this? It seems from reading this that any policy or plan under this act does not affect the rights and liabilities. Further to that in subsection (2):

No action may be brought on the basis that an entity has acted in a way that is inconsistent with a policy or a plan under this Act.

If you have plans in place and you are on a trajectory to reduce emissions, but an enterprise comes to South Australia, whether that be mining or manufacturing, and wants to undertake an activity that could well cause emissions to increase, maybe not substantially but that is counter to policies in place, can you confirm, minister, that recourse for those aggrieved at such undertakings happening will not be able to tie up and use this bill, should the amendments carry, to be able to stymie and prevent those activities occurring here in South Australia?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Indeed, I think the member has summarised why this is a useful clause. This act is not intended to be punitive: 'You must, and if not the full consequences of the law will rain down upon you, primary producer, you, manufacturer'. This is not that law.

This is a piece of legislation that establishes the view of the Parliament of South Australia that this is where we need to go, that this is wise and sensible to go, and creates facilitatory mechanisms to get there. There are obligations on the minister to create plans, there are opportunities for the minister to enter into sector agreements should that be voluntarily wanted by the sector as well, and the minister can require government agencies to enter into some risk

assessments and plans. It is not about making life harder for businesses and communities in South Australia.

While clearly it has not been drafted with any such consequences, we wanted to make that beyond all question by adding this clause so that entities, whether they be a primary production group or an individual manufacturing company or a small community, can enter into the kinds of plans and so on that we are talking about without fear. What this is about, I hope, is capturing the sentiment, desire and ambition of South Australia to position ourselves intelligently in the face of the decarbonising global economy so that we avoid risk and reap the maximum reward we can and honour our obligation to do our best for the future generations.

Mr PATTERSON: Thank you for that answer. Maybe if you could talk through, minister, what is meant by 'no action may be brought on the basis': is that purely legal action or is that action around decision-making for awarding of grants or for directing organisations? To help outline and give an understanding of the terminology that 'no action may brought on the basis', maybe articulate in detail what 'no action' entails.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: That is legal action. On the basis of any policy or plan under this act there cannot be an action brought that an instrument is inconsistent with it.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (13 to 15) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Premier, Minister for Industry, Innovation and Science, Minister for Climate, Environment and Water, Minister for Workforce and Population Strategy) (16:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

In so doing, I do not wish to take people's time, nor just express meaningless platitudes saying, 'Thank you, everyone has been fabulous.' The truth is that it has been a very good discussion. It has been a good series of questions through the committee stage, very thoughtful questions, and the contributions made by all members during the second reading debate were useful and, again, very thoughtful.

We face what it is not an exaggeration to say is an existential crisis for, if not entirely our species, at the least the way of life to which our species has become accustomed. It is the most complex challenge we have for humanity, because it requires the action of so many different places, different individuals and different activities. As I said in the course of the estimates stage, I cannot believe that humans are not sufficiently ingenious, resourceful or lacking an interest in self-preservation that we will not rise to this challenge.

I suspect what will happen is that there will be a sudden and decisive shift once it becomes apparent that looking the other way and positioning for your own jurisdiction's advantage over another is not going to work anymore. When that shift happens, South Australia will be ready, because we have never denied the science of climate change. We have always accepted that it is real and that it requires a response. We have positioned to date the jurisdiction in a way that sets us up well in comparison to the other mainland states, and with this legislation and with all of the actions that are undertaken across government and across the community we continue to prepare ourselves for this existential threat.

It may be that we fail. As I say, I refuse to believe that that will happen, but we will not fail for the want of trying in this state, and I therefore commend everybody who has participated in a positive, constructive way on this element of our response, which is this bill.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:18): I wish to add to comments previously made, I suppose looking at the committee stage and updating or adding to the comments made previously in the second reading speech. Of course, in that speech I did outline that I think all of us here in the chamber understand that in South Australia we really do have a vital interest in the success of global efforts

to avoid the worst effects of climate change. Of course, we are the driest state in what is the driest continent, so where the impacts of climate change cause dryness we are materially affected because we are already quite dry. Certainly, that is the case and it has been canvassed where the state is going and where there have been reductions in emissions.

However, when we talk about some of the issues, it is a wicked problem because it is relying on all jurisdictions throughout the world to have the same ambition and to act in unison, which is very difficult, of course, because different jurisdictions are at different stages of their development. We have the developed world and we have Third World countries all trying to manage their populations, feed their populations and give their populations energy.

A lot of the efforts here in South Australia, as I said, have gone into two areas: the land use side of things and energy. Energy is itself technologically demanding because of the technologies we have available today. In the energy trilemma that exists with current technologies—which is what we have to deal with while we await other ones coming online—there are emissions, there are price impacts and there are reliability impacts. Unfortunately, the lived experience is that pushing too far in the direction of one results in adverse effects in the others. Certainly, here in South Australia, that is a serious issue.

During the second reading debate, I talked about the impacts of power prices we have seen here in South Australia, where the last three ESCOSA reports released under this Labor government have seen prices for households, the average electricity bill for households, go up significantly by \$798, or 44 per cent. Small businesses are the same.

The intention to have climate emissions taken into account and updated in this bill was a perfect opportunity to also try to put into legislation the energy trilemma. Amendments I sought to put in on behalf of the opposition tried to account for that by putting in place targets for residential power prices, targets for small business power prices and targets for grid reliability, all of which are in line with this bill to do with emissions reductions and putting in place targets relating to electricity. To have those amendments ruled out of order really denied the opportunity—

Mr ODENWALDER: Point of order: the member is reflecting on a ruling of a previous Chair and I ask that he be brought to order.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hughes): I think that is a fair point; you are reflecting. It has been very amicable, at least while I have been in the chair, so if you would like to continue, but not in that vein.

Mr PATTERSON: I am not trying to talk about a particular ruling. While we did have debate around the energy trilemma and how to handle it and the opportunities afforded to us, we sit here now that we have been through the committee stage of the bill that we have before us, to be decided on at the third reading, and it makes no mention of power prices, it makes no mention of power prices for residential houses, it makes no mention of small businesses and it makes no mention of grid reliability. At the same time, it does make mention of renewable electricity. So while there is that ability, I think the debate has been the poorer for this house to not be able to talk openly and frankly. Of course, I am trying to not defy the rules. So I would say the opportunity was there—

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Hughes): I will just pull you back a bit. The bill was far narrower than you are trying to paint it, so to go down these particular tangents I do not think is particularly fruitful. I am sure you will get plenty of other opportunities in the house, in the days and the weeks and the months and the years to come, to talk about all of those issues but, in relation to this particular bill, I would ask you to come back to the bill itself.

Mr PATTERSON: Certainly. I think it is incumbent on all of us in this house to understand the complexities of what is involved with greenhouse gas emissions reduction, with climate change, with adaptation as well, and those areas have been canvassed. Woe betide that they be elevated to discussion here. I will be interested as we go forward, as this bill goes through this parliament. Of course, we have another house and I will be interested to see what their view is of emissions reduction and what their view is of the energy trilemma and how they seek to articulate that. I certainly welcome articulation of discussion around the energy trilemma. It is a difficult issue to grapple with,

it is complex, there are trade-offs required, and I look forward to those continued discussions as we move forward.

Bill read a third time and passed.

HIGHWAYS (WORKS FOR RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 11 September 2024.)

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (16:27): I indicate to the chamber that I am the opposition's lead speaker on this matter. The opposition opposes the Highways (Works for Residential Developments) Amendment Bill, and I will articulate the reasons why we are doing that and what we are concerned about.

Our main concern with the bill is that it grants excessive powers to the Commissioner for Highways and the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, undermining the role of local councils in managing developments. It certainly appears to be a very heavy-handed response to a very tragic situation with a particular builder who did not fulfil obligations.

We are concerned that the government has gone straight for the sledgehammer. There are many other tools in the box that could have been used that are already in place, and we do not believe that the government has explored those at all. As a matter of fact, it seems to be a flexing of muscles and certainly an overreach of government in this situation. We believe it undermines a critical tier of government: local councils.

We have already seen quite a bit of confusion with the responsibility of local councils when SCAP make decisions for planning, for example in new zones. Being the member for Unley, when there have been height changes, I have experienced the impact that higher density makes on traffic, on rubbish collection and on other processes that are to be managed by local government. Local government has very little say on the input of that SCAP development.

Because we are seeing more and more of these decisions being made outside of council but with council being left holding the can, we are seeing that there is simply not that cooperation between local government and state government, which is very important particularly in development and providing an efficient service, an efficient planning approval service, and an efficient process of providing a choice of housing and a variety of housing in South Australia that matches our changes in diversity, our change in demographics, as our community expands and becomes more sophisticated, if you like.

We know that there are more and more single-person homes now than what there were even 20 years ago. It is important that we meet those, but it has to be a collaboration between the government planning system, infrastructure, transport coordination and, of course, local government.

This bill allows the Commissioner of Highways to complete infrastructure works without council approval or input. It raises the question: does it give them any insight as well? Does the council only get to be aware of what is happening when the job is finished? Local councils who best understand community needs are sidelined in development management and the bill erodes local governance and weakens council's ability to represent their constituents.

People are very quick to criticise local government but I think in general it does serve the community well. It does, in most instances, have an understanding of the local area, where the trouble spots are and where potentially changes could complicate an already complicated situation and so consequently may look at alternatives in managing those changes.

The bill appears to be a reaction to a specific failure in the building industry. The Felmeri developer collapse is the one that comes to mind, where the government spent \$3.5 million to cover the cost of a specific group of creditors. I think blind Freddy could see that that was a disaster waiting to happen, where houses were going up before roads were complete. I think there was even a situation where half a road was started on one side of the creek and half a road started on the other

side of the creek and they did not join before the whole thing went knees up and the administrators had to move in.

It lacks a clear rationale for why this particular group received financial assistance while other creditors, tradies and builders were left out. This is what happens when governments respond to a media interest—talkback radio—a very populist approach evolves and is developed and consequently the unintended consequences or the precedent that it may set can set up problems in the future. I think that is where this bill is heading. It was a knee-jerk response to a serious situation that had a lot of media interest and consequently we are seeing a sledgehammer brought in to deal with the issue.

It creates an unsustainable precedent for government intervention for future developer failures, leading to expectations of further bailouts. This is very dangerous for any free enterprise economy. In China we are seeing what happens when government policy, government intervention, drives the building industry. We are seeing an oversupply and buildings demolished, without anybody ever living in them in some cities in China, because of excessive government intervention and expectations of residents and developers from government.

The bill enacts checks and balances on the commissioner's powers. There is no mechanism for resolving disputes between councils and the commissioner over the costs for all of their decisions. This, of course, we think is a flaw or an omission in the bill. There must always be some mechanism for dealing with disputes whenever there is a new process that is introduced. You can guarantee that if something is going to go wrong in the delivery of a new process, it will go wrong.

The bill puts smaller regional councils at a financial administrative disadvantage without sufficient safeguards against potential abuse. The bill also introduces new taxation powers on councils and developers, breaking a key election promise by the Malinauskas Labor government not to introduce new taxes and charges. There was an omission in that promise; it should have said, 'Only sneaky ones will be introduced.' This is what I think we are seeing here, because it is something that the government simply cannot continue to do at the taxpayers' cost. It is something that will incur a cost.

For this bill to work as the government intended, I can imagine that the government will go straight to a source to pick up that cost. It is not philanthropic legislation; it is legislation to enable the government to recover the full cost and even more perhaps. What is the process for auditing the costs? The government is in control of the contract, the council or somebody else gets the bill and yet they have had no input into the process, including the choice of contractors based on quality, reputation and cost, etc.

Councils, particularly in regional areas, may bear the cost of completing infrastructure for failed developments. The bill prohibits councils from passing these costs on to ratepayers, leaving no clear way to recover these funds. That in itself raises alarm bells, because in the end there is no free money. Consequently, if councils spend money, there is an implication through borrowing to cover that and then rates will go up to cover that borrowing and the interest and the repayment of the capital in that borrowing. The financial strain could lead councils to become more risk averse in approving new developments, impacting regional growth.

At this time we are not looking for a slowdown in the approval process, or a slowdown in developments and infrastructure to support developments, we are actually looking for a speed-up. What is concerning, in our view, particularly in regional South Australia, is that this will freeze councils into the fear of becoming risk averse. Even though those risks might be low and minor, they are actually exaggerated or increased by this bill.

The minister can unilaterally designate areas for intervention, creating a potential for political interference in local planning processes. I have been sitting in this place for 18½ years and for the last 10 years this parliament has been talking about the removal of politics from planning decisions, but what this does is it puts it straight back in.

We know how political this government is about every decision it makes, because it will not release cabinet documents to the Auditor-General for the Auditor-General to do his job, despite the fact that there is a Premier's circular that says that that is an option available to the Auditor-General

to ask for those cabinet documents. Those cabinet documents were always supplied by the Marshall government but are never supplied by the Malinauskas government. You have to ask the question: why? On top of that, we have legislation like this that is very heavy-handed and allows everything to be hidden behind a 10-year cabinet document lock-away. Just be aware that that is an implication of this bill.

The bill allows the minister to designate these areas for intervention, and it creates confusion over responsibility for development outcomes and diminishes local planning authority. In this modern world, where so many things are global and people are very aware about what is happening everywhere else in the world through social media and 24-hour news cycles, often they are not quite as aware of what is happening around the corner. This makes it even harder for that local interest and that local input into a local issue.

The public rhetoric of the bill does not match its contents. The bill does not specifically address issues related to failed builders, rogue developers or administrative failures by councils, contrary to government statements. The bill provides broad powers to intervene in developments without requiring builders or councils to have committed any wrongdoing. This is an interesting proposal. The bill provides broad powers to intervene in developments at any time, at any trigger, at any motivation. It is not there just to fix up the situation that we saw with the collapsed building company. For anything the government desires they have this ability to bring in the intervention.

The bill imposes significant legal and financial risks on councils which could lead to new procedures, red tape and delays in the housing development process, contradicting government claims of accelerating development. Of course, I always find it difficult to understand when people say they are bringing in legislation to speed things up. I think that the way you speed things up is to actually remove legislation, streamline legislation. This is another layer of legislation in the planning and development process. It will certainly slow the process down. It could cause blockage in housing approvals, exacerbating the housing crisis rather than solving it.

We know there have been announcements after announcements of housing developments by this government, but we have not seen those houses started. We have not seen people moving into those houses. We have not even seen materials ordered for those houses. In some instances, we have not even seen any sign of SA Water participating in the process of those subdivisions.

The bill appears to have been drafted with insufficient consultation with key stakeholders, including local councils and developers. There has been a lack of engagement, raising concerns about the bill's potential to create more problems than it solves. I guess it is an opportunity for some of those developers to pay their \$500 on Friday and bail up the planning minister and Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and explain to them what their concerns are about this bill. I wonder if that will make any difference.

We acknowledge the need to address incomplete residential developments, but we oppose the bill due to its undermining of local councils, lack of oversight, financial burden on communities and potential for political interference. We call for legislative reform that empowers local councils and provides proper oversight to ensure state intervention only when necessary. I think that is the whole thing. I think a big difference between this side of the chamber and the government is that we believe government is there when it is needed. It is not the first place you go to.

We think community, the private sector, business, the economy and those who participate in the free enterprise system are the first place to go to. Let the market sort it out. Let the private sector deal with it. Let the regulatory process deal with it. If none of those work then, yes, there is a role for government, but there is not a role for government as the first option. That experiment failed in the Soviet Union in just 70 years. We need to have less government intervention and a stronger ability for the private sector to deliver for the community.

There are existing insurance bonding mechanisms that could very well be considered, which might make this bill unnecessary if they were utilised correctly. Mechanisms already exist to ensure developers fulfil their obligations, such as councils requiring bonds for development. Instead of granting new powers to the commissioner a mandatory bond system could be introduced. That is a suggestion that has come from the development industry. I think the development industry is very

scared of the big government model that is being presented to this parliament for debate at the moment.

I do not have a lot of hope for any change based on concerns being raised in this place by this side of the house. We know the large majority the government has in this chamber and we know that, with the Greens, the Labor Party has control of the upper house as well. We have a situation where anti-business legislation and legislation that is big government has no trouble getting through this parliament the way it is structured at the moment. I ask the public to remember this at the next election, that when you have a government with a very large majority and an arrangement in the upper house you have less scrutiny of what happens in this place. It is important to have a well-resourced and sizeable opposition and an upper house that requires more than just the Greens to negotiate with in order to get legislation through.

I have covered the point about councils being more risk averse in approving developments. As I said earlier, it does not matter what the circumstances are, the commissioner still has the ability to step in. Councils and disputes and building disputes are not new. They have been around for a very long time. When I was growing up in Barnett Street, Salisbury, there were three streets just off Commercial Road that were built on what was formerly farmland. There were a couple of farms around us when I was growing up.

There was Brian Street, Barnett Street and Porter Street, and the middle of Porter Street was the City of Elizabeth boundary. When I was in primary school, Porter Street was the only street out of those three that was a dirt road. The other roads were bitumised. There were Salisbury ratepayers living on the southern side of Porter Street but there were no ratepayers in the Elizabeth city council. This was before the amalgamation and the establishment of the Playford council. Those ratepayers demanded that their street be bitumised, so the Salisbury council's solution was to bitumise half the street. The southern side of the street had bitumen and the northern side that was owned by the City of Elizabeth was not bitumised.

I guess this is the sort of thing that happens when decisions are made for political reasons rather than common sense with the future in mind. It was not long before that whole part across the road from the City of Salisbury side was developed, there were houses there and the whole road needed to be done. So it is scarred in my mind how silly local governments can be at times. Even as a very young child, I remembered that experience. This reminded me of some of the outcomes that could happen when politics is reintroduced into infrastructure and planning decisions. With those remarks, I indicate that the opposition does not support the bill.

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts) (16:50): I rise today to support the Highways (Works for Residential Developments) Amendment Bill 2024. This bill is just one of the many measures that this government is taking to increase housing in our state. The bill has arisen as a result of what is the heartache of 20 families who were forced to suffer when Felmeri Builders and Developers went into administration.

I note the member for Unley's concerns that we did jump in to help those 20 families. Twenty homes had construction started on them in O'Halloran Hill, and they could not be completed or occupied due to the failure of Felmeri in not constructing the access road to the subdivision and the related services that needed to be installed. Each of those 20 homes represented a future home for a South Australian family down south, and each week that the delayed construction of their homes added up these families incurred additional costs, making the prospect of home ownership much more difficult.

That is why on this side of the chamber we stepped in. We built the access road to ensure that these homes could be completed. We need to ensure that South Australians are protected from poor business practices. One step that has already taken place is the State Planning Commission's practice direction requiring community title developments of more than six lots to complete common driveways before titles for those lots can be issued. Of course, this bill goes further and seeks to protect South Australian taxpayers from being left with the bill to make good where a developer has failed.

The Commissioner of Highways will be able to undertake prescribed works and recover the associated costs from the relevant developer or council that approved the residential development. This will ensure that landowners who are faced by the challenges of a developer going bust are not left with unfinished common infrastructure, like what occurred at O'Halloran Hill, preventing their homes from being built. It also places pressure on local councils to ensure they take the appropriate security over developments they approve.

As I mentioned, the bill is only a small piece of the puzzle that this government is committed to in addressing housing in our state. Earlier this year, the Treasurer and I announced a review to ensure South Australians are properly protected when building a house. Builders are legally required to take out building indemnity insurance (BII) on behalf of home owners when they sign a major building contract. This provides protection to those home owners if the builder dies, disappears or becomes insolvent, like Felmeri, before finishing the building work or for defective work on a completed home for up to five years post completion.

The BII review examines whether the existing BII cover is fit for purpose by looking at factors such as what is covered by BII, the minimum thresholds and addressing gaps in consumer protection. It is also considering issues that have arisen from recent insolvencies, including whether the insurance limit of \$150,000 is adequate. The state government, through SAFA, underwrites BII through reinsurance agreements with QBE.

I want to ensure all South Australians have the strongest level of protection possible when building a home. Building a new home should be a time of excitement, and we will be considering what protections should be offered to people to safeguard them throughout the building process as well as what can be done to better support consumers when their builder has failed to comply with legislation governing BII and in cases of substandard work.

We are seeking to strengthen our building laws and increase protections for people to undertake building work as well. We are undertaking the most significant review of our state's building regulations in nearly 20 years. It is important that South Australia's regulatory framework for building and construction work is well placed to meet our current and our future needs.

Our Building and Construction Industry Review will look at ways to achieve this objective with a focus on opportunities to enhance industry compliance, protect and inform consumers, and support building practitioners to deliver high-quality work. Items that will be covered in the discussion paper were identified by a series of round tables that I convened with key industry bodies, state government agencies and training providers. Consumer and business services also contributed suggestions to improve compliance, streamline dispute resolution processes and better protect consumers.

In addition, the review will consider recommendations from the national report, the Building Confidence Report, which was prepared by Professor Shergold and Ms Weir, the Shergold-Weir report. The report was commissioned by the national Building Ministers' Forum and produced a number of recommendations to improve the implementation of the building construction standards in the National Construction Code.

In our paper there are five key areas canvassed, including improving dispute resolution processes, regulating the building and construction industry contracts, reforming licensing and registration, continuing professional development for building workers, and strengthening compliance and enforcement.

South Australians rely on builders and tradies, whether it be for a minor installation or repair through to significant renovations and major building projects like building an entirely new home. It is crucial that we have strong protections in place to protect people when they are making such a significant investment. We are working on building a stronger building and construction industry to ensure the best outcomes for consumers. This bill is part of that and is a step towards making sure that South Australians who are building their dream family home and South Australian taxpayers are not forced to cover the costs of failed businesses. With that, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr TELFER (Flinders) (16:56): I rise to speak on this bill. I take a lot of interest in some of the words the government is using because, on my reading of this piece of legislation, the minister

speaks about not wanting taxpayers to be left holding the cost of development, but what this bill does is actually sheet that cost from taxpayer to ratepayer. They are the same people who are going to be left liable, and the risks for us as a state are significant. I thank the member for Unley for the points that he has made as he has looked into this legislation.

I highlight to members in particular the ham-fisted way that this piece of law-making is happening. I get the need, I get the situation, and absolutely I recognise that there needs to be a mechanism in place to make sure that people who invest in their homes are not left with a situation like we saw very obviously with the Felmeri case, but this is not the way to do it.

This is a bill which is amending the Highways Act 1926. I want to walk through a bit of the detail of what is actually within this amendment to try to highlight that inconsistency of trying to shoehorn in this aspect. Honestly, the Highways Act is about roads, highways.

The first point that is made, and when we get to the third clause and the questions that I will be wanting to ask, it deletes subsection (2) of section 26 of the Highways Act, which is talking about the ability of the commissioner to be able to carry out roadwork in a district, provided that the commissioner first gives the council notice in writing of the proposed roadwork and the date on which it is proposed to commence the roadwork. It is all about the roadwork.

This change, this amendment, instead puts in additional aspects. Sure, it is about carrying out a roadwork but it is also about carrying out prescribed works in a designated residential development area—prescribed works. What are these prescribed works? We see it also referenced later on in some of the other changes that are going to be made:

to the extent that such a road is located in a designated residential development area, carry out prescribed works in relation to the road...

Firstly, there is the question about what is going to be the designated residential development area. This is going to be whatever is at the whim of the minister to designate the residential development area. And what are these prescribed works? We see that later on in the definition:

Prescribed works means any 1 or more of the following for the purposes of a designated residential development area:

(a) roadwork;

That is exactly what is already in the Highways Act in the original iteration, so that is fine. Secondly:

(b) works related to the provision of public infrastructure;

Thirdly:

(c) works of a kind prescribed by regulation,

This amendment puts in place the ability for the minister to designate whatever that minister wants as prescribed works—whatever they want as prescribed works. 'The provision of public infrastructure' is pretty broad. What is public infrastructure? Later on, we look in the definition:

Public infrastructure means infrastructure and other facilities used in or in connection with—

(a) the supply of water, or electricity, gas or other forms of energy;

This change means that the minister has the ability, the power, to go in carte blanche, prescribe the public infrastructure of the supply of water, of electricity, of gas or other forms of energy. The bill continues:

(b) the provision of telecommunications;

The power for the minister, through the Highways Act, to come in and put in place telecommunications infrastructure. It is going a long way away from highways and roads. Thirdly:

(c) the provision of stormwater, waste water or sewage management infrastructure; or

(d) the provision of any other service of a kind prescribed by regulation,

This amendment gives the minister the ability to go to an area, go to a development, prescribe it as a designated residential development area and then have the power to decide to invest in any bit of public infrastructure in that development—any bit at all. It is nothing to do with just roads. It is any bit

of public infrastructure: the supply of water, the supply of electricity, gas, other forms of energy, the provision of telecommunications, the provision of stormwater, wastewater, sewage management infrastructure or any other service of a kind prescribed by regulation. This gives the opportunity—

Members interjecting:

Mr TELFER: I hear the interjections of the member and I look forward to hearing the contribution that they might make, because the member interjecting recognises and knows local government well, as I do. Later on, we see the cascading effect of this amendment bill, because in those prescribed works the minister has the power to be able to make *carte blanche* decisions about any of that provision of public infrastructure. Then we see:

Section 26—after subsection (9) insert:

- (9a) Any expenses incurred by the Commissioner in carrying out prescribed works in a designated residential development area—

and we have already seen that the minister has the ability to be able to designate a residential development area—

together with interest at the prescribed interest rate, may be recovered from—

- (a) the council for the district in which the area is located; or
(b) with the approval of the Minister—the relevant developer,
as a debt due to the Commissioner.

What this amendment is doing to the Highways Act is giving the infrastructure minister the ability to go in and designate the development area, decide what piece of public infrastructure they want to invest in, at whatever level—it could be gold-plated, it could be the most fantastic footpath that goes down the side of the road—incur whatever expenses and then bill the associated council in which the area is located, charge them interest and have that debt due to the highways commissioner.

Not only that, we also see further down the designation that:

- (9d) A council cannot raise or recover expenses referred to in subsection (9a) by way of a rate, charge, levy, fee or other amount imposed on ratepayers.
(9e) Without limiting subsection (9d)—

which I just read out—

a council cannot impose a separate rate, service rate or service charge on land used for residential purposes in a designated residential development area for the purpose of raising or recovering expenses referred to in subsection (9a).

So we have a situation where a minister can go in, designate a residential development area, decide what level of infrastructure they are going to be putting in—do not forget that this is public infrastructure, so we are talking about water, electricity, gas, telecommunications, stormwater, wastewater, sewage management infrastructure—and decide to whatever level and to whatever cost, and that cost can then be sheeted directly to the council in which the area is located.

As I said at the start, I get the thought behind this amendment. I get the scenario that we are facing. But to have a situation where a minister has the ability to—let's wander down that scenario. We could have a builder halfway through a development without any sort of public infrastructure in place, and the minister comes in and decides, 'I'm going to put in a road. I'm going to be putting in a nice nine-foot wide footpath on either side. I'm going to get the highest level of wastewater management system in place. I'm going to underground the power infrastructure because that's what's best. I'm going to make sure that they've also got the gas connection that they need. I'm going to do all this infrastructure investment and then bill the council in which the area is located.'

Like I said, I understand the individual circumstances we are looking at. I look forward to hearing the explanations and answers in the committee stage because my reading of this gives whichever minister—and not just the current minister, but future ministers once this is in place—the ability to recover directly from the council in the district in which the area is located.

If you have a significant development with significant cost, the cost will be recovered from the council in the district in which the area is located, and that additional cost to a council cannot be covered with a special rate, cannot be covered with an increase and cannot be covered with a service charge or an additional rate, charge, levy or fee. How are these going to be paid for? We are going to end up having a situation where local government is, potentially, at significant levels of debt without any ability to raise the funding that is needed to not just service the debt but repay the debt.

It might be alright in a council area that may be able to absorb an additional development—that is, a large metropolitan council for which, as a component of their total rate take, it might be only a small component. They may be able to absorb that in their debt levels. But what happens in a situation where we have a developer that is halfway through a development in a regional centre, in a small regional council, and the decision is made by the minister to come in and make them pay for that infrastructure? There are regional councils all throughout South Australia that are already facing a great challenge as far as being able to not just service their existing communities but service the debt that is incurred for some of the investment for infrastructure that they are putting in.

As I said, this is about lawmaking that is for the long term. It may be the intention of the current minister that we would never get to the point or the situation that I am hypothetically talking about. However, if you are putting a law in place that gives the minister what reads to be this level of power, you have to set it up for whatever variety of minister you might find down the track. On my reading, this gives the opportunity for a minister to be able to make whatever decision about whatever expense and directly impose that cost onto a council that they need to incur with interest and without the ability to raise additional money from additional rates or additional service charges. So what I fear with this legislation is that we are going to have a situation where we have a law coming in, well meaning, to try to suit a situation but the risk for me as the shadow local government minister is that it has the potential to undermine local councils.

As we get to a situation with this law in place, as has already been articulated around some of the vagaries of the planning system, do councils then have to be trying to make decisions about which developments they support by trying to work out if a developer is financially viable? If they were making a decision about a development and the process it was going through and they were uncertain about the long-term financial viability of that developer, basically it is a heightened risk for that council. You could have a situation where if there was a developer at higher financial risk—and councils do not have the capacity to be able to judge that sort of thing—they could then be left holding the can, holding the baby, unfortunately, with this piece of legislation.

My worry around the accountability and oversight of this really is writ large within some of these amendments that are being put at the moment. The risk of the financial burden on councils I think is significant. The erosion of the local planning authority is a real risk, and the objectives of what is trying to be achieved through this amendment bill I fear is not what is actually going to be delivered when this is put in place. We actually have a situation where we could have perverse outcomes for future development, perverse outcomes for future house building because of that extra layer of risk, that extra layer of obligation which is now being potentially put onto local government, and we have a situation where those consequences could actually have a negative outcome.

As I said, the capacity of local government budgets ranges from a council with a rate base of a few million dollars up to hundreds of millions of dollars. Sure, those bigger councils might be able to absorb a project like the Felmeri project that we saw, a \$5 million project. There could be that potential. But what if we have a situation where we have a \$2 million development which then a small council with a small budget does not have the ability to absorb? They already have the pressures that they are facing at the moment with debt levels, they already have the challenges that they are facing with making sure that they are accountable to their local ratepayers as to any rate increase or extending their debt levels, and this adds that extra obligation, that extra risk and that extra uncertainty.

I look at the powers that this puts in place and, as I said, I do not mind the motivation of the minister, and the minister might in his words say we would never get to this hypothetical situation. When something like this is written into a piece of legislation, actually we could get to that hypothetical situation. When we are making laws, we need to have an eye on any perverse potential outcomes.

In the discussions that I have been having, I recognise that there needs to be a solution to make sure that, as I said, for people who are in this situation, as we have seen with one or two of the builders in South Australia, there are proper supports put in place to ensure people are not at the point of losing their potential future family home.

However, to try to crack that nut with the sledgehammer that is this amendment bill I think is poor lawmaking. The rationale behind it is flawed, and I think the potential for this piece of legislation, this change to this legislation of the Highways Act, has the potential to be misused by current or future ministers. It is a long way away from the original of the Highways Act. It is now basically shoehorning in highways and any other public infrastructure within a bill. That definition is broad.

This is why the opposition, in dissecting what is not just the motivation but also the potential outcome for this amendment bill, is looking at—and the government might be well meaning—what the potential risks and outcomes can be for local government, for local communities and for future ratepayers who, unfortunately, with the stipulation that is within this bill are going to have to be doing the heavy lifting, the shouldering of the burden, because you could have a situation where a local government does not have the ability to raise any extra rate or service charge to service the debt that is imposed on them because of the development in this designated area. They have no ability.

We have no insight into how the logistics of that judgement are going to be made around the council not being able to raise or recover expenses referred to by way of a rate, a charge, a levy, a fee or other amount. I am not quite sure, but I am sure I will be enlightened through the committee stage as to how that is actually going to be judged, who is going to be making that call if a council has made a decision to increase a rate level for a broad budget reason or a specific development reason as is set out here within the designated residential development area aspect. Who is going to be making that call? Are we going to have a situation where—I am not sure—it is going to be the Ombudsman or whoever?

It is a pretty interesting little aspect here, which I fear is going to add complication, is going to add risk and is going to actually lead to potentially perverse and poorer outcomes for people who are looking to go into either a first home or extend it.

Ms THOMPSON (Davenport) (17:17): I rise in support of the Highways (Works for Residential Developments) Amendment Bill, a bill that this government introduces to protect families from dodgy developers, failing businesses and enabling councils.

These make-believe scenarios put forward by the member for Flinders are just not really stick. If you are so concerned about the financial burden on councils, all you need to do is speak to them and tell them to make good planning decisions. As long as they do not do the wrong thing, they will be just fine.

Let me paint a picture for you of a realistic situation, one that this bill would actually seek to improve. The collapse of Felmeri Homes in 2023 had wide-reaching consequences, but no-one paid a heavier price than families of the O'Halloran Hill estate on Main South Road in my electorate of Davenport. These families are good people and I can say that because I have come to know them well over the last two years. It is unfortunate, though, that I have grown to know them so well in such devastating and personal circumstances.

Residents of the O'Halloran Hill estate were left with half-built homes, shoddy and incomplete common infrastructure and most notably no road to access their properties. This was not just an inconvenience. It prevented new builders from safely accessing the site's 20 homes, leaving 20 families without roofs over their head and in the middle of a countrywide housing crisis, it meant 20 fewer homes for South Australia's growing population.

Felmeri Homes and its directors bear significant blame for the business's demise, with the liquidator's report finding significant use of funds for non-business related purposes, but they cannot be solely responsible for the impact on the O'Halloran Hill estate residents. At the request of Felmeri Homes, the City of Marion allowed building construction to commence before appropriate shared infrastructure was installed. That should never happen and if they do not do that again, they will be just fine, member for Flinders.

What this meant was that when Felmeri Homes ceased trading, there were half-built homes ready for completion but no safe way to access them. Why permission was granted in the first instance remains a mystery to me, but the outcome is proof of why this highly unusual decision should never have been made. The toll this took on my community can only be described as devastating. The financial impact is apparent, with one resident having borrowed approximately \$100,000 to finish a house they had already paid for.

Another resident spent \$30,000 addressing defects alone and that is after accessing \$150,000 in builder's insurance. All were already paying a mortgage on the home that they could not finish, while also paying rent or a second mortgage elsewhere—thousands of dollars for every month that they could not complete their homes. Some families just could not afford to do that, so they were forced to couch surf with relatives for extended periods of time.

But there was more than just money at stake. Unfinished homes and blown-out deadlines were a cause of anxiety and suffering. For so many their dream of home ownership—for some of them it was their first home ever—had become an absolute nightmare. As a government we could not allow this to continue. It is not government overreach, member for Unley; it is looking after our constituents and that is why the Department for Infrastructure and Transport stepped up to the plate. Remedied Felmeri homes neglected the common infrastructure and laid the road that these families so desperately needed.

Today our message to developers and to councils is simple: this can never happen again. Costs incurred by the state government to get these families into their new homes exceeded \$4 million, a significant burden on the taxpayer and one that was wholly avoidable.

Now the City of Marion has acknowledged fault in this matter, doing so in writing to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. However, not only did it refuse to contribute towards the cost of the road but it would not even consider a rate rebate for the period that these residents were locked out of their homes. And when building indemnity insurance only stretches so far, home owners are paying rent to keep a roof over their heads plus mortgages on what were supposed to be forever homes. The absence of any rate relief was a swift kick in the guts.

There are important lessons learned from the Felmeri Homes saga, there is no doubting that, but the only players that seem to have taken a hit through this process are the O'Halloran Hill estate home owners and South Australian taxpayers. For a problem it had such a significant role in creating, the local council washed its hands and walked away with the rates of 20 families that it had failed. To me, that is unacceptable and thankfully my government colleagues agree. This bill affords the highways commissioner power to intervene should there be another Felmeri-type incident, giving them authority to complete prescribed works on residential developments with approval from the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport.

More importantly, though, it also allows the commissioner to recover the costs of these works from the relevant developer, council or any other person deemed responsible for the development, meaning taxpayers will not be left on the hook for the mistakes of developers or councils ever again. And if you think there is an opportunity to shirk these new responsibilities, then you would be wrong. The bill restricts local councils from passing any costs they incur along to ratepayers, be that through a rate, charge, levy, fee or any other mechanism. If a council makes a mistake the onus is on them to own that mistake and pay to remedy the situation.

Just like residents of the O'Halloran Hill estate, every South Australian deserves a roof over their head and that is exactly why we have introduced a suite of policies to deliver more houses for more people. The Malinauskas Labor government's A Better Housing Future initiative is well and truly off the ground, with stamp duty abolition for eligible first-home buyers, the single largest residential land release in the state's history and streamlined code amendment processes unlocking new homes right across South Australia. What is more, in the 100 days since launching the Housing Roadmap, more than 1,000 new allotments have been approved for construction, all with guaranteed water and sewer services.

An investment is not limited to houses available on the private market, with 82 government-led public housing homes completed and construction on a further 177 homes underway. This is a serious policy for a city and a state that is quickly becoming the envy of jurisdictions across the

country, and we are doing all that we can to accommodate the ever-increasing demand for housing. To do that, though, means more than throwing money at infrastructure and freeing up land for development. It means ensuring our state's policy settings are correct, but that is through new legislation or tweaking what has served us so well. It also means setting clear expectations for the private sector and each of those agencies that play a role in approving new developments, including local councils.

While some builders have encountered difficult trading conditions during and through the wake of COVID-19, we know poor strategic management and greed played a significant role in the Felmeri Homes dilemma, a dilemma that wrongly extended to families looking for a place to call home.

The Minister for Infrastructure and Transport rightly described the Felmeri disaster as 'a dark chapter in South Australia's building history', but instead of pointing fingers, we are learning from these mistakes, safeguarding consumers and taxpayers not just through the bill before the house today but also through changes adopted by the State Planning Commission last year. We are getting on with the task at hand and helping more South Australians into home ownership, but we are not going to let developers and councils take advantage of anyone looking to live out that dream along the way, be that through oversight, neglect or poor planning.

To Edward, Jordan, Jess and everyone else in the O'Halloran Hill estate who has advocated relentlessly to protect South Australians from enduring the hardships that they suffered, we thank you. I commend this bill to the house.

Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:25): It is my pleasure to speak and provide my support on this bill. As a state, it is absolutely crucial that we plan for future growth and that we do it well. It is why, as a government, we are committed to making home ownership and secure housing more available to those living in our beautiful state. As our economy booms and our population grows, it is vital that we address the challenges of housing affordability and the need for quality public spaces and supporting infrastructure.

We have an incredible reputation. Adelaide is one of the world's most liveable cities, and we certainly want to do what we can to keep it that way. We also know it is getting harder for South Australians to get into the housing market, and we are pulling every lever to help address this. We have a Housing Roadmap. We are looking at where we can build the infrastructure that is required to make it happen, how to help those entering the housing market, and we are focused on skilling up our workforce to be able to ensure that we can build the homes as expeditiously as possible.

We also want to ensure that homebuyers are protected. This is the single biggest investment that you can make in your life. Now more so than ever, provided the climate that we are currently living in, we want to ensure that they are protected wherever possible. We do not want to see jobs half done. We want to support the need surrounding housing while also ensuring our state continues to be viewed as one of the best places to live. It is why we stepped in last August to provide an infrastructure solution to ensure builders could complete work on 20 unfinished homes in O'Halloran Hill after the builder, Felmeri Builders and Developers, entered into liquidation.

This highly unusual situation left 20 families who had bought home and land packages within the development facing an uncertain future with deteriorating financial positions while their homes were unfinished and uninhabitable. I honestly cannot imagine not only the financial pressures this would place on a household but the physical and mental pressures that places on a family to keep afloat during that time. They were absolutely left in a dire situation through no fault of their own. It is why we have worked hard to support consumers to be able to access building indemnity insurance. I certainly would like to thank all ministers who have been involved in this process, as well as the member for Davenport for making sure that the special circumstances of these 20 families at O'Halloran Hill were well understood within the government.

In the middle of a housing crisis we are not prepared to sit by and let people like these suffer, losing more money when their homes, in many instances, are nearly complete. To be honest, I am still surprised that the developer was actually given approval to be able to build on these blocks without completing the roadway or providing financial security to be able to do so. We made a promise to examine the options to make sure that this absolutely does not happen again, which is

why we are now here today. We do not want to see this scenario happening again, and we would like to avoid situations where the government needs to step in to undertake works and construct common infrastructure at residential developments at the government's cost.

It is why I am so pleased to share that we now have this bill before us today, one that benefits landowners who are affected by a builder or a developer going into liquidation, ensuring they are not left with unfinished common infrastructure such as roadways which prevents their homes from being built. It is one that would also address future risks to the taxpayer of having to front the cost of unfinished common infrastructure in the event that the government was required to intervene. It is also one that encourages councils to ensure that they have appropriate security in line with the State Planning Commission Practice Direction 12 (Conditions) 2020, which places a condition that councils must confirm that either a common driveway has been constructed or that appropriate security for the construction of the common driveway is provided before a land division certificate is issued.

These amendments are necessary safeguarding provisions that will ensure that when a developer fails to complete common infrastructure on a community title development the state is not required to bear the costs or enter into a licence agreement to ensure the works are complete. I want to ensure that any development that happens in my local community is one that value-adds to those who are already so proud to call this beautiful piece of South Australia home. This means that I want to ensure that any works done are done right.

I do not want to see anyone in my community placed in the same situation as those who were caught up in the Felmeri incident. It was unfair, it hurts the individuals and it has flow-on impacts to the community on a greater scale as well. It is important that we absolutely learn from these experiences and that we exercise the powers that we have to reduce the risk of this happening again. This bill helps to achieve this, which is why I commend it to the house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (17:30): I rise to make a brief contribution at the second reading. As far as this side of the house is concerned, it has been well put by the member for Unley and the member for Flinders. There are good reasons why the opposition opposes the bill and perhaps there will be an opportunity for me to participate rather more fully in the committee stage. I flag that my concerns are partly about what is past, and Felmeri has been a disastrous set of circumstances. The member for Davenport has given what is a contemporaneous and close to home recitation of how disastrous that has been. There is no doubt about it.

The concern that we have is that that is a set of circumstances that has befallen everyone involved. There is a set of approvals that have been granted and the council has had a significant role to play in all of that. The builder has then gone under and we all have to deal with how that is best resolved. We hear that the council might not have been terribly reasonable in maintaining an insistence that rates be paid and all the rest of it, but that has all the ingredients of an individual negotiation.

With skill and application by all interested parties, you can get to an outcome where there are contributions, including by the various public authorities, to make sure that the worst of those oppressive outcomes are not visited upon these poor home owners, would-be residents. It is really important that an outcome is reached so that those homes can be built and people can be in their homes, but that has all the ingredients of an individual negotiation.

Going forward, there are a few alarm bells that start ringing when you hear constantly from the government in the process of it legislating, 'Don't worry, this is not going to come up very often,' or, 'Don't worry, these are nightmare scenarios that have been raised. They're never really going to occur.' If so, why are we legislating? The very set of circumstances prospectively that this is contemplating seems to me to include just about everything in terms of residential development, potentially, and circumstances where the costs of works that have been deemed desirable can be sheeted home to either the council or to the developer.

It seems to me that as a result of this legislation the state can get a rush of blood to the head any time you like and say, 'Right, it's high time that the developer bore the cost of what we now think is an important priority to get on with.' I just flag that I might have a few questions to ask about one example of a bit of a tug of war that has been going on for some years in Mount Barker, which is the

way in which to ultimately get everybody to play their part in the completion of Heysen Boulevard. That is just one example.

There are plenty of means by which I can see this legislation being used to just come along and impose itself on councils primarily—it might be said, the decision-makers in terms of grants of development approval in many cases—but also developers in ways that are superimposed on the arrangements that had been made.

Another general chilling effect that this kind of legislation, in fact this legislation as it is presented to the house, risks is that you will have a super risk-averse response from the councils responsible for giving development approval and a sort of banking effect in terms of councils having to provision, conceivably—and these might be questions for the committee, as well—for the possibility that this kind of thing might be imposed upon them out of the blue and they have to make some sort of risk provision for that. That might have capital consequences that flow on to rates.

Whether or not councils are prohibited from passing on the costs of capital provisioning to account for a risk that this sort of legislation imposes will be, I think, a question that is likely to come up in the committee as well. It might be seen as necessary and prudent on the one hand but prohibited on the other. With just that brief contribution, I look forward to the committee stage.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (17:36): I would like to thank first and foremost everyone who has contributed to the debate and especially the member for Davenport, who I think gave a heartfelt description of what those residents with Felmeri at O'Halloran Hill went through.

It is hard to understand, unless you have been through it, the stress and anxiety of the idea that the actions of other people removed from you can have such an impact on your family, the idea that your mortgage repayments are not stopping, your dream home is not being built, there is no-one with a sympathetic ear other than your local MP and council are saying, 'Bad luck. Up to you. You deal with this. It is your problem. It is private land; we cannot spend taxpayers' money on private land.'

I do hear that the shadow treasurer said that there is some sympathy for the circumstances that occurred here; he is just not happy with the solution the government has come up with. I accept that, but let us explore what happened. Council approved the selling of lots before the common infrastructure was built. That is unacceptable behaviour. In my opinion, that is maladministration or misconduct at the very minimum. How a developer was able to get any council to agree to that is ridiculous.

Under those circumstances, with the opposition's opposition to this bill, if they are successful, those councils can get away with it again, and then the taxpayer—who the shadow treasurer is meant to be more interested in than anyone else—would have to come up and front up and pay up to look after people like the people at O'Halloran Hill who did not have the ability to pay. I have to say, after hearing the last remarks from the shadow attorney, both men were elected on a platform of rate capping.

All of a sudden, when a government says, 'Hang on a second. If a council maladministers or conducts misconduct or does something wrong and does not follow the basic planning codes set out by the state planning authority about how developments should be approved, they should pay,' somehow it is in breach of their independence, but rate capping is okay. But I suppose there has been a change of heart about council rates since they chose the new candidate in the seat of Black, who proposed the second largest rate increase in the state of 7.1 per cent, which of course is going to be each and every year over the next three years.

So I understand that the shadow treasurer and the shadow attorney do not like the idea of interfering in council matters when it suits them, but it suited them at the last election, the election before 2018. They went to the election with a policy of actually telling councils what they could and could not rate and how they could increase their rates, taking away their independence. So I think the hypocrisy here is a bit thick.

What the government is attempting to do—

Mr Telfer: You voted against rate capping, though.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sorry?

Mr Telfer: You voted against rate capping.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That's right.

Mr Telfer: Now you are bringing it in.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is right. I did vote against rate capping and voted against it for very good reasons, because I believe councils should be able to raise the appropriate rates that they have for their infrastructure. That does not mean that they should be able to charge their taxpayers some mistakes that they made, which is what the opposition is saying. The opposition is saying if council makes mistakes, one, they should not have to pay, and, two, how dare you force them to pay. That is what you are saying.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: But again, if I was a former mayor, I would not want this type of legislation either, because who knows what it might uncover.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, but that former mayor supports this legislation. There is a difference.

But let's get to the point here. The point is I think what the opposition's concerns are, I do not want to put words into their mouths, but what they are paraphrasing here is: what is deemed to be misconduct or an error by a council, and does that mean that the Commissioner of Highways or the minister just all of a sudden will start getting councils to pay for other people's infrastructure?

I think what you are basically implying, and I mean the shadow minister, is that a developer cannot afford to build an intersection to get into their land, they can use this legislation to buddy up with a minister and the minister can say, 'Yeah, no worries. I will make the council pay for it. I will build it and charge them.' That is not what this bill does; it simply does not. Quite frankly, to presume that I think misinterprets the bill.

However, I have undertaken to meet with the Local Government Association to try to iron out what is a way of codifying what that type of behaviour is, and I am happy to look at that, absolutely. So I suppose my request of the opposition today is: I do not think you should oppose this bill, I think you should allow the government to pass this bill and allow the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I had not noticed the numbers.

Mr Telfer interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, the previous government could not pass legislation and they were the government and it is in the name.

I think there is a point I want to make here about how we will deem this and I think it is an important point to make to the parliament because the Felmeri situation can happen again, and I will tell you why. It could be undertaken again because councils in my opinion have a perverse incentive: the more development, the more rates. The one thing that is not growing are their boundaries, so their rates are limited to their size and dwellings and the values, and of course the budgets that they set, and obviously good common sense and what the public will accept.

But a very easy way of increasing revenue is allowing more development, especially development like this where the council almost have no infrastructure at all to put in place—like none. It is a private road, electricity and gas have been put in by the developer, driveways have been put in by the households, the council just receives the rates. They do not put their hands in their pockets at all but they receive the revenue. So the perverse incentive here is the council approve the selling of these allotments and the issuing of titles on the basis that they would get more revenue before

they allowed the very clear, concise steps that are set out to make sure that the state planning code is met.

There are steps that can be taken to ensure that the appropriate developments are followed, and I think it is important to know that if a developer has not followed the prescribed steps set out through good management and good development, that could be a trigger. If council has allowed no security to be taken, or has allowed the issuing of lots and building approval on the basis of common infrastructure not being built yet, that could trigger it.

Let's say, for example, that council is not at fault and a developer is, council and government have no recourse over that developer other than through the courts. I would say to the shadow treasurer: would it not be a useful tool for our constituents, councils and government alike to have the ability to pursue developers who were liquid, who do have assets, to make them liable, to make sure that their constituents, our constituents, got the services that they were promised and through no fault of the council and no fault of the state government those constituents got the infrastructure that they were promised and paid for?

Currently, we have no recourse, and in the undertaking here in Felmeri what we found was that stormwater retention basins were not put in properly, electricity and gas were not rolled out properly, the road was substandard and the access road into the development from the Commissioner of Highways road should have been completed first. It was not done, yet council still allowed construction to proceed.

When the government went to Marion council and said, 'Look, this is a very difficult situation. The government is prepared to meet half the cost of this and half the cost for the council, and we will limit the costs of council to half a million and the government will deliver this,' council's response was no—no.

I got a letter of apology from the mayor, who later admitted that the council did err by allowing development to begin before the common infrastructure had been put in place. He just had not been aware. This is the frustration that governments face. When I say government, it can be any government. That is what we cannot allow to continue. We cannot allow developers to take payment and begin selling allotments without putting in the shared infrastructure first.

There is a good order to this, and the order should be followed. If the order is not followed, and the taxpayer—it is not coming out of my pocket or the shadow treasurer's pocket; it is coming out of His Majesty's Treasury and the way we raise that money is through debt and taxes. We have a responsibility to make sure that that money is spent appropriately.

Why is the taxpayer liable for what happened at Felmeri, and why is the opposition okay about it? Why is the opposition okay about it happening again? What is the alternative? I have pledged to work with the opposition between the houses if they support the bill, because I think supporting the bill shows a level of good faith. I am open for amendments, and I do not think we are going to draft amendments on the floor as we go through the legislation.

We are coming up to the end on Thursday and then another break. I undertake to meet with the opposition and come up with an alternative that allows us to appropriately codify, so that we do not have a situation where an infrastructure minister can simply start saying to councils, 'I want you to build this. If you don't build it, I will build it and then send you the bill.' Sure, but I am not going to allow developers and councils to be negligent and get away with it again. It cannot happen again.

Marion council is responsible for this legislation, and the LGA and other councils should know that the reason this legislation is here is because of the actions of Kris Hanna and his council. He is the reason we are doing this. That council is the reason this occurred. That council could have avoided everything that occurred at Felmeri if they had simply followed good practice, but they did not. There is no consequence at all for any officer in that council. The only people who have borne any consequence are taxpayers and the people at the top of the tree, the residents of that Felmeri development.

I have never had that type of stress in my life. I have been very, very lucky. I have been blessed. I can only imagine what a young family was going through, wondering what was going to happen. The member for Davenport was talking about people couch surfing after they had paid for

a house. Council were asked—okay, you cannot contribute, but you could at the very least not charge these people rates. Do you know what council said? No. Well, that forces the government's hand.

If we had a cooperative council and if the LGA were able to have some sort of internal process that would allow this never to occur again, the government might have a different point of view. But in the absence of an alternative, the government is forced to act. If the opposition have found what they think are errors in the legislation, or gaps—and, of course, there are always gaps in legislation; no piece of legislation is perfect—I am happy to look at it between the houses. That is no problem whatsoever.

My point remains: in the absence of this, what? What? Just let Marion council get away with it again? Let the council just do as they please, when they please, as often as they please? No. There need to be consequences and there needs to be the ability to remedy the taxpayers' loss. Taxpayers are the ones who pay. I could do another scenario: how many taxpayers who have built in these types of allotments and who have paid for their private infrastructure are looking at this and thinking, 'Gee, the government didn't build my driveway. They didn't build my access road.' It is not fair. So what we are trying to do is apply a fairness here to make sure that this never occurs again.

You might ask, 'Why not just go after the City of Marion? Why not have special-purpose legislation that just recovers the cost from the City of Marion? Because, as far as I am concerned, they are the ones who are liable here.' Well, I suspect if I had done that, that would be a very different conversation I would be having with the opposition and the LGA about targeting individual councils. What I am trying to do here is build a prophylactic measure where we avoid this ever happening again and no-one has to pay.

My door is open. I am open for negotiation between the houses. I hope the opposition sees sense and supports this legislation and takes me on my word. But if they oppose this legislation, why would I negotiate with them? I am open for a bilateral discussion with the opposition about something that can work, and include the LGA and have a successful outcome. If the opposition opposes this, well, I suppose that is off the table. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

PORTABLE LONG SERVICE LEAVE BILL

Final Stages

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

**AUTOMATED EXTERNAL DEFIBRILLATORS (PUBLIC ACCESS) (MISCELLANEOUS)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

**CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE (OVERSIGHT AND ADVOCACY BODIES) (CHILD DEATH
AND SERIOUS INJURY REVIEW COMMITTEE) AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:55 the house adjourned until Wednesday 16 October 2024 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***PORT BROUGHTON SCHOOL AND KINDERGARTEN KOALA CROSSING**

In reply to **Mr ELLIS (Narungga)** (12 September 2024).

The Hon. D.R. CREGAN (Kavel—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Special Minister of State): I have been advised:

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (the department) has made contact with the Port Broughton Kindergarten and the Port Broughton School to review the nominated preferred operation times regarding the koala crossing.

*Estimates Replies***SMALL AND FAMILY BUSINESS**

In reply to **the Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised by the Office for Small and Family Business that \$5,000 was spent on advertising and publicity for Small Business Week 2024.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for the Department of State Development:

The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds under my responsibility for the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 financial years:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000	2026-27 Estimate \$000
Small and Family Business				
Centre for Business Growth	Support the creation of a new position, the Playford Professor of Business Growth, and provide continued support for outreach activities included in the centre's Growing South Australian Companies program.	275	—	—
Small Business Strategy	The small business strategy seeks to increase the skills, capability and capacity of small business owners, and support them to create jobs and build the economy.	1,428	1,267	1,304
Women in Business	The funding provides a suite of programs to South Australian female-owned businesses and boost our economy, creating jobs and supporting local entrepreneurs. Through the provision of upskilling, capability development and support, the Program will build resilience and strengthen innovative female-owned businesses in South Australia.	919	918	930

The following table provides details, including the value and beneficiary, for any commitments relating to contracts executed on or before 30 June 2024, for contracts with a total value of \$200,000 (inclusive GST) and above.

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (GST Exclusive) \$*
Small and Family Business			
Centre for Business Growth	University of South Australia	Refer purpose of grant program above.	275,000
Small Business Strategy	South Australian Employers Chamber of Commerce and Industry (trading as Business SA)	Refer purpose of grant program above.	37,963
Small Business Strategy	City of Salisbury (trading as Polaris Centre)	Refer purpose of grant program above.	37,963
Small Business Strategy	Social Traders Ltd	Refer purpose of grant program above.	82,253

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value (GST Exclusive) \$*
Women in Business	Adelaide Business Hub	Refer purpose of grant program above.	25,000

*Value of remaining instalments related to the contracts with a total value above \$200,000 (remaining financial commitments).

ASSOCIATION INCORPORATION ACT

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

In relation to incorporated associations that are involving or are for the benefit of Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander communities, it is difficult to determine how many are governed by associations that are incorporated under the Associations Incorporation Act 1985.

For example, not all of these associations would have the term 'Aboriginal' or 'Torres Strait Islander' in their title.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

From 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, Consumer and Business Services (CBS) conducted 256 conciliations about domestic building products and services which resulted in redress being obtained for the consumer.

CBS records a conciliation as resulting in redress being obtained either when:

- the consumer indicates to CBS they are happy with the agreement reached voluntarily with the trader, such as an agreement to return to site and attend to rectification works or an agreement to reduce a payment demand; or
- the trader and consumer reach an agreement recorded in an instrument of agreement approved by CBS.

Unless a consumer then proactively returns to CBS to inform CBS that the trader did not follow through with the promise or a new dispute has arisen, then CBS is not aware of what occurs after the conclusion of the CBS conciliation process. Therefore, CBS is not able to answer how many conciliations ultimately resulted in successful completion of a home or related works.

GAMBLING REVENUE

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

The Liquor and Gambling Commissioner publishes data regarding gaming machine revenue from hotels and clubs on the Consumer and Business Services (CBS) website at the end of each quarter. This data includes the amount of gaming revenue and tax payable for each month in that quarter.

Additionally, following the conclusion of the financial year, the commissioner makes available net gaming machine revenue data (NGR) by local government area. Section 20 of the Gambling Administration Act 2019 limits the commissioner to only provide this data if the statistics have been aggregated by council area. If there are less than 3 premises in a particular council area, the commissioner must group that data together with an adjoining council to maintain commercial in confidence information relating to the individual earnings of a particular venue.

GAMING MACHINES

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

The number of gaming machines in operation as at 30 June 2024 was 12,786, which is broken down as follows:

Hotels	10,665
Casino	1,080
Clubs	1,041

GAMBLING REVENUE

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

The total turnover for gaming machines in hotels and clubs in 2023-24 was \$10,875 million, which resulted in net gambling revenue of \$956 million.

These amounts are published annually in the Auditor-General's Report to parliament.

GAMBLING REVENUE

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

Due to the commercial-in-confidence nature of financial data pertaining to an individual business, revenue is not generally publicly disclosed for that business unless it has been aggregated with other data. This includes gaming machine revenue specific to the casino operations of SkyCity Adelaide.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

From 1 July 2023 to 30 June 2024, CBS has taken action on 37 building work contractor's licences. This has ranged from imposition of conditions because of concerns about financial viability, through to suspension or cancellation as a result of the conduct of the builder, as well as prosecutions.

This number does not include those licences which have been cancelled or suspended administratively as a result of matters such as a failure to pay renewal fees.

CONSUMER AND BUSINESS SERVICES

In reply to **Mr TEAGUE (Heysen)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised of the following:

Consumer and Business Services became responsible for some compliance and enforcement functions under the Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products Act 1997 (the TEP Act) on 1 July 2024.

Prior to that SA Health was the agency responsible for administration and enforcement under the TEP Act, which included licensing, compliance, and enforcement; conducting inspections and investigations; and management of complaints and enquiries. Accordingly, any shopfronts investigated in the 2023-24 financial year would have been investigated by staff at SA Health.

EXECUTIVE APPOINTMENTS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

Since 1 July 2023, the following executive appointments have been made. This includes appointments made to vacant positions.

Role Title	Classification
Commissioner Consumer & Business Services	SAES2

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

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

Since 1 July 2023, there have been no executive positions abolished.

EXECUTIVE POSITIONS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

There have been no executive position terminations since 1 July 2023.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

As required by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet Circular PC013—Annual Reporting Requirements for 2023-24 information relating to expenditure on consultants and contractors including the vendor, total cost and nature of work undertaken, will be detailed in annual reports published by agencies.

CONSULTANTS AND CONTRACTORS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

The estimated total cost for engagement of consultants and contractors in 2024-25 is \$335,000 (excluding temporary labour hire costs).

The following is a summary of external consultants that have been engaged at a total estimated cost above \$10,000, the nature of work undertaken, and the estimated cost for 2024-25.

Consultancies	Purpose	Total Estimated Cost
Susan Bates	Leadership coaching and facilitated sessions/workshops	\$15,000
Hon. Brian Martin	Investigation into the suitability of SkyCity Adelaide to hold the casino licence and the suitability of its parent company to be a close associate (entire cost will be recovered from SkyCity in accordance with section 25 of the Casino Act 1997).	\$300,000

The following is a summary of external contractors that have been engaged at a total estimated cost above \$10,000, the nature of work undertaken, and the estimated cost for 2024-25.

Contractors	Purpose	Total Estimated Cost
KPMG	Review of Unclaimed Bonds (Phase 2)	\$20,000

GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

The budgeted expenditure on goods and services for the financial year 2024-25 and each of the years of the forward estimates period is as follows:

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Consumer and Business Services	5,478	4,795	5,047	5,069

	2024-25	2025-26	2026-27	2027-28
	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000	\$'000
Office of the Small Business Commissioner	661	678	695	714

Note that the 2024-25 budget for Consumer and Business Services includes expenditure in relation to the OneCBS project.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The Attorney-General's Department (AGD) Strategic Communications Unit undertakes communication and promotion activities for all AGD business units.

As the business units under my responsibility (Consumer and Business Services and the Office of the Small Business Commissioner) are within AGD, they receive support for communication and promotion activities from the AGD Strategic Communications Unit where needed.

Table 1 shows the total budgeted FTE and cost to provide communication and promotion activities for the AGD Strategic and Communications Unit for 2024-25 and the estimated employment cost of those FTEs:

Table 1: FTE employed in communication and promotion activities

Unit/Branch		2024-25 Budget	2025-26 Budget	2026-27 Budget	2027-28 Budget
Attorney-General's Department	FTE	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4
	\$m	1.108	1.123	1.124	1.120

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department:

As an open and transparent government, marketing communications activity reports and annual media expenditure details are proactively disclosed. The reports list all marketing campaigns over the cost of \$50,000 and budgeted expenditure for approved campaigns and are disclosed on the DPC website:

<https://www.dpc.sa.gov.au/about-the-department/accountability/government-marketing-advertising-expenditure>

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds under my responsibility for the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 financial years:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000	2026-27 Estimate \$000
Consumer and Business Affairs				
Tenant Advice and Advocacy Service	Establish and provide a tenant advice and advocacy service to tenants (as defined in the Residential Tenancies Act 1995) and residential park residents (as defined in the Residential Parks Act 2007).	318	318	318
Harm Minimisation Fund	The Harm Minimisation Fund provides resources for programs that support health and safety education and rehabilitation services for intoxicated persons.	208	213	218

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000	2026-27 Estimate \$000
Australian Institute of Conveyancers (SA)—Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Provide an advice service and educate conveyancers or members of the public about conveyancing matters or issues.	391	401	411
Real Estate Institute of SA—Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Provide an educational program and advisory service for the benefit of agents, sales representatives, and members of the public.	477	489	501

The following table provides details, including the value and beneficiary, or any commitments already made to be funded from the program or funds mentioned in the previous answer.

Grant program/ fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$000
Consumer and Business Affairs			
Tenant Advice and Advocacy Service	SYC Ltd	Educating and informing tenants. Advising and supporting tenants to resolve tenancy issues. Assisting tenants with completing tenancy forms or drafting tenancy related letters. Supporting tenants at tribunal hearings. Policy development and advocacy.	1,273 (\$318k p.a. over 4 years)
Harm Minimisation Fund	Encounter Youth Hindley Street Program	Support volunteers in patrolling the Hindley Street area offering a safe presence.	145
Australian Institute of Conveyancers (SA)—Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Australian Institute of Conveyancers (SA)	Provide an advice service and educate conveyancers or members of the public about conveyancing matters or issues.	391
Real Estate Institute of SA—Professional Development Program and Public Advisory Service	Real Estate Institute of SA	Provide an educational program and advisory service for the benefit of agents, sales representatives, and members of the public.	477

REMOTE WORK

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised that for units under my responsibility within the Attorney-General's Department (AGD):

AGD does not segregate remote work infrastructure costs from general business costs for digital tools, cybersecurity, and support services. It is estimated that the percentage of the total AGD budget allocated specifically to the management of remote work infrastructure is less than 0.1 per cent, which is in line with previous years' estimates.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

DPC provided a range of supports in the form of resources to the South Australian Museum through a corporate services agreement. DPC also provides people and culture support to the South Australian Museum under a service level agreement, people embedded within DPC. The services provided are from within the department.

Any third-party contractors engaged outside the terms of the corporate services agreement were contracted by the Museum and not through DPC.

ADELAIDE FESTIVAL FUNDING

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The Adelaide Festival has not reported a shortfall in sponsorship or loss of any major donors for the 2025 Festival to the Minister or Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN MUSEUM

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

Per the Memorandum of Administrative Arrangement between the Department and the SA Museum, there may be adjustments to the SA Museum's operating grant as determined by the state government. The SA Museum is notified of any such adjustments in writing. In the 2023-24 financial year, the department provided an additional \$378,000 as an adjustment to the Museum's 2023-24 operating grant and to primarily fund building and asset management projects.

The department did not approve a deficit budget for the SA Museum in 2023-24.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

Arts South Australia continues to support Anangu artists through the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Arts Strategy for South Australia, Arts South Australia's grant programs and its strategic initiatives.

Through these channels seven grants totalling \$779,340 have been distributed to key Aboriginal led organisations, groups and individuals in 2023-24 for specific projects and initiatives involving artists working on the APY Lands or for Anangu artists working elsewhere in the state.

NETLEY COMMERCIAL PARK LEASE

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport negotiated a lease term for two (2) years, commencing 11 June 2024.

This includes a 3 per cent increase to the applicable rental rate per square metre, from commencement of the lease extension on 11 June 2024. And a fixed rent review increase of 3 per cent from 11 June 2025.

DEPARTMENT OF THE PREMIER AND CABINET

In reply to **the Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

As at 25 June 2024, further to the panel making referrals to the ACCC on 15 December 2023, the ACCC contacted DPC on 26 March 2024 requesting information relevant to the referral. DPC provided information to the ACCC in early April 2024.

The ACCC is under no obligation to report on their investigation to the South Australian government.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM INDUSTRY

In reply to **the Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The South Australian Film Corporation (SAFC) advises that in the 2023-24 financial year it committed \$3,902,342 of funding for sixteen film and TV productions through the Screen Production Fund and the ABC-SAFC Content Pipeline Fund. These sixteen productions generated private sector investment of \$57 349 773.

This information is based on the funding contracts for SAFC Screen Production Fund and ABC-SAFC Content Pipeline Fund projects committed in 2023-2024.

Anticipated private investment generated by SAFC grant funding cannot be reliably estimated at this point for 2024–2025 because of the number of variables within the composition of a production's finance.

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Ms PRATT (Frome)** (25 June 2024). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. A. MICHAELS (Enfield—Minister for Small and Family Business, Minister for Consumer and Business Affairs, Minister for Arts): I have been advised:

The following table provides the requested information on grant program/funds under my responsibility for the 2024-25, 2025-26 and 2026-27 financial years—Controlled:

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000	2026-27 Estimate \$000
Arts South Australia				
Major Arts Organisations	Annual operating funding to major arts organisations—includes rebates paid to the South Australian Film Corporation	115,089	116,496	118,614
Arts Investment Fund	The Arts Investment Fund was established to drive targeted investment in reform and strategic initiatives across South Australia's arts, culture and creative industries	4,800	4,920	5,043
Arts Organisations Program	Grant funding to vibrant arts organisations that contribute to a sustainable and thriving arts culture in South Australia	6,468	6,787	6,939
Arts and Culture Grants Program	Grant funding for a broad range of activity under the categories of Development, Projects and Major Projects	2,686	2,744	2,807
Richard Llewellyn Deaf and Disability Arts Program	Support for projects and initiatives by South Australian practising professional deaf and disabled artists	280	280	287
ATSI Arts Development Program	Grant funding towards arts and arts projects produced by Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people or involving or incorporating Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander people and cultures as the focus or presenters of work	530	520	533
Aboriginal Art Development (SICAD)	Support for Aboriginal leadership, project ownership and community wellbeing through the arts	100	100	103
Grant for artists leading to sustainable careers	Increase funding for existing programs and the establishment of new grant categories allocated in the 2018-19 State Budget process	1,000	1,000	1,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Support artistic development and to sustain businesses in the contemporary music sector	230	240	240
Robert Stigwood Fellowship Program	Mentorship and professional development for musicians and industry entrepreneurs	150	150	150

Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2024-25 Estimate \$000	2025-26 Estimate \$000	2026-27 Estimate \$000
Live Music Events Fund	Support for live music events and festivals to grow into major tourist attractions	550	550	550
Contemporary Music Organisations Funding	Grant funding to support music projects and organisations	493	493	493
See It LIVE	Bringing South Australia's music scene back to life through vouchers, grants and support programs	468	-	-
Other Arts Assistance	Funding towards Festivals Adelaide, Fringe Honey Pot, DreamBig, Adelaide Festival Awards for Literature, Theatre Presenters' initiative, community initiatives, regional development programs, arts capacity building, international engagement and Recognition	2,185	1,519	2,205

The following table provides details, including the value and beneficiary, or any commitments already made to be funded from the program or funds mentioned in the previous answer.

Grant program/ fund name	Beneficiary/ Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Major Arts Organisations	State Theatre Company	Operating grant	1,731,000
Major Arts Organisations	State Opera of South Australia	Operating grant	1,117,000
Major Arts Organisations	Adelaide Symphony Orchestra	Operating grant	1,082,000
Major Arts Organisations	Adelaide Fringe	Operating grant	8,666,000
Major Arts Organisations	South Australian Film Corporation	Operating grant	1,878,000
Major Arts Organisations	Adelaide Film Festival	Operating grant	2,140,000
Arts Organisation Program	Access2Arts	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	369,603
Arts Organisation Program	Contemporary SA Incorporated	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	937,206
Arts Organisation Program	ActNow Theatre	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	356,403
Arts Organisation Program	Adelaide Chamber Singers	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	337,922
Arts Organisation Program	Ananguku Arts and Culture Corporation	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	739,206
Arts Organisation Program	Artlink Australia	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	308,884
Arts Organisation Program	Australian Network for Art	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	343,203
Arts Organisation Program	Australian String Quartet	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	950,407
Arts Organisation Program	Brink Productions	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	1,188,008
Arts Organisation Program	Chamber Music Adelaide	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	435,604
Arts Organisation Program	Feast Festival	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	483,123
Arts Organisation Program	Guildhouse	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	765,606
Arts Organisation Program	Nexus Multicultural Arts	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	913,292
Arts Organisation Program	No Strings Attached Theatre of Disability	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	369,603
Arts Organisation Program	Open Space Contemporary Arts	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	287,922
Arts Organisation Program	Restless Dance Theatre Inc	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	979,779

Grant program/ fund name	Beneficiary/ Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Arts Program Organisation	SA Living Artists Inc	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	633,604
Arts Program Organisation	Slingsby Theatre Company Ltd	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	1,234,511
Arts Program Organisation	The Mill Incorporated	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	369,603
Arts Program Organisation	Tutti Arts Incorporated	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	554,405
Arts Program Organisation	Vitalstatistix Incorporated	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	1,161,608
Arts Program Organisation	Writers SA	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	572,885
Arts Program Organisation	Gravity & Other Myths	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	50,000
Arts Program Organisation	Creative Original Music Adelaide	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	25,000
Arts Program Organisation	Feltspace Incorporated	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	25,000
Arts Program Organisation	Lewis Major Projects	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	25,000
Arts Program Organisation	Adelaide Contemporary Music	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	25,000
Arts Program Organisation	Theatre Republic Ltd	Operational and core activity funding for the organisation	25,000
Arts and Culture Grants Program	Brink Productions Limited	Flying Penguin Productions	40,000
Arts and Culture Grants Program	Beacon Studios	Support for an element of the Illuminate Adelaide Festival	80,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	V O E	V O E International Europe Tour 2024	8,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Placement	Album release plan	7,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Hidden Intent	Hidden Intent New Album	7,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Django Rowe Music	St Morris Sinners 'Nightmares' album post production	6,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Street Legal	Bruxism EP NSW tour	6,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Vincent Barbaro	Divebar Youth National Tour	6,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Aaron Thomas	New LP—International Tour	5,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Abbey Jane Howlett	Music Video + Launch event at ILA	5,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Naomi Keyte	Album release, PR, and merchandise strategy	5,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Laura Hill	Recording completion of New Laura Hill EP	4,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Travis Cook	Collaborative songwriting and music production project	2,000
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Isobella Alyssa Caruso	Expansion of Rebel Yell Brand and Artist Services	8,000

Grant program/ fund name	Beneficiary/ Recipient	Purpose	Value \$
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Soundcity	Equipment update and improvement	5,150
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	The Jade	Equipment upgrade	5,150
Music Development Office Project Support Grants	Ryan Martin John	Studio gear to optimise workflow	4,000
Live Music Events Fund	Australian Independent Record Labels Association Limited	Support for Electric Fields representation at Eurovision 2024	12,000
Live Music Events Fund	Five Four Entertainment	Spin Off	100,000
Live Music Events Fund	Beer & BBQ Pty Ltd	Beer & BBQ Festival	10,000
Contemporary Music Organisation Funding	Music SA	Support for delivery of activities that provide accessible industry development pathways for South Australian professional artists and music businesses	468,937
Contemporary Music Organisation Funding	City of Playford	Northern Sound System	125,372
Contemporary Music Organisation Funding	Nexus Multicultural Arts Centre Inc	Support for Interplay Program for musicians from culturally diverse and First Nations backgrounds	101,604
See It LIVE	Lion Arts Factory	Support for See It LIVE	18,600
See It LIVE	Broadcast Bar	Support for See It LIVE	15,200
See It LIVE	Semaphore Workers Club	Support for See It LIVE	21,200
See It LIVE	Murray Delta Juke Joint	Support for See It LIVE	19,200
Other Arts Assistance	Festivals Adelaide	Support for Festival City Adelaide: Strategic Partnership	136,581
Other Arts Assistance	Holden Street Theatres Incorporated	Support for Holden Street Theatres Theatre Presenters Initiative Funding	51,250
Other Arts Assistance	Adelaide Festival Corporation	B2B program	150,000
Other Arts Assistance	Adelaide Fringe	B2B program	150,000
Other Arts Assistance	Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	Support for DreamBIG Children's Festival 2025	765,000
Other Arts Assistance	Macquarie University	National Survey of Remote Indigenous Artists: South Australia module	25,000
Other Arts Assistance	State Library of South Australia	South Australian Literary Awards	400,000
Other Arts Assistance	University of Canberra College	Australian Research Council Linkage Projects	24,000
Other grant payments	Hans Heysen Foundation	Commonwealth funding under the Adelaide City Deal—Construction of the Heysen Gallery at Hahndorf	6,000,000
Other grant payments	Music SA	Strategic Initiatives	23,000
Other grant payments	Australasian Performing Right Association Limited	Strategic Initiatives	20,000