

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 1 April 2025

**The SPEAKER (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)** took the chair at 11:01.

**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.

*Parliament House Matters*

### APRIL FOOLS' DAY

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Clerk, we just have a few changes that we are making in parliament after some discussions yesterday. There will no longer be speeches or questions and answers; they will be replaced with interpretive dance. The education office is getting a whole lot of props back here that you can use from 2 o'clock today.

No, of course, yesterday I had the Tatachilla Lutheran grade 5 students in and they wanted to know what these little things were with the date on them, and I said, 'That's the 1<sup>st</sup> because tomorrow is the 1<sup>st</sup> of April,' and they asked, 'Are you going to do an April Fools' Day joke?' I said, 'What would your suggestion be?' and they said, 'Why don't you get rid of speeches and make people do some mime?' So we are not actually going to do that, but happy April Fools' Day to everyone.

*Bills*

### STATE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION AND FACILITATION BILL

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

(Continued from 20 March 2025.)

Clause 27.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, if you remember, we had just started on clause 27. I asked a question specifically around the aspect in clause 27 which talks about the decision-maker having the power to do anything necessary to implement the CGO's decision. The question I asked was around the breadth of the clause and what limitations apply to the abilities of the decision-maker to implement the decision of the CGO.

At the time, you made a comment which I wanted to just briefly revisit, because I did not quite get the aspect in particular. You said that if there is any variance between the original decision and the substituted decision this power is for the CGO's decision. I am not sure if you can remember the wording that you used in particular, but regarding the aspect which we have talked about around limitations or otherwise, the limitations to the ability of the decision-maker to implement the decision of the CGO, seemingly within this clause it sets out that there is no limitation and the power to do anything necessary is in play. Can you, perhaps, for the sake of the chamber speak a little bit more about that variance between the original decision and what you called the substituted decision?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This perhaps requires a bit of explanation, so I will do my best. If it is not sufficient, let me know and we can have another go. The bill enables the CGO to review decisions and to make decisions on behalf of other bodies, for example, the State Planning Commission or a local council and so on, depending on what the context is. If the CGO reviews a particular decision, then it is the CGO's decision that stands, not the original one, which might have been made, again, by a local council or the State Planning Commission.

It is that decision which must be implemented without limitation. That may require, for example, that original decision-maker—either the council in this example or the State Planning Commission—to give effect to the decision. What subclause (9) attempts to do is to make it very clear that it is the CGO's decision that stands and must be implemented without limitation. There cannot be, for example, a return to the original decision which has been reviewed and effectively—although this is not the correct term—overruled by the subsequent decision that the CGO has taken. Does that provide enough clarity?

**Mr TELFER:** I think so, on this aspect in particular, because there is a bit of ambiguity with the definition of decision-maker which we talked about earlier. After the steps that you have set out, there is a decision-maker, e.g. a council that can have their decision overruled, for want of better terminology, by the CGO, but then there is a further decision-maker, e.g. the minister, who has to actually implement the decision that the CGO has put in place. Is that correct? So the final say sits with the minister. However, subclause (11), for instance, provides:

Without limiting subsection 10(a), the decision maker has power to do anything necessary to implement the CGO's decision.

That decision-maker is the original decision-maker, which you are talking about, rather than the minister as the decision-maker?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think that is right. If the original decision was of a council, for example, it is reviewed by the CGO, then that decision is made by the CGO, but it remains the responsibility of the council to carry out or to implement that reviewed decision. Similarly, with the State Planning Commission, if the State Planning Commission's decision is reviewed and, to use your term, 'overruled by the CGO', it still remains the State Planning Commission's responsibility to carry out that final reviewed decision. In that context, it is not for the minister to be responsible for carrying it out, it is for that original planning body to be giving effect to the reviewed decision.

**Mr TELFER:** For further clarification, basically this piece of legislation and this clause in particular is giving the CGO these extraordinary powers to, at their decision, come in and challenge or review a decision from the State Planning Commission, a commission that is very well respected and a process that they fit into as the final decision-maker. The CGO now sits above that Planning Commission and has the ability to review any of their decisions and overrule those decisions, and there is no other point of review or appeal from the Planning Commission and their process that they will follow? The CGO has the power above all of that Planning Commission decision-making capacity?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is true, with some limitations. The CGO can only take on a decision-making function on a matter if it satisfies the fundamental tenets of the bill, that is, that the development or the nature of the development that is being reviewed is of sufficient environmental, economic or social significance to the state; that it has gone through that referral process where it is either called in by the CGO itself, it is referred to them by the minister or it is designated to them by the Governor, for example; but, most critically, that the process by which a decision is reached is consistent with the process that the original decision-making body had.

It has to satisfy all of the planning decision criteria that either the council or the State Planning Commission has to go through. In effect, it can review errors that are made, either by the council or the State Planning Commission, where they have not considered appropriately all of the aspects that they are required to in reaching the original decision. So it is not a carte blanche saying, 'I don't like that decision and we are going to choose to review it because we have got a difference of opinion.'

If, to use your example, the State Planning Commission has considered a development and it has gone through the appropriate rigorous process, ticked every procedural box, taken into consideration everything it must and then arrived at a decision, then there would not be a flaw or a problem or an infelicity with the decision that had been originally made, and it would not provide the CGO the capacity to review it. It would have to be in those circumstances where there was a referral made to the CGO, either of their own volition from the minister or the Governor, based on a decision not having adequately considered one tenet of their normal process that they would otherwise do.

**Mr TELFER:** Just a little bit on from that, minister, that is the ideal. We could have a situation, though, because there are no measure points for that economic, social and environmental trigger

point. This is the challenge of a piece of legislation like this: the CGO could actually come in and say, 'The State Planning Commission has ticked all their boxes, gone through their process, sure, but they didn't know that there was an overarching economic, social and environmental aspect or impact that this could have,' and then they could come in and follow that whole process. Is that right?

We have discussed earlier within the debate that there is not a trigger point necessarily, it is a decision for a referral and that decision can be enacted by the CGO, basically. Although you have set out the framework, there could be the potential for there to be a judgement call made by the CGO saying that there could be a greater impact beyond the checklist of the Planning Commission.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The one overarching caveat that exists with all of this, of course, is that when the CGO is exercising its powers under the legislation we are considering now, those judgements and decisions that are made are conceivably subject to judicial review, so if there was an aggrieved person or entity or a proponent that thought that the CGO had not conducted itself according to the requirements of this bill, then they could seek that review.

I keep coming back to the colloquial example I gave in previous responses: the CGO cannot call in somebody's application to the council for a pergola extension, for example, because it will not satisfy those overarching criteria. Similarly, even if there is a development that is of statewide significance according to those three criteria, if the CGO is not able to demonstrate that it has followed those same requirements of the original planning process, then you could see how that would enliven the possibility of a potentially successful judicial challenge.

It is not that once the bill becomes law and the CGO is created that they are beyond review or rebuke; they certainly will be. I would argue that given the significance of the legislation and the new process which is being established by it, it is likely that there will be an enormous amount of scrutiny on this and the risk that anyone who is aggrieved or unhappy with the processes or the decisions of the CGO could seek for them to be reviewed.

Clause passed.

Clause 28.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 28 outlines the responsibilities of the CGO in a state development area and their functions generally. Does this clause terminate the need for any other department to provide similarly defined responsibilities, given the responsibility now lies with the CGO?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No is the answer. As we have discussed previously, it is likely that existing agencies may provide some of their resources—whether it is human resources or otherwise—to support the CGO in considering matters, including in relation to state development areas, as well as those existing agencies continuing to carry on with the work that they do. But because we are creating a new entity—the CGO, with its own resources—we would anticipate that between the existing agencies and the new agency (the CGO) we would see a greater capacity to consider matters and, in all likelihood, that matters are considered more expediently than they are currently.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, I am interested in how this clause in particular exactly applies to state government responsibilities relating to AUKUS. The state is not, obviously, responsible for any physical infrastructure that is associated with the project since the land swap agreement between the state and federal governments which saw Osborne land traded to the federal government by the state in exchange for the land at the Keswick Barracks. Where does it actually fit into that responsibility?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It does have a relevance to AUKUS-related activities. While the commonwealth will be funding significant infrastructure improvements to facilitate the AUKUS industrial endeavours, there will still need to be a planning function to consider and approve any of those developments. You would have heard me and the Premier and others talk about the need to triple the size of the shipyard at Osborne, for example, as well as to consider all of the infrastructure augmentations that that will require—for example, electricity, gas, water and so on—which are not necessarily all housed on the site.

They will be coming to the site from other locations, whether it is from across the Port River, from Torrens Island or Garden Island or whether it is coming up the peninsula, etc. So having this sort of capacity to declare a state development area would enable the CGO to undertake that work on behalf of the state as well as facilitate the commonwealth development more expediently than what we think we would be able to do without it.

**Mr TELFER:** As with the previous debate we had about the AUKUS expert that is legislated to be within the structure of the CGO in particular, I am trying to get my head around where is the validity and importance of having an AUKUS expert on the CGO. Clause 28 obviously outlines the responsibilities of the CGO, yet the federal constitution prevents the state government from intervening in defence infrastructure matters, and any conflict between state and federal legislation is automatically, obviously, resolved in favour of the federal government, so having an AUKUS expert does not necessarily get value for the sorts of associated infrastructure that you are talking about.

Having an infrastructure expert, when you are talking about what power is needed, what water and wastewater infrastructure, etc., might be better suited than a specific AUKUS defence expert when the defence infrastructure itself is separate to what the CGO could potentially be looking at in the scenario that you have pointed out.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, not necessarily. The benefit of having somebody who is specifically able to advise on broader AUKUS-related matters as it comes to here—to state development areas—might mean, using the example that I have given, that if you are tripling the size of the shipyard then there is hard infrastructure and utility-type infrastructure that would be required, that you rightly point out are no doubt complex but pretty well understood planning considerations. Where do the high voltage powerlines go? Where does the gas main come in, etc?

There is a benefit of having somebody who is advising more broadly about AUKUS; for example, we have BAE Systems, which is ostensibly responsible for the construction of the submarines in partnership with the ASC. They are having to massively increase their workforce. In fact, I think during the course of this year it is some 80 additional employees per month that they are having to grow their shipbuilding workforce by. You can imagine that trying to take on a thousand workers over a calendar year is an extraordinary endeavour.

They have to be trained, so there are two training facilities that are being pursued on the peninsula at the moment. One is the federally funded Skills and Training Academy, and the other one is the broader, common-user training facility called the trades hall concept. That is something that a person with specific AUKUS advisory responsibilities would be bringing to the table, which necessarily goes beyond just what the current hard infrastructure needs of the site are. These are coming in not from the Department of Defence for the expansion of the shipyard but are coming in representing what the private-sector proponents of the shipbuilding activities will be—what their needs will be on site or adjacent to site.

For example, something that has been made clear to me, to the Premier, to the Governor and I think to the previous Leader of the Opposition and others who have visited the UK and their shipyards, is an understanding of what some of the pressure points are with the interface of the shipyard and the local community.

Not so much encroaching on housing, but if you have thousands of workers turning up there every day, firstly, how are they getting there and, secondly, if they are driving themselves where are they parking? If you have to suddenly think—and these are illustrative figures here, not precise ones—that you are going from 1,000 workers on the site to 5,000 workers on the site, and if that means an increase in the number of vehicles from this-thousand to that-thousand, that is a huge additional area that has to be accommodated, maybe not within the fence line of the shipyard but immediately adjacent to it, so that workers have ready access there—or it may need public transport augmentations.

These are all scopes of work that are immediately relevant to the expansion of the shipyard but are not necessarily the immediate planning considerations of the federal Department of Defence. That is why it is important to have the capacity to have somebody who is able to provide further advice to the CGO when they are considering something like a state development area: what else is going to be conceivably required for this broader area, and are we making provision for it when we

are putting the dotted line around the land that is in question and identifying how much space is necessary for the ancillary needs of the expansion? That is probably one example I could give.

Then, of course, there is AUKUS pillar 1, which is the naval shipbuilding, and then there is pillar 2, which is the more technology-focused procurements that are already coming from the Department of Defence, including to South Australia. We are talking about developments in some of the soft technologies like cybersecurity and artificial intelligence and that sort of thing, but we are also talking about electronic warfare and the development of an indigenous capability to manufacture missiles, including hypersonic missiles, and being able to test them and that sort of thing.

So you could see how there may be a state development area-type consideration for facilities around Woomera, for example, where the Department of Defence obviously will know exactly what they want within the boundaries of that. But we would have to consider, if we were seeing a huge influx of people who are testing their missiles or hypersonic weapons in this area: what do they need outside the boundaries and are we considering that if, for example, it were to be declared a state development area?

I think that is why the government has tried to think a bit more broadly about how we can have a new entity which can consider all this but make sure we have as many heads in the room to ensure we are getting it right the first time, rather than thinking, 'Actually, we didn't think through how much land we would need in the next 10 years for this additional use that is not immediately a part of but is an ancillary function of that state development area.'

**Mr TELFER:** Just one more question on this one. The second example, which has a lot of technical understanding, I think is a good example. The first one is curious. You spoke about parking, public transport and road infrastructure, all of that stuff again does not feel like it is defence. That could be whatever industry having a growth point in that footprint. This is why having someone who specifically is capable and knowledgeable about defence, AUKUS, etc., does not necessarily get that level of skill transferred to something like social infrastructure, parking infrastructure or public transport. For that one, I think it would be better suited to have someone with expertise in public infrastructure delivery rather than someone with a speciality in defence.

The other example, the second one, yes, absolutely, I think that is a standalone footprint in a designated military zone, for instance, like we have seen previously at Woomera, absolutely. But with the interaction with some of that public infrastructure, would someone with that public infrastructure delivery capacity and knowledge, engineering capacity, not be better placed to be making those sorts of recommendations? You are getting your advice directly from the defence companies saying this is how big—the 80 people a month, the 1,000 people, the 10,000 people by the end of however long. That does not take a defence mind to ascertain what is socially and economically necessary for the associated aspects of that sort of development.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I disagree. The CGO itself is going to have those requisite planning skills, as you would imagine. It does not matter if you are building a facility completely unrelated to defence or something that is defence focused, having somebody who can bring a particular defence lens to the process, I would argue, is absolutely essential.

Take car parking for example, you would think any planning officer worth their salt should be able to make a judgement of: if you have a thousand workers turning up every day, what is the planning rule of thumb for how many people are going to drive versus how many people are going to carpool versus public transport or whatever? I get all of that.

**Mr TELFER:** That was just an example that was given.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, but putting a defence lens over it, for example, we are building some of the most sensitive and secret machinery in existence on the planet today: nuclear-powered submarines. The technology that goes into these things is very closely and jealously guarded by those countries that have developed it. The nuclear propulsion system which is going to go in the SSN-AUKUS is the most modern, current nuclear propulsion technology that the United States has generated in modern history and it has only just been shared in recent times with the UK, let alone being shared with Australia.

When you have workers driving to work each day and you have an Australian economy, for example, which is seeing more and more people buying Chinese-made electric vehicles with cameras all over the inside and the outside of them, you need a defence lens to say, 'Well, what is the appropriate car parking facility?' We probably do not want cars parked outside the enormous window shining into the hall that is installing the nuclear propulsion unit. You probably want it the other side of the fence. You want it close to the fence, but you want it the other side of the fence so as to decrease the risk of there being any nefarious surveillance-type opportunities from these vehicles.

Is that a realistic risk or not? Maybe, maybe not, but you have to put on the table how you are designing and approving these sorts of large-scale developments to make sure you are making additional considerations and accommodations for these sorts of defence-specific sensitivities. That is something I would argue is not able to be picked up by a regular planner.

I guess the other example I would give, and the reason why I gave those examples of the Skills and Training Academy and the Trades Hall, is that we are trying to support those people who are going to be active on the site. The big part of this push by the federal government and, of course, also by state governments is that, regardless of what the defence spend is, we want Australian supply chain involvement. We want local businesses in South Australia on South Australian-manufactured programs as engaged as possible, and it might mean that it makes sense to have the capacity around the shipyard—to continue using that example—for those involved in the supply chain to be present and active in the vicinity of it rather than dispersed across other parts of South Australia where you have all sorts of freight and logistics inefficiencies inherent with that organisation, etc.

I think that is why we have tried to identify the utility of having someone who can apply that defence lens to what you quite rightly point out in any other context would just be a kind of regular planning assessment because there are characteristics of this which are unique to a defence consideration.

Clause passed.

Clause 29.

**Mr TELFER:** This clause, minister, is state development areas—planning functions. Clause 29(1)(b)(ii) provides that the CGO may publish a state development plan that identifies essential infrastructure required in the area. By virtue of the fact that the CGO has power—obviously, as we have spoken about—to order compliance of other departments, does this mean the CGO in a state development area has the power to order government agencies to provide specific infrastructure necessary for development? With the ones we talked about before, SA Water for instance or SAPN and the like, does the CGO have the power to actually order the agency to provide that infrastructure?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** No, it is to plan for the infrastructure. If you have a highly energy intensive use within that state development area and it needs for that development to occur a certain amount of energy, electricity, to be provided to it of 1.21 gigawatts or something similar, then they have to have the capacity to, in that plan, accommodate the delivery of that sort of electricity. You could say the same thing for gas, water, as well as anything else conceivably, such as waste removal and road access, etc., which may be required for a large area, let alone one that is undertaking industrial activities.

**Mr TELFER:** So it has the ability to be able to identify it, require the planning for it, but not order that it be delivered. I am also curious as we talk about the SDA planning functions in particular: what does the minister envision the size of the scope of an SDA could be? Could it be technically possible under the bill to declare the entire township of Mount Barker, for instance, or the Upper Spencer Gulf; across the water, the three cities together, for instance? How big could a state development area be?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not think there is a particular guideline or sliding scale of areas. It really depends what the use would be. We would not envisage that all of Mount Barker would be designated a development area because much of it has been developed.

**Mr TELFER:** Or Woomera, for example, or whatever.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It might be that there is an area of undeveloped land—

**Mr TELFER:** North of Adelaide.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —for housing, for example, which might be declared a state development area, so that that entire housing development, regardless of who the proponent or proponents are, can be planned thoroughly from day one, rather than piece by piece depending on who has what bit of land, and when they choose to bring it to market, etc.

Putting housing aside, if it is an industrial development, if there was a new industrial use for the Upper Spencer Gulf—again, to use your example—then it might declare an area to be a state development area and all the planning necessary for whatever that envisaged particular industrial use is, and make sure, subject to your previous question, that for that proposed industrial use, all of the essential infrastructure is understood and planned for to get to site or to get to different parts of the site and so on.

If it is defence-related, obviously that will be considered within the parentheses of what the defence department would tell us is feasible or likely or they are going to approve of. If it is an expansion of a testing area, or another activity adjacent to a testing area, like a staging area or an accommodation complex that is not currently available, whether it is near Cultana or Woomera, for example, or whether it is some development that would occur out at one of the rocket and satellite launching facilities that we have, like Koonibba—it would just depend on what the use is. If it is for something else, such as renewables, it would be trying to make sure that area is set out and any impacts on Crown land, or native vegetation, or even primary production land, is understood from day one and there is an appropriate process, including mandatory consultation, to go through in designating that. It will just depend on the use.

**Mr TELFER:** With your explanation, a state development area does not need to be contiguous. There could be a state development area designated which grabs little pieces of South Australia from all over which are grouped together. I am trying to work out the scope of what is envisioned within this, because the example that you give about satellite operations, for instance, could have multiple different areas; obviously that is not going to be contiguous. We talked before about the Upper Spencer Gulf, where you could have an area designated within the outskirts of Whyalla and then further up at Cultana and then maybe something at Port Augusta, or Port Pirie. So you could have different sections of South Australia grouped together under an SDA; is my understanding correct?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is not how the bill is drafted. All the references to a state development area are discussed in the singular; it is one area, rather than a collation of separate areas. It is not our view that the legislation would support that, if indeed it is passed. Because this is the most significant way that the Coordinator-General can exercise their powers, it is likely to be the physically largest area of land that is designated, it is likely to be undeveloped land, or it is likely to be a redevelopment of a brownfield site if it is not undeveloped.

Going to the effort and the resource intensiveness of the process that is required in order to successfully designate a state development area is unlikely to lend itself to someone putting forward a grab bag of non-contiguous or disparate areas, either in a geography or across the whole state. Instead, what is provided for in the bill is that there would be a designation, or that an investigation is required for the designation, of a particular area singular.

**Mr TELFER:** For further clarification—and you gave a few examples before about renewables projects, for instance, or some of the satellite launch projects—if there were going to be different areas within the state that had to have their own SDA declared for those pockets, maybe with the same sort of framework but actually separate SDAs declared, the Coordinator-General would have to manage them individually.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes; for example, taking the bottom of the Eyre Peninsula in your electorate versus Koonibba—I am not sure if that is in your electorate or in Giles—

**Mr Telfer:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** So it is in your electorate as well—

**Mr Telfer:** It's 220,000 square kilometres.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** They are geographically quite disparate, and different from one another; different local communities, for example, different geographical features of the land, different infrastructure requirements, and different existing infrastructure that is able to service them now. So yes, it is my advice that they would certainly be separately considered in the same way that, to use your earlier example, considering a state development area for a major housing land release either in the north of Adelaide or in some other part of non-metropolitan Adelaide would be considered separate areas and would have their own considerations as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 30.

**Mr TELFER:** This clause in particular is talking about the division of land in state development areas, under the subdivision heading of 'Interactions with other Acts' and what impact that has on other different aspects of legislation.

Councils use the powers contemplated in clause 30 to ensure that developers take certain steps before a decision is made; that footpath land, for instance, is transferred to ownership of the council, or that there is provision for the creation of open space or recreational reserves, as we have spoken about previously.

Before land is vested in a council, councils will often require that standards are met or actions are taken; for example, that the footpaths are properly designed, that the infrastructure they are taking on is proper engineering, or if there is contamination of land that it is first remediated. Can you give me some context, as far as this goes, of the impact this change could have on that capacity?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I guess it is coming back to that core requirement that the exact same process has to be undertaken by the CGO that otherwise might have been undertaken either by council or the State Planning Commission. All those requirements of that process will be adhered to, but all those considerations that may also be taken into account are also able to be ventilated through the mandatory consultation period and engagement of the original planning bodies. It is our expectation that the process facilitates all the matters you have raised to be incorporated into the process.

Clause passed.

Clause 31.

**Mr TELFER:** This runs on a similar sort of line, and it may be a very similar sort of answer. Regarding the category of impact assessed development—and obviously this is something that is pretty specific within the PDI Act—is the answer to the previous question similar to this one, that the obligations under the impact assessment development aspects of the PDI Act still need to have that overarching impact that they would with the CGO SDA, for instance?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The answer is yes.

Clause passed.

Clause 32 passed.

Clause 33.

**Mr TELFER:** At clause 33 obviously there are quite complex different aspects of the Mining Act, and there is always a lot of public and industry interest in particular. Clause 33(5) specifically removes the ability of this parliament to disallow specified decisions in the bill, such as the ability to call in a power pursuant to clause 25. Can the Treasurer now explain why the decisions contemplated by this clause are so important that we need to exclude the usual oversight and scrutiny of parliament?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Again, this provides for the capacity of the CGO to undertake the functions otherwise undertaken by the Mining Act. That subclause makes it absolutely clear that the Mining Act process and requirements must be followed by the CGO and that there cannot be any diversion or deletion from the process that is required under the Mining Act.



**Mr TELFER:** Obviously, within the structure given here there are significant decision-making powers given to an as yet unnamed body of government officials to override entire legislative schemes enacted by this parliament. Could there be justification for oversight to be enhanced rather than removed or are you confident that the parliamentary oversight that is built into the CGO act will be enough to balance out that oversight aspect, which seemingly could potentially be removed with this aspect?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is an important question, particularly with respect to this clause because this clause does talk with particular reference to the Mining Act, and I know for those members who represent regional South Australia where—

**Mr Telfer:** Mining happens.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, but in particular where agriculture happens as well. Sometimes there is friction between those two different land uses. It is important that the member has raised it.

It is important to realise that all the requirements in the provisions of the Mining Act absolutely must be applied by the CGO, but they can only be undertaken by the CGO if it satisfies that early test in the legislation that this is a proposition that has statewide significance under one of those three limbs: economic, social or environmental. You would not imagine it being enlivened for a regular Mining Act type application, only if it satisfies that test of statewide importance.

Secondly, I think we have also spoken in the committee stage about the CGO calling on the resources of existing agencies within government to enable it to do its role and whether they are, for example, environmental agencies, infrastructure agencies, utility-related agencies or, in this case, mining-related agencies. So there is, at the very least, a minimum level of rigour in the process which replicates the current arrangements.

Because we have an additional body and more arms and legs dedicated to this process, we would anticipate that we will get quicker decision-making, which is not just in the best interests of the proponent, it is also in the best interests of the community or communities that are affected by whatever the proponent is putting forward. As I have said before, having this process is not a guarantee to approval or to an answer of 'yes'; it might be that despite all of the work undertaken in the investigations that the answer is no. So I think having this extra capacity within government, established by legislation, will ensure rigour.

The existence of this function within government itself will attract a high level of attention. Everyone will want to know what the CGO is working on and why, and in particular what decisions are getting made by the CGO and whether they are reasonable or not. So I think in terms of rigour and transparency as well as expediency, this is going to be a much better outcome than what we currently have.

**Mr TELFER:** I would probably say that we might have more to dissect in that in the other house. Although there is some reassurance that the minister is trying to give the house on that through a few of those bits of language such as 'the statewide importance', how many mining companies and the like have come to you as Treasurer and in other roles previously, or to me as a local member, and said, 'The economic opportunity for the state because of this project is significant,' so, tick, it hits the economic aspect for a CGO to look at it? I can count multiple just within my electorate that could potentially tick an economic box and ask the CGO to consider a project such as that.

It is going to be interesting. You are right, there is going to be oversight from outside watching what the CGO prioritises, but sometimes public servants can overstep the mark or get it wrong or be talked into a narrative around economic opportunity, whether it is where we have seen Olympic Dam come and go in its iterations before. You have the hydrogen industry at the moment, for instance, and the conversations that were had five years ago: I had them and the current government—then opposition, obviously—had them as well where, because of perspective, a judgement could be made that there is an economic opportunity and a potential for statewide importance for this to come.

I think the aspect of excluding formal parliamentary scrutiny is a big step. This is why I am adding an extra spotlight onto it, specifically with this Mining Act aspect, because I am cautious—

and I will consider the ramifications for what we may ask for in the Legislative Council—that we could get a scenario where we could have a system which is not effective for that expectation of the community when it comes to mining companies, in particular, that could be trying to either supersede or shortcut a process that needs to have that community rigour, firstly, but then the parliamentary rigour that comes with it representing the community.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think it is legitimate to raise that concern from your perspective: in reality or in practice, what is going to satisfy that test of statewide significance? The member uses, for example, in the mining context Olympic Dam—well, you would like to think yes. Without being inflammatory about it, if it is a discrete gold mining operation in the Adelaide Hills that potentially subverts a winery, probably not.

**Mr Telfer:** But that is a judgement call, so this is the risk.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is a judgement call. Using the housing example, is it a Riverlea or, winding the clock back 15 or 20 years, is it a Mount Barker? Arguably. Probably. Is it a two for one? Of course not. But is it something in the middle? Take my electorate, for example. Is it a WEST development, redeveloping the land around Football Park, or the redevelopment of the old Port Adelaide wastewater treatment plant? Or going into the member for Colton's electorate, is it the Kidman Park former Metcash site? Maybe. Maybe not.

If you want to take any comfort from this, there is the fact that it has to satisfy that statewide test. Is the wastewater treatment station or Metcash or the WEST development of statewide significance? It is of significance, but I do not know that you would say it was of statewide significance. Is Riverlea or Mount Barker? Probably, yes; you could tick that box. There will be matters of judgement, of course, and it will not just be the CGO that is going to be responsible for answering whether they have made the right call or not. It will also be the responsibility of the minister, if they have referred it to the CGO or the Governor or, perhaps more practically speaking, the government of the day, if they have made the reference there as well. But I guess I come back to—

**Mr Telfer:** The mining one.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** —or the mining one—the scrutiny that is going to be attracted to what the CGO is doing. All the decisions of the CGO, firstly, in taking the referral, let alone making a decision after getting the referral, are gazetted in real time. Secondly, there is an ongoing requirement for an annual report as well, so the parliament and the public get full transparency around what the CGO is doing.

I think there should be enough built-in protection with it, even in the process itself, mandating minimum consultation periods for each of the three different processes that the CGO can undertake. For example, going back to mining and the potential friction with other land uses like agriculture, there is a process in real time for those voices to be heard as well as understanding what the decisions are along the way and, of course, at the end. Coming back to another example I gave, if there is any concern that the CGO has not followed the legislative process or the initial process, of what would have been the agency or decision-maker, their judgements and decisions can be subject to judicial review as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 34.

**Mr TELFER:** I have not pre-prepared a lot of these questions. It is coming from the answers that I am getting. On this clause, in particular, it is only my first term in parliament to see a definition clause which refers to a future clause, which we will be considering, but then that future clause does not really provide much definition in itself. A facilitated project, for instance, refers to 'a proposal for a project in a State development area'. In the definition of 'statement of regulatory requirements' it says 'see section 35(2)'. When I flick to section 35(2) all it says is the CGO would be responsible for preparing a statement of regulatory requirements. It does not actually specify or define what a statement of regulatory requirements would be. Is the way I am reading it accurate, or is there a further definition somewhere beyond the section that it refers to in particular? If so, should it be changed to include that definition in its specificity?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As Tim Smith from Demtel would say, 'Wait, there's more'. If you go to 35(6) it articulates what a statement of regulatory requirements must include.

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** If I am reading a whodunnit I do not like to skip ahead, but if you do read the entirety of clauses 34 and 35 then you can see that, while it might not be upfront in clause 34, there is a requirement, and that would itself require some further examination of other pieces of legislation. But, effectively, what the statement of regulatory requirements will be is an articulation of all of those things necessary in order to consider a matter under its original act. Setting that out in one document then provides not only a rigour for the CGO to make sure they have a list where they have to tick every item on the list in considering that but also some transparency whereby, if you were particularly interested in a matter that the CGO has considered, you have got the CGO's checklist, so you know all of the matters that they have to consider and satisfy before they can make a decision on it.

In that respect, it provides an enhanced level of transparency from somebody on the outside looking into the process, trying to understand whether the CGO is looking at this properly. I will give you an example: if the CGO was considering one of these state development areas and it was likely to have an impact in an undeveloped area on some native vegetation and you were one of those organisations like the Conservation Council or friends of buffel grass, or whatever, you would be able to see—

**Mr Telfer:** It's a basic species.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It depends what part of the state you are in, apparently. I have seen some roads where it is celebrated, some roads where it is identified as a pest, but what would I know? Then you will know what the CGO has to do in order to adequately assess that. If you think that the CGO has not adequately assessed each of those items on the statement of regulatory requirements, then that would be the capacity to highlight a shortcoming in the process, if not subsequently challenge it by judicial review.

Clause passed.

Clause 35.

**Mr TELFER:** My appetite was whetted by the discussion on 34 and for 35 to come, because it is the aspect around the statement of regulatory requirements, facilitated projects. Clauses 34 through to 36 are cascading. As the minister set out in the previous answer, the statement of regulatory requirements for facilitated projects, once again I was curious as there is a specific clause around a definition that does not actually provide the definition within the clause, but that is fine—I am not a parliamentary counsel member. Clause 35(1) states:

CGO may, for the purposes of promoting development in the State, prepare and adopt a proposal for a project in a State development area...

Is the CGO, by virtue of this clause, now a development arm of the state government? Is it direct or a subsidiary designed as a consultancy firm to conduct business with private developers, because the preparation and adoption of a project is far beyond the scope of simply ensuring the CGO can conduct essential infrastructure works to facilitate a project?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** There are two parts to it. No, this is not the CGO in that respect being used as the arms and legs of a proponent or a developer. After particularly a reference by a minister or the Governor, or even of their own volition, if there is to be a certain type of development that would require accommodation within a state development area—for example, as we have discussed, a large-scale industrial development, housing development, mining development or whatever—then rather than wait for the private sector to come to government in an ad hoc and uncoordinated manner suggesting that those forms of development happen in disparate different places around the state or in a particular geography of the state, it instead enables the CGO to do two things.

One is to say, 'This is the state development area which that sort of activity must occur in.' Then, having done that, it can go to each of the regulators that would otherwise have considered an

application—whether it is, for example, the Department for Energy and Mining or SA Water or with respect to other utilities and transport and so on—and say, 'What would you require in order to favourably consider a development that is to occur for this purpose in this area?' Then you are able to say to anyone or any proponent, 'If you want to develop this particular land use, in this particular state development area, these are all of the boxes that your proposition has to tick.'

On that basis, when the proponent turns up for the first time to propose something to occur in that state development area, they have already been advised what they will require in order to be considered. It is likely to expedite the process for the proponent, let alone for the CGO and, I guess in that respect, the planning process itself, so you are providing greater clarity up-front as to what is going to be required for the development. It is likely to then mean that you do not have what you quite often have at the moment, and that is someone coming forward saying, 'I want to build this over here,' and then having to find out iteratively from different agencies, 'Well, you are going to require that, and we are going to require you to have that,' and so on. Does that make sense?

**Mr TELFER:** Yes. To follow the bouncing ball, in making a request of a responsible entity which would normally be responsible for granting the approval but the CGO has now superseded or taken over that process, there are a lot of timelines around the responsibility of the CGO. There are obviously no timelines that I can read—maybe I am missing it; it is an extensive clause—for there to be a time for the responsible entity to be replying to the CGO.

This is all about fast-tracking a process, making sure that a developer or a project will have the framework and understanding of exactly what their obligations are under all the processes. But if a CGO went to the department for mines or went to the planning department and requested all the different aspects of regulatory requirement that would be necessary for the facilitated project, there is not a real obligation written within this legislation for that entity to make it a priority or try to streamline that process.

This could be a sticking point for the poor old CGO in trying to fast-track a process because in the end the department or entity is obviously one where the CGO is not confident in their capacity to be able to fast-track a process, because they have come in and taken over the process. They still have to rely on that original entity to prepare all the regulatory requirements that will be necessary. There are responsibilities within the legislation for the CGO and the timeline that they have for different aspects but not for that entity. Is my reading of it correct?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In clause 35(3), it enables the CGO to require a specific period for that responsible entity, but in 36—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is right—that old chestnut. In clause 36(4), it talks about providing within 10 business days advice to the CGO from that responsible entity. So the CGO—I think I understand this properly—can specify another timeframe, but in any event it has to be within 10 days unless the CGO says they can have an alternative period of time. But in that respect, for the benefit of the proponent, it is clear what that timeframe is and when they can expect that those entities are providing their advice back to the CGO so that it is not left drifting, as can sometimes be the case in some government agencies when they are not considering things very quickly.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, you have jumped ahead to the facilitation certificate, but this is specifically talking about the statement of regulatory requirement, the development of that. So, yes, it is 10 business days once the regulatory requirement process has been gone through and the facilitation certificate issued—it is 10 days at that point, not when the CGO is requiring the regulatory body to be putting together the framework for the regulation. Is that right? This is an early step. You are pointing to the timelines around the further step, but this is the early step that we are specifically focusing on here.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, apologies, that is my mistake. I thought you were making reference to the fact that there were no timelines, but there is also within clause 35 itself a timeframe of at least 14 days under subclause (2) to give a copy of the proposed direction to the responsible entity. Your question appears to be, 'What is the timeframe under which a statement of regulatory requirements specifically must be provided?'—is that correct?

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I am advised there is not a set timeframe for that because it depends on the nature of the development. For example, if it is a very broadscale housing development or industrial development that requires many different elements to be considered and contemplated, that might be a period extending into months. If it is a simple requirement—for example, an access road—that is the sort of thing that you would envisage the CGO requires within perhaps a couple of weeks.

Clause passed.

Clause 36 passed.

Clause 37.

**Mr TELFER:** This is subdivision 5—Other functions. Clause 37 speaks of when the CGO may be authorised to undertake essential infrastructure work. We spoke earlier about the capacity of the CGO to require planning for these sorts of works, and you specifically spoke about the planning aspect, making sure that it was prepared for. This is where the CGO may be authorised to undertake that work.

Maybe I should have asked the question on clause 36. There is provision within the act for appeals against the decision of the CGO. I am curious around the process for what that might look like. Who would conduct the defence? You spoke about judicial appeals and judicial challenges previously in some of the other answers. Who would conduct the defence against such an approval? Would it be the CGO, or would it be the designated authority whose powers have been called in?

That judicial appeal may not seem a big deal when it is a CGO that is part of the state government and then, for instance, in the examples that you have given previously, the Planning Commission, which is the responsible entity for that approval. I will make sure you get your head around it.

If there is a judicial appeal, you said that the CGO requires the responsible entity to be doing the work of approval and the like, which is fine if it is the CGO with the Planning Commission, state government or whatever. But if it is a CGO requiring the responsible entity, which is a local government, a council, and there is a judicial appeal against a decision of the CGO, who is responsible for the defence of that? Is it the CGO who is the state government body responsible or is it the local government, which has not been involved in any of the decision-making processes, but it is under their powers that the decision has been made?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is a good question and there is not an answer that fits every circumstance. It would depend on what the judicial review is seeking to interrogate. If it is a function that the CGO has carried out, if it is a decision that they have made themselves, then it is likely that the CGO would be the respondent. The Crown will be the respondent, but the CGO would be the respondent.

If, to use your example, the CGO has had an involvement in taking on or reviewing a decision that has been made by council, it will depend on what is being reviewed in the overall application for approval. Was it a function that was exercised by the council or was it a function that was exercised by the CGO? That may mean that there has to be some determination reached between the CGO and the council about who undertook what part of the planning function and then who is best placed to respond to the request for review of how that particular function was undertaken.

I cannot really give you a hard and fast answer that it is always going to be the CGO or it is always going to be the responsible entity, but hopefully that gives you an idea that it could be one or the other. If it is something that the CGO has taken on responsibility for, then of course they will, but if part of the process has been superintended and undertaken by another entity then conceivably the other entity either would be the respondent or would support the CGO in their role as the respondent.

**Mr TELFER:** With your indulgence, I think we need to unpack this a little bit more, because it may well be that when there is a challenge to these decisions this conversation is reflected on to try to understand the intent of the legislation. We can only hope, minister.

If the CGO is coming over and above a decision of a local government entity—I want to focus on council in particular because I think the state government aspect is probably in hand within the capacity of the state—local government has followed a process and done some steps along the way. The CGO comes in and says, 'No, I want to challenge this process because of the economic, social, environmental,' etc. If the CGO then adjusts aspects of that decision and leaves other aspects, is the CGO taking responsibility for the whole decision? Because basically within that review they are accepting that we agree with these aspects, this is where we want to change—whatever it might be. I am talking hypotheticals, but I am talking about a process.

Does the CGO then take responsibility for the entirety of that decision? Thus, if there is a judicial appeal against the decision, the CGO has taken responsibility for that. It is the whole process that the CGO has taken over rather than there being aspects that have previously had a decision from local government. I want to ensure that there is some clarity around responsibility because we do know that individuals can get judicious with local government more readily than with state government.

I am just trying to delineate between this responsibility, especially with some of these potentially significant developments that would have potentially significant economic upsides or downsides for the developer in particular if they are considering one of these.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The advice I have with respect to the particular example you give, where the council is otherwise the planning authority or the decision-maker, is the involvement of the CGO is likely to come about to rectify an error in the process of considering an application for development by that council. So they may not be calling in the entire decision, they might be called in to consider one element of the decision that has been undertaken by the council and, in reviewing that discrete area and potentially coming up with another alternative decision about that discrete part of the application, they then hand it back to the council and say, 'Well, we have fixed that up now.' It now remains with you in order to continue conducting your role as the decision-making authority.'

My advice is that that is how we most likely consider the interaction with local government to go. This is not designed to consume the development considerations and responsibilities of local government, otherwise the CGO would be quickly utterly consumed with demand. It is here as a separate and independent decision-maker in order to consider matters where the council might not have considered things appropriately.

I am tempted to give examples where that might occur but, given you point out that our remarks may indeed be subject to judicial review, I am reticent to. I think the only thing I can say is that this of course is entirely untested. We are setting up a new entity that has not yet conducted any functions, let alone had any of its functions subject to judicial review, but with respect to local government, the advice I have is that that is how we anticipate it is most likely to be effected. Of course, as I said in my previous response, there is likely to be some interaction between the local government entity and the CGO in confronting that particular circumstance.

**Mr TELFER:** In that circumstance, you are talking about when the CGO—as per clause 25—may call in a designated function or a specific aspect of it. I think we need to be clear: if a council incurs legal costs through no fault of their own, would there be an expectation or a responsibility that the CGO covers these costs or is involved in that process? If the CGO potentially conducts a legal defence of a decision that has been appealed, would they be able to do this in a manner that is potentially inconsistent with what the preferred approach of the council would be, if the conduct of the defence or the settlement reached would have potential long-term cost implications for the council?

It might be in the best interests of the CGO to rectify the situation with an appeal, but it may not be potentially in the best interests of the local community and the local council. This point of interaction, I think, is a really important one that you speak about. Would there be a scenario that could potentially be in place where the best interests of the local council and community may potentially be ignored by the CGO to try to defend a decision that they were a part of?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** There are a couple of things in that which I will try to answer. If you cast your mind back to clause 4 where it talks about the primary principle, within that clause it also requires that the CGO must consider the interests of the locality—I think that is the term that is

used in there—as well, which I think is probably a pretty good proxy for what you are articulating, and that is: what would otherwise be local government's concerns with respect to a particular development application or similar?

Secondly, I have tried to be at some pains to make it clear that the CGO is not being established to undertake the regular development approval roles of council, and it is only likely to be enlivened if somebody is able to highlight the fact that there has been an error in the process that has been undertaken by the council.

You also raised the question as to whether there would be some form of indemnification of local government for legal costs. That is not canvassed in this bill. I think it would be difficult for anyone to say, 'Don't worry, if there's any problem in this, if there's any legal challenge, the state will pick up the costs,' because I think you could anticipate that that may incentivise a behaviour from some local councils to not be as rigorous or as prudent in carrying out their lawful responsibilities as responsible entities. I would not say that all councils would do that, of course.

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, that is right. Of course, it would then depend on the circumstances, firstly, of what is sought to be reviewed, but also what the role of the CGO has been in considering what would otherwise have been considered by the local government entity. I am sorry that I cannot be definite about whether there would be a cost-sharing arrangement and how that would be entered into, but I think it would be the intent of both parties in that respect—the local government entity and the CGO—to be reasonable and to act in accordance with their respective roles within the process.

Clause passed.

Clause 38.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 38 is an interesting one. It talks about entry onto land, etc., and speaks about the capacity for a person authorised in writing by the CGO for a designated purpose to enter and pass over any land and to bring onto any land any vehicles, plant or equipment and the occupation of land, etc. Clause 38(4) states that:

- (4) A person must not, without reasonable excuse, hinder or obstruct a person performing a function under this section.

Given that clause 38(3) does not require persons entering land to outline to the landowner what functions are to be performed but only that the CGO has permission to enter that said land, how is this different from giving police powers of entry, for instance? Who or what power decides what a reasonable excuse is for entering of the land if there is not that specification within subclause (3) of what the requirement is or the functions are that are to be performed by the person entering the land?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The provisions in clause 38, I am advised, have been modelled very closely on existing powers of land access that, for example, the highways commissioner has as well as other entities in government. There is, importantly, a notice period that is provided. There is a process to ensure that, in the event that there is any damage to land or any loss that is incurred by the owner of the land as a result of that access, there is a compensation regime, and if the compensation cannot be mutually agreed then there is an arbitration process that is available to the owner of the land.

But it is important that we look at subclause (8) of the clause, which reaffirms that this can only occur for a designated purpose under the act. This is not providing a right of entry in the same vein that law enforcement has. Law enforcement does not have to provide a seven-day notice period if they are going to raid a drug lab, for example, let alone compensate them for damage and so on. So I think this strikes the right balance of providing lawful access to land in which the CGO has been obliged to undertake functions and also balances that with the interests of the owner of the land, including ensuring that any damage or financial impact is made good.

**Mr TELFER:** Looking at the notice period in particular that you speak about, seven days is certainly not as long as, for instance, a mining right of entry period of time, which is longer and allows people to have a bit more certainty. Also, I cannot find any definition or direction as to exactly what

that notice to the owner and occupier of the land looks like. I guess this is the sort of thing that may well be developed in regulations, but can the minister set out what his expectations would be of what form notice can be? It is easy to knock on a front door and find an occupier of a land, but sometimes it is a bit harder to find the owner; especially in some of the more challenging areas of the state it may be a bit harder to find an owner of land. What is the process that the minister envisages the notice process will look like?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** You are right. This does not set out what the process is, beyond what we have in front of us here in terms of what the contents of the notice have to be, or to what extent activities by the CGO have to be set out. Practically and reasonably, I think we would expect that in carrying out this function, if it is required, it would be a regular course of interaction between the CGO or their designate and the landowner or the land occupier.

You might imagine, for example, that the CGO contacts a landowner and says, 'We've got your development application for something you want to do on your land. We are going to come out and look to see if it's suitable.' If it is a farmer they might say, 'Could you just hang off, because we are about to bring in the harvest. Give us a few weeks,' or 'Actually, we're moving our livestock and it's not an opportune time.' We would anticipate that that would be worked through. I cannot imagine, unless it is Crown land, of course, that there would be many circumstances where there is an application made for development on land that is not put forward by the owner of the land. So you would like to think that the actual requirements of each individual circumstance would lessen the tension that would otherwise be enlivened by this clause.

**Mr TELFER:** Subclauses (5) through to (8), as you pointed out, outline the process for aggrieved landowners to obtain compensation from the CGO or the individual organisation entering the owner's land on behalf of the CGO. Given the rules of the Supreme Court require the landowner to bear the burden of proof for such compensation, why was there not provision for the reversal of that burden of proof where the landowner is presumed to be the aggrieved party? I know that has been the case for some of the other pieces of legislation that have been considered during this term of government.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** As I said in a previous response, these provisions are trying to mirror the other lawful land access arrangements in other pieces of legislation. Of course, this is about land access only, most likely for the purposes of surveying, for example, or perhaps taking some assessment of where utilities might best be able to be provided to the subject land, or maybe even some testing.

I think it is not unreasonable to say that if there is any damage done to the land then there will be a compensation regime, but I do not think it is reasonable to reverse the onus of proof for them to say, 'Well, we haven't damaged anything.' I think if the landowner thinks that something has been damaged then they should be able to highlight that and say, 'This is the damage that you have caused. This is the value that I attribute to that damage and can you please compensate me.' I think that is a fairly consistent and orthodox way in other forms of property law that most parts of the community would be familiar with.

**Mr TELFER:** So the example you give is the differentiation between someone who has put forward a development process themselves as the landowner. You spoke a bit about the associated infrastructure that goes with it: where do you get the access for water, for wastewater, for electricity? This is where third-party owners and occupiers of land can certainly come into play without any knowledge of the project, with a process that we are still uncertain about, that seven days of notice.

I give the example of SAPN, for instance, going through an inspection process for powerlines. They have an existing easement and there is an existing compensation process already set out and is not as onerous on the burden of proof to a landowner. So you could have a scenario where a CGO, or a representative the CGO has given the power to, do their best endeavours to find the owner of the land: a notice was put on the front gate seven days ago—that is good enough notice—then go through the property, damaged crop, cause land degradation. Often, if there is a longer period of time and a specified body of work that is going to be done, a landowner could go and take photos, take a video, prepare, and if there was a scenario where there was damage, they could have a basis for proving what has happened: here is a before; we will do an after.



But if we have a process which is only seven days, I am not sure about the notice aspect, then the requirement of the burden of proof is on the landowner or land occupier, and there is no existing process in place, and it is a landowner or occupier not involved with the project as a whole, I think this is where there could be some uncertainty about this aspect in particular from subclauses (5) to (8). This is why I am asking you: if you are not shifting the burden of proof then do you envision that within the regulations potentially it could set out what a compensation process could be further to what subclauses (5) to (8) have already set out?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think it is appropriate that you raise the concern and it is a curious point, I guess, about giving notice as opposed to attempting to give notice.

**Mr Telfer:** Hence why I brought up the example of the mining because it is front of mind for the notice.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Of course, we are talking in presumably the rare circumstance where there is a private landowner who is entirely separate from a proponent that is causing the CGO to be motivated enough to want to enter the land to do some investigations or whatever. I would think in that perhaps relatively rare circumstance, it is most likely that notice will be given—not attempted but given—and that, like you would, when SAPN says, 'By the way, I am shutting your power off for four hours,' you think, 'Well, 6am to 10am, I have to get the kids ready for school, etc.,' there might be some correspondence entered into. You might ring them and say, 'That might suit you blokes but for the rest of us participating in society, maybe you could think about doing it at a time that is convenient to us rather than to Joe on the cherry picker.' Similarly, I guess, there is likely to be a discussion which is enlivened about: well, why and what do you need and for how long, and could you consider perhaps changing what your intention is to accommodate how I need to use my land and so on.

You are right in that the bill does not go into fine detail about how that is to be required. I cannot answer off the top of my head whether it is the outset intention to codify that in regulation, but I would like to think that this is probably a more amenable process for land access than, for example, what causes perhaps some of your constituents the most friction, where you might get a mining company come into agricultural land and conduct themselves in a way which only enhances the friction that is inherent in those two competing land uses. I am happy to give that some further thought, if that is of interest to the member.

Clause passed.

Clause 39.

**Mr TELFER:** This is a step on again, minister, from the process that we have talked about in clause 38. Although you say it is relatively rare, one of the purposes of this legislation as a whole is to try to fast-track processes, especially with essential infrastructure works. The compulsory acquisition of land obviously is not with projects for which the proponent is the one who has put the application in; it is for people who are within an infrastructure corridor, for instance, similar to what we spoke about in clause 38. Are there enough protections in place within that existing Land Acquisition Act?

The Land Acquisition Act talks about essential state infrastructure, and we see examples with the north-south corridor of going through this land acquisition process and how challenging it can be. Although a CGO does have a threshold for importance for economic, social or environmental, there could still be questions as to whether that is important enough for compulsory acquisition of land, especially when it is for the advantage of a third party, not necessarily a government project. Are there enough protections in place within this section? This is a different scenario to some of the other land acquisition processes the government goes through.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My advice is that clause 39 essentially reflects powers which exist in other acts as they stand at the moment. So whether it is essential infrastructure works, for example, whether it is road infrastructure with the provisions under the Highways Act and the Land Acquisition Act, whether it is for a state project—building a hospital, for example, or other major state government developments—or a designated project, this provision essentially will reflect the

provisions that occur in the Highways Act, the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, the Harbors and Navigation Act, and the Urban Renewal Act.

All of these powers currently exist; in particular, under the Urban Renewal Act it is possible for the government, through Renewal SA—or the Urban Renewal Authority, as it is legislatively called—and its minister, to compulsorily acquire land for development purposes. It has rarely, I think if ever, been exercised, but it remains allowable under law and then there is a process that must be followed under that law.

In particular, with the Land Acquisition Act and the compensation provisions under the Land Acquisition Act, there are some requirements, of course, that the state essentially tries to arm the landowner so that they are in a position to be able to negotiate equitably with the state. The state is obliged to pay for the owner to procure their own valuations and their own legal advice in order to represent their interests in such a process. I think while some may see the existence of this clause as being somewhat affronting, I reiterate to the house that this is replicating existing powers which would enable this for other entities in the event that the CGO does not exist.

**Mr TELFER:** Can I run a scenario, because I think it is important to try to understand. The compulsory acquisition of land is an emotive issue. One of the three goals of the CGO is around economic, social and environmental aspects and I want to just focus on the environmental aspect in particular, because economic is pretty easy to measure and social is a bit harder, but there is a community that goes around it.

I think if you start to unpack environmental there would be a little bit of ambiguity and uncertainty that comes with this. Potentially there could be a scenario where—I am not saying this government—an ideologically driven government could be making decisions about environmental investment; for instance, native vegetation plantings, or whatever it might be, offsets, that sort of thing.

There is scope within this act, from my reading of it, for the CGO to be requested by the minister to make a prioritisation of an environmental project: 'Go out into the electorate of Flinders and find me 1,000 acres for us to be able to make this environmental planting for the environmental advantage of South Australia. This aspect gives the CGO the ability within a state project to compulsorily acquire land to suit that which does not have the same level of accountability, from my perspective, as an economic or a social outcome. I know I am extrapolating out, but we are talking about powers within a piece of legislation.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I do not think it is unreasonable that you provide that scenario and raise the concerns that that scenario enlivens. In that scenario, a piece of private land is bought in an effort to dedicate it towards some sort of ecological conservation or whatever. You can quickly rule out a private interest trying to undertake that just because of the cost. What is the financial or economic incentive for a private entity to do that? They would have to be an extremely wealthy entity to want—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** But most of them tend to derive their financial wealth from not so much the conservation of the environment but the alternative.

**Mr Telfer:** Correct.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I cannot see that it is likely that private interests would do it.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.*

## **CLIMATE CHANGE AND GREENHOUSE EMISSIONS REDUCTION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (MENTAL COMPETENCE) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**CRIMINAL ASSETS CONFISCATION (REVIEW RECOMMENDATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**INDEPENDENT COMMISSION AGAINST CORRUPTION (CONDITIONS OF APPOINTMENT - INTEGRITY MEASURES) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN CIVIL AND ADMINISTRATIVE TRIBUNAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

Her Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

**PASSENGER TRANSPORT (POINT TO POINT TRANSPORT SERVICES) AMENDMENT 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—

Environment and Water, Department for—Water Security Update Annual Report 2025

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

Murray-Darling Basin Authority—Annual Report 2023-24

*Ministerial Statement***DROUGHT ROUND TABLE**

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:04):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** As every South Australian is now well aware, significant parts of our state are experiencing drought conditions, drought conditions that, for the last 30-month period, since February 2024, most of South Australia's agricultural districts are in severe or serious rainfall deficiencies, with many regions experiencing the lowest annual figures ever recorded. As a result, many agricultural districts are reporting significant impacts to primary production.

The current estimated grain production for 2024-25 has been revised to 5.2 million tonnes, which is over 40 per cent below the five-year average and the lowest total since 2008 (4.9 million tonnes). The estimated farm gate value of grain in 2024-25 is estimated to be \$2.1 billion, which is down from \$3.3 billion last year.

Livestock producers are also being significantly impacted by these drought conditions, with very poor pasture cover due to the rainfall deficit and the high volume and cost of supplementary feeding. Livestock conditions remain below average, with producers reducing stock numbers and reporting lower than normal breeding rates. Of course, the impacts are not just being felt by grain and livestock producers but across the board, including wine, fruit, dairy and other primary producers.

Just two weeks ago, I convened a special Emergency Management Council meeting which focused on what impacts these drought conditions were having on the agricultural sector and the implications around water security for the state more broadly. There can be no doubt that the drought is placing enormous pressure on our regional communities and primary producers. More needs to be done, and my government is committed to ensuring that our regional communities have the support they need.

Tomorrow, together with the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, I will host a round table with key stakeholders and farmers across the state. The round table will include key representatives from Primary Producers SA, Grain Producers SA, Livestock SA, SA Dairy Association, Horticulture Coalition of SA, SA Fresh Fruit Growers, Wine Grape Council of South Australia, Rural Business Support, as well as other grain and dairy farmers and lamb and beef cattle producers. The round table will focus on what more immediate relief measures the government can deliver, long-term resilience strategies and other collaborative solutions to support farmers, primary producers and our regions.

Drought is not just a rural issue; it affects all South Australians. The resilience of our regional communities is unwavering, but they should not face this challenge alone. My government stands with them and will continue to act decisively. This round table will be integral in building on our already announced \$18 million drought package, which was announced late last year, and ensure that our regional communities are getting the support they need during this difficult time.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** We welcome to parliament today several groups. We have Thorndon Park Primary School students, who are the guests of the member for Morialta—welcome to parliament—and we have students from Walford Anglican School for Girls, who are guests of the member for Unley. I know the member for Waite is an old scholar. I am not sure whether there are any other old scholars in here from Walford. Also, we have members of the Coober Pedy Together facilitation group, who are guests of the Minister for Local Government. Welcome one and all to parliament today.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Ms HOOD (Adelaide) (14:09):** I bring up the 130<sup>th</sup> report of the committee, entitled Lock to Iron Knob Pipeline Reversal.

Report received and ordered to be published.

**Ms HOOD:** I bring up the 131<sup>st</sup> report of the committee, entitled Construction of Water and Wastewater Infrastructure to Enable Metropolitan Growth: Tranche 2.

Report received and ordered to be published.

#### *Question Time*

### **COMMONWEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE FUNDING**

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Premier. What advocacy did the Premier do on behalf of South Australians ahead of the last federal budget? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** Last week, following the federal budget, *The Advertiser* reported that 'Beyond Whyalla, SA gets a relative pittance while the eastern states are lavished with infrastructure billions.'

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:10):** I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. In a way that might get touched on during the course of question time, I had the chance to be with the Prime Minister this morning and it provided an opportunity to reflect on the work that the state government has been able to do in conjunction with the commonwealth, particularly on infrastructure.

We were at Flinders Medical Centre, and anyone who drives past Flinders at the moment will see a huge investment unfolding. There are cranes in the sky. There is the biggest investment in the Flinders Medical Centre being undertaken at the moment that has ever occurred since it has opened—a massive expansion of facilities at Flinders. There are a lot more beds coming online at Flinders because we committed to \$200 million to upgrade Flinders at the last state election. It's happening. The commonwealth committed to \$200 million—their money is happening—and then we have added another \$98 million on top of that. So Flinders is progressing.

Of course, to get back into town we drove down the north-south corridor and what we see now is the T2D Project well and truly in train. There are many milestones to be realised between now and its completion, but you will see all the civil works, all the compulsory acquisition—that project is motoring along, no pun intended. More than that, it's worth noting that this is the largest infrastructure project in the nation. There is no infrastructure project in Australia right now that is larger in dollars being expended than on the north-south corridor.

Of course, that's a project that I am very grateful to acknowledge was started by this government. It is a project that was started in conjunction with an up-and-coming infrastructure minister in Canberra, none other than Anthony Albanese, and I made the point to him this morning—or he made the point to me that he started the project and I said, 'Now you're helping make sure that we are able to finish it.' Then we drove past the Repat, and I thank the member for Morialta for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left! The member for Morialta is on his final warning. Members on my left will come to order!

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I thank the member for Morialta for his interjection because what's being developed now at the Repat is the biggest investment we have seen at the Repat since it opened—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —the biggest investment at the Repat since it opened—which we are very grateful to be delivering. So these projects add up. Of course, if you were to continue all the way up through the north-south corridor and go on the Northern Connector and find yourself on the Port Wakefield Highway and continue north from there, eventually you will get around to Whyalla. In Whyalla there is a \$1.9 billion commitment from the federal government to steelmaking in this country. When you add all that up, I think it accounts for something like 11 per cent of the infrastructure budget—and then, of course, there is the Whyalla contribution. So there is a big investment.

Our advocacy to the federal government doesn't end there, though. I was onto the Prime Minister on a range of issues. Naval shipbuilding is now being honoured, the Skills and Training Academy has been delivered and, of course, the big one that we are really proud of on this side of the house is the legislation to protect kids from the harms of social media. That was advocacy from us that the Prime Minister has delivered federally. So I think there are many runs on the board that we are very grateful for.

#### GREATER ADELAIDE FREIGHT BYPASS

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14):** My question is to the Premier. Will the state government commit funding to the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass and, if so, when? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** The federal government announced the day after the federal budget \$525 million for the High Productivity Vehicle Network, but the Malinauskas government has not committed a single dollar. Without a state contribution, the project cannot proceed.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:15):** Do you know who else hasn't committed a dollar? The Dutton opposition. Do you know who else hasn't committed a dollar? The Tarzia opposition. I have to say, it is a bit rich hearing my young friend so upset about South Australia receiving half a billion dollars worth of funding from the commonwealth government.

Do you know who was most upset about this? Nicolle Flint and James Stevens, because these people had been caught out. They had been caught out.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond and the member for Chaffey, you are on your final warnings.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The looks on their faces when the Prime Minister and the infrastructure minister—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** We are talking about it right now. Have you noticed? I am on my feet. Have you noticed? I know you are not getting many questions anymore. Don't blame me; speak to the leader. It is not my fault. If it were up to me, I would promote you. I am not sure why he is not letting you ask questions. But if you want to ask me a question, go ahead and ask me a question.

We are very keen to see this project progress. Interestingly, given that the previous government had a plan to actually bring freight into the city and onto Cross Road and they had spent money upgrading intersections not only on Portrush Road but on Cross Road to take more freight, now that they have been caught out with a government that is actually investing in a freight bypass network to get freight off Portrush Road and off Cross Road, that is why they are so silent about what they would do.

The election is not that far away. The state election is coming, yet the opposition has been very silent about what they are going to do. We have a budget process. We have a Mid-Year Budget Review at the end of the year. We make our funding announcements through those processes. But members opposite have seen the commonwealth government make this announcement and there has been silence—silence from them. So everyone who lives in the state seats and the federal seats around Portrush Road and Cross Road know that the opposition do not support taking freight off those corridors.

In fact, they had a secret plan to get more freight onto those corridors, and if you don't believe me, look how they moved the Waite Gatehouse. What was that for? Why did you relocate the Waite Gatehouse? To get more freight. Why did you upgrade Portrush Road and Magill Road? For more freight. Their plan was more freight on Portrush Road; their plan was more freight on Cross Road. They even had a secret plan to grade separate Cross Road and Unley Road, to grade separate the freight corridor there as well. Why? They wanted more trucks coming down the South Eastern Freeway and onto Cross Road.

We make our assessments through a budget process, like all good governments do. It is important to note that the opposition's silence on this, I think, is because the Dutton opposition will not be backing this plan. So, in terms of advocacy, why isn't the Leader of the Opposition on the phone to Peter Dutton? If you want his number, the Premier has it. He will give it to you. He will hand it over to you, no problem.

Ring him up and ask him, 'Why hasn't the federal opposition committed to this project as well?' Why won't they? Because their plan is freight on Portrush Road, their plan is freight on Cross

Road, their plan is to get more trucks through Badcoe, through Elder, through Waite, through Dunstan and through Bragg. That is what they want, yet from members opposite: silence.

### HIGH PRODUCTIVITY VEHICLE NETWORK

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** My question is to the Premier. When was the Premier first informed that the federal government would be investing in the High Productivity Vehicle Network? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** The \$525 million announcement was first made on social media by a federal Labor backbencher. There was no formal announcement or immediate statement made by the state government and it took around 30 hours before the state government publicly acknowledged the funding.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:19):** I think his complaint is that we did not announce the commonwealth budget. His complaint is to a state premier: why didn't you announce the commonwealth budget? What they are really upset about is that the member for Boothby, Louise Miller-Frost, is out on the front foot fighting for her constituents, while Nicolle Flint has gone missing in the witness protection program, nowhere to be seen on this. There are plenty of photographs of her by herself on her Facebook page but not with any people, and plenty of selfies out the front of landmarks in Boothby but not with any people. More importantly, none with any policy. No people, no policy but, most importantly, no money—no money. The commonwealth government has turned up with half a billion dollars to take trucks off Portrush Road and Cross Road. Members opposite: silence, no money, no commitment, no policy, nothing.

So asking us about the commonwealth government and its budget processes just shows you they have got no questions of their own—no questions of their own. So my point is, ring up Peter Dutton; get his number off the Premier. Happy to give it to you, alright? He will introduce you if you like. He will introduce you and say, 'This is our friend, Vincent. He's got a long career ahead of him as opposition leader—a long career.' We would happily engage with whoever wins the next federal election to get trucks off Portrush Road and Cross Road. But there is a problem: a good one for us, a bad one for them. There is only one party promising to take trucks off Portrush Road and Cross Road, and that is the Albanese Labor government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's the Albanese Labor government. And there's only one party that had a secret plan to get more trucks onto Portrush Road and Cross Road, and that was members opposite.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, there is a point of order from the deputy leader.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Standing order 98(a), and the question goes to timing. It's very specifically about timing, not about what the minister has just been debating now for the reheated second or third time. It's when. He needs to answer the question and he has only got a minute or so left.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I know members opposite have been in government previously, so they know the processes. The processes are obviously business cases, the processes are Infrastructure Australia, the processes are commonwealth budget and state budget processes.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Marginal seat members who make announcements are entitled to make announcements, and do you know what? Louise Miller-Frost has got all of you talking about a Labor project. Why don't you talk about your projects? Why don't you make your own announcements? There are a lot of these come-to-Jesus moments from members opposite. The first one was the Morphet Road grade separation. The member for Morphet has been in that electorate

and as mayor, but never called for it previously. Once he got wind of us planning on it with Louise Miller-Frost, he was all over it afterwards. The question is: why won't members opposite, at the very least, come out and match this proposal?

*Mr Patterson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morphett, final warning.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** They won't do it because they've got no plan to take trucks off Cross Road or Portrush Road; they've got plans to put more trucks on Portrush Road and Cross Road. The member in the back there sitting with a little wry smile on his face, he knows what's going on. Duplication of the Swanport Bridge, he wishes he had thought of that but he hadn't. He wishes he had thought of that but he hadn't.

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Really? I'll check my mail. How many times have you written to me about duplicating the Swanport Bridge? How many times?

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Okay, alright. Well, I have been here 27 years. How many times you have written to a government about the Swanport Bridge?

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** I will come back and check.

#### **GREATER ADELAIDE FREIGHT BYPASS**

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24):** My question is to the Premier. Will the state government fund the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass on a fifty-fifty funding split with the federal Labor government? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA:** When the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport was asked on ABC radio last week whether the funding for the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass would be a fifty-fifty split with the federal Labor government, the minister said, 'No.'

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:24):** Let me get this straight: first he complains about the commonwealth budget and its timing and now he wants us to pay more. This is genius. It really is a unique tactic by the opposition: Gupta rings up, give him \$50 million; the commonwealth government comes up and says, 'Here's \$500 million,' match it, don't say 80:20, make sure it's fifty-fifty. Why would we pay fifty-fifty on a national freight network? Why wouldn't we pay 80:20? And why aren't members opposite backing us on an 80:20 funding split? Why aren't you?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Tax and spend Liberals. They haven't found a commonwealth dollar they don't want to give back: 'Take it back. No, no, it's too much, take it back.' Of course, we have our own budget processes. We will not meet the timeframes of the Leader of the Opposition, we will meet the timeframes of the parliament. We have a budget. We have our own processes.

We are grateful that the commonwealth government have put up half a billion dollars to get freight out of our city and through a bypass, and we will make our decisions about how we fund that, how we deliver that and how we build that. If the opposition want to come out and make a fifty-fifty funding split, make it public. Stand up now and say that you will pay fifty-fifty. Silence!

The irony of any member who is in the Adelaide Hills who would ever argue about taking freight off the South Eastern Freeway, here it is. When the deputy leader held the functions and powers of the role of Attorney-General, he was actively supporting an infrastructure program to



upgrade Fullarton Road and Cross Road, Portrush Road and Magill Road to get more freight down the South Eastern Freeway and onto two of those roads to get it to the Port of Adelaide.

Why wouldn't you be arguing in the cabinet—even when you only hold the functions and powers of a portfolio—to get that money and move that freight out of your community and onto a bypass? Member for Light, what was it called?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** GlobeLink. Imagine getting elected on a platform of GlobeLink, then abandoning it within six months and then finally getting into the cabinet and arguing that there should be more freight down the South Eastern Freeway and more freight onto Portrush Road and Cross Road, so much so that you put up business cases to the commonwealth government to get more freight through by moving the Waite Gatehouse.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** He is just plucking words out of the air and just yelling them. He is just plucking words out and just saying them. He is in the wrong house. You're in the wrong house, mate. Just plucking words out and just saying them, there's a word for that. Your colleagues are looking. I saw your preselection. You did very well. You got what, 10 votes? Ten? That was impressive. After that long in parliament, the most you could get were how many members in your branch? Excellent work.

We will make our own decisions about how we fund infrastructure. We welcome the commonwealth government's investment. We have our own budget processes and we expect to follow them.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:28):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Primary Industries. Can the government please advise my constituents, particularly those in areas north in my electorate of Stuart, is there any further assistance for those locations that continue to be impacted by the current drought? I am pretty emotional because of what I have been seeing, but I ask the leave of the house to explain further.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK:** The government some time ago was able to commit \$18.1 million, late last year, after I wrote to the Premier in late 2024, and again in March this year. Alongside the other five members of the crossbench, we wrote to the Premier asking for some assistance. Some of the things I have seen in the regional areas with the drought and the loss of farmland and animals is very heartbreaking.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:29):** I thank the member for his question. I am well aware that the member for Stuart has a great affinity with almost every area of his electorate, including with primary producers that I know do make up a significant proportion, particularly around livestock.

We are concerned about the destocking that is now being undertaken by many livestock producers around the state and it is a terrible challenge that they are confronting. It was obvious to us. I had a round table with primary producers in the South-East, specifically in Mount Gambier, who came from all over the South-East, in October last year, and that's what informed the assistance package that we announced in November. As I explicitly said during the ministerial statement, we are having another effort like that tomorrow afternoon and we will be announcing another package that I suspect will be announced a week or two after that.

The meeting that we are having tomorrow, I am really keen just to make sure we hear firsthand because we have been working on a package—and I have said this publicly. We have been working on a package, or a second iteration of the package over the last few weeks; in fact, the Treasurer and the Minister for Primary Industries and I have been talking about it really since January. We are now at a point where we've got the settings there. We just want to make sure the calibration of it is right, hence the round table tomorrow.

Certainly in terms of livestock, though, there is clearly an ability to make a bigger investment in the charity-led organisations that are doing the hay running. There are five organisations that have taken up the assistance that we made available in November last year and that's been taken up fully—I think it's reasonable to expect that we would be looking to increase that yet again, explicitly for those livestock producers who you are understandably concerned about—Rural Aid, Rapid Relief Team, Farmers Relief Agency, Aussie Hay Runners and others that we have given funding to. The minister is actively working with Aussie Hay Runners, in particular; they are a really thoughtful, powerful organisation that advocate for their cause I think adeptly and we are particularly alive to the fact that where there is hay available, we want to get it across the border.

The economics of it does necessitate government support. Often the cost of the diesel and the transportation, the value of transport and the cost of it, exceeds the value of the hay itself, which makes it a peculiar set of circumstances, and that's where it wouldn't stack up under any circumstances unless there was government support; it just wouldn't stack up. The circumstances are so grave that without hay that is worth less than the diesel, in effect, we will see greater destocking than otherwise might be the case.

All these things can make a difference. They will not solve the problem. Only a big rain over a sustained period is going to solve the problem, but that doesn't mean we shouldn't do more and we are going to do more. We are now at the point where we just need to make sure the settings are right.

Your question speaks to the livestock industry, but it's really across the board now, particularly the gravity of the reduction in rainfall that we have seen. I think we are all crossing our fingers and toes that we get those rains sooner rather than later. Top of mind is ANZAC Day. We really want to see some rain before then. That's an important milestone. It is more or less late April and now we are into April. Our fingers are crossed, but we've got to make sure we respond in a way that is practical, rather than just throw money at something to look like we are doing something. We want it to be practical and that's what we are orientating our effort towards now.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (14:33):** I have a supplementary for the Premier. With your round table tomorrow, Premier, could you also consider discussing the opportunities for the impact of the rural community retail sector and things like that?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:34):** That is an issue because lots of regional communities will have a main street in their local town and the main street is being impacted by the downturn and revenue coming through that is otherwise from the agricultural primary production sectors. That is having an impact. Trying to address that is more difficult. Delivering hay, government supporting investment in drought-resilient infrastructure: we are particularly attracted to those types of options, particularly the infrastructure piece, because we have to confront the fact that this isn't really the last time we will see this challenge. We know that.

I think it's crazy that even now I have a moment of pause in talking about climate change, as though it's a question. Climate change is happening, and that is not trying to insert a political debate into this. In fact, many long-term primary production producers—people who have had this in their families for a long time, and there are a lot of good producers where this is the case—can talk to the nature of climate change better than others.

The member for MacKillop would probably be able to account for the fact better than anyone in this place, although I know there are others, and talk to the fact that now in the South-East we are seeing conditions that we have never, ever seen before. The South-East talking about a drought is just a mind-boggling proposition. Lots of places have had droughts before, but the one in—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Chaffey can leave until the end of question time.

*The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Of course, as the member for Chaffey says, there have been droughts before, but this one is unlike anything we have recorded before, and the record speaks

for itself. This isn't the first time, and we certainly know it's not going to be the last. That is why, when we talk about investment from the government, we are looking for opportunities that go beyond just immediate relief and that also try to improve resilience into the future. We are, like I said, in the process of trying to calibrate that effort, and we look forward to announcing it, hopefully in the not too distant future.

### HEALTH CARE

**Ms HUTCHESSON (Waite) (14:36):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house how the Malinauskas state government and the Albanese federal government are working together to deliver better health care for South Australians?

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (14:36):** I thank the member for Waite for her question. The member for Waite is a committed member of her own community and is well familiar with the demands that an ageing population brings to our health system and the importance of the Flinders Medical Centre in and around her electorate, amongst others who represent people in the southern and south-western suburbs of our city.

Flinders is our second-biggest hospital. It's one of the biggest hospitals in the nation and it's certainly the busiest emergency department in this state. It's an institution that has served our state well for a sustained period, but it has never had the big upgrade. It has never had the big upgrade until now. We have \$498 million being expended in Flinders, and I referred to the hive of activity that it is at the moment. That would not be happening if this state government was not elected, and it would not be happening if the Albanese federal Labor government was not elected. That is just the undeniable truth.

Today, importantly, what we saw is recognition of the fact that this isn't just a one-off project in getting Flinders up to the capacity that we know it's capable of and that is required for the demand in services, which is going to require more again. To see a \$300 million announcement made today is something that we are very grateful for indeed—a \$300 million announcement; \$150 million from the commonwealth and \$150 million from Flinders University, of which a large number of people in this place are alumni. That combination of investment will see a brand-new facility being built immediately adjacent to the Health and Medical Research Institute at Flinders, which the Prime Minister and I had the privilege of opening last year.

So now we are going to have a world-leading hospital being redeveloped next to a world-leading Health and Medical Research Institute building—next to a world-leading facility that will be able to provide outpatient services for patients coming out of Flinders. Most importantly, it is to train an extra 1,300 staff a year, over and above the training that already happens at Flinders University for all the professions that are necessary to be able to sustain our health system in the context of the growing capacity that only this government can deliver.

I say that emphatically because it is an important point. Notwithstanding the challenges in the health system, which are acute and real, there is only one side of politics that went to the last elections, federal and state, with a plan to do something about it, and we are committed to make sure we keep doing something about it. Today's announcement speaks to that.

More nurses, more midwives, more allied health professionals—of which there are a large number, everything from physios to speech therapists—more doctors and more paramedics are able to be trained as a result of the announcement made today. That health workforce element is particularly important in a labour market as tight as this one. We are not just thinking about the immediate investments to grow our capacity; we are genuinely thinking about the long-term challenges that we see coming in our healthcare system, and of course workforce is central to that. So today was an important announcement at Flinders.

Everyone in and around the south-western suburbs, whether you are in Black, Gibson, Waite, Reynell—they are all electorates—in any of these places, if you are a constituent in one of these locations, you can look at Flinders with confidence that your health care is going to be here for some time to come. The member for Hurtle Vale knows Flinders better than anyone in this place, having worked there, and she has seen the necessity for the transformation. So on this side of the

house, we have a committed group of people to make sure this investment is ongoing, and today was an important announcement in that regard.

### **GREATER ADELAIDE FREIGHT BYPASS**

**The Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition) (14:41):** My question is to the Premier. Will the government fund the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass on an 80:20 funding split with the federal government? If so, what representations did the Premier make to the federal Treasurer ahead of the federal budget last week?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:41):** I am grateful to the leader for his question. Of course, this is a series of questions that the leader has asked about the federal government. The first question was: 'Why didn't the state get anything in the federal budget?' The second question was: 'Why did the state get something in the federal budget?' The third question was: 'When did you find out that the state got lots in the federal budget?' It is a genius tactic, as my colleague has said.

As the Premier has said, it is not just the redevelopment work that is going on for the Flinders Medical Centre but also today what was announced by the Prime Minister in South Australia in the Boothby federal election about working with Flinders University—not just the Torrens to Darlington, or the north-south corridor, or the \$1.9 billion commitment to Whyalla, or the \$700 million that was in the latest skills agreement, or the extraordinary increase in funding that we are seeing in the education agreement for our public school system, or Curtis Road now it is the High Productivity Vehicle Network.

As my colleague has said, we have our state budget process underway now. We are grateful that there is one side of federal politics that is willing to commit funding to improving South Australia's roads. That also happens to be the incumbent federal government. So, like we would normally do at every federal budget, which is usually handed down about a month before each state budget, we look at how the federal budget impacts the state. We weigh that up as we are putting together the state budget.

We are very much looking forward to considering that as well as the other commitments that were made in the federal budget for South Australia, including a commitment to grade separate Curtis Road out in the northern suburbs, a road project of high priority to northern suburbs communities, in particular with the huge addition of housing into those communities. We are grateful that, once again, the Albanese federal government is carving out more and more money for South Australia for more and more projects. We are looking forward to working through that as we put the state's budget together.

### **GREATER ADELAIDE FREIGHT BYPASS**

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley) (14:43):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Will \$525 million build the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass to get trucks off Cross Road, and when and where will the bypass be built? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I shall explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** A federal Labor backbencher last week posted on Facebook that Labor is delivering a freight bypass to keep trucks off Cross Road but did not provide details on investment. Budget forward estimates suggest only \$88 million will be spent before 2030. Thousands of trucks continue to pass homes, schools and local businesses every day on Cross Road, and without a funded bypass plan those communities will be left exposed.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:44):** That explanation was helpful, because the explanation talks about the plight of the member for Unley's constituents, it talks about them having to suffer from freight going past those homes. I suppose the question his constituents will be asking of him is why was it that he had a plan—a secret plan that we released, that we discovered, that they tried to hide through cabinet in confidence—that would have seen 190 homes compulsorily acquired

on Cross Road, including businesses, not to mention the potential impact on the playgrounds of Walford on the corner there of—

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Point of order: the question was quite clear. The question was: will \$525 million fund the bypass? That was the question. The minister is now debating the issue of the bypass. He is not answering the question, which is specifically about the cost of the build.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has a further three minutes and 15 seconds to answer the question, and I think he is providing some background to the project.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The question was so simple he needed to seek leave of the house to explain it, and after he explained it he talked about the plight of his constituents. The point I propose to the house quite openly is: if you cared so much, why were you secretly planning to compulsorily acquire 190 homes and businesses on Cross Road, to divert that freight down to Cross Road rather than a bypass, after you abandoned GlobeLink? Why is it that you actively funded an upgrade to an intersection at Portrush Road at Magill, and Cross Road in Fullarton, and attempted to destroy the Waite Gatehouse? If it were not for the opposition and the local community fighting to have it relocated it would be gone now.

The reason you were doing those things is because you were planning to have freight come along Cross Road through your community, yet you asked me a question about whether or not \$500 million for getting those trucks off Portrush Road and Cross Road is enough. I have to say: don't look at what people say, look at what they do. If you want an example of what they were planning to do, go to Fullarton Road and Cross Road, if you want a feel of what they were planning to do go to Portrush Road at Magill. The business cases for both those projects that, as a minister, would have gone through cabinet, do you know what that business case was? Better freight productivity, get more trucks through those intersections.

So when I hear members opposite ask me if \$525 million is enough, I tell you what it: it is a lot better than what you were planning. It is a start, a good start, a very healthy start. It has lots of zeros after the five; it is a good number. I have to say that duplication of the Swanport Bridge will be expansive—

*The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Unley will leave until the end of question time.

*The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As he is leaving he can go and explain to his constituents in Unley and apologise to them for wanting to have more freight down Cross Road. Perhaps the kids in the gallery found their playing fields that were to be compulsorily acquired—

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Standing order 98, sir: debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I do not uphold that point of order. The minister can continue his answer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, the plan—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morialta, you weren't here for the question.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** I was here for the answer.

**The SPEAKER:** No; you were here for part of the answer. Maybe sit down and listen for a little bit and you will get a little context about where the minister is coming from.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The plan is try to get PBS level 4A triple road trains. These road trains are over 53 metres long. The plan is that rather than semitrailers or B-doubles coming down the freeway and along Portrush Road and Cross Road, it will allow the freight industry to have these much larger trucks, trucks that are destined for the Port of Adelaide, or their destination is not Adelaide. To get these trucks off the freeway, the first thing we need to do is duplicate the Swanport Bridge. That is a very, very detailed piece of construction. It will take time to develop that. That work is underway as we speak. The other part of that, of course, is the Truro bypass. The previous bypass

only had a one-lane bypass, completely inadequate for what the needs were. The new plan is for a much larger Truro bypass—but unfortunately I have run out of time.

### **GREATER ADELAIDE FREIGHT BYPASS**

**Mr BATTY (Bragg) (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. When will work on the Greater Adelaide Freight Bypass, to get trucks off Portrush Road, commence, and when will it be completed? And with leave I will explain.

**The SPEAKER:** Two questions and leave has now been sought. Is leave granted?

Leave granted.

**Mr BATTY:** A federal Labor candidate last week posted on Facebook that Labor will 'help get trucks off Portrush Road', but did not provide details on the investment. Budget forward estimates suggest only \$88 million will be spent before 2030. Thousands of trucks continue to pass homes, schools and local businesses every day on Portrush Road, and without a funded bypass plan my local community is left exposed.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:50):** Work has already begun, the planning, the business case, the detailed hard work.

*Mr Batty interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** It's with Infrastructure Australia. Hang on a second. Has work begun? Yes. Where is it? It's with Infrastructure Australia. 'Well, why isn't it with me?' Why isn't it with an opposition frontbencher? Why isn't it over there? Of what benefit would it be to be with you? What would the member for Bragg do with a business case other than hand it to me to hand over to Infrastructure Australia? What are you going to do with it? What value could you possibly add to a business case? Could you imagine the member for Bragg adding value to anything? I am just trying to work out how this thing works. I will tell you what I will do: I will get my agency to consult you about all our business cases.

I will give you the process, Mr Speaker. What we do is we want to get trucks because we want to improve freight productivity. What we have done is that the commonwealth government gave us money that we have matched to do the business case. That work is underway. That was announced in previous budgets. That work has been ongoing. That work has been submitted to Infrastructure Australia for their consideration. Through that budget process, the commonwealth government has made an allocation of over half a billion dollars to this productivity network. That is an exceptional contribution made, the first time the commonwealth government has ever made that type of contribution.

I also point out, Mr Speaker, that unlike GlobeLink, unlike the 24-hour airport that was going to be at Monarto, unlike ripping up the freight line that goes through Adelaide and building a brand-new one sweeping across the Adelaide Plains and behind the Adelaide Hills to go to the port of Adelaide and off to Perth and Darwin, there is detailed work being done. They had no business case, no plan, no route, no funding. They did a very brief investigation and abandoned it, and are now demanding why hasn't it been done yet?

I am not the one who went to the 2018 election promising a massive freight bypass and then abandoning it. Members opposite abandoned and dropped it faster than they dropped their transport infrastructure minister Stefan Knoll. So, don't complain to us; we're getting on with the work. While we are getting on with the work of this freight bypass, what were they planning to do? They were planning to compulsorily acquire 190 properties on Cross Road in order to move that freight down through Cross Road, and are now complaining to us about the speed of this.

I have to say, members opposite haven't thought this through. We are the ones who are doing the hard work and the heavy lifting to get this done. Members opposite have just come up with slogans. No money, no plan, no business cases, no submissions to Infrastructure Australia, no submissions to the commonwealth government. Their colleagues in Canberra said they don't even think Adelaide is a major capital city. Bridget McKenzie today said that every major Australian capital city has a dedicated rail network to its airport. 'Oh, but Adelaide doesn't.' What does that imply, that

we're not a major capital city? How about members opposite, rather than complaining to us, getting on their phones to their colleagues and talking to them and saying, 'Adelaide's an important city, we deserve to have some funding.' I have yet to see any major infrastructure commitment from members opposite, in the federal opposition, to South Australia. Members opposite are telling us that Peter Dutton will be Prime Minister, living in Sydney, any time now. Well, where are the commitments on that?

**Mr TEAGUE:** Point of order: the minister might have forgotten that there was a second half to the question, which is: when will it be completed? He has 10 seconds left. He needs to tell the house when it will be completed and end this rant.

**The SPEAKER:** Well, it could have been asked as a separate question instead of trying to put two questions into one. There's only about 10 seconds left.

**Mr TEAGUE:** Plenty of time.

**The SPEAKER:** No.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** As I said, we have our own budget process. We need to go through our budget process, and once that budget process is complete the Treasurer will stand up, he will deliver to the house, then we will have an estimates process and in that estimates process members can ask questions.

#### **PATIENT ASSISTANCE TRANSPORT SCHEME**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister advise the house if the Patient Assistance Transport Scheme's processing times for claims have improved? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr McBRIDE:** Late last year, the minister told the house that work was underway to improve processing times which at one stage blew out to six to eight weeks for reimbursements to be repaid.

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Karna—Minister for Health and Wellbeing) (14:55):** I thank the member for MacKillop for his question but also his passion and interest in terms of health care for his electorate and broadly for regional South Australia. I also thank the other members of the crossbench—the member for Mount Gambier, the member for Narungga and the member for Stuart—who have raised these issues in terms of PATS advocating, of course, as the Independents do on behalf of their regional communities.

It is true, as the member said, that PATS, which is a very important scheme, did see a big uplift in terms of the demand on the scheme. Usually it had a benchmark processing time of around four weeks, and we did see that increase to around six to eight weeks. That coincided with the increase that we made to the fuel subsidy that we provide, doubling that, which is the biggest uplift in terms of support for people through PATS in the past two decades which saw increased demand in terms of claims.

Since then, there has been a lot of work done by the Rural Support Service and local health networks based regionally to make sure that we can bring that back. They brought in additional temporary staff, they improved some of their processing, they made sure that they were freeing up time with assessors and they implemented a quick claims assessment process for those more straightforward applications. I have been regularly monitoring this and asking questions of the Rural Support Service in terms of their progress, and I am delighted to be able to inform that there has been significant progress made in terms of this.

If you look back to where we were in October, there were 822 online applications that had been waiting over six weeks, 1,900 online applications that had been waiting up to four weeks and a number of other paper applications as well. To compare that, we got that down in January. There were no applications in January waiting longer than four weeks and there were 1,400 applications waiting up to four weeks, including paper applications—so that's a significant improvement.

But then as of now, 20 March, that number—which was originally 822 online applications over six weeks and 1,900 up to four weeks; so a very significant number of 2,700-odd—was down

to 159 applications awaiting processing and the processing time was in the order of one to three days. That is a huge turnaround and I want to pay credit to everybody who has been involved in the Rural Support Service and the PATS team in terms of that improvement, and I thank the member and the Independent colleagues for raising this issue.

That's obviously way in advance of our previous standard in terms of that four weeks, endeavouring from now on to make sure that we are well inside that four weeks, and I am sure the member and his colleagues will keep us honest in terms of that into the future. But this is ultimately of benefit for people across the state who need to, in many cases, visit Adelaide or travel to other regional centres to receive their treatment.

I was just last week travelling with the member for Giles and the member for Stuart through regional South Australia, visiting places such as Leigh Creek, Kimba and Hawker, where we opened the new Leigh Creek Health Service and the new Hawker ambulance station, and visiting Kimba hospital, which was the 71<sup>st</sup> hospital in South Australia I have visited. In all these places, PATS is a very important scheme and is very relied upon by the community, so I am sure that this improvement we have seen in terms of the processing time will be welcome news for everyone in regional areas across the state.

### **AVALON AUSTRALIAN INTERNATIONAL AIRSHOW**

**Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Defence and Space Industries. Can the minister update the house on South Australia's participation in the 2025 Avalon Australian International Airshow?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (14:59):** I thank the member for Playford for his question, because a lot of defence industrial activity occurs in our northern suburbs, which the member would be well aware of. Last week, Australia's largest international airshow, the Avalon Airshow, was held and I was very pleased to participate in the largest South Australian delegation to attend an Avalon Airshow.

We had 60 local defence and space organisations coming along to Avalon, the vast majority of them attending as part of Defence SA's stand. Defence SA continues its record as an organisation that not just establishes our credentials as the defence state in our nation but takes a leadership role in making sure that of all the states and territories in our nation South Australia has the most significant and the most sophisticated presence at these defence tradeshow.

It was really pleasing to see so many businesses present and showcase their capabilities in advanced manufacturing, in artificial intelligence and cybersecurity, in the space-related industries, and also in their capacity to provide services to defence industry partners and global decision-makers. In that respect, it was a great pleasure for me on the Tuesday, followed by the Minister for Trade and Investment on the Wednesday, to engage in meetings with major defence companies and the opportunities they are actively pursuing here in South Australia. We also had the state's three universities present there, highlighting their capacity to support research activities across defence.

But, of course, this was an airshow focused around the aerospace industries. South Australia is very fortunate to have one of the RAAF's two largest bases in Australia out at Edinburgh. The broader Edinburgh defence precinct holds not only a lot of defence companies but also the largest installation of the DSTG group, with more than 800 staff.

The state government has partnered with the RAAF in the construction of the \$200 million Deep Maintenance and Modification Facility. It is currently underway, being constructed, to make sure that the RAAF does all of its maintenance, upkeep and modification of the P-8 platform in South Australia. A great announcement from Avalon is that that is now going to be expanded, with aircrews and their airframes from both the United States and New Zealand bringing their aircraft to South Australia for maintenance and modification, building out the capacity of this important facility that the government of South Australia has built for our air force.

There was further good news in the last two weeks, with the intention of Canada to purchase the Jindalee over-the-horizon radar network that several of our defence primes located in Australia



are responsible for delivering—but from South Australia's perspective in particular, BAE Systems. This is a more than \$6 billion contract which, once granted approval, will see a significant further uplift in industrial output from the northern suburbs of Adelaide, providing this advanced technology for our global partners.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:03):** My question is to the Treasurer. How much and what further drought relief will be provided by the state government to farmers following the release of the federal budget? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr TELFER:** Following the federal budget last week, the Treasurer said on FIVEaa radio that the state government will be announcing further drought relief for farmers before the state budget this year.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (15:04):** I thank the member for Flinders for his question because, along with other members, he has raised in this place the travails that his constituents are experiencing at the moment with the extraordinarily dry conditions that continue to confront major parts of our state. I, and of course the Premier, have made it clear in this place as well as publicly that back in November, yes, we announced a drought package to support primary producers in South Australia, and it has become clear in the early months of this year that these conditions have persisted.

In fact, as the Premier said in his earlier remarks today, we are becoming increasingly concerned that we may not see meaningful rainfall before that threshold date of ANZAC Day. The Premier has made it clear previously to this place, and I have reiterated both in here and publicly, that the government recognises there is a need to provide further support to our primary producers and that given, for example, that threshold date that the Premier mentioned earlier, it may not wait until I hand down the state budget on 5 June.

The Premier has made it clear that we are considering a package and we are of a mind to announce a package before we hand down the state budget. What that package looks like and how much funding is contributed by the state government to support primary producers in that package is being considered, and in no small part I think the Premier's intention, along with the Minister for Primary Industries, is to listen carefully to the contributions that have been made by members like the member for Flinders and also by industry representatives and farmers directly. The Premier has made it clear that he, along with the Minister for Primary Industries, will be engaging with primary producers directly tomorrow.

All of this helps us make sure that if we are providing further support, not only is it the right amount of support but the support is going to the things that will actually make a difference for those primary producers who are struggling. I think I also said in the interview on talkback radio that the member for Flinders referenced before that, not too dissimilar to what we did with the River Murray flood, we announced an initial package of support to try to make sure that those flood-affected communities along the River Murray had the support of the state government.

That was rolled out over a period of subsequent weeks and then, after the full impact of the flood became apparent, we took the opportunity to supplement that initial package of support for those communities along the River Murray. I guess in that respect, we are taking a similar approach here. We have made an initial contribution, we are understanding how long these conditions are persisting and the impacts they are having on primary producers and the communities that they are a part of, and we are taking the opportunity to consider how we can make an additional contribution to support those primary producers and those communities.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**Mr TELFER (Flinders) (15:07):** My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier visit drought-stricken farming communities this week rather than expecting them to travel hours to Adelaide to speak with him? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Mr TELFER:** On 28 March, a social media post from Livestock SA Chair, Gillian Fennell, announced that the Premier had been invited, and I quote:

Not for a photo op. But to listen. To look people in the eye. To understand that without immediate and ongoing support, we risk losing more than just stock—we risk losing our producers, our communities, and the culture of care and stewardship they represent.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:08):** I thank the member for his question. The short answer is that of course I am keen to meet with primary producers wherever they might be in the state. I had the opportunity to do that in and around our country cabinet visit to the Mid North. I did that when I was in the South-East, like I said, last year when dry conditions became apparent. It hasn't happened overnight. The only reason why I am not doing it in the current few days is because I am here with members opposite answering your questions.

I am more than happy to relinquish my parliamentary duties but I don't imagine those opposite would want me to do that, so we have been able to make some time in the diary in the not too distant future for me to get out and about, but in the absence of being able to leave Adelaide because of my parliamentary responsibilities to His Majesty's Loyal Opposition—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** —and the people of this state, that's right—we have convened the round table in Adelaide, not too dissimilar to the Leader of the Opposition and yourself, as the member for Flinders, meeting with primary producers here on the steps of parliament a few weeks ago. I understand the tenet of your question, but I think you also will understand that I physically can't be in two places at once, notwithstanding the fact that I have enjoyed the opportunity to catch up with primary producers in their own environment in the South-East and the Mid North, and I look forward to hopefully having that opportunity again in the not too distant future.

#### **ADELAIDE EASTER CLASSIC BASKETBALL TOURNAMENT**

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta) (15:10):** My question is to the Premier. Will the government support the Adelaide Easter Classic Basketball Tournament? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The opposition has been advised that the government has been approached by the Adelaide Community Basketball Association seeking support for the Adelaide Easter Classic. Having grown over the years, the tournament has now expanded to bring in more than 10,000 visitors to our state, with 600 teams registered this year. They are seeking a modest but important funding contribution to bring in several dozen extra officials from interstate because, as a result of the unanticipated growth, they now have to officiate 1,600 games over the weekend, more than can be achieved with available South Australian local referees.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Premier) (15:11):** The short answer is I am more than happy to look at the request. I have to say, I don't recall it off the top of my head. I am not suggesting for a moment that it hasn't been submitted to the government, but I am more than happy to pursue it. I would also acknowledge that community sport plays an important role. I am a bit confused sometimes. The opposition criticise us when we invest in community sport, saying, 'All they care about is sport.'

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** I do take it seriously and it will be looked into. I think we have got a record of demonstrating our commitment to community sport. It exceeds—

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** Well, these guys have been waiting two months.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morialta, you have asked your question. Listen to the answer.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** It is a commitment to community sport that I think is well understood. We are investing in infrastructure. We are investing in people. We are investing in school sports voucher programs. The Assistant Minister for Junior Sport Participation has been enthusiastically not just advocating but delivering for people who are concerned about this community.

**The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner:** This would cost you 30 grand. You could fix it this afternoon.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** And maybe I will. Maybe I will, and maybe that will be a rare instance of bipartisan support for investment in community sport. Notwithstanding the opposition's consistent criticism of the government for investing in community sport, rest assured we are going to keep doing it. We are going to keep doing it because we want kids off phones. I am not too fussed if they are playing instruments or in community arts programs like the one that was announced by the Minister for Arts yesterday with our comprehensive cultural policy, or whether it was other announcements as part of it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** Carclew is an outstanding organisation, which I know the member for Morialta has some understanding about. Or whether it be netball, footy, soccer—I am really agnostic about it. We are committed to it. Let me tell you, basketball is growing as well, like so many other community sports. It is an outstanding example of how well-run grassroots sport is getting more kids involved. I suspect it will be even more so after the amazing effort from Josh Giddey from the Chicago Bulls. If your Facebook feed wasn't getting Josh Giddey's performance in the Lakers versus the Bulls game on the weekend then you should probably google it.

**The Hon. C.J. Picton:** I thought you were going to talk about the Minister for Education.

**The Hon. P.B. MALINAUSKAS:** That's right, the Minister for Education is the next best thing. Josh Giddey's effort was the best thing since the Minister for Education doing that amazing shot. Let me chase it up and maybe this is not an example of something we can resolve quickly.

*Grievance Debate*

### GREEK INDEPENDENCE DAY

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:14):** As is well known, 25 March was the national day of Greece, celebrating Greek independence in 1821. My goodness, this year saw South Australia's Greek community celebrating, along with the rest of us, with gusto and in style over a significant extended period of time and, of course, all happening together with Festival Hellenika that has been now underway for some weeks.

I was delighted to go along, together with Minister Michaels, the Minister for Small Business among other things, to *Echoes of Piraeus* on Saturday night on 22 March. Piraeus, the port of Athens, of course, is the place that was home to so much of the traditional Greek music that we know so well. It was poignant that we were all gathering, together with a full Dunstan Playhouse, ahead of the national day, because celebrating the music of the port meant also reflecting on the coming from that port, and particularly the departing, of large numbers of Greek migrants to Australia over the course of the last century.

I was honoured to represent the Leader of the Opposition the following morning at the archdiocese's celebration, the doxology service at Bowden, ahead of the memorial and wreath laying that took place at the state memorial later that day. It was indeed a great honour to stand alongside so many community leaders on that day and to lay a wreath at the state memorial recognising those who were lost in the fight for freedom.

The national day itself was celebrated significantly by a reception hosted by the Consul General of Greece, the Hon. Dr Alexandra Theodoropoulou, who brought together the whole of the community on that evening for just a tremendous gathering, recognising the extraordinary spirit and dedication and commitment to freedom that the Greek people showed despite those awful years under the Turkish Ottoman rule.

I want to recognise Bishop Silouan, who was part of that celebration and was presiding, of course, at the doxology service of the archdiocese on the previous Sunday and participated not only in the wreath laying at the state memorial but also was front and centre at the parade ground after that service. Very happily we spent some time together and hearing from children who were singing and reciting those important memories in recognition of independence.

Just last Sunday, the Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia gathered at the Cathedral of Archangels Michael and Gabriel to again commemorate and lay wreaths. I was honoured to do so, again on behalf of the Leader of the Opposition, together with so many community leaders. I think the gatherings of the Greek community for this significant event, over this last more than a week, have shown just how truly core to our community the Greek story is in South Australia and, as we say, freedom or death, eleftheria i thanatos.

The Meadows intersection has been a sore point for the local community now for many years, and the government, the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, promised to deliver much-needed safety and improvement, including the construction of a roundabout which he backed off from at the end of last year. He had his CE send a letter to the Mount Barker District Council, saying it was not funded.

Well, I am pleased to say, standing here today together with the community and the council, that we have got the government to reverse course. The government has indicated that it is funded now and that work will happen. At this stage, given the unreliable indications that the government has proven to make over time, we will believe it when we see it. But it must happen, and it must happen as a matter of priority.

#### **SOUTH AUSTRALIAN SPORTS INSTITUTE**

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (15:19):** We have been steadfast in doing what we can to help encourage our kids to get off the screens and be active and healthy in their local communities. We know it is so important for their mental health and wellbeing, we know it is good for their physical health as well, and it is very important in terms developing those all-important skills that will help develop them into well-rounded adults.

To do that, and just as importantly, we have to acknowledge that sport is an amazing facility for bringing people together. That was achieved this weekend through the opening of our SASI building, where we welcomed communities and members from all across our state to come and see this world-class facility. If we want to inspire our kids to get off their screens and be active, we need to be able to show them that we have world-class facilities to help inspire them on these pathways, whether they want to be future sporting champions or perhaps want to seek careers that are involved in sports—helping to develop their passions into their education and learning as well.

The SASI building was an \$88 million investment: \$68 million via the Malinauskas government in collaboration with UniSA, who have provided \$20 million and are providing world-class education in this field as well, at the building. It really offers our state unique opportunities through this collaboration, not only in what we are doing to support athletes and the education that is being provided but also in the way that people are able to come together, engage, learn from one another and support each other as well. This is something we have heard strongly from athletes already using the facilities, and from those who work there as well.

Of course, we are going to be seeing our future champions come through these doors for many years to come, and we have the facilities within the building to support them as well. We have:

- a strength and conditioning gym that features a five-lane synthetic turf testing space and an antigravity treadmill;
- an environmental chamber for athlete testing under a range of temperature, hypoxic and humidity conditions; and
- a full-sized indoor sprung timber court and a half-court movement studio, which has been designed for instant performance analysis under individual and team modes.

I am really pleased to share that that has already been taken up by some amazing athletes and teams, such as the Thunderbirds and the 36ers as well. We also have:

- an ergometer training space;
- a physiology laboratory and athlete health rooms;
- an athlete recovery centre, complete with athlete nutrition zone, hot and cold pools and dual saunas; and
- biomechanics and exercise physiology laboratories that are fit for allied health partners and students to learn about the role that forces play in movement and physiological responses to exercise and training.

There is lots going on at this facility. What was amazing was to then be able to invite the community in. We saw a wide range of families coming in through the doors on Sunday to have a firsthand experience of all these different chambers and how they all work together, done in such a way that inspires young people to get active.

We had some amazing, incredible and inspiring speakers. We had the legendary Callum Peters, who of course won silver in boxing at the most recent Olympics. He is a north boy from Davoren Park doing us all very proud. We had Jed Altschwager, who is a para-rowing champion; Meg Lemon, a paracyclist; Matthew Temple, Rowan Crothers and Harrison Biddell from swimming; Kiana Elliott, who is a weightlifting champion, but she started her career in gymnastics; Dr Ben Singh, a research fellow at UniSA; Akeesha Snowden and Olivia Sandery from athletics; Dr Clint Bellenger, who has a PhD in sport science from UniSA; and also the incredible Steph Talbot, who is a Golden State Valkyries player in the Women's NBA.

So we had a range of athletes from a range of different backgrounds showing all the students and young people coming through the doors, and their families as well, just what is available and what you can achieve through this amazing facility.

I was really fortunate in bringing my daughter along. We had a look at some of the different activations, and it was really interesting to see the sports that she got quite excited about. She particularly liked the cycling because she was able to use that to make a watermelon smoothie. She was really interested in the archery that we had available there and the little gymnastics.

What was particularly exciting for her as well was the movement studio that is available through this facility, where she was able to shoot like a Thunderbird with a wide screen behind her full of a crowd cheering her on. She was able to play 'Don't step on the lava' with other young people, helping to show how the movements work and how the different technologies integrate as well, and that is just the tip of the iceberg.

## INDIA

**Mr BATTY (Bragg) (15:25):** I rise to update the house on my recent visit to India, where I had the opportunity to participate in the Asian Forum on Global Governance as well as the Raisina Dialogue in New Delhi. The Raisina Dialogue is India's premier conference on geopolitics and geoeconomics. It is a conference that is hosted annually by the Observer Research Foundation in partnership with the Indian Ministry of External Affairs and this year welcomed 3,500 participants from more than 125 different countries. It was inaugurated by the Prime Minister of India as well as the Prime Minister of New Zealand.

I had the opportunity to participate in the conference as a Raisina Young Fellow, which brought together about 50 leaders from about 40 different countries to exchange ideas, forge really meaningful relationships and discuss big issues facing us in all corners of the globe, from artificial intelligence to climate policy to geopolitical tensions around the world. It is a program that I would definitely recommend for young people interested in these sorts of issues.

It was also a great opportunity for me to learn a little bit more about India and Indian culture. It was my first time visiting India. I have to say it is an extraordinary country. I was extremely impressed just by the sheer scale and size of the place, home to 1.4 billion people, now the world's most populous country. Indeed, every month in India, over a million people turn 18 years old—an incredible statistic. I was also impressed by the diversity of the country—India has the most languages spoken in any one nation—and also the ambition of the country. This is the world's fastest

growing major economy. It is the world's largest democracy, and it has one of the world's fastest growing middle classes as well.

Of course, I enjoyed learning a lot about Indian culture as well. I landed right in the midst of the Holi festival, which was a very colourful occasion in Delhi. I want to take this opportunity to acknowledge all of those in my own local community who were celebrating Holi here only a few weeks ago. We had the opportunity to enjoy a cultural night with Indian dancing and singing and, of course, indulged in a lot of Indian food, everything from dosas to curries. My personal favourite was the lovely chuski—quite delicious.

India, of course, is a very important country to South Australia. Our state is home to a growing and large Indian community. More than 40,000 South Australians are of Indian descent; that is the second-largest group after those from England. Many of those Indian South Australians call my own local community home, and it has been a great pleasure to be able to engage with our local Indian community as the member for Bragg over the past few years. As well as our people-to-people links, India is a really important trading partner for South Australia. India is South Australia's third-largest export market, valued at over \$1 billion, trailing only the US and China, with international education being particularly important on that front.

It is critical that we keep that momentum up, though. I was concerned to see a bit of a decrease in our year-on-year exports to India in the latest ABS data release. This is just one of the reasons why the Leader of the Opposition and the shadow minister for trade have been calling for direct flights from Adelaide to India, for which there would be huge demand here with my own local Indian community as well. I am pleased that the Premier could follow in my footsteps to continue these discussions over in India just over the past week. We hope to see some results from those discussions.

Just to conclude, I want to acknowledge and thank those involved with the AFGG and the Raisina Dialogue, including Dr Samir Saran, who is President of the Observer Research Foundation and Dr Shashi Tharoor, Dean of the Raisina Young Fellows Program, as well as say a big thankyou to all those on the ORF team who were responsible for the conference, in particular to Aditya and Sayantan for all their hard work in putting together a very successful conference.

### CLARE HOSPITAL

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:29):** Today I rise to reflect on the occasion of the Clare Hospital centenary celebrations held on 21 March 2025. Our Minister for Health and Wellbeing, the Hon. Chris Picton, gave a fitting speech reflecting on the profound impact of this institution over the past century.

The gathering reflected the community spirit, such as Yorke and Northern Local Health Network CEO Roger Kirchner and Governing Board Chair John Voumard, Director of Nursing and Midwifery at Clare Hospital, Jodie Kernick, members of the Lower North Health Advisory Council, and Mayor Allan Aughey OAM. There was also the federal MP and the state MP at the event, along with staff past and present and community volunteers who have dedicated decades of service over the years.

This event marked an extraordinary milestone—100 years of service by a hospital at the heart of the Clare community. Clare Hospital's history is deeply rooted in the commitment and resilience of the community it serves. From its modest beginnings in 1878 as a one-room casualty hospital at the local police station, Clare Hospital has grown to meet the evolving healthcare needs of its people. As Dr Gerry Considine also reminded us, the Clare Hospital is more than bricks and mortar: it is the people within the wards who have made it what it is today, emphasising that health care is not just a profession but a calling.

It was established in 1924 after tireless community fundraising, led by Dr Otto Wien-Smith, and represents a legacy of collective action and determination. Among the stories shared during the centenary celebrations we heard of baby Dunn, the first baby born at the hospital in 1924, who was followed shortly after by Dorothy Dunstan, the first female baby. Dorothy herself reached her centenary last year, a fitting reminder of this hospital's enduring presence and legacy.

The hospital quickly became an indispensable part of the community, serving 246 patients in its first year alone. In 1974 it had grown to care for 933 patients annually, and in the 2023-24 financial year it recorded 2,201 inpatient episodes, 2,838 emergency episodes and 3,344 outpatient episodes. This remarkable growth reflects Clare Hospital's ability to adapt and meet the needs of the community.

The Clare Hospital remains a vital institution providing high-quality health care to Clare and surrounding regions thanks to the dedication of healthcare professionals, volunteers and support staff. During the centenary celebrations we paid tribute to the long-serving doctors, nurses, midwives and allied health staff who have dedicated decades of service to ensuring that patients receive the care they need, close to home.

As we honour Clare Hospital's legacy, we take pride in its progress towards the future. That future would obviously include some further investment in the hospital. The helipad upgrade announced is part of the Malinauskas government's \$23.4 million investment to improve helipads at 13 regional hospitals across SA, enhancing safety and efficiency with larger landing areas, improved pathways, lighting, beacons and navigation equipment. Clare Hospital also benefits from enhancements to the Central Sterile Supply Department. These advancements will boost the hospital's capacity to deliver high-quality care, and maintain its reputation as a cornerstone of regional healthcare delivery.

The government's commitment to regional health care extends beyond infrastructure. Since 2022 we have also strengthened our regional healthcare workforce by recruiting more than 200 full-time staff, including 36 extra doctors, 162 nurses and 10 allied health professionals. Programs such as the Transition to Professional Practice Program, regional cadetships and scholarships are creating pathways for the next generation of healthcare workers.

These initiatives are critical to ensure that regional communities like Clare continue to benefit from skilled professionals who can meet their unique healthcare needs. Furthermore, our government is investing in dedicated mental health services for older South Australians through the Yorke and Northern Local Health Network and other regional networks. By expanding community health mental health teams with specialist roles, we are ensuring that older residents in regional areas receive targeted and accessible mental health care.

Clare Hospital is a shining example of what can be achieved when governments, communities and healthcare professionals work together with a shared vision. Its centenary is not only an opportunity to honour its past but also a call to action to ensure its future remains strong. The Malinauskas government is committed to providing the investment and support needed to sustain our regional hospitals, ensuring that South Australians, no matter where they live, can access the care they deserve. Clare Hospital stands as a beacon of progress and a testament to the power of community-driven health care. Let us continue to build on this legacy, working together to deliver a healthcare system that meets the needs of all South Australians.

#### **KAPUNDA BUSINESS ALLIANCE AWARDS**

**Ms PRATT (Frome) (15:35):** A few weeks ago, the Kapunda Business Alliance celebrated their inaugural awards, and I take this opportunity to recognise the recipients. Thirteen hundred votes were cast in support of Kapunda businesses in those inaugural awards. The awards recognise the highest ranking businesses in Kapunda based on Google reviews, with 34 businesses meeting that eligibility criteria of having at least 25 reviews.

The KBA committee, which is ably led by Chair Bridget Kimber, organised these awards in recognition of fantastic local businesses in Kapunda. I want to offer my congratulations to the following people and businesses. Peta and Troy Apps, who run the Prince of Wales Hotel, took out Business of the Year, which is extraordinary. They took on the pub just a few years ago. They have been making lots of improvements, building on their brand in social media and growing their business, possibly with local help, I am sure. They have brought back food offering, which really was impacted by COVID. They have introduced Wednesday night trivia, Thursday night poker and food van Fridays.

Maggie Bosankoe from Com Viet is a fantastic success story. She had two wins: Best New Business and Best Window Display. Maggie grew up in Vietnam, where her mother ran a restaurant, so is not any surprise that she loves cooking, but the story gets better. When she first saw the opportunity to have a stall at the Kapunda Makers Market, she jumped at it, but she has since moved to bricks and mortar in the main street, winning, as I said, Best Window Display. I am sure the member for Schubert will be pleased to hear that Maggie is going to be featuring at the Gather Round in the Barossa, where she has been chosen to set up one of the food stalls at the match.

Tim Daley and Paul Fisher from Anlaby Station, which is a proud landmark in our Light region, were awarded in recognition of innovation, transformation and sustainability. Hannah Heintze and Kayla Oliver from Pure Grace Handmade took Best Market Stall of the Season at the Kapunda Makers Market. They are sisters who started a small business selling crochet headbands, which are hugely popular. Their range has expanded to include placemats, coasters, stubby holders, earrings and, of course, their signature headband brands.

Peter and Andrea Duregon from Kapunda Home Hardware, helping all of those DIYers around Kapunda, took out Outstanding Customer Service. It is a recent acquisition for Peter and Andrea, who set out to improve the premises and provide that standard of retail in the main street. Sally Hunt from Sally's Treasure Hunt was named Retail Star. Sally's shop is just up the main street on Smedley, full of lots of intriguing little goodies.

Ben Feltus from Feltus Electrical was named Trade and Industry Star. He started his own business at the beginning of last year. Ben has quickly established himself as reliable, punctual and friendly, which we all love as customers. It is not hard to see why Georgia Tydeman from Beauty Vine Barossa took out Services and Community Star. She is always happy to put up her hand to assist in the community. Georgia's beauty business is a welcome addition to the main street. Finally, for these awards, Malcolm Johncock and the Kapunda Historical Society, museum committee and the volunteers were named Tourism and Hospitality Star.

For those who have not been to this place, you should do yourself a favour. This museum, while not privately owned, is run fully by volunteers. There is a fabulous display which tells the history of Kapunda and its surrounds. It is an opportunity to really understand the history of the town by walking through. There are displays of agricultural equipment; a motor pavilion, which contains Kapunda's old fire engine, an ambulance and a hearse; war memorabilia; the printing press that printed the first edition of the *Kapunda Herald* in 1864; and medical equipment, which includes an early X-ray machine and operating table. It is not for the faint-hearted, I would argue.

Secondly, I want to draw attention to an event that took place in Clare on the weekend that was hosted by the RFDS Clare group ably led by Christine and Colin; but, of course, there are all the volunteers who are on the committee. While the fellas could have bought their tickets, I think the girls worked out that it was an opportunity for a ladies' day, and I was happy to host my own table. Over 120 women flocked to the Clare Oval in support of not just this fantastic organisation, which represents Australia's largest waiting room, but it really was an opportunity to farewell the late Lee Burgess who was an enthusiastic member of the Clare RFDS group.

### **TEA TREE GULLY COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM**

**Ms SAVVAS (Newland) (15:40):** It is always a privilege to stand in this place and talk about what was, in fact, one of the largest commitments that I made in the lead-up to the 2022 election which was, of course, the transition of 4,700 septic tanks from the Tea Tree Gully Community Wastewater Management System to SA Water mains. It is something that I am incredibly proud of.

It was Labor who first committed to transition the tanks and only Labor who committed to transition all three stages of the tanks to SA Water and of course, also, only Labor who committed to scrap the \$745 levy that ratepayers in Tea Tree Gully were paying for the great privilege of being on a septic tank in favour of selling that system over from the council to SA Water and taking it over into SA Water ownership—and, let me tell you, it has been such an incredible project. I cannot think of anything quite like this happening in terms of the level of on-property works that is happening in my electorate at the moment, and of course we expected there to be a number of challenges.



There are so many homes impacted by this, and so many people's lives impacted by such a transition, but overall it has been so incredibly positive. I am very pleased to tell the house today that in the last few weeks we have hit our thousandth home, which is a huge milestone for the SA Water team, for the contractors at BTR and, of course, for us as a government who committed to transition these individuals' homes over to SA Water after some people being on the system for upwards of 40 years. I thought I might explain to you all a little bit about the system because it is, of course, incredibly complex and was actually stated in one report when I was a councillor as being the most complex system of sewerage in the country.

The Tea Tree Gully CWMS is, of course, not one system but 76 different systems of sewerage septic soakage trench, and the like, all connecting into each other with again roughly 4,700 properties when that transition commenced a few years ago. It is incredibly complicated, and the placement of those tanks is particularly complicated as well. We have examples of septic tanks being in people's master bedrooms, we have examples of septic tanks being under people's swimming pools and, of course, that was because for many years not only were the easements not listed on SA Water title searches but there was no central management of the system until the Tea Tree Gully council took it over some years ago.

It was, of course, a project way too big for a council to manage and a project way too big for the council to take on in terms of transitioning those individuals to SA Water. The right decision not just for the community and not just for the council but for each and every resident in Tea Tree Gully was for SA Water to take over that project and be responsible for putting our residents on SA Water mains.

We live in a metropolitan area in my community, and we have situations where on some main streets there is a house on SA Water, a house on septic, a house on SA Water and a house on septic all in a row; it is completely nonsensical. It has been such a privilege to see the progression of this project and be part of the progression of this project. I am so incredibly proud of the work that is being done, and I do want to give a shout-out today to the contractors, of course, at BTR who have been undertaking most of that work, and also our SA Water team who have been incredible.

We have a dedicated community engagement team in SA Water responsible for our Sustainable Sewers Program led by Ellie Ridgway, who is a local on the septics herself, and she has been absolutely incredible in driving the community engagement up in my electorate and has been a real source of knowledge as someone who is going through it herself with a septic tank at home and knows the system well and truly.

I would also like to acknowledge the Tea Tree Gully Community Wastewater Management System action group that did have around 200 residents. They are now defunct because we are doing what they asked us to do, but they continue to get in touch with me with questions, thoughts, concerns and comments about the process. We know that we would not be in this position and would not be bringing people into the 20<sup>th</sup> century—not the 21<sup>st</sup> century but the 20<sup>th</sup> century—if it were not for these community advocates led by Rose Morton, Adla Mattiske and others and if it were not for that incredible action group.

I am very pleased to be announcing today that we have hit that 1,000 tank milestone. I am incredibly proud. We are still doing a wonderful job and people are happy with the transition. I look forward to seeing thousands more tanks being transitioned, hopefully as I continue to be the member for Newland.

#### *Private Members' Statements*

#### **PRIVATE MEMBERS' STATEMENTS**

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:45):** In mid-February I wrote to Minister Kyam Maher on behalf of my community seeking two things: the public release of the dredging trial outcomes as soon as possible and a clear direction from the government on what their long-term plan will be. However, the response did not address either of those two points directly. Instead, I will quote the letter:

As you know, the State Government is committed to maintaining Adelaide's metropolitan coastline, now and into the future—

I am unsure if that means quarry sand for perpetuity. I will continue:

Since the conclusion of the operational phase of the dredging trial, the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) has been assessing the outcomes of the trial across a series of factors including water quality, seagrass and the condition of both placement and collection areas.

The final data analysis and assessment are currently being completed and will form the basis of advice to be provided to the State Government. As you would appreciate, these findings will need to be provided to the State Government to make an informed decision. I expect the report to be finalised in the coming months.

So, no timeline: one month, six months, 12 months—who knows? The letter continues:

DEW continues to engage with both the central and northern metropolitan beach communities to gather feedback on their respective observations and experiences during the dredging trial...

It continues:

I have asked for this feedback to be provided to me, along with the data and findings from the dredging trial, to inform the Government's decision on the future management of Adelaide's metropolitan beaches.

Bureaucratic speak, frankly, and lots of it. Three years in, the clock is ticking and the government continues to make our community wait while our beaches suffer.

**S.E. ANDREWS (Gibson) (15:47):** The Aussies are on, up on the Gold Coast. I am so pleased to say that Katrina Meehan, the President of the Brighton Surf Life Saving Club, came third and got a bronze in her Masters event for the Ironwoman competition. That is an incredible achievement, and she does that all the while being the president of the club. She is a fabulous mentor for all the young people in the club as well.

On the weekend I spent a fair bit of time out supporting tennis clubs in my community because, of course, grand finals were being held across the electorate. I am so happy to say that Warradale Park Tennis Club were premiers in the mixed division 1 team. I was then off to Marion Tennis Club, where I watched the div 1 and div 9 finals. They are a fabulous club who fought really hard to stay in Marion, with my assistance, after the council tried to kick them off their land.

I then spent the rest of the afternoon enjoying myself supporting the Brighton Tennis Club. They are a social club. The membership is open to all, but it is largely older people who are staying fit and healthy and enjoying each other's company while having a hit of tennis at the same time. They are an absolutely generous group of people and it has been lovely to be out and supporting them in their tennis.

**Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:48):** The Karoonda Farm Fair is alive and well, celebrating its 40-year anniversary last Friday and Saturday. It was a great event in the Mallee. Many came down to visit my mobile office over the two days and there were plenty of highlights to talk about. The agtech was there on display, as well as the farm machinery and the fashion parade—I did not get to participate this year, but I must say it really did demonstrate some of the great products on the catwalk. The South Australian yard dog comps were there and it was great to see some of the great dog breeders as well as the livestock breeders.

With the entertainment, the Funny Farmers and Wilbur's Wildlife were a great part of the farm fair, and they always have been. Ruby Thiele was the winner of the giant pumpkin competition and, at 104.5 kilos, what a specimen it was. I must say that the cooking section was very well attended and there was really tough competition. I was only able to pull off two silver medals this year—very, very disappointed. I want to thank Robin Hood as the chair, and his committee, Jenny, Gerry, Wade and Janine. They all do a fantastic job and it is a fantastic event.

I also want to just quickly raise that the GP concern at Karoonda is nearing completion and we will see a new GP starting there in a few weeks. It is great to see. I did talk to many farmers and growers. They were concerned about the drought. It is a concern in the Mallee. It is very dry. It is as dry as I have seen it in many, many a year and I wish them well with breaking rains.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:50):** It is a pleasure to reflect on the Mintaro Connecting Communities dinner held on 26 March at the Mintaro Institute. Representing the Hon. Clare Scriven, Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development and the Minister for Forest Industries, I had the honour of attending the Mintaro Progress Association event. A special thanks to the chair, Bek Holland, CEO Simon Millcock and the dedicated members of the association hosting me along with Mayor Allan Aughey and the local MP.

The association continues to demonstrate outstanding commitment to building community resilience. Their 11 events over the past year focusing on ageing well, health and wellbeing have attracted over 400 attendees, reflecting the association's dedication to fostering connections during challenging times. Supported by PIRSA and the Malinauskas government's Connecting Communities Events grant program, this dinner provides a welcoming space for our farming and agricultural communities.

With rural South Australians continuing to face challenges such as drought, the progress association has been instrumental in organising events like this to celebrate contributions, promote social connections and ensure vital services are accessible. The evening also launched the 2025 Clare Valley Festival of the Lamb program, a celebration of agriculture, tourism and culture. This exciting initiative will showcase local producers and foster connections that strengthen Mintaro's and the region's community ties.

### *Bills*

## **STATE DEVELOPMENT COORDINATION AND FACILITATION BILL**

### *Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 39.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Flinders, we are on clause 39, and you have had two questions.

**Mr TELFER:** If you cast your mind back to when we finished, the minister was halfway through an answer around—if you can remember, minister—a scenario that I put forward about a potential compulsory acquisition of land for an ideologically driven government on the environmental grounds of the CGO. That was my memory of the answer that you were halfway through.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I thank the member for Flinders for refreshing my memory. I have to admit, it is all turning into a blur of one blissful experience of clauses one after another. I think the point I was trying to make is it is readily conceivable that this is most likely to be agitated for either 39(1)(a) or 39(1)(b), and that if it was to be contemplated for 39(1)(c) 'a designated project', i.e. more likely a private proponent, it would be highly unusual that a landowner would find themselves subject to a land acquisition for a development which they were not otherwise a party to.

In response, the member for Flinders said, perhaps speaking with his experience as a member representing a regional constituency, 'What if there was an appetite for the purchase of land for ecological preservation-type endeavours?' That may qualify it for, I guess, one of those limbs under the state significance test, that environmental limb. Would it be of state significance or not? I guess it depends on what the quantum of land is that would be subject to that proposition and whether it was of genuine significance and relevance to the state, but I envisage it would be a very rare occasion indeed in that set of circumstances.

Nonetheless, if it did happen, then there are those protections under the Land Acquisition Act where, amongst other protections for the landowner, the government is required to pay for the property valuation services that the private landowner may need to inform them about what level of compensation they should be seeking as well as for their legal representation. The state would also be obliged to pay for that. Even in that context that the member for Flinders raises, with some justification, there are still inherent protections within this regime.

Clause passed.

Clause 40.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 40 speaks about when the CGO may take over state projects. It is an interesting juxtaposition really because we have been talking about how the CGO does not have expertise in project delivery and the actual practicality of infrastructure delivery, it has a planning perspective and a lot of the regulations that go with it, but it is a responsible agency (whatever that might be) that actually delivers it. Under what circumstances do you see a CGO taking over responsibility for a state project? Can you give me an example of what sort of state project you think would be one that a CGO may take over the responsibility of?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My advice is I think it is particularly conceived of projects in relation to state development areas, for example, where the CGO has already done an enormous amount of the up-front legwork determining what the precinct is or what the area is and what the area will require in terms of enabling infrastructure, facilitating infrastructure and so on. It may be that it is applicable to a discrete state development, but it would only be in that case, of course, where either the minister thinks it would be of benefit for the CGO to do it, whether it is referred to it by the Governor on recommendation of the government of the day, or if for example the CGO takes over a particular planning function that would otherwise be done by something like the State Planning Commission. There is no particular development in mind that we have, but it is able to be applied both within the state development area as well as in discrete developments.

**Mr TELFER:** Just further on from that, we have spoken already about there being limited resources that the CGO will have. They will be leaning on the expertise for this sort of thing from other departments. What resources will the CGO have at their disposal if they are in the scenario of taking over a state project? A state project in its own identity is obviously one which is a priority of the government and one which, at least a portion of it, has been completed already by a state department or agency. What resources will the CGO have and under what circumstances will that transition occur?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think I responded in reference to an earlier question towards the beginning of the bill that we will be making a budget allocation for the CGO in the state budget on the basis that, of course, the bill passes. So it will have its own resources, but again, it would have the capacity to draw on the resources of particular agencies that have their own functions relevant to a planning assessment of a development.

For example, if it is a state development it would probably call on some particular resources of the infrastructure department—potentially SA Water, the EPA, the environment department, as well as potentially staff within the State Planning Commission—in order to bolster its resources and make sure that in one area it has all the resources it needs to be able to consider all the facets of that development, (a) to make sure it has those resources, and (b) to expedite the consideration of the process and give it either a yes or a no to proceed.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, can you perhaps summarise what you see as the difference between a project that has received major project status from the government, which as a concept is about doing just this, streamlining processes and making a priority area for the state under that major project status, versus a project where it has been decided the CGO will take control of it? Are these two concurrent processes? Obviously, you have given many additional powers to the CGO through this process. How does that compare and contrast with the major project status versus what the CGO will be enabled to do?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** It is a really good question because on the face of it you would think: is there not already the capacity to be considering developments through that mechanism rather than through what we are proposing here? The major development declaration and process is quite different from this. It is very thorough, of course. I will stand corrected, but my recollection is that a project which has a major development declaration has to have an environmental impact statement, for example, which is an incredibly detailed environmental assessment that has to be produced and published and made available, which usually takes many months to put together.

The other difference is that the major development status project is considered through largely the existing regimes of a central planning agency with appropriate references to and discrete decisions from agencies around government. So there would be the going out and sourcing that information and a particular decision from the transport department, or from either the energy and mining department of that electricity infrastructure or perhaps the infrastructure department of that other enabling infrastructure, the environmental considerations from those agencies, water from SA Water, and so on. It is still that kind of central but satellite process that is not too dissimilar to the regular planning process as we know it today.

Indeed, certainly planning ministers in the past have said that the irony is that proponents used to race to get a major development declaration without realising that it could often procedurally be a veritable tar pit to wade through—it was incredibly onerous and cumbersome. Contrast that with

this process, where it is not a satellite arrangement but a centralised arrangement, and all the powers are brought to within the function of one entity, which is the CGO, enabling all those existing legislative provisions still to be exercised and those processes to be followed. But they are all exercised and followed by the one central unit, which means that it is done in a more coordinated, timely manner and is vastly more likely to give a quicker decision—yes or no—to the application.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, you talked about the major project status and how proponents are sometimes scrambling to get this declaration because they may see that there is an advantage to their project. With that satellite process—which you were talking about in regard to a major project status as opposed to a centralised one—do you think now with the CGO process there is going to be (and it probably reflects the debate we had probably a month ago) a scrambling from proponents advocating to not just the CGO but to the minister in charge, whoever that may be, to have the designation or declaration within one of those three aspects of the CGO process to be made?

If you see there is going to be a particular advantage for projects within this process, do you think there is going to be a potential scrambling? This is where we talk about trying to understand the resourcing component of the CGO. If this process is so much more streamlined than a major project status, do you believe that effort is going to be reflected in the amount that is trying to get this determination from the CGO?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Conceivably. I think industry generally has welcomed this reform, particularly because of what it promises in terms of more expedient decision-making. They might scramble for it and make requests for it, but that is quite different from actually getting it. Again, it is the CGO who effectively calls it in and it is the minister or the Governor who designates it to them, and it has to fulfill those criteria at the beginning of the bill. So there are some procedural and also some legislative hurdles that a proposition has to jump over. That is not going to stop a developer from saying, 'I want to carve that 900 square metre block in Seaton into three and build some townhouses.' It is not going to stop them from making the calls—

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Yes, that is right. Those requests will still happen, no doubt, but it is not likely that calls like that are going to get much consideration at all, because it does not meet the criteria of the bill. It is only likely that a CGO is going to be calling it in in practice, I think.

We have not discussed this during the committee stage more recently but we did earlier. Take the example I gave before about my electorate, or I should say the council area that my electorate falls into, the City of Charles Sturt. They have the WEST development—and I know that happened a couple of years earlier—which is the Port Adelaide Wastewater Treatment Plant redevelopment, the Metcash redevelopment at Kidman Park, and what the government is now doing at Seaton in redeveloping the public housing. Those are four really big, quite complex planning propositions forward.

After the planning minister usually gives their code amendment insofar as it is necessary, then the council will sit down and kind of nut that out with the proponent: where are the streets going in the middle of it, what is the density, where is the open space, and so on. But if you have all of those balls in the air, then the council might proactively request that it gets called in by the CGO so that their dance card is not quite so full and they can deal with the regular business that a council of that size would normally have in terms of planning applications.

So it may be that, for good procedural reasons, there are other bodies that ask the CGO to take those roles on. But in terms of an individual proponent going to the CGO saying, 'Can you please shove mine through your process rather than through the regular one?', they have some reasonably high hurdles to jump over in terms of the characteristics of the project in order for that to be considered.

Of course, it may be that, by the time this is implemented, if it passes the parliament and is established and staff recruited and that sort of thing, this government or a subsequent government might say, 'These are the things that we think are the most important'—there might be one or two state development areas and a couple of other projects that are of state significance—'get cracking with those.'

Even when a council quite legitimately says, 'Do you know what? We haven't got the bandwidth to deal with this. Can you take it on?' the CGO might say, 'I am sorry. If you want it dealt with quickly, you are going to have to do that because we don't have the capacity. We have a full dance card.' Unfortunately, the proof will be in the pudding. We will not know until we see this up and running, if indeed it passes the parliament.

Clause passed.

Clauses 41 and 42 passed.

Clause 43.

**Mr TELFER:** This clause, minister, talks about disallowable notices, consultation and publication. Clause 43(2) states:

- (2) Before a disallowable notice is published, the person authorised to make the notice must, in accordance with any requirements of the regulations, consult on the notice for a period (of at least 10 business days) determined by the person with any entity (including, for example, a council) the person considers would be affected by the proposed disallowable notice such that the entity should be consulted.

I am curious, minister, why this period of consultation is set at half of the length of the majority of the other consultation periods within this bill, being 10 business days rather than 20, which has been what most of them have been throughout the rest of the bill.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is a good question. Those other consultation processes of at least 20 days are for a normal type of consultation that would occur in the course of a planning assessment process. This is something quite specific, though. This relates to disallowable notices. They are *Gazette* notices made under the act that propose either a modification to, or an exemption from, an existing legislative requirement in relation to a declared project to be done on a once-off basis. This would be a notice that basically says that in order to consider this the CGO must follow all of the existing legislative processes that would otherwise be in existence under that act, whether it is the Mining Act or some other act that facilitates the approvals of particular developments.

But a disallowable notice can ask for a provision of that act or part of that process not to be adhered to, stepping away from that process. The existence of this clause is to try to provide some transparency and accountability so that that is not used as some wholesale mechanism to walk away from what those existing processes are and subvert the existing planning process. So it is making sure that it is gazetted in real time—again, that sort of transparency—and making sure that there is a period of time for those entities that would be interested in that gazettal notice or interested in that development, giving them at least two weeks or 10 business days to consider whether they are okay with ignoring that particular provision or whether they think it is a problem for them. I think that is really important.

It does not need the same amount of time as every other period we have spoken about to date in the bill—like you made reference to—but it does need a reasonable period of time, if the council says, 'Well, hang on a minute; you can't issue one of these disallowable notices for that part of the process; that's really important to us for X, Y and Z reasons and we need to be able to formally submit that to the CGO for their consideration before they move forward with that.' Similarly, I am advised that the minister has to concur with those disallowable notices as well. So there is kind of an external and internal check on that use of the disallowable notice by the CGO.

Clause passed.

Clause 44.

**Mr TELFER:** This clause relates to parliamentary scrutiny of the disallowable notices. Clause 44(2) provides:

The minister must cause a copy of a disallowable notice and the related report to be laid before both houses of parliament within six sitting days after publication of the disallowable notice.

I am curious as to why the period of time stipulated is six sitting days rather than three, given that a six-sitting-day timeframe can permit a minister to avoid tabling the notice for anything up to a month during sitting periods and three weeks on the back of a seasonal adjournment.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This clause was actually inserted into the bill post consultation. There was a request from one of the consultants: I do not have in front of me exactly who sought this change, but there was a request that not only would there be the gazetting of the notice and the consultation period but there needed to be a higher level, public level of scrutiny, so tabling something before parliament would be desired.

We have picked up the timeframe which, I am advised, is consistent with most other regulatory notices over which parliament has scrutiny. I would say the existence of this clause shows, firstly, how effective the consultation around this bill has been and, secondly, that we have just tried to pick up a regular way that parliament has scrutiny over these sorts of things.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 44(4) provides:

A resolution of a House of Parliament is not effective for the purposes of subsection (3) unless the resolution is passed within 14 sitting days (which need not fall within the same session of Parliament) after the day on which the disallowable notice was laid before the House under subsection (2).

On this basis, why can the parliament delay a disallowable notice for potentially up to six months if the notice is tabled at the right time—or wrong time, as it were?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is a good question. Again, we are advised that these are the same times that apply to the disallowance of regulations, and we were advised that this bill should not derogate any of the parliament's powers in respect of being able to disallow these sorts of actions. Remember, the disallowable notice is notifying the public—and in this case the parliament—that a legislative provision is not going to be adhered to.

Conceptually, if the parliament has required that there are provisions in order to consider a particular application and the CGO is saying, 'No, I'm going to publish a notice saying that I don't have to follow the law,' then the parliament, the lawmakers, should have the capacity to be advised that that is the case and have the capacity to disallow it. We have been convinced that that is an appropriate check and balance on the use of these notices.

**Mr TELFER:** Just on from that, obviously the regulations put forward are considered by the Legislative Review Committee. That process has been pretty fulsome in the surety that there are parliamentarians specifically tasked with looking at this as well. Do you think that would be something which would be replicated for a resolution such as this? What sorts of enhancements to the process do you envision?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My understanding is that, in the same way the Legislative Review Committee reviews all regulations tabled or at least has the opportunity to review them all, it will be the case for this as well.

Clause passed.

Clause 45 passed.

Clause 46.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, clause 46(1) states that a regulated applicant must:

...provide any report, information or material of a kind prescribed by the regulations in accordance with the requirements prescribed by the regulations.

Neither the clause nor the section stipulate a timeframe for the provision of a report to the CGO. Why is the timeframe left to regulation rather than legislation?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This is information which is being provided to the CGO by the applicant, so inherently they are motivated to do it as quickly as possible if they want the CGO to consider their application in a timely manner. We have not thought that, in that respect, it is necessary to prescribe a period of time. The applicant would be creating a rod for their own backs, figuratively speaking, if they were to delay providing the CGO with information that had been required of them.

Clause passed.

Clauses 47 to 50 passed.

Clause 51.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 51 obviously is the aspect around the annual report. This will be a pretty important couple of lines in this piece of legislation because, as you said, there will be a lot of eyes watching this at the parliamentary level but also part of the interest in this will be with industry and other decision-making bodies as well. Clause 51(2) states:

- (2) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving a report under this section, cause a copy of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

Why is the period of 12 sitting days considered necessary? To take this year as an example, an annual report is prescribed in clause 51(1) on 30 September, which is the last day permitted for an annual report to be submitted. The minister can choose to only table the annual report on the final sitting day of the year, for instance.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** This is a standard provision that exists across many pieces of legislation about the requirements for an annual report and the tabling of the annual report. It has been the custom, I think in all the time that I have been a member of parliament, that the parliament has usually sat for a minimum of 12 days, and often 15 days, across October and November. That ensures that it gets tabled each year.

I would also add that there are standard contents for every annual report published by government agencies or published pursuant to legislation that require certain information to be provided—so not just a statement of what the organisation is, but what they do, what they have been doing for the past 12 months, what they plan to do for the coming 12-month period, as well as standard financial information, human resources information, expenditure on consultants and contractors, advertising services and so on.

All of that is going to be of particular interest to the CGO, given that in previous clauses we have spoken about the need for not just other agencies to provide some staff and resources to support the CGO, but the CGO might engage their own consultants, for example, to undertake works to better inform them as they are going through the decision-making process. So that will be important for the parliament to understand what is being done by the CGO in order to consider these applications.

**Mr TELFER:** Obviously, this is creating an entity that has a lot of interest, as I have said, but also a lot of responsibility. Within the annual report itself, do you envision that there will be a thorough setting out of all the decisions that have been called in by the CGO and an explanation around the reasons for these decisions?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My advice is yes, also bearing in mind that at each stage of the process the CGO will be gazetting these notices as well. So hopefully the existence of the annual report further reinforces that transparency.

**Mr TELFER:** Does the minister expect that the annual reports for the CGO will also set out a summary of all declared coordinated projects or declared designated projects or declared state development areas or facilitated projects at summarisation?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** I think so. It will just be a question of, as I said, the minimum requirements for an annual report that are provided to the parliament. On my understanding, that includes the activities of the year that has been completed and a forecast or an estimation of the activities that are to be completed in the coming financial year. So at the very least, for those matters that you referred to for those two years, we would anticipate that being the case and that should hopefully be sufficient to capture the entirety of the CGO's activities. Whether that extends further into the past or is able to project further into the future I guess we will have to wait and see.

**Mr TELFER:** Or a combination of both, potentially. The only other aspect that is important to get clarification on, and whether it be included in the annual report, is the schemes that are created pursuant to schedule 3, which we have not got to get. In relation to those schemes and the associated scheme coordinators, do you think that this is something that will be included, and is there an expectation that this is included within the annual report as well?



**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That largely refers to schemes, such as an infrastructure scheme, and we would anticipate that if it is not captured in the CGO's annual report it may be because it has actually been determined by, for example, the planning agency. If that is the case, it is most likely to find its voice in their annual report rather than here. But it would be a component of the overall application that had been considered by the CGO, and the existence of that application and the work that has been done on it would be referred to in the annual report.

Clause passed.

Clause 52.

**Mr TELFER:** Clause 52 talks about regulations and fee notices. Treasurer, what new government fees are contemplated under the proposed subclause 52(4)?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** The concept of fees has been considered by government. This just provides the capacity to charge a fee. The government will have to make a determination about what that fee structure looks like. That determination has not been undertaken yet or completed.

I think there are two things, if I could foreshadow how the government is going to approach the setting of fees. One is we would probably want to charge a fee so that the CGO does not get clogged up with frivolous or noncomplying applications, but to balance that we do not want to be charging a fee regime that adds yet another layer of cost to the process. So we will be trying to strike the right balance that can tick those two criteria in setting whatever fees.

It is conceivable, for example, that if the CGO needs to undertake a particular investigation for the purposes of considering an application that might otherwise have been undertaken by the proponent themselves, that might mean that the CGO has the capacity to charge for that cost that is incurred. But we have to work that out; we have not settled any of that.

**Mr TELFER:** Obviously, the process that we have gone through over the last many sitting weeks has set out a number of different scenarios—ones where the CGO proactively takes control of projects, where local government submits that that process be considered, or a private proponent or a consortium of private proponents, really. Do you envision there will be a range in the fee structure? With the aspect here—which is very open: 'The Minister may prescribe fees for the purposes of this Act'—can I get an indication whether you see it as an administration fee, an application fee or a fee reflecting the amount of work burden that the CGO has taken on board to consider an application?

I think there needs to be a little bit of clarity because this is going to be something that eyes will be on and there will be local government areas, for instance, that will be keen to partner with the state government to put forward projects. I am not asking for a level, but can you categorise what type of fees you envision—application, etc., as I have said?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** In terms of charging some form of application fee, I think that is what is being considered at the moment, because we need to send a price signal of some form that we do not want frivolous or utterly out-of-scope applications being made and clogging up or bogging down the CGO, so we have to have that mechanism. To go to the other extreme, I do not feel that we are looking at a full cost recovery, pay-as-you-go-type service.

*Mr Telfer interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** That is right. Bearing in mind that we are trying to provide something which facilitates more expedient decision-making, we do not want to be introducing a new layer of cost burden on proponents when they are trying to get developments considered. However, in the middle of that is we will have to have a reasonable regime where if the CGO has a huge burden of work to undertake for a proponent who has perhaps met the criteria of state significance and so on but there are a lot of investigations that need to be done and so on, there would have to be some regime that the CGO can enter into with the proponent about who is going to bear those costs which would otherwise be borne by the proponent.

I guess with the Treasurer's hat on, we have to protect taxpayers from having to subsidise the costs that would otherwise be incurred by a regular proponent in pursuing an application as well.

But we do not have any of that detail sorted out. I guess the only two principles that I can affirm to the house are setting an application fee as a deterrent from frivolous applications, and not loading up the applicant with a whole new cost base which makes this process burdensome or financially onerous for them.

Clause passed.

Schedules 1 and 2 passed.

Schedule 3.

**Mr TELFER:** Minister, can you outline all the circumstances in which, as a result of the operation of this bill, the usual requirements of state or local government to consult communities on decision-making will be removed or restricted?

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** Can you repeat that question?

**Mr TELFER:** Yes, and I will give an example if you like. Can you outline all the circumstances in which, as a result of the operation of this bill, the usual requirements of state or local government to consult communities on decision-making would be removed or restricted? For example, in clauses 9 and 10 of schedule 3, a scheme coordinator can be appointed to develop a scheme, which details what infrastructure might be required, and then to deliver the scheme. Infrastructure is defined in schedule 3 to include parks, playgrounds, nature reserves, cycling parks, sporting and recreational areas, libraries, community buildings and multiuse local community facilities. My question is whether the usual requirements for consultation with councils and local communities when this sort of infrastructure is created are effectively removed by this bill.

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN:** My advice is that the external consultation processes that exist at the moment are not interfered with, so they will remain in place. There are impositions on the internal processes of considering applications within government. For example, if the CGO takes on that role, there are greater strictures around how long agencies have to respond to the CGO or that they have to make their own discrete determinations in order to allow for the consideration of an application. However, that is not the case with the external consultation processes.

When we are talking about community-type infrastructure like you have articulated, whether it is playgrounds, libraries, open space or whatever, all of that has to be located within the context of an overall development or declaration of state significance. In that context, it is likely to be part of a broadscale master planned housing development, for example, and those discrete considerations about where is the library going to go, is there enough open space, what about playgrounds—all of those external consultation processes—remain intact. They have a minimum of 20 days. What gets contracted is, I guess, the internal timelines and processes of government consideration.

Schedule passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (16:41):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**SUPPLY BILL 2025**

*Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (16:42):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending on 30 June 2026. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Treasurer, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Police) (16:43):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

A supply bill is necessary until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2025 receives assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the supply acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the Appropriation Bill. The amount being sought under this bill is \$7,681 million.

I will not speak at any further length about the bill, but I note that the Supply Bill is usually an opportunity for all members of the house to reflect on not just matters that may be relevant to the state budget but, in particular, the opportunities that they have had in the preceding financial year and the coming financial year to represent their communities and to highlight to the house some of the matters of interest or concern to their communities.

In that respect, I am very much looking forward to the contributions of members on the Supply Bill and, of course, their ultimate consideration of the bill. I seek leave to have the second reading explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

*Explanation of Clauses*

1—Short title

2—Commencement

These clauses are formal.

3—Interpretation

This clause provides a definition of *agency*. An agency is a Minister, an administrative unit, or part of an administrative unit, of the Public Service of the State or any other instrumentality or agency of the Crown.

4—Appropriation

This clause provides for the appropriation of up to \$7,681 million from the Consolidated Account for the Public Service of the State for the financial year ending on 30 June 2026.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Telfer.

**PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (ENVIRONMENT AND FOOD PRODUCTION AREAS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 19 March 2025.)

**Mr FULBROOK (Playford) (16:45):** I stand in support of this bill and from the outset I challenge anyone opposing it to step forward with their alternative suggestions. I have noticed in recent weeks an effort made by the opposition to somehow embroil the government of the day with the housing crisis while trying to paint themselves as saints, as if the whole problem suddenly erupted exactly three years ago. Anyone who knows anything about housing will know that this is not the case, and to carry on weaponising something as crucial as getting a roof over your head is displaying nothing short of complete ignorance.

As I said in my maiden speech, it took a generation to create this mess and it is sadly going to take this long to probably unravel it, so long as we have the nerve and the staying power to want to see this through to the end. We must be honest and accept that neither party, at both federal and state levels, are free from blame. While the opposition will be tempted to suggest it is all the government's fault because Labor have been in power for 19 of the last 25 years, it does not excuse them from the fact that they have only suddenly woken up to there being a housing problem.

They may not have been in government for the majority of the time, but they hardly raised an echo throughout and while I do not want my contribution to be tit for tat, for the benefit of trying to set this issue into some form or context, let us not forget that some of the most savage rises in average property values against average incomes happened when those opposite were last in office.

We should not also forget that their poster boy, former Prime Minister John Howard, was famously quoted as saying, 'Nobody ever complained to me about their house price going up.' What we are dealing with is the fallout of alarm bells ringing, maybe as early as 2004. At the time, the likes of then Prime Minister Howard and Treasurer Costello ignored them and in some ways you could hardly blame them. The issue was just impacting a small cohort of the community at the time, while the bulk of the electorate were arguably beneficiaries. So why would anyone flying high politically care, when it was just a small group of people missing out and buying a home, when all it really meant was that with a little bit more saving they would soon catch up and enter the market?

I should not necessarily be picking on 2004 as I reckon the multiple roots of this problem can be traced back further. Back then you could get an average home in Adelaide on around six times the average household income. This is data extracted from an annual report compiled by Demographia, which I read for the first time in shock horror as someone in their mid-20s working for the Property Council.

Their second report, published in 2006, incorporated Australian markets for the first time and funnily enough used language such as 'housing crisis' back then. It seems strange that only in the last few years has the political world, and indeed the media, brought this concept into the mainstream. While I hate to generalise, most of our leaders at the time had probably secured a roof over their heads many years prior when that average number had been much lower than six times the average household income. What was emerging was a major issue, but the commentary of the day did not see it like that.

I think we can all recall picking up newspapers and reading reports that celebrated another suburb joining the \$1 million club. It was a sign of the times, as if it translated into some form of national prosperity. While I have been critical of Mr Howard, there just did not seem to be a problem within mainstream commentary, while the issue quietly simmered in the background.

Gradually, over time, that number started rising, and today it means that in Adelaide you need 9.7 times the average household income to buy the average-value home. I use the 2021 census as a guide, knowing full well that we have travelled further in time, with the goalposts moving with it. If \$75,660 was the median household income that year and you needed a deposit of 20 per cent, just to give some rough, indicative numbers, it would take a deposit of around \$150,000 to enter the private housing market. In other words, slowly the chorus of cheers gradually started to subside and was replaced with jeers as, bit by bit, the beneficiaries started stepping towards retirement and as the have-nots began emerging into a loud and growing critical mass.

At this point in my speech, I want to remind the chamber that this neglect has made some people very rich. It then has to be asked: why should they be forced to abandon their wealth for something they would argue they have worked very hard to build? They cannot be begrudged, and nor should they be. These beneficiaries were simply following the rules and playing to the market conditions of the day.

While some of the things I have said could be described as being critical of the Liberal Party, I want to be fair and point out that the people sitting opposite me did not necessarily create the problem that I have described. Should they want to play politics on this they should be derided, but if they want to be part of the solution, then, on a personal level, I feel that they should be welcomed with open arms.

Taking a step back: when those in desperate need of a roof over their head see us squabble, their hope that we can somehow overcome what is a dog's breakfast diminishes. It is therefore imperative that we work in their best interests, or we run the risk of handing control of the problem to the crude and ill-informed political fringe. We must accept that time is arguably one of the key ingredients in addressing the problem and, with it, the reality that at some point, hopefully no time soon, governments change, and the last thing we need is to change the course and abandon this piece of the puzzle, which is in many ways part of the solution.

While I stress that this will help, as a government we are not putting all our eggs into one basket, knowing full well that there are other facets that must be considered and addressed as a way forward. The reality of the situation is that there is truth both on the left and on the right in restoring something we once took for granted. I think it is reasonable to suggest that the relaxation of the urban growth boundaries is something that has been coming from the right side of politics for some time.

To the historians in the room: you might want to look back at the calls made by Ross Elliott of the Property Council, who was championing this cause from the early 2000s. I am not saying I totally agree with Ross, but I do agree with him in many parts. I feel that what is before us is a reasonable compromise that will hopefully back in some of the points he has been arguing for decades. I stressed earlier that there is a lot of truth on the left side of the housing affordability debate that should not be dismissed either.

Some years ago we had an incredible bastion to insulate us against the problem, and it was called public housing. I could be dismissed by saying that we still have it now, but these days, after significant stock sell-off, it has been rebranded and repurposed as social housing. I am not saying the latter is wrong; indeed, we should be using our resources to put roofs over the heads of our most vulnerable. But, as Julie Macdonald from the Housing Trust Tenants Association points out, there is a big difference between the two.

Wind the clock back 40 years, or dare I say even 50 years, to when South Australia had an abundance of public housing that was a viable pathway for anyone to access. As I understand it, no matter your circumstances, if you wanted a house then the public market was a viable option to go through. Sadly, as time has gone by, the stock numbers have either been sold off or could not keep pace with increases in population, meaning we slowly lost something powerful. I say 'powerful' because it was a lever that governments had at their disposal to rein in any excesses seen within the private market.

It has now gone, and while we have seen some credible efforts by both the current state and federal governments to end the decline, it is a long road ahead if we ever want to restore the glory and collective benefits we once had with the Housing Trust. I can imagine that is an inconvenient truth to some, but to end the erosion we are seeing in housing affordability, some of the solutions are not going to be palatable to both sides of the debate. This is why compromise and staying power are significant in the road ahead.

I note *The Advertiser* on 28 March, which points out some interesting numbers. It points out the reduction in agricultural production on the rezoned land equates to an average of \$3.6 million and 19 full-time jobs, representing 0.01 per cent of current grain production and rising to only 0.23 per cent after 40 years. I am not here to say the loss of agricultural land is not significant, but when it is pointed out the changes before us will lead to a loss of 0.14 per cent of the four million hectares currently being cropped in our state, you cannot help but see the argument in a different light.

It should also be pointed out that, just because something is being rezoned, it does not equate to some form of compulsory acquisition whereby some Stalinist force removes farmers off their land to make them work in collectivised properties for the glory of the state. In fact, the legislation points towards numerous rezoning processes. None of these are triggered automatically through the legislation: it simply shows where they will be happening and due process, including significant community consultation, which will follow in due course.

The point must also be reiterated until we are all blue in the face: farmers will be free to keep their rezoned land as farms, and it will be up to them if they ever want to sell their properties. We should not pretend otherwise: this does present a loss in the current areas farmed, but in the spirit of compromise, we all need to work together in the hope we can manage what I see to be one of the biggest challenges facing Australia today.

But it does not just end with more land or restoring something like public housing: the future of tackling the problem could be considering changes to taxation, the planning and building approval process, building codes, training and what building materials we use, just to name a few. This builds on what I have been saying since I arrived here: we cannot afford to dismiss any suggestions at this point. Everything should be on the table, with experts on all sides of the arguments hopefully being mature enough to find consensus to plan a credible way forward.

This then takes me to the opposition's recent announcement of additional land for rezoning over what is earmarked for this legislative change. I imagine the tone of my colleagues may be more aggressive, but in the spirit of cooperation, it does suggest they are moving in a similar direction to where the government is heading in this matter. Again, I note the opposition leader in his quotes to *The Advertiser* on 29 March cannot help but take a swipe out of the government by stating how the housing crisis has become worse since Labor took power. I draw back to my earlier point that it is pointless trying to claim some form of partisan superiority on the problem when we all know it has been simmering in the background for decades.

I do wish to point out that what we are debating today is one by-product of the consultation process of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan. Perhaps there is a need to look at the areas the opposition is suggesting, but I would argue at this point let us stick to the land that has undergone thorough consultation rather than going down the rather humorous path of one side saying, 'Mine is bigger than yours.' That said, minus some of the political pointscoring, hats off to the opposition for beginning to realise that additional land releases are part of the recipe in tackling the problem, which grows by the minute.

In raising the consultation process of the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, I wish to place on record that I provided submissions both to the initial call for suggestions and in relation to the draft plan. Key to my suggestions was a relaxation of urban densities around our key urban transport corridors, in particular our railway lines. In a low-density city like Adelaide, we should count our blessings that we have as many operating railway corridors as we currently have. Personally, I would like to see a lot more, but for this to happen, we really need to extract bang for our buck from the money we already invest in these networks.

For this to happen, it is my view that an increase in the densities along these corridors would bring an instant customer base, therefore providing the rationale and trigger point to bolster services and making our urban areas less car dependent in the process. Another positive side effect would be the trigger of urban regeneration in areas that could do with a lick of paint.

Having said that, if you are quick to jump to conclusions you might suggest I prefer increased urban densities over urban growth. I would argue that while we are seeing a lot more subdivisions and a move to apartment living, fundamentally the Adelaide urban landscape has been made up of houses with large backyards. While they have come at some cost in stretching our finite resources to many front doors, this has also delivered significant benefits for decades.

It is my view that there is not one preferred method to structure our urban landscape. We have an abundance of large blocks, but what we need more than anything else is choice in the types of dwellings built across Greater Adelaide. As a basic rule the further you get from either a CBD—and let us be honest, there are quite a few in Adelaide—or a public transport corridor, the lower the densities should become.

We have people bemoaning the loss of the backyard but, let us face it, depending on where you are in your life a backyard may become a liability rather than an asset, so having hierarchical documents like the regional plan to help guide the process of the right dwelling for the right part of town is invaluable—and I take my hat off to Minister Champion for his invaluable work in guiding this process.

As mentioned, I do agree that some urban consolidation is necessary and desirable, but the reality is that squeezing 85 per cent of all growth through infill could be quite a challenge, especially if we are expecting our urban population to reach 2.2 million people by 2051. With this in mind, I feel the minister deserves another tick for injecting realism into the plan through the modest release of some additional greenfield development.

In the beginning of this speech I encouraged those with better ideas to come forward. I am going to end it with a challenge to the other detractors out there, the ones who advocate that we do nothing. We have planning laws to ensure that development and land use is managed responsibly and sustainably, balancing community needs, environmental protection, and economic development, so I challenge anyone who argues against this legislation, or the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, to envisage a world where this form of responsible government does not exist.

Adelaide, above most cities in the world, is testament to the benefits of good planning practice. While we have not always got it right, there are not too many cities in the world where either the grid, or a look in the direction of the hills or the sea, will save you if ever you start feeling lost. Ignoring these foundations will lead to urban design anarchy, which is on display in some cities across the world—some of which are rather close to home.

I have touched upon housing affordability and pointed out that there is much more to do, but this bill does sow some important seeds. As I see it, its key intention is to bolster supply and lower the pressure on supply that has triggered some of the adversity people have encountered in getting a roof over their head. Anything that helps to achieve this should be supported. With that, I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (17:03):** I would like to make a brief contribution on this bill and in so doing, recognise the importance of housing to our constituencies around the state. It certainly has risen over the time I have been in parliament—not that it was not important from the get go, but it has certainly risen over the time I have been in parliament to an issue of absolute primacy. It is one of the things we deal with most and about which we have the most correspondence forwarded to us, and there are truly some heart-wrenching stories that come before our office about people who are struggling to find housing and who find themselves in a real predicament when it comes to homelessness.

I have talked about it in this place before, but these are not always people you would ordinarily associate with homelessness. Quite often these are people with respected professions, families and quite upstanding lives who have, through no fault of their own, found themselves without a home to live in and with the stress and anxiety that comes along with being removed from a rental and having to find somewhere at short notice. It is clear that housing is an issue of absolute primacy across the state and that something needs to be done on that front, and releasing land is one way to do that.

There are, however, I think, some questions that this land release raises, and the first question that I would like to raise is with regard to planning. We often hear in this place, not least from the member for Kavel, about the poor planning that went into the Mount Barker settlement some 10 or 15 years ago that has left it without train services, without proper public transport facilities to get that now rather large population down into the city, into metropolitan Adelaide to fulfil the task or employment they might need to go to Adelaide to do. That is quite a real issue.

I would like to point out, for the people who have not noticed, that the significant development that is happening north of Adelaide already at Riverlea might well encounter those same problems. There is no train line that runs to Riverlea at this stage. It has a massive population that is growing quite quickly and it will inevitably reach a point where it has a critical mass of people moving in the same direction at the same time, trying to get from one point to the other.

I suspect we will have a similar problem at Riverlea in the not too distant future, where people will be crying out for improved public transport options and improved facilities, and by that point it will be too late to install a rail line or more suitable public transport options, and we will be left trying to fix the same mess that we are in at Mount Barker currently, notwithstanding that Mount Barker has an existing rail corridor.

As these new developments are released and this land is rezoned for housing purposes, I hope that proper planning goes into it to enable public transport and other required infrastructure services to be pre-planned and pre-installed. It would be far better if there were a rail corridor put aside there to allow for public transport to be provided from the outset, rather than having to come back to it later and find that does not fit.

On that topic, on the planning of significant developments, I have to say the stoplights that have been installed at Riverlea have been a tremendous burden—burden might be the wrong word—on my community. The dissatisfaction that my constituents have with those stoplights being placed at Riverlea is immense.

Successive governments of both persuasions have gone to great effort to remove stoplights between Adelaide—and I do not think, save for the one at Riverlea, there is a stoplight before Port

Augusta. That is how much effort went into streamlining that road and ensuring that it was a smooth, seamless transition from city to country. Now we have this extraordinary situation where, after that last stoplight was removed when the north-south corridor was finished and the concrete road was complete, we have this stoplight whacked in place at Riverlea, which now brings fully laden grain trucks on their way to Port Adelaide to a complete stop on the highway without much warning. It is really quite an extraordinary thing.

I remember taking it up with the previous Minister for Transport, the former member for Gibson, who informed me that once that development has sold a certain number of allotments they will be required to fund a grade separation of their own accord. I look forward to chasing that up with the current government and ensuring that they are held to account because the sooner that stoplight is removed from that road, the better. The sooner those trucks can continue to go unencumbered through that intersection past Riverlea, the better off my farmers will be in trying to get their product to port.

As part of these new developments, I hope that the proper planning is in place to ensure that the road infrastructure that we enjoy on Yorke Peninsula in the seat of Narungga is not interrupted by stoplights or any other road infrastructure that brings traffic to a halt, and if new infrastructure is required because of the quantum of residents that will be moving into these developments that a grade separation will be in place to allow for traffic to go over the top and rejoin in the proper way. That would be entirely appropriate.

As an aside to the Riverlea stoplights, I would like draw to the house's attention, if I have not already—I may well have done—the repeated efforts I have made to get warning lights installed at the Riverlea intersection that flash in preparation for a light swapping from green to yellow. It is quite an extraordinary thing the resistance the bureaucracy has towards these warning lights. Currently, there are warning lights there that flash repeatedly 24/7 and, as such, offer no warning whatsoever. It is like when we were at uni and people highlighted the whole page; it is just completely pointless to highlight the whole page because nothing stands out. These warning lights that flash repeatedly over and over again offer no warning at all because you have no idea when the lights are about to change.

If the trucks had appropriate warning, if those lights started flashing as the stoplights were about to change from green to yellow, they could begin their slowing down process confident they knew what was happening ahead of them. As it stands, they are none the wiser when they go past those warning signs. If the minister is listening or the government is listening and they want to revisit that infrastructure, we used to have it on Waterloo Corner Road when we used to come to town way back when, so you cannot tell me there is no precedent for it in this state. I vividly remember it happening at that intersection. It would be well worth installing that at the Riverlea corner.

So the first point I wanted to make about this is just the proper planning systems, which I have endeavoured to do, ensuring that there is no interruption for our traffic coming from the peninsula like we used to have before the Riverlea lights; ensuring that there is consideration for the proper public transport that should go there, including train services, which I suspect will be demanded in the not-too-distant future; and hoping that this work has been done to service what is an incredibly quickly growing area of our state.

The second point I wanted to make in the time that has been allotted to me is that it is wonderful to see the primacy of quality arable land coming to the forefront again. This was a debate that I attempted to have with very little support with the passage of the mining bill in the last parliament. I attempted to convince the entire parliament that our arable land is a precious resource, one that we cannot go around carving up and removing forever willy-nilly.

We need to have some sort of plan to preserve arable land and ensure that we continue to have enough stocked, moving forward, as our population grows, and it is wonderful to see that argument come to the forefront. It will be interesting to see as this bill progresses whether there is an appetite from the parliament to preserve this land at Roseworthy that is now being removed, because it is for certain some of the best arable land that we have in this state. We can cast our minds back some generations to Andrews Farm being carved up into residential areas. We have



Two Wells, which used to host wonderful farmland, and the number of homes, which are needed for sure, that now exist on prime agricultural land around Gawler and surrounds is quite startling.

The argument that we hear not just from this government but from proponents in successive governments, whether it is relating to mining or housing, is 'It's only a tiny percentage so it won't matter. We've still got quite a bit left.' Well, if we continually nip off tiny little percentages of arable land eventually we will get to all of it. No matter how small the bite of the pie is, if we take enough bites we will eat the whole pie, and I think we need to give some consideration to whether we are chewing off too much arable land as we go forward. No matter if we are chewing up 1 per cent or 15 per cent at a time, we are still chewing off bits and bits, and it will get smaller and smaller.

I am pleased this was able to be part of the debate as we have gone forward. I will be interested to see, as debate proceeds, whether it forms part of the discussion and whether there are any votes cast along those lines. Lord knows, with the season we had last year and the dry start to this year, of all the times that the agricultural industry needs our support in this place this might well be it, and sending a signal that the ever-decreasing amount of arable land is worth protecting and worth saving so we can continue to feed our population and export our goods would be a wonderful step in that direction.

In question time today we heard the Premier make a brief reference to other factors that are reducing arable land as well. There is no doubt that weather patterns do seem to be changing and that some arable land that used to have been reliable in previous years might now be decreasing in terms of its reliability and its variability when it comes to good seasons. With that, with taking out chunks of our arable land as well, and with mines and residential developments too, we are getting a decreasing amount of arable land that is worth preserving. We will need to make a stand sometime soon, I think.

I look forward to seeing that progress. As I said from the outset, I do not mean this to be interpreted as a speech denouncing a housing release. There is certainly a dire need for more housing in our regions. But I suspect that if you live in Adelaide you need to be prepared to live in a more densely populated region. You might well need to accept that if you are accessing the services and opportunities that exist in a metropolitan city it might mean forgoing some of the comforts that those of us in regional South Australia enjoy. There are certainly quite a few side effects of enjoying those creature comforts, not least of which are the health services and other essential government services which I have been campaigning on in the last couple of weeks and which do not appear to be as fulsome in regional South Australia as they are in the city. So I would like to make that point. I hope that the proper planning has gone into these new releases.

I know that, having talked to the minister about the proposed land release on the western side of the highway near Dublin, there would be significant infrastructure costs associated with pursuing that parcel of land and it was indicated to me that it might well necessitate another stoplight being installed to ensure that the population that might inhabit that land could get out onto the highway. That is the last thing we need. If that were the case, I am sure that my community might have second thoughts about supporting such a release—but we know, of course, that housing is required. I look forward to seeing the passage of this bill, how debate proceeds and whether there are any votes held.

**Mrs PEARCE (King) (17:15):** South Australia like the rest of the nation is in the middle of a housing crisis. My local community is not immune to this. When I am out on the doors and meeting with my local community I hear from young people who are just absolutely dying to be able to step into their first home, whether it is in the rental market or buying their very first home. I hear from parents who want their children to be afforded the same opportunities and choices that they were when they stepped into the housing market, and likewise grandparents and the like.

They have seen changes in the trends of housing within South Australia over the years, they have seen when maybe some poor decisions have been made and the impact that has had, and they want government to learn from this and that when we are planning and moving forward we are putting the right measures in place so that those coming up and into the housing market have adequate options with adequate infrastructure as well.

It is no secret that Adelaide is one of the most liveable cities in the world—there are so many amazing testaments to what makes it special—and we certainly want it to stay that way as well. That is why it is absolutely crucial that we do adapt our policies and continue to develop our communities to be able to protect what makes our great state and city special.

A key initiative of the government's Housing Roadmap and the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan is to be able to ensure that there is an appropriate supply of serviced land to be able to meet both the current and emerging housing demands that we have. In fact, it was a matter that was raised last night at community cabinet, which was hosted in my local community. We had reflections from residents in the area saying that we need more housing but we need to be able to do that right. We need to have the right infrastructure—connections to water, connections to sewerage—we need to make sure we have health infrastructure in place, schooling opportunities available and that all the other amenities that make a local community special and great are considered and put into the planning that we do as we address housing. That is certainly something that we are getting onto as well.

People from all over know that is SA Great, and that is why they are choosing South Australia as a base—and who can blame them? There are almost 12,500 more businesses operating in South Australia compared with the number of businesses operating at the 2022 state election. There have been 73,000 jobs created since the 2022 state election, 54 per cent of which are full-time. We are a city that will reach 2.2 million people by 2051, and it is no secret that the commencement of AUKUS is driving and will continue to drive employment and innovation in our state, while our mining and mineral sector continues to also remain strong.

With this unstoppable growth and potential, we do need to ensure that we as a government plan well for the future and that does include ensuring that we have adequate housing and communities set up and in place for the workforce that we know is to come, in addition to what we already know is needed. This is why our state government has launched the Greater Adelaide Regional Plan, more commonly referred to as GARP. This strategic plan identifies where 315,000 new homes will be built over the next 35 years, and it is done in a way that preserves important land for future infrastructure requirements. Additionally, no new general infill development areas have been planned, and the GARP has removed the former objective in previous versions which targeted 85 per cent of future housing being infill projects.

We have seen the outcomes where proper planning has not taken place. Poor planning has cost communities lost amenities, productivity and increased taxes. I do not think there are many of us who have not heard from residents who have been impacted, where roads soon become congested, parking is an issue and there are issues getting into local schools and the like, and we need to take all of this into account to make sure that they are adequately addressed moving forward in the actions that we are taking.

That is why the areas that have been identified for new homes are already connected to infrastructure, have infrastructure commitments in place and are all located in areas where future investment in infrastructure is planned. Having all of these components thought about in this process is just as important as putting the bricks and mortar on the ground. We want to get this done right and we want to do it in the most efficient way that we possibly can. By 2050, Greater Adelaide's population is expected to grow by an additional 670,000 people, and GARP sets a clear direction for coordinated strategic growth.

Last year, our government proudly launched the South Australian Housing Roadmap, a coordinated response to get more South Australians into safe, secure and affordable homes. In order to deliver more housing, our government is implementing a wide breadth of measures. We are making sure that we have the right people for the job, with a record level of investment in skills and training which will ensure we have the trades available to construct these new homes.

Importantly, the tech colleges that we are building across our state will play an important role in this. I am really pleased to see that we will have one out in the north-eastern suburbs to support developments in skills that we know are needed for the jobs of the future and the communities that they will be needed in as well.

I have spoken to many parents in my community who are concerned that their children may never get to live out the Australian dream of owning their own home, as they were able to do decades ago. Just as importantly, which I have mentioned earlier, is also having the choice of the home that they wish to live in that suits their needs now and well into the future as well, which is why we have delivered financial support for first-home buyers by abolishing stamp duty for eligible homebuyers who want to buy or build a new home and expanding the First Home Owner Grant as well.

I am proud that this government is on track to deliver the biggest investment in public housing in decades, fast-tracking construction with over 1,025 homes projected for completion by 2026, which, as we all know, is right around the corner, because we all know that public housing for those on fixed or low incomes is a critical element of a fair and inclusive society. Again, it was another matter that was raised last night at community cabinet. I am really happy to see that what we are putting in place is being reflected in the desires from local communities.

I know that renters in my community were very pleased to hear of this government's commitment to support renters with innovative and balanced solutions, such as our 2023 major tenancy reforms and investment in affordable living. We are also coordinating and investing in public infrastructure like water and wastewater projects. Again, as I have already reflected, we have recognised decisions that were made in the past, where maybe bricks were put out before we had the infrastructure in place. If you come out to the north, you can see it now going into the ground. We are working very, very hard to get that done. There is a need to make sure, moving forwards, that we do what we can to have adequate infrastructure put in place before we take those next steps.

We know that water and wastewater infrastructure simply did not keep pace with the ever-growing developments, especially in the northern suburbs where development is occurring across 25 kilometres from east to west. That is why our government will invest an extra \$1.2 billion over the next four years, along with other investments included in SA Water's 2024-28 delivery program to be able to deliver services to an estimated 40,000 new homes, including an extra 17,000 new homes in the state's growth areas.

As part of the state's biggest ever land release, a patch of land right in the corner of Golden Grove has been unlocked for new development. It is something that I have engaged heavily with my community on. They want to see this release. They are very eager to see homes coming up in our local community, but again, it is about getting this done right, making sure we have the right infrastructure and amenities in place to make sure that it complements our existing community well.

They made their messages clear. The community certainly would like to see that it is complemented well in terms of our infrastructure and planning, that our roads, hospitals, schools and shopping centres are able to service the local community that we have developing in the area, as well as public infrastructure such as the footpaths and bus shelters being also up to scratch. That is certainly something we are taking on board and working very closely on to make sure that this development is the best it can simply be.

No matter where we are developing, these principles should remain the same, and that is what this legislation aims to achieve. This is one of the key features of GARP, that land for community and social infrastructure is identified early and upfront. We can lock in land for schools, for hospitals and our emergency services early, which does have a significant strategic and financial advantage for state government but also local communities.

This also leads me to some great news: I am beyond excited to hear that we have committed to the Northern Parklands. Knowing the popularity of our already treasured Cobbler Creek Recreation Park, I know how much of a gem that this will be for our northern local suburbs. I am a firm believer that the northern suburbs deserve just the same investment and intention as other areas, and that we rightly will treasure a parklands just as much as our local Parklands in the city are treasured as well.

Our government has committed \$53 million towards the first stage of the Northern Parklands, and it will serve my neighbours and emerging growth areas inclusive of Angle Vale, Kudla and the Gawler River. At maturity, our new Northern Parklands will cover almost 1,000 hectares of land, which is 39 per cent larger than the Adelaide Parklands, at the heart of which will be a 70-hectare village green and a sport and recreation area, which is actually going to be equivalent to 31 Adelaide

Ovals in size. I cannot stress enough just the size and the scale of what these parklands will be, and all the benefits that they will be able to bring to those who live and visit the northern suburbs.

The playing fields will include ovals, courts and clubroom facilities, and it will also be home to numerous local sporting clubs. I am really excited in thinking about the community connections that are going to be formed in this space. I have talked many times in this place about the importance of sport and the benefits that it brings to an individual, both physically and mentally, but what is just as important is the way that it brings people together and the benefits that that has. It is often our grassroots that are there to support people in tough times, and we want to see more of that, more connections in local communities occurring. It is certainly going to be achieved when we are looking at such a major project in the northern suburbs.

I am also pleased that more than 760 hectares will be preserved for natural green open space that will support greater biodiversity and help increase habitats for native animals. I know firsthand how much that is treasured in my local Cobbler Creek. Residents love being able to walk through and see the native wildlife and the like, and there are a lot of projects that are happening with local volunteer groups in the area in terms of the vegetation that we are planting to draw more in, all the way from butterflies to kangaroos and beyond.

We know that we are SA Great, and everyone across the nation knows that too. We want to make sure that Adelaide remains one of the most liveable cities in the world, not just for us, but for our children and their children too, and that means it is absolutely crucial that we adapt our policies and that we continue to develop our communities to protect what makes our state and our city special.

We need to ensure that there is an appropriate supply of serviced land to meet both current and emerging housing demand, and that is exactly what our government's Housing Roadmap and the GARP are doing. I certainly commend this bill to the house.

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Stuart) (17:28):** I certainly would like to have the opportunity to talk on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Environment and Food Production Areas) Amendment Bill 2025. As a regional person, I agree with the member for Narungga and others who have said that homelessness and the availability of new homes and land for houses is of the utmost importance to people not only in the metropolitan and outer metropolitan areas but also in regional South Australia.

We need to make certain that what we do with the zoning and release of this land ensures that the areas that are being released are the most opportunistic and the most economical, not only for the houses but also for future generations. In Port Pirie, for argument's sake, we have plenty of land. We would certainly welcome the minister releasing more land around Port Pirie and other locations in regional South Australia as part of that.

Going back to the member for Narungga's comments, I can remember many years ago where the market gardens used to be on the northern side of Adelaide around Two Wells, Virginia, Roseworthy and places like that. Now all of a sudden it has been rezoned, and lots and lots of houses are going in there. The fact is that is not only arable land. It has been mentioned previously that this proposal will only take up 1 per cent of arable land in all of South Australia.

Arable land includes land not only for the grain producing sector and cattle and sheep grazing but also for market gardens for the food that we all enjoy. I am sure that in regional South Australia around Port Pirie, where we had market gardens many years ago, you will not see any market gardens growing up there because of the climate and also the unavailability of water. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

At 17:31 the house adjourned until Wednesday 2 April 2025 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

In reply to **Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop)** (31 October 2024).

**The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Wellbeing):** I have been advised:

The remuneration of the 6 (six) positions referenced relate to roles that are based at the Mount Gambier and Districts Health Service (Mount Gambier hospital) and include the following:

Remuneration band \$686,000—\$726,000

- Staff Medical Specialist, Anaesthetics
- Staff Medical Specialist, Emergency Medicine

Remuneration band \$446,000—\$486,000

- Staff Medical Specialist, Oncology
- Staff Medical Specialist, General Medicine
- Staff Medical Specialist, Emergency Medicine (2 (two) positions).

*Estimates Replies***DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT**

In reply to **the Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining):** The Department for Infrastructure and Transport advises it estimates that Access Taxis contributed \$192,000 under the transport service transaction levy in 2023-24.

**DEPARTMENT FOR INFRASTRUCTURE AND TRANSPORT**

In reply to **the Hon. V.A. TARZIA (Hartley—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 June 2024). (Estimates Committee A)

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Energy and Mining):** It was the former Marshall government that privatised our train and tram network. Part of the privatisation included a secret plan to reduce security on the rail network.

These cuts by the Marshall Liberal government included:

- Reduction in the number of Passenger Service Assistant (PSA) roles, from 93 to 63, to cut costs for the potential contractor.
- Removal of PSAs from services after 7pm each night.
- Elimination of fixed security officers on trains, to be replaced by mobile security teams across the network.
- Proposed staged implementation of the mobile security teams.

On the contrary, the Malinauskas Labor Government understands the importance of improving safety and security across the public transport network.

The Department for Infrastructure and Transport (the department) employs several regular and ad hoc security measures to provide a visible deterrent, as well as to attend to incidents that occur. Wilson Security, as part of contracts with the department and Keolis Downer Adelaide (KDA), provides physical security presence consisting of on-board guards on train services, roving guards on tram services, mobile patrol cars servicing the bus and train network, and 24/7 CCTV monitoring.

There are collectively 175 prescribed officers and passenger service assistants prescribed under section 57 of the Passenger Transport Act 1994, to undertake certain compliance or revenue protection duties.

As part of the state government's commitment to bring train services back into public hands, an additional 23 passenger service assistants will be employed on Adelaide Metro trains, which will bolster our overall resources to assist in cracking down on fare evasion and anti-social behaviour across our public transport network.

The supply and installation of new protective bus driver screens which will soon be rolled out across the Adelaide Metro fleet. This \$7.5 million initiative aims to assist in protecting bus drivers from the risk of physical assault

and anti-social behaviour. Screens will be fitted on all 940 government-owned buses, with the rollout having commenced on 21 January 2025, and will be completed by the end of 2026.

I have also tasked the department to explore options to give the department the ability to ban offenders from public transport and introduce tougher penalties; currently, only South Australia Police has the power to ban people from public transport.

The department advises that in 2023-24 there were 184 reports of physical assault on the bus network, 95 on the train network and 18 on the tram network, reported to the department.

The state government acknowledges the importance of passenger safety and the wellbeing of all South Australians, and such behaviour is unacceptable on our public transport network. Our initiatives are to crack down on this behaviour unlike the Liberal Party who planned to reduce security on the rail network.