LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Wednesday, 15 November 2023

The PRESIDENT (Hon. T.J. Stephens) took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:01): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable petitions, the tabling of papers, the giving of notices of motion, questions without notice, statements on matters of interest, notices of motion and orders of the day, private business, to be taken into consideration at 2.15pm.

Motion carried.

Members

MEMBER'S LEAVE

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (11:02): I move:

That leave of absence be granted to the Hon. D.G.E. Hood until 31 December 2023 on account of medical treatment.

Motion carried.

Bills

HYDROGEN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 November 2023.)

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (11:03): I take the opportunity to thank all those who have made contributions so far on this bill. This is, after all, a bill that will have a profound impact on our state for our positive future. A number of comments were made during the second reading contributions, and I think it is fair to say that, during the briefings that have made on the bill to honourable members who have sought them, they have certainly been taken into account and we appreciate all of those who have been willing to provide feedback. My understanding is that most, if not all, of those have been addressed in some way.

I will be happy to provide more specific feedback on some of the comments that have been made when we go into the committee stage and look at the clause by clause discussions. However, I think this is a bill that, as the Hon. Mr Hanson referred to yesterday, has a lot of analogies in terms of the opportunities that we have going forward. Mr Hanson, of course, referred to a copper rush, I think, and that was following the discussion, or the observation, by the Hon. Mr Simms that this was potentially being referred to as a new gold rush.

What I think is particularly relevant is that there are the opportunities here for South Australia to be leading the way in many different ways. We talk about how Western Australia has had a boom in recent years, and the Premier has referred, as has been observed by members in this place, to the opportunities that, for example, Victoria had back in the 1800s. With the opportunities presented

by hydrogen, there is the potential for South Australia to experience similar levels of growth, similar levels of investment in today's terms, and similar levels of excitement within the state.

This is something that as a state we should be proud of. This government is committed to renewable energy. We have a strong record already that we stand upon. We have a strong record in terms of solar energy. We have a strong record in terms of wind energy, and now we have the opportunity for hydrogen to similarly contribute to our credentials for renewable energy. Existing renewable project frameworks have served the state well, helping us to reach over 70 per cent renewable energy, and it is clear—

There being a disturbance:

The PRESIDENT: Minister, sit down for a sec. I have a good idea, the Hon. Mr Wortley: take it outside. That is now warning number 20. It was 19 yesterday. Today is 20. I can see a privileges committee coming on.

The Hon. R.P. Wortley: Is that a threat?

The PRESIDENT: No.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I will say again—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Existing renewable energy projects and frameworks have served this state well, helping us to reach over 70 per cent renewable energy, and it is clear that the world is headed for a new wave of large-scale hydrogen and renewable energy development.

Gigawatt-scale renewable energy projects are necessary to manufacture green hydrogen, which can be used as renewable energy firming, closing the gap in renewables that is currently met by gas and interconnection with coal-addicted states. This change in scale and complexity demands a single end-to-end framework that can consider the needs of the environment, landowners, communities and the state's strategic and economic ambitions.

We already have dedicated regulatory frameworks for other natural resources like minerals and gas, but we are missing a dedicated framework for one of our highest quality natural resources: our world-class wind and solar. In response to the Leader of the Opposition in this place yesterday, who asked why this is needed, that is exactly why it is needed: an apolitical, technology agnostic, regulatory framework to govern large-scale hydrogen and renewable energy projects.

To the north-west of Port Augusta and Whyalla, we have some of the most abundant prospective wind and solar resources, not just in this country but in the world. These are the best examples of coincident wind and solar resources that you will find anywhere, the kind of resources one might say other countries only dream of. It is almost the equivalent of finding oil in Saudi Arabia, in addition to what we mentioned earlier, such as finding gold in Victoria. That is why we have seen sudden interest from international investors, following global geopolitical events which have outlined or even underlined the need to diversify supply chains and move away from traditional fuels.

Our regulators are renowned globally, so they relish the opportunity to draft fit-for-purpose legislation. The consultation, I am advised, has been comprehensive. Certainly, the minister in the other place considered it was perhaps the most comprehensive consultation that he has witnessed on a bill. The government released an issues paper in late 2022 and a resultant draft bill was released in May 2023, with the government receiving nearly 200 submissions throughout the consultation.

Since the beginning, the advice of our First Nations people was sought on the design of the reforms. The state hosted two South Australian Aboriginal Renewable Energy Forums in Port Augusta—one in November 2022 and the second in March 2023—to understand the issues and challenges impacting on Aboriginal groups and to discuss opportunities to work together on the development of renewable energy.

There was a regional visit, dedicated workshop and follow-up online webinar delivered for the pastoral community to support quality engagement with the government on the draft bill. A total

of 18 information sessions were conducted across South Australia's regions during consultation. Two online webinars were held and recorded, with over 200 recorded attendees. There were dozens of meetings with key stakeholders and individuals and an extensive conversation, which will continue once this bill does pass—in the event, of course, that it does, which is our hope.

The government will continue to work with all stakeholders and rights holders to develop the associated regulations and to move forward in identifying the first release areas for competitive tender under this framework. This landmark legislation gives South Australia a real opportunity to help decarbonise the world.

Hydrogen for renewable energy firming is just one application, and there are other applications that can further our decarbonisation efforts. Steel, for instance, accounts for between 12 and 15 per cent of the world's carbon emissions. There is no foreseeable future anywhere in the world where steel is phased out and we stop using it. Steel needs to be decarbonised, but presently it is hard to abate. One method to abate it is by using green hydrogen.

South Australia has the world's best magnetite resources to the west of Whyalla, and locally we have a population that has social licence and is well trained. The projects made possible by this legislation could allow South Australian companies to decarbonise those products here and export them to those countries using our vast renewable resources, using our vast magnetite resources, using our smelters and ports to export a decarbonised product that will not attract looming carbon import taxes.

Both domestic and international steelmakers need hydrogen-based iron to reduce their carbon footprint, to help achieve the global goal of reaching net zero carbon emissions by 2050. South Australia is one of the few locations in the world where renewable energy and iron ore sources are co-located, putting the state in a prime position for boosting export potential of green iron or green steel. This proposed legislation is a sensible and necessary step to achieving our decarbonisation aspirations, and I commend it to the chamber.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, you are on your feet.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Yes, I am. Mr President, I am not on the list to speak.

The PRESIDENT: No. The Hon. Mr Pangallo, the debate has been concluded. If you wish to make a contribution, if we get to clause 1 that would be your opportunity to make a contribution.

Bill read a second time.

Referred to Select Committee

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (11:13): By leave, I move contingent notice of motion No. 3 in an amended form:

1. That the bill be referred to a select committee of the Legislative Council for inquiry and report.
2. That the committee consist of six members and that the quorum of members necessary to be present at all meetings of the committee be fixed at four members.
3. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

I have already outlined in my second reading speech the rationale for this committee, but to make it very clear to this council, the Greens have always been open-minded on the proposal that the government has put. Indeed, my default position when it was canvassed during the election was to be supportive in principle of the proposal, but we always said we wanted to see the detail. We did try over many months to get briefings with the government. We did eventually secure one and that was a welcome breakthrough for us, but it would have been good to have had the opportunity to dive into this bill in more detail.

That is why I will be moving to refer this on to a committee, so that there is an opportunity for the parliament to scrutinise in greater detail the implications of this bill. What are the implications for the environment? What are the potential implications for native title? What are the implications for

our economy and do the benefits stack up? What do the individual provisions of the bill mean? How do they interact?

I think there is a dangerous precedent being established in this parliament; that is, when the government has big picture projects, they seek to rush them through with limited scrutiny. I really urge crossbenchers in considering this proposal to consider their role in this place. It is not the role of the crossbench to acquiesce to the government of the day. People do not vote for crossbench members because they want them to simply wave through the legislation the government presents. They vote for a crossbench because they want bills scrutinised.

This is not about trying to delay or stymie the government; it is about ensuring that we do our due diligence as a parliament and consider a significant proposal, so I urge crossbenchers in particular to turn their minds to their role when they consider this question.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (11:16): I want to remind members of what I said just a few minutes ago in the summing-up around how much consultation has happened on this. That was consultation with stakeholders and with the general public, all of which we have all had an opportunity to be part of in addition to formal briefings within the parliament on the final draft bill, so therefore the government will be opposing this motion.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (11:17): I rose yesterday in support of Mr Simms's contingency motion, and I rise again today to reiterate that support. I also reiterate Robert Simms's call to the crossbench.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Robert Simms.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Apologies; the Hon. Robert Simms. I urge the crossbench to think very carefully about their decision today on this contingency motion. This bill is an incredibly technical bill. I note that we were receiving amendments filed by numerous members only just yesterday on this bill. I think many of us have not had an opportunity to really consider those amendments properly, and I think that, certainly from the opposition's point of view, it is absolutely pertinent that this parliament do its due diligence when it comes to these significant bills, bills that have the power to, in particular, have significant impact on landholder and landowner rights. So I again urge the crossbench to think about that when they are considering the Hon. Rob Simms's contingency motion.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (11:18): I rise briefly to address the comments that have just been made. If it has to be said in relation to amendments, I would urge the opposition to heed the same advice that has just been provided to us.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. BONAROS: No, we have had this issue time and time again when it comes to amendments being filed in the same week that we deal with a bill.

The Hon. N.J. Centofanti interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I urge the opposition to not make a suggestion that anyone on this crossbench has not done their due diligence just because they do not agree with you, and with respect, in this instance, with the Hon. Robert Simms. That does not mean that we have not done—I have not done—my due diligence. If that is the suggestion—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C. BONAROS: If that is the suggestion of the opposition, then I will remind you of every occasion that you have come in here and made a decision that suits you. I have done my due diligence. I have looked at the work and I am not going to be criticised by you about the work that I have done on this issue. Other members in this place can speak for themselves. I speak for

me and I will not take a criticism from the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, or indeed anyone else in here, about whether or not I have done my due diligence.

The PRESIDENT: I am going to put the question that the motion in the name of the Hon. Mr Simms be agreed to.

The Hon. C. Bonaros: And we don't need the smirks either.

The PRESIDENT: You can actually be silent, thanks, while I am speaking.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes 6
Noes.....9
Majority 3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.	Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.
Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.	Simms, R.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Game, S.L.
Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.
Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)	Wortley, R.P.

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.	Martin, R.B.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Hanson, J.E.	Franks, T.A.	El Dannawi, M.

Motion thus negatived.

Parliament House Matters

CAR PARK SECURITY INCIDENT

The PRESIDENT (11:25): Just before we commence the committee stage, I wish to update members concerning yesterday's security incident. At around 4.45pm yesterday, a black Audi sedan forced entry to the Parliament House car park by driving through the closed roller shutters. The driver approached staff, who refused entry. Protective services officers responded, together with South Australia Police. After inspecting the vehicle, police determined that it posed no immediate risk. Shortly after 11pm last night, the man was observed re-entering the car park, and protective security officers responded. The man was later arrested. Police advise that they do not consider the incident an intentional attack on Parliament House.

Bills

HYDROGEN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BILL

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: There are issues I wanted to talk about in relation to this bill. They are issues that are not specifically set out here but where the bill nevertheless is likely to have a significant impact. I have a particular interest in the effect of the interaction of this bill with the Electricity Corporations (Restructuring and Disposal) Act 1999 (the ECRD Act). The primary continuing effect of section 3 of schedule 1 of the ECRD Act is to provide a big discount on the rates a council can lawfully levy on land used for electricity generation. The ECRD reduces rates for

electricity generators, and that loss in revenue must be made up by charging higher council rates to all other ratepayers.

I refer to the ECRD rates clauses as the clauses which create this effect. The ECRD clauses are a form of corporate welfare for electricity generation companies, which is paid for by home owners, businesses, primary producers and other hardworking Australians. Through my questions today, I hope to help the council understand the impact of the ECRD Act and the larger financial impact, should the ECRD Act operate in conjunction with this bill in its current form.

My understanding of the ECRD Bill is that in the late 1990s the Treasurer of the day, the Hon. Rob Lucas, was trying to maximise the sale price of South Australia's electricity assets. One of the ways he did this was by offering prospective purchasers discount council rates; that is, to raise more money for the state government he gave away an ongoing revenue stream for local government.

We are in the middle of a cost-of-living crisis; inflation is eating at the heart of living standards. Cost of living is one of the biggest issues, if not the biggest issue, we hear about on a daily basis when talking to people in communities all over the state. As lawmakers we need to be alert to the impact our deliberations have on ordinary households.

That is not just with new laws. If it comes to a government's attention that an old law is hurting households, that old law should also be reviewed. In fact, in the state government's own *Better Regulation Handbook*, government is expected to review regulatory impacts from time to time and to consider whether the regulation is still the most appropriate action.

One of the questions I will be asking, for the minister's consideration, is whether the state government has ever undertaken a review of the ECRD rates clauses—that is, the impact of section 3 of schedule 1 of the ECRD Act, which prevents a council from charging fair rates on land used for electricity generation.

My second question, which is related, is: what is the current policy objective of the ECRD rates clauses? If there is no continuing policy objective, I would appreciate the minister admitting as much. I ask this question because the government's *Better Regulation Handbook* expects government to be clear about regulatory objectives and to ensure that the regulation is targeted to the problem that the regulation seeks to address.

It seems to me that if the original policy objective was to help privatise the state's electricity assets that objective has long passed. So what is the current policy aim? Why are we still taking money out of the hands of mum-and-dad ratepayers, farmers and small business ratepayers and using this money to give a giant subsidy to the electricity generation industry?

To be clear, I am not anti the electricity generation industry—far from it—and we are not corporate welfare per se. I am saying that good policy and good law should have an objective that is understood, and that governments should not hand out subsidies and discounts without a clear objective in mind.

I can tell you about the two policy objectives that have not been achieved by the ECRD rates clauses. In setting these out, I am grateful for a research paper, prepared in 2019, on the ability of local government to support economic growth. It was prepared by the independent AEC Group, which are experts in the resources industry. I understand that this research report has been provided to the government, the opposition and honourable crossbenchers in this place.

Firstly, the ECRD rates clauses do not impact on the amount of investment in the electricity generation industry. The AEC Group research paper found that electricity companies make investment decisions based on access to sources of power—wind, sun and fossil fuels—and access to the electricity grid. Investment decisions are not made on the basis of where council rates are the cheapest. The research found that the cost of council rates was a negligible component of the annual operating costs of electricity generation companies, so removing the ECRD rates clauses would not impact investment one way or another.

Secondly, the ECRD rates clauses do not impact on electricity prices. At any given minute, there are a large number of companies bidding to supply electricity into the national market. Individual

suppliers are price takers, in the sense that they do not have market power. That means that a South Australian electricity supplier cannot pass on cost increases to electricity consumers. In any event, the research found that council rates are already a negligible component of electricity company operating costs. So if electricity companies could pass increased costs, which they cannot, the impact would be negligible.

I now turn to the forecast of the Australian Energy Market Operator in its May 2023 report, titled South Australian Generation Forecasts. AEMO forecasts that total renewable energy generated in South Australia will increase from 9,673 gigawatts per hour in 2021-22 to around 47,373 gigawatts per hour by 2031-32. That is, over the next decade, AEMO predicts a 490 per cent increase in South Australia's renewable energy generation capacity. I note that this is a best-case scenario from AEMO and it assumes that the HRE Bill is passed and enacted.

My third foreshadowed question to the minister is: has the government estimated the increase in land that will be used for electricity generation in South Australia should the HRE Bill pass in this parliament? My fourth question is: has the government's economic impact analysis in relation to the HRE Bill measured the increased amount of council rates that councils will forgo as a result of the interaction of the HRE Bill with the existing ECRD Act?

My fifth and final question, which comes back to cost-of-living issues, is: if the HRE Bill is successful and much more land is used for electricity generation, can the minister give an estimate of the increase in council rates that will be needed to be paid by all other ratepayers to meet the reduction on council rates by the owners of the land used for electricity generation?

In closing, the focus of my contribution and my questions is on the cost of living of South Australians, particularly those living in regional communities where electricity is generated. I support the measures to increase the amount of electricity generation in South Australia. We also agree it is a good thing that the bill promotes the creation of a new renewable energy capacity and that the commonwealth, state and local governments should all be doing their bit for the environment and climate change, and the HRE Bill will make a positive contribution to those objectives.

What I do not support is for the inadvertent interaction of the HRE Bill with the existing ECRD Act and the consequent substantial reduction of revenue to regional councils and their communities. The electricity generation industry are doing alright. They are making record profits and AEMO are predicting huge growth in that industry. I understand that they are all companies with corporate headquarters interstate and overseas.

In a nutshell, the ECRD rates clauses require all of the ratepayers in many regional communities to pay higher rates. This money is taken out of regional South Australia and transferred to the bottom line of interstate and overseas companies. I do not see any continuing policy justification for a subsidy to electricity generators that must be paid for by the ratepayers of regional communities. I look forward to the minister's response to those questions.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the government advise whether or not they have struck any side deal with One Nation and SA-Best to kill off a parliamentary committee into this matter?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I can answer that question for myself, in terms of where I sit, and the answer is: no.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I have struck no deals either.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Did you want to make a contribution, the Hon. Ms Game?

The Hon. S.L. GAME: Thank you, Mr President, only to state that no deals have been done.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: In the lead-up to the 2022 state election, the government promised green hydrogen; indeed, that is featured in their election platform. This bill allows for both blue and green hydrogen, and you will see in the government's discussion paper that there are references to blue hydrogen and the potential sites. Can the minister advise what the rationale is for including blue hydrogen in this bill?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill is agnostic in terms of the technology used to generate hydrogen. This legislation will enable the market to determine commercially viable hydrogen projects based on all technologies available to them, including green hydrogen from the electrolysis of water using renewable energy and blue hydrogen from the reformation of methane combined with carbon capture and storage.

All types of hydrogen generation will contribute to building the necessary infrastructure required in the transition to a future clean hydrogen industry. Allowing all hydrogen types encourages the industry to develop and test economically feasible technologies, which will ultimately bring down the cost of hydrogen production. It is the role of other legislation to determine how South Australia, and the country more broadly, will meet our decarbonisation goals.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Why has the South Australian government adopted a different position to the federal government in relation to blue hydrogen? The federal government has stated in their energy blueprint, I believe, or their energy documents, that they do not see a future for blue hydrogen. Why is the state government going down a different path?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised, first of all, that there are no bans in the federal legislation on blue hydrogen. To speak to the point more specifically, blue hydrogen can be part of the transition towards green hydrogen, with obviously the most environmentally responsible and sustainable being the ultimate goal.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: What is the urgency in relation to this bill? We have heard many times in the media and in the debate that the government wants this bill dealt with by the end of the year. What precisely is the urgency? Why has the government imposed that time frame, and why has the parliament been denied the opportunity to scrutinise the bill in more detail?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: First of all, I certainly do not accept the premise of the question in terms of the ability to scrutinise the bill. Through my summing-up I talked about the large amount of consultation that has happened to get us to this stage, and obviously this committee stage is a further part of the scrutiny.

In terms of the reason for wanting to move quickly on this important opportunity, there is significant interest from the market into hydrogen. If we delay, we certainly risk some of that interest potentially moving to other jurisdictions. If we want South Australia to be a leader in this space, then we need to make sure that we are moving quickly and that we are moving with the interest in the market so that we can capitalise on those opportunities.

Secondly, currently there is no framework for these renewable energy projects on Crown land. What we want to do is ensure that there are frameworks in place that make it clear and simple for those who have rights, either as leaseholders or landholders, to be able to actually get the best benefit for any agreements that they enter into. Some agreements are being entered into already, but in the absence of a framework. This is about providing that clear framework, which will protect the rights of those landholders and leaseholders.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: But why precisely does that need to be done by Christmas? Why the urgency?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I mentioned, there is a lot of market interest and we do not want that interest to move into other jurisdictions.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Just so I am clear: the government is concerned that if it did not pass a bill in haste it would lose that market interest in the space of a few weeks; is that the concern?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The issues paper was issued in 2022. There have been ongoing discussions and consultation throughout this year.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: There are some concerns that burning hydrogen produces nitrogen oxide, which can cause damage to the human respiratory tract and increase a person's vulnerability to asthma. It is also potentially damaging to vegetation and crops. Is the government concerned about the increase in nitrogen oxide pollution as a result of the hydrogen industry, and what steps will it take to mitigate that risk?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Any potential risks to health are covered through the environmental assessment, with health aspects being considered as part of that environmental assessment, and that would apply to any risks, not just the one potential alleged risk the honourable member has referred to.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Could the minister provide a list of those members of the Conservation Council who support the bill in its final form—to be clear, in its final form without amendment?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that we do not have the level of detail of individual members, but I can certainly take it on notice to see whether there is additional information that I can bring back to the chamber.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Can the government advise of any environmental organisations that support the bill in its current form, even one?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that various conservation and environmental groups were consulted. Some of those groups have provided feedback, which they were not necessary expecting would be provided publicly. That is the information I have to hand at present.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: To be clear, the minister cannot provide a single environmental group that supports the bill in its current form in this state, despite the government's extensive consultation, which apparently according to the minister was the most extensive consultation he has had to do on any bill ever. So not a single environmental group supports the bill in its final form here as we are debating today. We are waiting for that list as well; you have said that you will take it on notice. We would like to see the list, because when we the Greens did our consultation there was general support for the bill.

Certainly, from many groups and stakeholders there was a discussion that a small committee and a short time frame to make improvements to the bill, to put some of the protections that we are told will be in regulations into the actual bill to become part of the act, rather than delegated legislation, would be preferred by the environmental movement and that they had some concerns that this process was being rushed and that their concerns had not been addressed or listened to in the final form of the bill.

The Greens have come, having done that work talking to our stakeholders, to find that the government does not have a single environmental group they can point to that supports the bill in its final form. When we are in the committee stage—not the second reading speech of the minister, but in the nitty-gritty, in the clauses of this bill—to not have information for the parliament does ring alarm bells. Can you provide us with at least one group that supports this bill in its final form, as we are debating it here right now on 15 November?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there is a variety of views from various stakeholders, but all feedback that has been received has informed the current version of the bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Does this bill allow for pink and brown hydrogen?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I mentioned in an earlier response, I am advised that the bill is agnostic in terms of technology.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister provide a list of pastoralists who support the bill in its current form?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that both the Pastoral Board and individual pastoralists were consulted, and I did mention that in my summing-up. As one would expect, there is always a variety of views.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Can the minister advise how the bill will avoid issues seen interstate regarding opposition to transmission infrastructure?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the licensing arrangements that will be in place require environmental assessment and consultation with affected landowners and landholders, and that that will be a robust system that should be able to address many concerns.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Just on from that, can the minister also confirm that the bill finally addresses the very archaic legislation we have in this state regarding wind farm proposal approvals, which has failed to keep up with technology in that space?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that yes, that is the case. Wind farm approvals now will be under this piece of legislation rather than under the planning act and that is expected to have positive benefits for all involved.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: In terms of the positive benefits, can the minister confirm that there is some futureproofing in terms of keeping up with technology in that space?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I thank the honourable member for her question. The answer is that yes, the intent is that it will futureproof in many ways, because the act will be objectives based, therefore proponents will need to demonstrate how the technology they are proposing meets the expectations and objectives, positive environmental outcomes and so on. The act will be reviewed every five years, which will also give that additional opportunity for review.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The minister in her second reading summing-up noted the extensive First Nations engagement on this bill, and I know that there was a forum in March and a forum in, I believe, April. Could she just clarify the dates of those two forums, and when the final bill was released, and whether every member of that forum was then sent a copy of the bill and allowed to provide documented feedback in the same way that the two blue-sky thinking forums were held?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: In terms of engagement with First Nations, I can provide the following additional information: South Australian Aboriginal Renewable Energy Forums were held in Port Augusta in November 2022 and March 2023, and they brought together Aboriginal groups from across the state to strengthen relationships, understand the issues and challenges impacting on Aboriginal groups, and to discuss opportunities for Aboriginal people and government to work together on the development of renewable energy in South Australia.

All discussions and feedback from the fora were documented, collated into reports and distributed to participants and their organisations. Additionally, individual meetings, presentations and discussions were held on request. I am advised that feedback provided the Department for Energy and Mining with clear support for regulatory and policy actions that embed early engagement, improved communication, early identification of significant cultural and ecological values, and free, prior and informed decision-making into the bill and regulations, with a particular focus on Aboriginal engagement throughout the release area process. Confirmation also confirmed the importance of capacity building and partnering between native title groups, renewable energy companies and government.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: To clarify, I have the March energy forum in front of me, and the forum report was in April. There was a previous one in November 2022, and I did ask the minister: when was the bill was released for consultation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised the issues paper was released in late 2022 and the draft bill was released in May 2023. I was further advised that all attendees were sent a copy of the bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: So the bill was not released until after the two consultation forums, just to be clear. Sure, there was an issues paper, but the draft bill prior to this final bill was not released until after the conclusion of those two forums. That is not necessarily a question because that is actually what the minister has just confirmed, which I was keen for her to confirm. I am now told by the minister that the attendees have received a copy of the bill. I would hope so. What was their response to the draft bill, and what incorporated changes were made in the bill that we debate today from that response?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised, in reference to the honourable member's first part of that last question, that, yes, the draft bill was provided after those two forums because obviously

those forums were providing input into that draft. Secondly, in the current bill the requirement for native title agreement is essential before any licence can be granted, and, thirdly, as with all feedback that was provided, it has all been taken on board and considered in the process to date.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Having read the feedback, and I alluded to some of it yesterday in my second reading contribution around the Aboriginal Heritage Act, I will point to the one that the minister has just mentioned, which is free, prior and informed consent. How come the government did not have a third forum where attendees were able to see the exposure bill, and if they were not given that third forum, how on earth do we have free, prior and informed consent even in the consultation process here?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that quite a large amount of additional feedback was received following the release of the draft bill. There were obviously numerous ways to provide that feedback.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What work has been done on the RARBs?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised the bill requires early consultation on proposed release areas. In terms of reconciliation action plans, that is outside of the scope directly of this bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: How many RARBs or RARB applicants were consulted with regard to this bill?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that all native title groups for South Australia were represented at the forum—sorry, in that region were represented at the forum.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Can the minister explain the difference between a RARB and a native title group for the council, because she does not seem to think that there is a difference?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that native title groups and representatives of Aboriginal heritage corporations were all consulted. In terms of additional detail, my advice is it would not be appropriate to provide that without consent from those concerned.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Could the minister please take on notice then to provide that information to the council?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that due to privacy concerns that would not be appropriate.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Could the minister outline what the privacy concerns are about which native title or Aboriginal representative bodies were consulted with regard to this bill?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I think there has been a misunderstanding between the question being asked. I thought the honourable member was asking for details of the individuals. I am advised that we can provide a list of those organisations that have been consulted. Could I also ask the honourable member if she could speak up, because a few of us are having difficulty in hearing the exact questions. Thank you.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Can I just ask the minister if and what consultation is intended to take place on draft regulations and when?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there will be discussion papers released in regard to potential regulations and that will be consulted on. The goal of that, depending when of course this bill passes—if indeed it does—that will hopefully be either late this year or early next year. There will then be consultation on the drafted regulations and that consultation will be for a six-week period, with the hope that that would be in the first half of next year.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: There have been some major concerns raised with the opposition regarding landholder rights in this bill. What feedback did the government receive in regard to this balance and how does the bill address or achieve that balance? Just to clarify, I am talking about the balance between the landholder or lessee and the licensee.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that on freehold land the owner of the land has the right to determine who comes onto that land. For Crown land, which is called designated land and

includes pastoral land, there will be a competitive bidding process to gain a licence, which would provide access to that land.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In regard to freehold and land access, can the minister outline the role of a special enterprise agreement and what that will mean for the landholder rights in the case of freehold land in that situation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised, in terms of the special enterprise licence, it allows for a freehold landowner to retain ownership and receive appropriate compensation from the proponent, ongoing, for the use of the land. Therefore, it is not compulsory acquisition. The landowner will receive compensation from the proponent plus any other negotiated benefits, just as they would with any other licence type. This is the case even if they object to the project taking place on their freehold or licensed land.

Further, a freehold landowner can opt to sell the land to the proponent, and the act provides that the proponent must purchase the land if the landowner chooses to sell. What is particularly important is that this is essentially a power of last resort. A special enterprise licence therefore is less likely to be frequently used. Also, it is a lesser intervention than is currently provided for under other legislation such as the Electricity Act 1996.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister explain what she means by 'last resort'?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that for something to be granted a special enterprise licence it will need to meet the major economic significance threshold. Whether a project is of major significance to the economy of the state will depend on the nature and scope of the specific project and the value and benefits that it will provide to South Australia. The threshold assessment will take into account multiple factors, which may include considerations otherwise outside the HRE Act's scope, and then the Governor will decide whether an activity proceeds, on advice from cabinet.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Just to confirm: the minister is saying it will be cabinet that makes that decision in regard to the economic threshold of what is deemed of state significance?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: No, the cabinet will provide advice, and the Governor will make that decision.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: So the minister is confirming that it is the Governor who makes the final decision. Is that normal practice?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that that provision is modelled on the Mining Act, which, according to my advice, has a similar provision where cabinet provides advice for the Governor's final decision.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I want to refer the minister to a submission from SACOSS. One of the issues that they flag is about ensuring community and consumer benefit and, in particular, the importance of lowering power prices for South Australians. Can the government talk about how they intend for this legislation to reduce power prices and deliver community benefit, or are they agnostic on that question as well?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is: given that the bill will help to unlock the state's pipeline of renewable energy projects—which has a current estimated capital development investment of approximately $21 billion as at June of this year—the bill is designed, along with the government's Hydrogen Jobs Plan, to deliver increased supplies of reliable, affordable and clean energy, with the hydrogen power plant enabling lower power prices for industry, which should in turn help bring down cost-of-living pressures.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Why is reducing power prices not listed as one of the objects of the act?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is expected that lowering the cost of production will have a flow-on effect to bring down cost-of-living pressures.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Why does this bill address freehold land when the main intention of the bill is to unlock Crown and pastoral land for renewable energy projects?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The intent is to provide a consistent and complete regulatory framework that would apply to freehold land as well as to other land types.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: If the intent is to provide such completion, why is so much being put into delegated legislation in the regulations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: It is a very large bill. It is not possible or appropriate to put all detail in the actual lead legislation.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Following on from some of the questions that were just asked, can the minister elaborate on and confirm the potential that this bill has in terms of being a world-first model, and international investment in South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that it is a world-first model in terms of having a specific bill for renewable and hydrogen energy combined, and it is designed to provide certainty for investment—which, obviously, will be a benefit—as well as certainty for landowners and landholders.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Is that because other legislation across the country is not technology agnostic on what they would call renewable energy and would not, therefore, support blue, pink or brown hydrogen in their legislation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that this is about having the regulatory framework in place to provide that certainty. It is not about choosing one technology over another.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Does the minister have any concerns that this is a world-first model and that the South Australian community might be seen as test subjects, and that the risk is great?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that they have been modelled on the petroleum and mining act, which is recognised globally as being leading in terms of its consultation and regulatory framework.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I will go back to the questions I asked in my speech beforehand, which have not been answered by the minister, and I will ask them again. Has the government estimated the increase in land that will be used for electricity generation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I can probably respond to each of the questions that the honourable member asked in his original contribution at clause 1. My advice is that the ECRD Act and rates associated are outside of the scope of this bill.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Will this bill, and the addition of land that will be required for this project, have an impact on council rates and the rates that are paid by the owners of the land that is used for electricity generation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that because it is outside the scope of this bill, there is no information that I can provide on that particular matter.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The minister, in the previous answer before the Hon. Frank Pangallo's contribution, noted—in fact, it was a little self-congratulatory—'we do this the best, that's why we're doing it this way'. Is the minister aware that in the consultation on 19 March 2023 with First Nations groups, and I will read verbatim:

> It was acknowledged that government has not worked with Aboriginal people appropriately in the past and DEM is working to address this by engaging with Aboriginal people throughout the development of the HRE Act.
>
> The concept of 'just transition' is a global movement for greening the economy in a way that is as fair and inclusive as possible to everyone concerned, creating decent work opportunities, minimising environmental impacts and leaving no one behind.
>
> Companies need to meet environmental, social and governance (ESG) principles, including those of free, prior, informed consent (FPIC), to receive funding nationally and internationally. Poor performers do not get funding.

So by the government's very own admission, in their consultation they admit that they have not done it that well to date and that they have pledged to do better. They have also promised free prior and informed consent, and to be guided by ESG principles. My question to the minister is: in the First

Nations consultation, was it made clear that we were not just talking about green hydrogen and renewables with this piece of legislation but, indeed, it was technology agnostic on hydrogen?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that all parties were advised that this bill is technology agnostic and, secondly, that renewable energy approvals previously—until this bill passes, if it does—were under the planning act. They were not under the leading frameworks that we are seeking to have here. I also note that we can always improve our consultation. Even if we have world-leading and first-class regulatory frameworks, we should always be looking at continuous improvement in terms of consultation.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: How were participants at a forum before the bill was released told that the bill was technology agnostic? Did you also have time travel incorporated into this bill? The bill did not even exist at the time.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the issues paper that was released, prior to the forums to which the honourable member refers, referred to it being—I am not sure if it was by name or not, using these words—technology agnostic. The draft bill, of course, was then structured on that.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: So weasel words, basically. Can the minister provide that list of the environmental groups that support the current incarnation of this bill in its current form, as she took on notice well over half an hour ago now?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the following groups were consulted: the Australian Marine Conservation Society, AP4CA in New South Wales, the Conservation Council of South Australia, the Native Vegetation Council, PEW Charitable Trusts, the South Australian Nature Alliance, the Coast Protection Board, and Friends of the Earth. I do not have any further updated information other than that they were involved in the consultation.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: With respect, the question was: which of the environmental groups that the government consulted support the bill in its current form? The minister did not answer that question.

The CHAIR: That question has already been asked.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I did answer the question a moment ago. I said I do not have any further updated information other than that these other groups were involved in consultation.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I am advised that in the other place a bill from the Hon. Sarah Game relating to ministerial travel has now been moved up for debate for the next sitting week. Earlier, the government advised that there had been no deal done with the Hon. Sarah Game. Is that still the government's position?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Each of the crossbench in this place made statements to the effect that they had not engaged in any deals. I think the line of questioning is quite offensive.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In the committee stage of this bill in the other place, the minister spoke about one rule book. Is that the case in other jurisdictions? In other words, do other states have a consistent framework for both leasehold and freehold land?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that other states do not have purpose-built legislation for renewable and hydrogen, and therefore that answers that question.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Has the department undertaken any modelling on how many renewable energy projects will be constructed as a result of this legislation, both on designated land and on freehold land?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that we have the total estimated capital development investment, and that is the figure I mentioned earlier of $21 billion. That is obviously dependent on which specific proponents come forward, but that is the total estimated pipeline of renewable energy projects.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: But has there been any modelling as to which areas the government would be looking at to place these projects?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that, yes, modelling has been done. There is consultation on study areas at present with native title holders, but in terms of formal consultation obviously that cannot occur unless and until this bill is passed.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The minister mentioned that consultation is being done on various study areas. What stakeholders exactly form part of that consultation process?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that informal consultation is happening at this stage. As I mentioned, the formal process could not commence unless and until the bill is passed. To provide the information on who that informal consultation is occurring with would be commercial-in-confidence, because obviously it would identify the potential areas and provide commercial information.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister outline what she means by informal? Is it a tap on the shoulder? Is it phone conversations? Is the informal consultation documented or is it just a handshake?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that the use of the word informal relates to the fact that it is not forming part of a formal consultation process as outlined in this bill. In that sense it does not have that level of formality. I am advised that the focus is on building relationships with landholders and that those interactions would be documented by the department but, as I mentioned, have a commercial confidentiality attached to them.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I ask the minister again, because she has not answered my question: what actually makes up that informal consultation process on those study areas?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that it would be a variety of interactions.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: The minister previously noted that the government had consulted with the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia. I have a copy of their correspondence of Thursday 29 June, and I note that four paragraphs in it says, 'The bill as drafted will not provide adequate protection for South Australia's biodiversity.' What updates have been made to the bill since that time to respond to those concerns raised by the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the role of a statement of environmental objectives is to outline the obligations for a specified activity and area and will establish particular objectives regarding the management and prevention of biosecurity risks, to ensure landholders are protected from any incursion. In addition to that, whilst mentioning biosecurity, biodiversity would also be covered. A statement of environmental objectives is developed through an open consultative process, including with affected pastoralists.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: My question again is: how did the government address the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia's concern that the bill as drafted will not provide adequate protection for South Australia's biodiversity? I note that the minister referred to biosecurity. That is a different portfolio.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Perhaps I am not speaking loudly enough today. I mentioned biosecurity, and then I also mentioned biodiversity and that all of those things will be covered under that statement of environmental objectives.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: What changes were made between the correspondence of 29 June and the bill that we have before us currently?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that that was always covered under the proposed bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: To be clear, when the government has finally come up with a few environmental groups that they have actually spoken to, they have cited this one, the Nature Conservation Society of South Australia, as one of the ones that has been consulted and then they have provided in an answer that they made no change in response to their serious concerns about a lack of adequate protections for biodiversity. Is that the case?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that their view was that adequate protections are in place under the bill.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: That certainly was not necessarily the environmental stakeholders' view. It might be the government's view, but for the government to present that they have properly consulted I find a little dubious right now, given they have not taken on board quite reasonable suggestions.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: We have had reference to the various types of hydrogen, and in response to some of the questions already asked the minister has confirmed, obviously, that the bill covers these. Can the minister also confirm that this extends to gold hydrogen, which has a smaller footprint compared to other exploration activities and does not necessarily require fracking and hydraulic stimulation to be produced?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that gold hydrogen is naturally occurring, and therefore is under the scope of the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Can the minister just confirm, when it comes to green hydrogen, where will the water come from to produce green hydrogen?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the source of water to be used would depend on the location of the projects, the environmental practices, the commerciality of those projects, and so could come from any number of sources, whether that be desalinated sea water, whether it be groundwater subject to the water allocation plans of the location, or SA Water types of provision.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The minister spoke earlier about the statement of environmental objectives in regard to biosecurity and biodiversity. What protections are in place for landholders if a statement of environmental objectives is not adhered to by the licensee?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there are escalating levels of compliance, starting with directives, going through to fines, and going through to the removal of licence, which would mean that the operator would be unable to continue with their enterprise.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister give any indication, perhaps from other areas, where certainly fines and, more specifically, the removal of licence has occurred from licensees under these circumstances?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Was it petroleum or—

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Mining.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised we do not have that information to hand and will need to take it on notice.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Can the minister tell me what the storage capacity will be once the project is completed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That would need to be a specific question about a specific project.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: What I mean is, once the hydrogen plant is completed what will be the storage capacity?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, assuming the honourable member is referring to the Hydrogen Jobs Plan and the project that has been announced there, the storage capacity would be sufficient to come on when electricity being produced by wind and solar has dropped to insufficient levels. To my understanding, there is not a figure that has been publicly released.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Are you saying that you cannot say how much is actually going to be stored on site? How is that going to work?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there are a number of project partners who would be involved with that project, and they may either provide storage on site or via a pipeline or potentially a combination, so until that is finalised, that is as much information as I can provide.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Is there any intent to transport or export hydrogen to other markets overseas and how will that be done?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that this bill provides the opportunity to set criteria. For example, criteria could be set in regard to the benefits to South Australia directly, but all of that will be subject to commercial negotiation.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: I guess this is something that may have to be answered further down the track, but I am wondering what type of security arrangements will be undertaken when the projects are underway and when they are completed?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Could I clarify? Is the honourable member referring to security such as holding a bond, or the other meaning of security?

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: To secure the sites.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: So physical security. In terms of security for individual licences, I am advised that would be considered under the statement of environmental impact. If there were going to be, for example, people who would normally come onto that piece of land who would no longer be able to do so, that would come under the statement of environmental impact. If the honourable member is referring to physical security around the plant that has been announced as a government project, that is the sort of thing that would be worked out closer to the time.

Clause passed.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 12:52 to 14:16.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:16): I bring up the 35th report of the committee, 2022-23.

Report received.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Reports, 2022-23—
- Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency and the National Boards
- International Koala Centre of Excellence Trading as Koala Life
- National Health Practitioner Ombudsman
- Parks and Wilderness Council
- Pastoral Board
- South Australian Heritage Council
- South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board
- Stormwater Management Authority
- Suicide Prevention Council

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. C. M. Scriven)—

State Government Response dated October 2023 to Coronial inquest recommendations relating to the death of Zhane Andrew Keith Chilcott

Ministerial Statement

ENFORCEMENT AND PROSECUTION, REAL-TIME DATA

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:18): I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the launch of Department for Energy and Mining enforcement and prosecution real-time data made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Energy and Mining.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Question Time

RENEWABLE ENERGY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Hon. Sarah Game regarding renewable energy.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The member's One Nation policy document states that energy policy must be based on evidence, not ideology, and that inefficient renewables damage the environment and result in higher energy bills for everyday South Australians. My question to the Hon. Sarah Game is: can the member inform the chamber whether One Nation party policy with regard to renewable energy has changed?

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Ms Game, you can choose to answer the question, if you wish. It has been pointed out to me that it possibly doesn't fit within the standing orders.

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:20): I will take it on notice.

BORDERTOWN WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Has the minister completed her due diligence by checking the accuracy of a *Hansard* quote I read out yesterday from the Minister for Environment and Water, and is she now able to answer:

1. In line with the answer to the question without notice by the Minister for Environment and Water on 2 November 2023, can the minister now confirm that indeed no extra water will be available to Bordertown prior to 2028?

2. How can the Malinauskas government make a promise to build an extra 60 houses in Bordertown before 2028, given that there have been no substantive plans to provide the necessary infrastructure?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:21): I thank the honourable member for her question. She does seem to be somewhat confused between the short-term plans and the longer term plans. While SA Water's existing drinking water network in Bordertown meets current customer demands, significant augmentation of SA Water's local water infrastructure is required to support the town's future projected demand associated with new developments.

I am advised SA Water has been working closely with the Tatiara District Council to understand local industrial and residential growth and has identified a range of infrastructure solutions to increase the capacity of the town's water network to enable this growth. These solutions include the construction of a new water storage tank, pump station and large water main within Bordertown.

SA Water advise that the new infrastructure will support council's development plans for around 29 industrial allotments, 200 residential allotments and an 80-bed commercial facility, while ensuring continued reliable water services for existing customers in the town. The development of the concept designs for this solution is underway and, subject to all required approvals, SA Water expects to commence construction in 2025.

At the same time, it is also important for SA Water to consider options towards ensuring a secure long-term water supply for Bordertown. As referenced by the Deputy Premier in the other place, SA Water has proposed funding in its 2024-28 regulatory submission to enable investigations into long-term water security options for the town. This initiative will include completing additional

groundwater monitoring to update modelling previously developed by SA Water and the Department for Environment and Water to enhance SA Water's understanding of the complex interactions between the freshwater lens and the surrounding brackish aquifer.

BORDERTOWN WATER SUPPLY

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:23): Supplementary: I note the construction starting date of 2025, but when will the infrastructure be delivered?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:23): Subject to all required approvals, SA Water expects to commence construction in 2025 and have it completed as soon as possible after that.

FARMER WELLBEING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries on farmer wellbeing.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: It is a fact that the rate of farmers dying by suicide is twice that of the general population. It is also anticipated that due to the current challenges farmers face—whether it be lack of worker resources, the rising cost of doing business, skyrocketing electricity prices, water buybacks, or market access challenges—mental health issues will rise over the coming years.

Professor Kate Gunn, founder of the incredibly successful farming mental health program I Farm Well, along with farmer John Gladigau, co-founded Vocal Locals after receiving a grant from the federal government's Future Drought Fund. The Vocal Local program won several awards, including the 2022 Farmer of the Year Award for Agricultural Research Excellence. The group are now looking to think bigger and to ensure these critical support programs are present to help farmers in need.

The team applied for a federal grant program earlier this year to the tune of $17 million to develop a national approach to suicide prevention and wellbeing for the agricultural industry, with the support of the National Farmers' Federation. However, they were unsuccessful. They are looking to reapply in 2024. My questions to the minister are:

1. Was she aware of this initiative by the I Farm Well team here in South Australia?

2. Has she written to Minister Watt in support of the group's $17 million national approach to tackling suicide prevention in agriculture?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:25): I thank the honourable member for her question. I became aware of this particular initiative through the excellent articles in the media over the weekend, I think *SA Weekend*, if I recall correctly. I wonder whether that is also where the opposition became aware of them.

In terms of the application to the federal government, I am more than happy to provide a letter of support if Dr Gunn or Mr Gladigau would like to contact me about that. I can obtain some further information from them, although I must say that I thought the weekend article was very useful and informative, and the work Dr Gunn is doing and has done is certainly worthy of support and also of more widespread knowledge.

I commend *The Advertiser* for giving it that kind of exposure. I am more than happy to either meet with Dr Gunn and Mr Gladigau or have a conversation over the phone, given that Dr Gunn is from Eyre Peninsula, if I recall correctly. I am more than happy to do that and provide support through a letter or similar, if I am able to do so.

FARMER WELLBEING

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Supplementary: can the minister confirm that PIRSA was indeed a financial supporter of I Farm Well?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:27): I can take that on notice and bring back a response.

SA MUSIC AWARDS

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (14:27): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Would the minister inform the council about APY music group Dem Mob's recent success at the 2023 SA Music Awards?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:27): I thank the honourable member for her question; I would be most delighted to inform the chamber of Dem Mob's recent success at the 2023 music awards. I have spoken before about the increasing success of particularly central desert musicians, and that applies very much to Dem Mob, a hip-hop group hailing from the APY lands. Earlier this year, members may recall that I shared that they would be the first Aboriginal group ever to perform at Spain's huge Primavera Festival, listed alongside such names as Kendrick Lamar and Blur.

Dem Mob's story is exceptionally inspiring. Its three members—Matt Gully, Elisha Umuhuri and Jontae Lawrie—were brought together on the APY lands, where Matt was a teacher, and teamed up with fellow musicians to put together personalised musical tools to help Matt's students, and Jontae in particular in his journey through high school. After Jontae successfully completed high school, the three men came together and realised that their partnership had a future beyond the classroom.

Not long after the group's formation they were invited to play at WOMADelaide, and during the COVID period the band bunkered down during lockdown and perfected their craft while not being able to perform live shows, emerging to the success of performing at Primavera Festival in Spain, and now having huge success at this year's recently awarded SA Music Awards. The group took out five categories in the awards including Best Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander Artist, Best Hip Hop and Best Regional Artist.

Dem Mob also won the Emily Burrows Award, which awards $5,000 to further the professional development of an emerging artist or group. Previous recipients of this award in South Australia have included artists who have gone on to bigger and better, and in some cases great, things, such as Tilly Tjala Thomas, Electric Fields (with members also hailing from the APY lands) and the Hilltop Hoods. So Dem Mob is certainly in very esteemed company.

Importantly, the group also took out the Best Educator Award in honour of their work in the APY lands and in Ceduna to implement programs like the one created by Matt and Elisha to help Jontae get through school. They encourage students to engage with first language and are one of the first, if not the first, hip-hop outfits to sing in Pitjantjatjara.

Next for Dem Mob is a trip to New York in 2024 to perform at the Lincoln Center and the recording of a debut album. It is clear to see that there is a very bright future for Dem Mob, and I send sincere congratulations for their excellent, although utterly unsurprising, success at this year's SA Music Awards.

POLICE COMPLAINTS

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (14:30): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Attorney-General on the topic of the application and interpretation of section 46 of the Police Complaints and Discipline Act.

Leave granted.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Section 46 of the Police Complaints and Discipline Act applies to members of the public and of the media. It is exceptionally broad and it criminalises the publication of information or material that may identify anyone involved with a complaint. That, of course, could be not just potential members of law enforcement but those who make the complaint or who were there at the time the complaint occurred. It has a penalty of up to $30,000 for a natural person and, less relevant to this particular question, $150,000 for a body corporate.

That section for its application requires, of course, the permission of the police commissioner to release information and authorise information about any complaint made to media and members of the public. On Wednesday 8 November, police commissioner Grant Stevens authorised the release of the footage showing two police officers dragging a man out the front door of a house and pinning him to the ground, but just 24 hours before the police commissioner and SAPOL had made a statement saying that they would issue no further information other than the written statement that they had previously provided.

That written statement, of course, allowed media to publish details of that particular southern suburbs complaint. However, there is no written advice on the SAPOL website, so I ask the Attorney-General: when the police commissioner then further released the footage 24 hours later, with no further identification of what permissions were given, is it now an offence for members of the public to share that footage on social media or the like, or are they to know that they are now no longer subject to the operations of section 46 of the Police Complaints and Discipline Act?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:32): I thank the honourable member for her question and her interest in this area. Certainly, the issue garnered significant media attention over recent days. In terms of the application and how it applies to media outlets, how it applies to private individuals, I will have to get some advice on that. I am happy to take it on notice and bring back quite a speedy reply.

Particularly since we are not sitting next week, if I can get some information about it before then I will undertake to the honourable member to get it to her before going through the process of the normal answering of questions in parliament, because it is an important question, and how people conduct themselves depends upon the interpretation of legislation. I am happy to get some advice and bring that back to the honourable member.

I do know, and I might add as well, that how the Police Complaints and Discipline Act works generally is the subject of a current inquiry being conducted by the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee of this parliament. Once they have finished their deliberations in relation to this, they will produce a report. I look forward to that report that might give some guidance as to the views of that committee on any possible changes in policy or legislation in this regard in the future.

HEINZE, MR R.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Attorney-General on the topic of harassment by an incarcerated individual.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: On Tuesday 14 November, it was reported in *The Advertiser* that Roman Heinze, known as the Salt Creek monster, who is currently serving a minimum sentence of 17 years in prison for kidnapping and assaulting two backpackers at Salt Creek in February 2016, has been harassing his daughter, Kendehl, from jail.

It was revealed that this harassment has occurred from hidden mail that was sent to other people, and having them pass on to Kendehl, causing severe emotional abuse to her. This harassment has continued to occur despite Kendehl first highlighting this to the Department for Correctional Services since April 2021. Kendehl has said, and I quote:

> They've known about this, I've told them about this, I have emails from them saying I've been removed from his mailing list, and it just hasn't stopped.
>
> I think I deserve an apology, really…it's just not good enough…I want peace without fear.

My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Is the Attorney-General's Department aware of the harassment that Kendehl has received from her father in jail?

2. If so, is the Attorney-General working with the Department for Correctional Services to rectify the situation and issue an apology for their three years of inaction?

3. What measures will the Labor government implement to ensure that individuals who have been incarcerated cannot continue to cause harm by harassing and abusing innocent members of the public?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:36): I thank the honourable member for her question, and I also saw those very recent media reports in relation to this matter. The issue that is raised has an intersection with a number of different areas, particularly, as the honourable member outlined, the Department for Correctional Services. I am confident that the Department for Correctional Services will be looking at what can be done in relation to this, but I certainly will bring the honourable member's comments in this chamber today to the attention of the head of the Department for Correctional Services, and if there is more that can be done I am happy to suggest that whatever can be done to protect innocent people is done.

AGTECH GROWTH FUND

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (14:37): My question is the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the progress of projects awarded funding under the first round of the AgTech Growth Fund?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:37): I thank the honourable member for his question. It is estimated that the return on realising the potential of agtech in South Australia is currently $2.6 billion a year in gross additional value of agricultural production. This is the economic benefit we can harness as a state if new technological innovations are adopted which better manage our scarce resources amidst a changing climate.

To support this opportunity, the government's AgTech Growth Fund provides supports for projects which solve critical industry challenges through grants of up to $100,000. To be successful, projects must be sponsored by a primary producer, and in this way the fund brings together important players in the value chain of primary production, from the developers of technological products to primary producers, and then, ultimately, consumers.

Nine recipients were announced as part of the first round of the AgTech Growth Fund in June 2022, with grant funding for that round totalling over $717,000. A varied bundle of projects was funded across the grains, horticulture, viticulture, dairy and seafood industries, and many now have results they are sharing with the broader agtech community as well as primary producers in region.

Two projects are particularly advanced and are worth highlighting because they are demonstrating to primary producers in the field the benefits of adopting advanced agricultural technologies. The first project, under the business name Cropify, is developing artificial intelligence technology to classify grains. I am advised that currently in Australia and overseas, about 50 per cent of classification is performed subjectively by the human eye, leading to an annual value leakage up and down the supply chain of $54 million because of misclassification.

The Cropify system works to alleviate this problem by training the system's algorithm to benchmark the results of lab-tested samples and then applying this benchmark to new samples. Through this process, the Cropify system has achieved results of greater than 98 per cent accuracy—more accurate than the classification.

The project financed through the AgTech Growth Fund facilitated Cropify's building of prototype hardware and software to demonstrate the accurate classification of one of the most challenging grains, namely, small red lentils. I am told that in addition, it is likely to reduce carbon emissions, because trucks are often lining up in silo line-ups with the engines running for quite a long time as they wait for a human to classify the grains. Instead, the Cropify system takes about 25 per cent of the equivalent human time.

Founders of Cropify, Anna Falkiner and Andrew Hannon, have already taken the prototype directly to bulk handlers and growers and have exhibited the prototype at major agricultural field days. Reflecting on this engagement, Anna emphasised and I quote:

> Keeping our target customers involved during Cropify's development has been crucial…It means the technology has a greater chance of being widely accepted by industry.

This is vital, because the benefits of agtech advances will only be realised if the benefits of producer investment and adoption are demonstrated, marketed and understood by primary producers.

The second project, under the business name Capture Actual Time, or CAT, has produced eight infield loggers for real-time bunch weight sensing in the wine industry. I am advised that traditionally, in order to estimate vine yield, growers strip about 10 per cent of their fruit for sampling. The CAT system removes the need for this process by using load cell technology in conjunction with Internet of Things sensors to provide bunch weight samples while still on the vine. This achieves greater sample accuracy and, because the measurements are provided in real time, the system provides the data needed to better understand bunch weight responses to different climatic conditions, such as heatwaves, cool spells and rainfall, improving irrigation and harvest decisions.

While the technology is still in the trial stage, the interest in the technology from industry has already been extremely promising, with CAT producing and installing systems in the Napa Valley, California; and in New Zealand. The proponents of both projects have reinforced how crucial finance received through the AgTech Growth Fund has been in accelerating the development of their prototypes and staying ahead of potential market competitors. I look forward to seeing how these innovations progress and providing further updates on AgTech Growth Fund projects.

FOSTER AND KINSHIP CARE INQUIRY

The Hon. S.L. GAME (14:42): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries about child protection in South Australia.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.L. GAME: In January this year, the child protection minister made a public statement and promised to review the outcomes of the Independent Inquiry into Foster and Kinship Care. She stated:

> We wholeheartedly acknowledge that foster and kinship carers are deeply concerned about the Inquiry into Foster and Kinship Care's capacity for independence. We hear you.
>
> South Australian Labor is committed to ensuring that carers are heard. At the conclusion of the inquiry, South Australian Labor will seek the views of carers and should carers voice that a review of the inquiry's findings and recommendations is warranted, Labor will seek to establish such a review.

The Carer Council was a key recommendation of the Independent Inquiry into Foster and Kinship Care, designed to amplify the voices of carers and provide the minister with independent advice that contributes through a form of foster and kinship care in South Australia. However, the legislative review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act closed for feedback on 11 November 2022.

My understanding is that the feedback closed more than a month before carers received the report from the Independent Inquiry into Foster and Kinship Care on 15 December 2022. Carers therefore were not provided with the opportunity to consider the outcomes of the inquiry and make well-considered submissions for the legislative review based on those outcomes. My questions to the minister are:

1. Why didn't the minister consult with all the carer community as per the statement of commitment to seek their input for establishing the Carer Council and why did the minister refuse to provide carers with the promised review of inquiry outcomes?

2. Will the minister revisit the report for the legislative review of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 with carers prior to completing the draft legislation and provide carers the extension they had previously requested so they can also make submissions based on the inquiry outcomes?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:44): I thank the honourable member for her question. I'm happy to refer it to the Minister for Child Protection in the other place and bring back a response.

REGIONAL ROADS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:44): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Regional Development about regional roads.

Leave granted.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: It was reported at the *Australian Financial Review* National Infrastructure Summit this week that the Infrastructure Australia chief executive told those who attended the summit that he is expecting the Albanese government to cut billions of dollars' worth of projects. My questions to the minister are:

1. As the Minister for Regional Development, will the minister ensure that projects of strategic importance, such as the Truro bypass or the regional roads package of safety works, which are funded on an 80:20 basis with the federal government, will not be abandoned?

2. Can the minister provide a guarantee to SA regional communities that funding for rural roads will not be compromised by the Albanese government to cut billions of dollars of funding?

3. Has the minister or the state government received a formal update from the federal government to outline which road project fundings in South Australia will be affected?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:45): I thank the honourable member for her question. It is clear that the former federal Coalition government made a lot of promises but failed to adequately budget to deliver them and this is a failure that we also saw at a state level under the former Marshall Liberal government leading to projects that were undercosted—

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: —and inadequately planned.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: They were undercosted and inadequately planned.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Having taken the time to fix these issues, with projects such as the north-south corridor, we acknowledge the efforts of Minister King to undertake this review process. We await the outcome of the federal government's review, at which time we will respond accordingly.

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO: Supplementary.

The PRESIDENT: Well, I will listen, but I didn't hear much of the answer.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I wasn't inviting comment from both of you. The Hon. Ms Girolamo, what is your supplementary question?

REGIONAL ROADS

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (14:47): What conversations has the minister had with the federal government around ensuring that billions of dollars are not cut out of these projects? What have you done? Have you done your job?

The Hon. K.J. Maher: That has nothing to do with the answer.

The PRESIDENT: I really don't know how to adjudicate because I didn't hear the answer. Minister, would you like to make a response?

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:47): I'm happy to give my previous answer, particularly for your benefit, Mr President, as well as anyone else who couldn't hear because of the rabble opposite. What I said was that it was clear that the former federal Coalition government made a lot of promises but failed to adequately budget to deliver them and that was a failure we also saw at a state level under the former Marshall Liberal government leading to projects being undercosted and inadequately planned—undercosted and inadequately planned.

Having taken the time to fix these issues with projects such as the north-south corridor, our government acknowledges the efforts of Minister King to undertake the review process and we await the outcome of the federal government's review, at which time we will respond accordingly.

ABORIGINAL AND TORRES STRAIT ISLANDER WAR MEMORIAL

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Will the minister inform the council about the recent service at the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial in honour of its 10th anniversary?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:48): I thank the honourable member for his question. It's always an honour to be invited along to the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial and to be a part of the services that mark the lives and contributions of Aboriginal veterans.

The memorial on the corner of King William Road and Victoria Drive is a credit to Aboriginal Veterans SA. Aboriginal Veterans SA, in the capable hands of Uncle Frank Lampard OAM and Ian Smith, do much to honour the legacy of these veterans and their selfless sacrifices for the nation that for many years did not return the favour in the same manner.

There are countless stories like those of Tim Hughes that I shared the other week, where Aboriginal veterans returned home from service to find they had been excluded from the benefits bestowed upon counterparts with whom they had served, particularly whilst overseas. We owe a great debt to people like Tim Hughes and now to the chairs of Aboriginal Veterans SA for making sure these stories are told and that some of these injustices are corrected.

Along with advocating for the establishment of the memorial, Aboriginal Veterans SA's work includes the restoration of Aboriginal veterans' graves, maintaining a register of Aboriginal veterans, and spreading awareness of Aboriginal veterans' legacies through exhibitions and events. The work of this organisation is a credit to co-chair Frank Lampard in particular, who has dedicated so much of his energy and life to help Aboriginal veterans, which is one of the many reasons Uncle Frank Lampard was awarded the Premier's NAIDOC Award earlier this year.

The memorial was dedicated 10 years ago this month on 10 November 2013 and was unveiled by then Governor-General Quentin Bryce. Since then, the memorial has hosted many moving services, including an annual service during Reconciliation Week, which I mentioned in this chamber earlier this year. Last week, we gathered again at the memorial on a very hot day where the mercury just tipped the 40° mark, to mark the 10th anniversary of the memorial.

Despite the heat the service was, as these occasions always are, very well attended. There were many of our colleagues there, from both this chamber and the other place, including the Minister for Veterans Affairs, the Hon. Geoff Brock, the member for Waite, Catherine Hutchesson, as well as the member for Morialta, the member for Heysen and the member for Hammond. It was a poignant service with musical performances from Vonda Last and Florence, who performed a rendition of *The Old Rugged Cross* in Ngarrindjeri. Ngaire Jarro gave the key address, sharing her father, Jack Huggins', story of being a prisoner of war on the notorious Burma-Thailand Railway during World War II.

I was honoured to be part of sharing in the 10th anniversary of the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander War Memorial last week.

PUBLIC SECTOR HONESTY AND ACCOUNTABILITY

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (14:51): My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

The PRESIDENT: The Hon. Mr Pangallo, you need to address the question to the minister representing the appropriate minister.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: My question is directed to the Leader of the Government and is for the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services:

1. Is it now accepted practice that any senior public officers who have admitted or have been found to have breached laws like the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act will not face any disciplinary action and are, in fact, immune from any such action simply because of their reputation in the community?

2. Why was there no investigation undertaken into the conduct of the former Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, Mr Gregory Mornington May, when a court found he had breached section 17 of the Public Sector (Honesty and Accountability) Act on multiple occasions?

3. Did Mr May ever self-report to any integrity agency about those findings, particularly when that conduct is defined as corrupt under section 5 of the ICAC Act?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:53): As I represent, in this place, the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services in the other place, I thank the honourable member for his question. I will refer it to the minister in the other place and bring back a response.

OPTUS BLACKOUT

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (14:53): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney-General a question in relation to his role as Leader of the Government in this place.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON: In relation to the Optus blackout on Wednesday 8 November, the Premier said, 'We have a contract with Optus, as do other governments around the country. That is something that we will turn our mind to.' My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. What services was the government unable to deliver to South Australians at the time of the Optus blackout?

2. What is the status of Optus's contractual obligations to the state government?

3. Has the state government contacted Optus?

4. Has Optus provided compensation or any other means of redress to the state government?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for her questions. Her questions traverse every single government department, I think, in what is being asked. I will have to take those on notice and bring back a reply for the honourable member.

BIOSECURITY, KANGAROO ISLAND

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister update the council on the campaign to strengthen Kangaroo Island's biosecurity?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:54): I thank the honourable member for his question and his ongoing interest in Kangaroo Island. I am delighted to update this place on the government's latest initiative to protect Kangaroo Island's unique landscape. Kangaroo Island's relative isolation and distinctive environment is well recognised, and its clean and green image is key to its economic and social wellbeing.

The island's relative pest and disease-free status is significant to its environment, industries and social amenity. A significant amount of work has gone into ensuring the island remains pest and disease free. Members in this place may recall previous speeches I have made relating to the

excellent ongoing work to eradicate feral pigs off the island, with only two male pigs still remaining on the western part of the island.

Ferry services to Kangaroo Island are recognised as a major pathway for potential biosecurity incursions, and that is why random biosecurity checks for travellers to the island are in place. Since July 2020, staff have attended 3,159 ferry services, checked 99,698 vehicles and engaged with over 260,000 passengers. As a result of the work of PIRSA biosecurity officers, 2,179 consignments of honey, 1,716 consignments of plants, 110 consignments of livestock and 77 potatoes contaminated with soil have been prevented from entering Kangaroo Island. Further to this, 878 machines used for earthmoving, agricultural and construction purposes have all been stopped before coming onto the island.

It is critical that we continue to carry out biosecurity checks for travellers coming onto the island, and that is why the Department of Primary Industries and Regions has recently commissioned the Kangaroo Island biosecurity awareness video. This is a new tool in the suite of measures to assist in promoting compliance with the legislative requirements that are in place to protect the island's agricultural industries and environment.

The video features local Kangaroo Islanders, including a seed potato farmer, a beekeeper, an oyster farmer, a wildlife park operator, national parks rangers and PIRSA biosecurity officers. In the video, local producers deliver messaging on biosecurity requirements related to honey and bee products—I am not sure if that includes wax, as there were questions here about candle makers—potatoes, weeds, aquatic pests and pest animals. The video includes graphics that provide clear instruction on actions that travellers should take to comply with biosecurity requirements.

The video will be shared with the tourism industry, and it is hoped it will improve awareness of the biosecurity risks that the island faces and the role that each and every traveller plays in protecting it. I am advised SeaLink will be playing this video on the ferry over, and the Kangaroo Island tourism authority will share it with their tourism members. This is complementary to pre-existing measures introduced in recent times, including new road signage as you approach the ferry, social media messaging and information on SeaLink ticketing. This latest campaign is a timely one as we fast approach the festive period, when we see an even higher increase in tourism to the island.

SOCIAL HOUSING

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (14:58): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question without notice to the minister representing the Minister for Human Services on the topic of social housing maintenance.

Leave granted.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: On Monday, the New South Wales government announced that they will take back control of the maintenance of their social housing properties to reverse outsourcing to the private sector. The New South Wales announcement includes a new maintenance hub within Homes NSW that will coordinate work orders and deliver better outcomes for tenants. The Greens have been calling for the establishment of a publicly owned builder who could undertake construction of new public and affordable homes and complete maintenance work as well.

My question to the minister is: will the government follow the lead of New South Wales and bring maintenance of public housing back into public hands, and will the government consider establishing a publicly owned builder to undertake construction of new public and affordable homes?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (14:59): I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, we are still living with the legacy of various privatisations of particularly a previous Liberal government. I will refer this question to the Minister for Human Services in the other place and bring back a response.

CRIME RATES

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:00): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Attorney-General regarding crime rates in the northern suburbs.

Leave granted.

The Hon. B.R. HOOD: On 17 October 2023, Labor's federal member for Spence told the House of Representatives about worryingly high rates of violent crime occurring in his northern suburbs electorate. Matt Burnell MP informed the house that one of his own staff had been assaulted on that same day, enduring multiple blows to the head, and was threatened with a knife. Mr Burnell said:

> …such behaviour is not isolated in my community. I constantly read reports of crime happening in the north, and it's simply not good enough.

The member for Spence then went on to say that when these perpetrators were convicted they tended to remain in the community without rehabilitation or reprimand. He then called on the state government, the Attorney-General and the police minister to act. My questions to the Attorney-General are:

1. Has the Attorney met with the federal member for Spence to specifically discuss his concerns over the high rates of violent crime and the courts' lack of rehabilitation or punishment of these perpetrators?

2. If so, what immediate action is he taking to ensure the safety of those living in our northern suburb communities?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:01): I thank the honourable member for his question. Of course, it is an exceptionally important function of government in general to keep people and the people who live in this state safe. I know that the primary responsibility for the detection of crime and the apprehension of those who commit crimes rests with the South Australian police force, who target their resources in such a way to maximise the effectiveness of how they do that and keep South Australia safe. I am sure that SAPOL will continue to do that.

RAUKKAN ABORIGINAL SCHOOL

The Hon. T.T. NGO (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. Can the minister tell the council about his recent visit to the Raukkan Aboriginal School?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:02): I thank the honourable member for his question. I will be more than happy to inform the honourable member of the recent visit to Raukkan school, and I thank the honourable member for his interest in this matter. I know, as the former Chair of the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee, he has had a longstanding, keen interest. I know members of that committee have in years gone by visited the Raukkan Aboriginal community.

I had the privilege in the last couple of weeks to attend the Raukkan Aboriginal School, located about two hours south-east of Adelaide. The establishment of the Raukkan Aboriginal School is intertwined with the broader historical narrative of Aboriginal education and missionary efforts in Australia. Raukkan school has a rich history and was built originally by Ngarrindjeri people with George Taplin during 1859 and 1860. In 1886, the school was assumed by German Lutheran missionary pastor August Kavel under the name Point McLeay Native School. Pastor Kavel aimed to provide education and religious instruction to the Ngarrindjeri people.

The school's early years were marked by the challenges inherent in bridging cultural differences and establishing effective communication. As the 20th century unfolded, the school underwent significant transformations. In 1916, control of the school was transferred from the Lutheran Church to the state government. This shift marked a turning point in the administration and funding of Aboriginal education. The school continued to evolve, adapting to challenges in educational policies and practices over the decades. In the 1980s, the school was renamed Raukkan Aboriginal School to reflect a desire to connect with the Ngarrindjeri language and cultural identity.

Throughout its history, Raukkan Aboriginal School has faced challenges, including issues relating to funding, cultural preservation and the broader context of Aboriginal education in Australia. The school's commitment to preserving and promoting Ngarrindjeri culture is evidenced in its curriculum, which incorporates traditional knowledge alongside standard academic subjects.

This was clearly demonstrated to me by four young students of the school: Brooklyn, Jeffrey, Shakaya and River, all of whom are in years 5 and 6. These students apparently led the tour of their school and highlighted cultural practices incorporated into everyday schooling, including art and the growing of native foods on the school premises.

The relationship between the school and the local community is integral to its success. Collaborative efforts between the school and community members have led to the development of programs and initiatives that reflect the unique cultural context of Raukkan. These collaborations extend beyond the classroom, fostering approaches to education that encompass cultural, social and emotional wellbeing.

In recent years, Raukkan Aboriginal School has had a number of successes in Aboriginal education, showcasing the importance of incorporating these cultural elements into the curriculum. The school's success stories include students who have gone on to pursue higher education and contribute more broadly to their communities.

I would like to congratulate the work of Principal Cheryl Bawden, Helen Forrest and Debra Long for all the hard work they do at Raukkan school, and acknowledge the commitment of the students I spent time with and the achievements of Brooklyn, Jeffrey, Shakara and River.

ISRAEL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:05): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Attorney a question about a motion moved yesterday at Adelaide City Council.

Leave granted.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Yesterday, Adelaide city councillor Arman Abrahimzadeh moved a motion seeking the council's support to express its sadness at the tragic loss of innocent Israeli and Palestinian lives, and for the Adelaide Town Hall to be lit in the colours of the Palestinian flag—red, black, white and green—amongst other things. It followed the illumination of Adelaide's landmarks—including the Town Hall, Adelaide Oval, the Railway Station and, indeed, this parliament—in the colours of the Israeli flag on 9 October. At the time, the Premier tweeted:

> Landmarks around Adelaide are being illuminated in blue and white tonight in solidarity with the State of Israel.

Since 7 October, some eleven and a half thousand Palestinian lives that we know of have been lost, including more than 5,000 Palestinian children and 102 UN aid workers. Dozens and dozens of journalists have also been killed in the current conflict. My questions to the Attorney are:

1. Has his government considered the motion and what does it intend to do in response to the outcome of that motion?

2. Does the South Australian government intend to light up landmarks in solidarity with the Palestinian people, in light of the outcome of the motion that passed yesterday at Adelaide City Council?

3. Does the government appreciate the level of anger and disappointment amongst our Palestinian and Muslim South Australian community members, especially—especially—because no immediate action was taken to show the same solidarity in recent weeks, after thousands and thousands of deaths that continue every day as we watch on?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:07): I thank the honourable member for her question. I don't think there is a South Australian who looks on at reports of what we are seeing happening in that part of the world, in Israel and in Gaza, and doesn't look on with a sense of horror and helplessness at the so many thousands of unnecessary deaths occurring to innocent people—to men, women and children who are just getting on with their daily lives.

In relation to specific questions that the honourable member has asked about the lighting of monuments, I am pretty sure that is something that the Department of the Premier and Cabinet would handle. There would be a process that would be gone through to decide when that is done and how

that is done. In relation to the motion of the Adelaide City Council, I have only heard brief media reports on radio news this morning about that motion, so I will have to inform myself more of those.

ISRAEL

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:08): Supplementary question: does the Attorney acknowledge that it is a small but significant gesture that would go a long way towards addressing the helplessness and feelings of horror that we are all confronted with in terms of what is happening in that conflict?

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (15:09): As I have said, the illuminating of monuments is not a decision for me or the Attorney-General's Department. As I said, I think everyone shares the sentiment that this is completely unnecessary, and on all sides of the conflict would like to see the unnecessary loss of lives come to an end.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (15:09): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before addressing a question to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development on regional development.

Leave granted.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: The federal industry minister, Ed Husic, confirmed last week that the federal government has pulled $113 million from an SA-based plant protein project, which would have seen three manufacturing sites as part of the project: one in the northern metropolitan suburbs and two in our regions. This proposal was intended to be a major job creator for the regions, and the state government's contribution to the project was $65 million.

In a previous answer to a question on the plant protein project, asked in this place by the Hon. Jing Lee, the minister brought back a reply from the trade and investment minister who said that, and I quote: 'The state government grant is contingent upon federal support and remains in active discussion with the relevant parties.'

My question to the minister is: will she as the Minister for Regional Development, and the Malinauskas government, commit that the state's contribution to the project of $65 million will still be used in the regions towards other projects to stimulate growth and economic development in country South Australia, or will the funds simply be put back into general revenue?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:11): I thank the honourable member for her question. As she mentioned in her answer, this particular issue has been with the Department for Trade and Investment. I think it is fair to say that, given that news came through only last week, there isn't as yet to my knowledge a definitive answer to the question. I will refer the question to the Minister for Trade and Investment and bring back a response.

SNAPPER FISHERY

The Hon. R.P. WORTLEY (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Will the minister inform the chamber about the recent changes to the South-East snapper fishing bag limits?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:12): I thank the honourable member for his question. In what was I think very welcome news to anglers, the state government recently announced a bag limit increase for snapper in the South-East fishing zone. The West Coast Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent snapper stocks remain depleted and are therefore closed until 2026, but the South-East fishing zone is a separate zone and has experienced recent record recruitment events, and increasing biomass, with the fishery shared between western Victoria and the South-East of our state.

The bag limit increase will see recreational anglers able to take a bag limit of two legal-sized fish per person—legal size being 38 centimetres and over—which is an increase of one, and a boat limit of six, where three or more people are fishing on a boat, which is an increase of three per boat.

The South-East fishing zone encompasses a large area of state waters from the bottom of Kangaroo Island and around the Murray Mouth, right through to the Victorian border, providing many opportunities for fishers to get out and enjoy the increased snapper bag limit across some of our state's most iconic fishing spots.

Of course, as is so often the case, anglers don't just enjoy the great fishing; they also spend and support local communities. With the start of warmer weather and the upcoming holiday period, it is a great time to get down to your favourite spot, from the Murray Mouth right through to the Victorian border, to go fishing and enjoy the many attractions of that great part of our state. Anyone who does so I would certainly encourage to call in at Port MacDonnell and enjoy that wonderful town that I happen to call home.

The increase in bag limits, as recommended by the Marine Scalefish Fishery Management Advisory Committee, is based on SARDI science, showing it is sustainable, based on the increasing biomass and spawning activity that I mentioned a moment ago. It is a responsible change that takes into account long-term sustainability, balanced with the ability, on this occasion where the science permitted, to have a measured increase and access to the resource for recreational fishers, which we know is important for a range of reasons.

I take this opportunity to reiterate the requirement of recording snapper catches, via Fishwatch or the SA Fishing app, as an important part of ensuring that the snapper fishery in the South-East is managed sustainably within its total allowable catch limits. I look forward to hearing of our keen recreational fishing community getting out and about in the South-East and enjoying some snapper fishing. If you are in Port MacDonnell, please say hello when you see me.

ROAD FUNDING

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:14): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, representing the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, about road funding.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: The jungle drums are starting to beat, with fears circulating the state government will have to start shouldering the majority of the cost of future major transport infrastructure projects as the federal government pushes responsibility for such projects back onto the states. Fully funded or 80:20 splits between both federal and state governments will no longer be the default for infrastructure deals related to nationally significant road and rail projects or where the commonwealth contribution is at least $250 million.

That is because an audit commissioned by the Albanese government earlier this year found about $33 billion blowout in about 700 unstarted federally funded projects which are now in limbo. According to media reports, the federal government has already renegotiated terms and time frames and even scrapped some projects with state and territory governments. The Auditor-General in South Australia recently found that there is almost $1.9 billion of road maintenance works still to be carried out and that is likely to grow. My questions to the minister are:

1. Has the South Australian government been forced to renegotiate terms and time frames for specific projects and, if so, what are they?

2. Have any future projects been scrapped?

3. How do federal Labor's new priorities impact major projects like the $15.4 billion twin tunnel Torrens to Darlington upgrade of South Road, and also the outstanding road maintenance works? What impact will that have on the backlog?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:17): I thank the honourable member for his question. As I did respond in an earlier answer, we are awaiting the outcome of the federal government's review, at which time we will be able to respond accordingly as a government. I am aware, of course, also of some of the media commentary, but I don't have any additional information at this time. I will refer the question to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport and bring back a response.

STRENGTHENING INDUSTRIES PROGRAM

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:17): I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking a question of the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development about the Strengthening Industries Program.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.S. LEE: According to the PIRSA website, the Thriving Regions Fund Strengthening Industries Program supports primary or regional industries impacted by significant supply chain disruptions, market access constraints or changes to the operating environment. Through this program, the government recognises the importance of industries that support our regions to thrive.

The PIRSA website goes on to say that PIRSA will assess applications to the Strengthening Industries Program individually and make recommendations to the minister accordingly. However, nowhere on the PIRSA website is there a link to an application process. My questions to the minister are:

1. What industries has the minister or her department communicated with to ensure they are aware of the programs?

2. Given there are no apparent public links to the applications, how do those various primary or regional industries apply to participate in the program?

3. Why haven't the details regarding the application process been made public?

4. Why is this program, which is apparently designed to support our regions to thrive, such a secret squirrel business?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (15:19): Given that the honourable member is referring to what is publicly available on the PIRSA website, it is really quite remarkable that she is then suggesting that this is somehow secret. I really don't think the PIRSA website is password protected and firewalled. I am pretty sure that anyone who wants to go on the PIRSA website can easily do so.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order! I would like you to finish your answer, please, in silence.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Any contact details for PIRSA will get your application through.

Matters of Interest

COST OF LIVING

The Hon. L.A. HENDERSON (15:20): In March of last year it was reported that house prices in South Australia are growing at a faster pace than the national rate, with a lack of supply pushing the median value of metropolitan homes up by 25 per cent a year. When I shared this figure in my maiden speech, I noted that this is not obtainable for young South Australians, South Australians who are aspirational and working hard to save, in the hope that one day they will be able to afford to buy a home for their family but are struggling to keep up with the price rises as they try to reach their financial targets.

Sadly, since that time, the dream of owning a home has become more and more out of reach for young South Australians and, frankly, so too has renting. ANZ chief executive Shayne Elliott noted only this week that:

> Getting credit is slowly becoming the preserve of the rich...The average income today of a person getting a home loan is materially higher than the average citizen and that gap [is] continuing to grow. If you want a loan you have to be better off, or essentially, be rich.

We have seen 13 rate rises since May 2022—13. More than half of South Australian mortgage holders are now experiencing mortgage stress. There are now at least 169,653 households enduring mortgage stress across our state, a staggering 57.72 per cent of mortgage holders. To put this into perspective, that is like filling the Adelaide Oval to full capacity almost 3.2 times or the Adelaide

Entertainment Centre nearly 17 times. The number of households under mortgage stress will increase if the RBA imposes another pre-Christmas blow to budgets at its final meeting of the year on 5 December. Across the weekend, the *Inquirer* reported that:

> Many living in typically well-off areas are in financial counselling and seeking social support for the first time.
>
> Required mortgage repayments as a nationwide share of disposable income is at a record high of 10 per cent. Bill shock—for petrol, electricity, insurance premiums, rents, childcare and eating out—is on everyone's lips.
>
> While the consumer price index increased by 5.4 per cent in the year to the September quarter, living costs for these 'employee households' rose by 9 per cent (that includes mortgage interest charges; the CPI does not). Living costs for self-funded retirees rose by 5.7 per cent across the year.

It was reported that:

> Real per capita household disposable income (that is, after tax and inflation) fell by 2.2 per cent in the year to June.

It should be noted that dealing in averages of course masks some big swings for some families. Without fail, when I am out in the community, constituents talk to me about the cost-of-living crisis. Make no mistake, there will be children who go to bed hungry tonight. There will be families who forgo sports for their children.

There are people in our community who cannot afford the fuel they need to be able to drive to work, and people in our community who go from community food service to community food service. Foodbank recently released their hunger report for 2023. Under state and federal Labor governments, 3.7 million households in Australia experienced moderate to severe level food insecurity in the past 12 months.

Closer to home, 33 per cent of South Australians are facing moderate to severe food insecurity: people in our own communities not knowing if they will be able to afford their week's groceries to put food on the table for their families. So let's break it down and be clear: South Australians are worse off under Labor. Since the Malinauskas and Albanese governments have formed, inflation across the country has increased, putting pressure on South Australian families.

Take September 2022-23, for example. Bread and cereal products up 8.9 per cent. Dairy and related products up 8 per cent. Rent is up 7.6 per cent. Electricity is up 18 per cent. Gas is up 12.7 per cent and fuel is up 19.7 per cent. I think you get the picture. Household income is not safe under Labor. In the 12 months to June, Australian household incomes slumped 5.1 per cent while it rose 2.2 per cent in the United Kingdom and 3.5 per cent in the United States. The ball is in the government's court to address the cost-of-living pressures for South Australians and they should get on with the job of doing so.

Time expired.

AUTISM WORKS

The Hon. E.S. BOURKE (15:25): If you have been out and about in the city or on social media in the last few weeks, you are more than likely to have come across the new Autism Works campaign. For those who do not know much about the campaign, Autism Works is a newly launched community education campaign that features five autistic individuals: Deanna, Dorian Tisato—who many in this chamber would know—Bianca, Malcolm and Rebecca in their current workplaces.

From a community relations manager, to a teacher, to a radio presenter, Autism Works aims at promoting and building knowledge of autism inclusion across South Australian workplaces by shining a light on living examples of how autistic individuals achieve and contribute within our state's workforce. Led by the Office for Autism, which is headed by an autistic director as well as by an autistic adviser, Autism Works is playing an important part in delivering the Malinauskas Labor government's commitment to making our state a more inclusive place for the autistic people and their families.

As a Labor government, our priority is always centred around employment, not just for the obvious economic benefits it has for families, communities and our state but for the dignity it provides individuals. Having a job is more than putting food on the table, for many it is the reason to get up

and out the front door in the morning. However, for many in the autistic community access to employment is often riddled with barriers.

Currently, if you are autistic, you are three times more likely to be unemployed than someone else with another disability and around six times more likely to be unemployed than the general population. While these statistics speak for themselves about the problem in front of us, autistic people themselves at every community meeting, every forum and every event speak about the importance of employment and have shared their personal experiences in facing many barriers in trying to enter and stay in the workforce.

As I have mentioned before in this chamber, autistic people are our country's largest disability group. In South Australia, we also sit above the national average of 35 per cent, with 41 per cent of our NDIS participants being autistic. We are not talking about a small minority of individuals. The new Autism Works campaign continues growing the Malinauskas Labor government's commitment to making SA the autism inclusive state.

However, we have not just released a shiny awareness campaign. Autism Works directs you to the new Office for Autism website: autismworks.sa.gov.au, which features a range of evidence-based resources both for employers who are wanting to build their knowledge of how to create a more autism inclusive workplace and guides and tips for prospective autistic employees. I encourage all who may have not already to visit the website and share these resources with your local community and businesses.

Whether you have seen it on a tram stop, on TV, if it has popped up on your Facebook feed, or perhaps even at the Adelaide Oval, I hope the new Autism Works campaign has made you stop and think, stop and think about all the myths and stereotypes about autism, and has started a conversation with not only yourselves but your loved ones, your colleagues and your friends.

We know that when we make our communities more inclusive for the autistic and autism communities, it benefits our entire community. When a state is a more inclusive place for autistic individuals to live, work and thrive, we all benefit because autism works.

MENOPAUSE

The Hon. C. BONAROS (15:29): One of the campaigns I am most proud of having worked on in this place with my colleague Irene Pnevmatikos was, and continues to be, the period poverty campaign. Today, I wish to speak about another overwhelmingly neglected group in our South Australian community and hope that this will be the first of many opportunities to shine the spotlight on women who are experiencing the sometimes debilitating effects of menopause. In so doing, I acknowledge that the Greens at a federal level have stolen my thunder and moved for an inquiry, but, in any event, I am pleased that that inquiry has been secured in the federal parliament and that there now will be an inquiry into menopause and perimenopause.

As a woman nears the end of childbearing years, she produces less oestrogen and progesterone causing changes in her menstrual cycle. It is a natural ageing process causing egg production to eventually stop. For those who are interested, the word menopause actually comes from the Greek words 'mens' meaning month and 'pausis' meaning cessation, so it actually has nothing to do with males.

The average age of a woman to go through menopause is 51, with most women falling between the ages of 45 and 55. Premature menopause in women under 40 affects about one in 100, whilst early menopause, between 40 and 45, affects about five in 100.

Menopause is something that receives very little attention. Women are expected to, and indeed do, suffer in silence. They soldier on without having much in terms of support around symptoms. Women are expected to deal with those symptoms, physical and emotional. They include hot flushes, night sweats, fatigue, anxiety, heart palpitations, dizziness, memory loss, joint pains, sleep disorders, mood swings, low libido, hair loss, bloating, itchy skin and weight gain, and the list, as many of us nearing that age would know, goes on and on.

Not all women experience menopause symptoms, but it is thought about 80 per cent do. Symptoms can be mild to severe and generally last between five and 10 years. For the lucky ones,

there can be mild or no symptoms. For those who are on the severe end, it can significantly impact the quality of a woman's life. The effects can be debilitating and require medical interventions, including hormone replacement therapies. It can impact employment, relationships, families, mental health and everyday functioning. There are also long-term effects caused by the decrease in female hormones, such as osteoporosis.

I did have a motion to deal with menopause here in state parliament. I have put that on pause—pardon the pun—given what is happening at the federal level, but it is something that I intend to raise in this place as the feds progress through that inquiry.

It is time to address the stigma and have a real and open conversation about menopause, just as we have done in this place around periods and period poverty; in fact, it is well overdue. There is a need to increase our knowledge and awareness about this important women's health issue, to look at funding and support models, and to explore the impacts on workplaces and the economy more broadly. One of the single most neglected groups in South Australia are women who experience menopause.

We also need to speak about gaslighting when it comes to women's bodies. They need to know when their pain or symptoms are normal and when they are not and not be left to rely on Dr Google. There are also subgroups of women who we should be looking at when it comes to menopause. There are vulnerable groups who have unique challenges: women in prison, regional and socially disadvantaged groups and our Indigenous women. This is an issue that is neglected by us as a health issue and a state issue.

I know that everyone in here learnt a lot about periods and period poverty as a result of the campaign that is ongoing and there are amazing people doing amazing things in the background on that. It is my intention to make sure that we all know everything there is to know about menopause until we get some traction and movement on that front.

EVENT TOURISM

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (15:34): I recently had a bit of an interesting discussion. Unless you live under a rock, you would know that a very popular American financial journal recently indicated that Adelaide—indeed, South Australia—might just be one of the coolest cities in Australia. Whether you think we are or not, what was interesting about that was that it came up in a discussion I then had very recently with some of my interstate colleagues from the east coast.

Very recently, we also announced that the Gather Round is coming back to South Australia. We have the dates for it. We have the schedule. It is coming out. Make sure you get along to it, Acting President, because it is going to be fabulous. The fact is that most people who come along to the Gather Round, if they are coming from interstate, come from Victoria, and I had a discussion with some of my friends in Victoria about how they are going to come here.

We had the usual jibes that we always have around, 'You can come across for the F1s and we will come across for the Gather Round.' It was like, 'Ha, ha.' The interesting thing about it was that the coolest city thing came up and they felt the need to tell me, 'You know you're not the coolest city, right?' I was like, 'Well, I don't really care. I don't think anyone in South Australia really did. It's nice, but we don't really give a stuff. It's interesting that you do.'

It was interesting as well that they raised the F1s, because they felt the need—as an F1 fan—to raise that. Despite having it for over a decade, they are yet to beat the attendance record that Adelaide set when we last had it in 1995—520,000 people, by the way. Maybe they will get there one day. However, the Gather Round for us was an enormous success last time, bringing in 220,000 people. My understanding is that the largest amount of them came from Victoria.

That was just it: we had this back-and-forth with Victorians, my mates, and I started to realise that I do not actually care. I do not care what Victoria is doing, it has not come up with me, but they seem to know a lot about what is happening in South Australia, which was really quite encouraging. They raised a number of events we had recently. They even raised the Premier, Peter Malinauskas. They said, 'He might be popular, but wait a while.' Well, nonetheless, he is popular, and they knew who he was. I am actually struggling to remember who is going to be the Victorian Premier once Dan Andrews resigns. I do not know who that is going to be, which is interesting.

So they know who we are, they knew that we had the Gather Round, they knew that we had Illuminate Adelaide, they knew that we had WOMADelaide, they knew that we had LIV Golf, they knew about the Adelaide 500—albeit, the old Grand Prix thing came up—and they knew about the Tour Down Under. They even knew about the Harvest Rock festival, which I found very interesting.

What was fascinating about this was all the psychology that was playing out in this conversation I was having with them. I am sorry to my mates for putting you on the front page, guys, but I said I would—and I am. It just raised with me this vibe: something has changed about South Australia. They have not changed. They are talking about us now. South Australia has changed.

The fact is that when you are dealing with these kinds of things you are going to be judged because you created something, or you can be ignored because you did not bother. South Australia has really created something. We have created something around a strong domestic market. The fact is that is how most Australians travel.

Most Australians are enthusiastic travellers, even more so after the pandemic finished. In 2022, overnight and daytrip spending surpassed pandemic levels nationally. The fact is that local or domestic travel via interstate is a goldmine and accounts for almost three-quarters of the total of Australia's tourism spend. It will add up to over $130 billion by 2027, and the fact is that South Australia is getting them here.

It is not just for the Gather Round; it is for all the events we are having. We have created something pretty special here, and I am always reminded by it when I see the increasing numbers of numberplates coming to South Australia from Victoria. They have somewhat of an ironic slogan now on some of them, because they say, 'The place to be', yet here they are, in South Australia. Long may they come. I hope they stay an extra night, and I look forward to seeing them over the next few months.

ANGLICARESA

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:39): 'Thank God for the Salvos': it is a brilliant catchcry for the Salvation Army and all the outstanding work it does. But today I am going to say, 'Thank heavens for Anglicare South Australia,' and pay my respects to the incredible work this exceptional charity does for the community day in, day out, every day of the year.

From its humble beginnings more than 160 years ago, AnglicareSA has made an enviable reputation, supporting South Australians in need with one goal in mind: to transform their lives for the better. With more than 2,000 hardworking staff and 300 dedicated volunteers, the organisation supports more than 55,000 vulnerable, in need South Australians each year; not that you would know it, given its humble and modest nature.

Today, I want to share just one story of the 55,000 people Anglicare South Australia supports each year. My office has been assisting a South Australian Housing Authority tenant in Parkside over the past year who is facing eviction for failing to keep her property in a clean and tenantable state. This is a very complex matter involving a long-term PTSD sufferer, which has led to a severe psychological condition that has manifested into an extreme hoarding disorder, which is significantly impeding her quality of life.

Hoarding, or what SA Health refers to as 'severe domestic squalor', is not a matter of laziness or an unreasonable unwillingness to throw things out: it is a debilitating and emotionally constraining disease, with the sufferer having a complete inability to cure themselves or, if forced to, does so with significant stress and emotion. This woman—and I will not name her to save her the ignominy—lives a lonely life in squalor. Such is her condition and the mountainous piles of belongings she keeps, there is no place in her two-bedroom apartment to lie down and sleep.

She does not have any family to help her with her dilemma. She does, however, continue to receive some wonderful support from her support person at SA Housing, a psychologist and a former work colleague, but they alone cannot physically help the woman undertake the decluttering of her townhouse that needs to occur to appease the authorities, such is the volume of the material that needs to be removed.

Enter AnglicareSA, who I approached for help prior to a hearing the woman was ordered to attend before SACAT. Together, we put together an action plan that involved removing a large volume of the woman's belongings from her property and storing it. This is a process being overseen by Dominic Gagliardi, Anglicare's executive general manager of social enterprise, and Paul Gent, its warehouse manager. It was a start, but there is still much work to be done.

The next stage is another commitment from AnglicareSA to store another 40 boxes of the woman's belongings. This will occur over the ensuing weeks in the hope that the woman's property will soon be returned to a state that satisfies the SA Housing Authority and she can get on living her life in a property she has called home for more than 20 years without the fear of eviction and confronting homelessness. All of this would not have been achieved without the outstanding work of AnglicareSA, but as Dominic says, that is what they do. For that, and from the bottom of my heart, I say thank you, and thank heavens for AnglicareSA.

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. H.M. Girolamo): I call on the Hon. Mira El Dannawi to deliver her first matter of interest.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

The Hon. M. EL DANNAWI (15:43): Last Friday marked a very special day for early childhood educators in South Australia and across the country. For the first time, educators were joined by federal government representatives to begin the formal process of multi-employer bargaining. Early childhood educators are the first in the country to use the new multi-employer bargaining laws to engage in bargaining for their sector. While the process of bargaining is sometimes long and exhausting, I am excited to watch the journey unfold, as I know educators will fight hard to achieve good outcomes for educators.

Multi-employer bargaining was introduced by the Labor government last year and is becoming the norm worldwide. Giving workers more bargaining power is one of the best ways we can combat wage stagnation, poor working conditions and low investment in the skills and training of the workforce. Through this process they hope to lift their basic wage and set new standards in early education.

As members in this place would know, I have worked as an educator in the early childhood sector for over 15 years. This is one of the most vital sectors for the functioning of our society. Unfortunately, it is often underpaid and undervalued, and it should not be surprising that 90 per cent of the workforce are women.

Early childhood educators are not babysitters. Children's learning is dynamic and complex, and it requires an exceptionally passionate, skilled and professional workforce. Their professional judgement is central to facilitating children's learning and helping them to develop a sense of belonging and a disposition for learning.

The first five years of life are fundamental for children's learning, health and positive development, as more than 90 per cent of their brain development occurs during this time. Educators observe, develop and implement a curriculum that aims to promote each child's wellbeing and the development of a range of skills and processes such as problem-solving, inquiry, experimentation and investigation.

These are all essential learning skills and early childhood educators provide the scaffolding needed for each child to meet their developmental outcomes. Therefore, it is vital that educators are engaged as highly trained and skilled professionals, which means paying them in line with their significant contribution to the wellbeing of our children.

Children's early learning experiences set the foundation for their later success. High-quality childhood education and care is also an essential part of ensuring parents can return to the workforce, whether they are returning by choice or by necessity. Access to high-quality early childhood education benefits all young children but particularly those from disadvantaged groups or with developmental delay, who are at higher risk of poor educational achievement.

According to data from the 2021 Australian Early Development Census, one in five Australian children start school developmentally vulnerable. This rises to two in five for Aboriginal and Torres

Strait Islander children. Research from the Mitchell Institute at Victoria University has shown that over a third of children in Australia live in childcare deserts—that is, areas where there are more than three children for every place in an ECEC centre.

The sector is underpaid and as a consequence understaffed. The most straightforward way to ensure that all children are given the support they need in the early years is to improve the working conditions of those who are providing that support. All children deserve access to high-quality early education, and improved conditions can provide greater opportunities for educators to reach those children and families who need support.

I want to congratulate all my former colleagues who have embarked on the bargaining process. We need a well-paid, well-resourced system and practices that put early learning in reach of all children and families. I hope this will be the first step towards making that a reality.

NATIONAL AGRICULTURE DAY

The Hon. B.R. HOOD (15:48): Friday 17 November is going to be National Ag Day. Many people here know how passionate I am about agriculture. Having grown up on a farm in the South-East, I had a pretty amazing lifestyle. Cleaning troughs, helping dad at harvest time, shearing, crutching—it was an amazing life, but I also know the enduring challenges of farming.

Farming demands resilience, patience, stamina, perseverance and, of course, passion: you have to love the job to do it year in, year out. But there are some current challenges with our farmers, and I am hearing them from my mates not just in the South-East but around the state. A recent ABARES report has shown that the agricultural value in Australia has dropped from $92 billion to $80 billion.

The National Farmers' Federation wants us to get to that $100 billion industry by 2030, and I really hope we can, but farmers are not immune from the cost-of-living crisis and they are currently in a perfect storm. Input costs have gone up with the increases of meat that we saw over the last couple of years, but they have not followed the prices at the market that are now going through the floor. I tell you what: we do not see much of a change at the checkout either.

I know reports of farmers who have spent three grand on cattle, per head, who are now lucky to get a thousand bucks per head for those cattle. Farmers are really the only people in our economy who buy their inputs at retail, sell their outputs at wholesale and then get squeezed in the middle. Of course, the narrative always is, 'Well, if you're in tough times, cut your spending; you'll be right,' but the fact is that farmers need to keep spending to keep productivity up.

Farmers grow our food. They keep us going in this country and around the world. In fact, we need to increase food production by 70 per cent by 2050 to feed all the people in the world. Australia is perfectly placed to do that, but our farmers are struggling.

Let's think about our Australian sheep farmers. They are faced with decisions on ways to de-stock their sheep because their sheep are deemed worthless by the people who are setting the prices, and feed is becoming too scarce to carry these sheep through until next year. Many are facing the terrible prospect of having to actually pay to dispose of their animals at the saleyards and meatworks because the returns are less than the cost of freight and of other fees.

Of course, let's not forget the shameful decision to phase out our live sheep exports, an industry that is worth $82 million to us annually. Luckily—and I say this sarcastically—the department of ag have a statement on their website for people who might be struggling through the physical and emotional toll of cancelling that industry: they understand the phase-out may be distressing for some people.

It is not all doom and gloom. I want to make sure that Ag Day is something we can celebrate. There is community support for farming. The IPA polling recently showed that 68 per cent of Australians believe that farmers and food producers are unappreciated—and they are—and more than 2½ times more Australians think farming has a positive impact on the environment rather than a negative one. Our farmers are our greatest conservationists. They look after their land because it is what ultimately makes them a profit.

I want to touch on some really amazing local people quickly in my speech. Recently, the Australian Society of Viticulture and Oenology had their 2022-23 Awards for Excellence. That saw Cath Kidman—a local from my patch down in the South-East, a technical viticulturist at Wynns Coonawarra—take out winemaker of the year. At the 2024 Halliday Wine Companion Awards, Penley Estate's Kate Goodman from Coonawarra took out their winemaker of the year award gong as well.

I am going to continue to advocate for farmers in this place, because we have to. National Ag Day is coming up on Friday. Their tagline is, 'Grow you good thing'. You know what? We need a farmer three times a day: for breakfast, for lunch, for dinner, and all the yummy little snacks in between. I am reminded of something that Paul Harvey said in 1978:

> …on the 8th day, God looked down at his planned paradise and said, 'I need a caretaker'...someone to seed, weed, feed, breed and rake and disc and plow and plant…and not to cut corners…so God made a Farmer.

Happy National Ag Day to all my mates on the land out there. I know you are doing it tough, but keep fighting the good fight. We need you in this country.

Motions

GENDER DYSPHORIA

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (15:53): I move:

1. That a select committee be established to inquire into and report on young people seeking assistance for gender dysphoria in South Australia and related matters, with particular reference to:
   - (a) the health care and related support services provided, and options available, to children, adolescents and young adults seeking services for gender dysphoria or other gender identity related issues in South Australia, and their parents, guardians and families;
   - (b) the role, rights and obligations of parents and guardians of minors seeking services for gender dysphoria or other gender identity related issues;
   - (c) the public funding of health and education services in South Australia in relation to sex-related and gender-related issues; and
   - (d) any other related matters.
2. That this council permits the select committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it sees fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being presented to the council.

I wish to speak on the motion in my name. It deals with the issue of gender dysphoria and gender-affirming care. Gender dysphoria is defined as the distress that trans people can feel because of the incongruence of their gender identity and gender presumed at birth or sex characteristics.

This subject is perhaps one of the most complex and controversial medical issues confronting our society today, from the troubled children and adolescents being engulfed by it, to medical and mental health professionals grappling with the ethics and standards being applied to treat this condition, our educators, who are being confronted by young people uncertain about who they are as they map their learning future through a maze of other personality problems, and finally to the families being torn apart over the welfare of their own children through the phenomenon and sudden surge of gender transformation and ideology.

This social contagion, relatively obscure in the last century, and mostly associated with prepubescent boys, is now sweeping the world at such a frenetic pace that it is becoming increasingly difficult to determine whether the practices and policies being promoted by government-funded interest organisations and other self-interest groups, then being put in place by well-meaning medical institutions, are helping individuals or is it causing them more harm than good in the long term; is it evidence based?

This is the intent of the select committee I am proposing. I understand there are many members in this place who may find this difficult to engage with because of the sensitivity of the subject matter involved. I want to make clear my own position, which I have not taken lightly. It is not to be seen as a reflection of any preconceived views or hysterical prejudices about the transgender community.

This is all about having a balanced perspective and learning more, so that we as legislators can take a far more responsible approach in dealing with it. To ignore it would be at the peril of those we are trying to assist. I fully expect to be attacked by the transactivists and ideologs who dominate this arena. However, I want them to participate and contribute, to put aside the vexed politics. Yet, raising it in the proper context of a public debate still attracts fury, hate and retribution.

A respected children's psychiatrist was suspended by the Queensland hospital where she worked because she raised her professional concerns. A Tasmanian councillor is facing charges of inciting hate speech, all because she voiced an opinion that contained nothing of the sort of inflammatory language she is being accused of.

A Victorian MP, Moira Deeming, was castigated by her own former party, the Liberals, for her stance. Senator Alex Antic has probably copped it since introducing his private member's bill to stop puberty blockers being given to children under 18. We saw what happened to federal Liberal candidate, Catherine Deves, last year for her views against transwomen in women's sport. On it goes.

In the transactivist world it seems you can have an opinion if you agree with them, and without it fuelling contempt and derision. But they are losing sight of what is being sought by some of the world's leading health professionals and organisations, as well as the confused and distressed families and individuals caught in the crossfire.

People should never be intimidated or afraid to speak up for their beliefs or silenced by the dictatorship of minorities, as award-winning French clinical psychologist Celine Masson and French child psychiatrist Caroline Eliacheff describe it after being subjected to activist attacks for their research, which suggested that some trans identified children and adolescents rushed into medicalised treatments were not trans at all but were influenced by activity on social networks and peer contagion, which is a form of social contagion, where children can be influenced by the behaviours within their network of friends.

That may well apply in Australia and explain the surge in gender dysphoria amongst girls and people on the autism spectrum. Transgender advocates define transgenderism as a belief that a person was born in the wrong body and the body must be adjusted to fix those beliefs, an assumption that the mind is correct and cannot be questioned. There is a term for this: psychological solipsism. An example of this type of thinking is a person with anorexia nervosa, who believes they are fat when in fact they are thin.

French journalist and author Pauline Arrighi, in her recently published book, *The Ravages of Gender*, asks: 'Is gender reassignment always the solution for these young people? Can a child really be trans?' Pauline says that the majority of transgender child or adolescent cases she explored were in fact young people suffering from psychosocial difficulties that were brushed aside in favour of an illusory gender affirmation.

I hope members in this place know me by now as someone who delves into matters for the right reasons and probes to get answers so we can have a better understanding to help us make informed decisions. I have spent months researching and reading a lot of material from all sides. I have spoken to medical, legal and teaching professionals. I have met with families. I have spoken with individuals who have gone through the treatment.

There is no point in abstaining from this debate nor pretending there is not anything here that needs to be addressed because it might be perceived as politically unpleasant to upset an already marginalised and psychologically vulnerable group in our community from the attention it receives. We need a mature discussion, not one which is polarising. There is a lot of misinformation, emotive language and, surprisingly, a lack of credible scientific evidence, despite what you might hear.

There is a striking division globally within the medical and mental health professions about the treatment of gender dysphoria. On one side, there is support for intervention and criticism for delays they say could be harmful. On the other side, there is the view that these interventions are unnecessary and harmful, calling for a more cautious approach to the medical affirmation model.

Many international jurisdictions are moving in this direction, including France, Sweden, Denmark, the UK, the US and Finland, which issued new guidelines that emphasise that

psychotherapy be first considered before medical interventions for the treatment of gender dysphoric youth and no sex change surgery for minors.

American states have followed, while Sweden's largest children's hospital, the Astrid Lindgren, stopped prescribing puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones to children under 18. Britain's Tavistock gender clinic had to be closed after a review by British paediatrician Dr Hilary Cass exposed an activist-driven culture and concerns over their treatments, particularly in rushing children onto puberty blocking drugs without any prior investigation of their complex psychiatric issues.

A landmark UK High Court case in 2020 dismissed the claims by affirmative therapists and found that minors were not capable or competent enough to give their consent to gender transition and taking puberty blocking hormones. The National Association of Practising Psychiatrists says its main areas of concern include the child's capacity for informed consent and the medical risks, known and unknown, of treatment with puberty blocking drugs, sex hormones and surgery before the age of 18.

Dr Georgie Swift, the psychiatrist involved in setting up the gender clinic at the Women's and Children's Hospital in North Adelaide, told a psychiatry conference only last month that the evidence for gender affirming treatment was not robust. Here is what she told the conference:

> I'm reasonably confident to say that no matter where you stand on gender-affirming health care for children and adolescents, that you agree that we need more evidence—our evidence isn't robust, it isn't good enough.

In other words, the evidence is weak. She went on to say there were many unknowns in gender medicine, and the impact of quality of life and mental health, and that professionals were still waiting for more evidence. So what is happening here? We have doctors who are conducting a live social experiment with young patients without the proper professional, ethical and efficacy protocols being undertaken for a clinical trial.

According to the South Australian Women's and Children's Health Network, the gender service follows treatment guidelines issued in 2018 by Melbourne's Royal Children's Hospital and promoted as standards of care—and which concedes there is a scarcity of high-quality published evidence. An expert in evidence-based medicine, Professor Gordon Guyatt, has described the Victorian guideline as an untrustworthy source.

The latest data, between 2014 to 2019, shows there were around 4,000 children and young people receiving puberty blockers from five Australian medical institutions, with 157 of them in South Australia. Referrals to the Women's and Children's Hospital gender clinic rose from 44 in 2017 to 116 in 2020. I am still waiting for updated figures since filing an FOI earlier this year, but it is likely to have continued the rapid upward trajectory.

SA Health in July released its statewide gender diversity model of care to deal with the increased awareness of trans, gender diverse and non-binary persons. It is a sincere document, and it, too, admits we are dealing with an emerging area of health care, and that new evidence must continue to be reviewed as part of ongoing monitoring to ensure that future service delivery models and clinical pathways continue to be evidence-based. I believe this is what we all want to achieve.

It goes on to say that trans, gender diverse, and non-binary TGD and B people are at greater risk, among other things, of self-harm and suicide compared with their peers. They based this on a study that is more than 13 years old. Their quoted figures are disputed, and factual figures show it is overstated.

A reanalysis of a landmark UK study found 34 per cent of children aged 12 to 15 reported their mental health had deteriorated after taking puberty blockers for one year while 29 per cent saw their psychological health improve. No mental change was reported by 37 per cent of the children who had been on blockers for 12 months. Overall, 71 per cent reported a decline or no change in their mental health after one year of treatment, yet the main argument for introducing puberty blockers to the under-16 age group was the potential to relieve psychological distress while the children explored their gender identity.

The SA Health document does not provide alternatives of care, nor does it reference anywhere the shift away from rushing into puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones, nor does it

provide advice about people who decide to detransition. It also fails to explain in any detail the 2022 report by Dr Cass following the Tavistock clinic fiasco, which notes a lack of safety data for puberty blockers, uncertainty about their rationale, and concern about their effects on the adolescent brain.

Consequently, the NHS in the United Kingdom will restrict puberty blockers to clinical trials, yet here these life-changing experimental drugs come with little warning of possible side effects, apart from bone density deterioration. In fact, treatments can start from the age of 10 to 12, and lead to sterility before they become adults.

The authors of that UK study, Professor Susan McPherson from the University of Essex, and retired social scientist Dr David Freedman, regarded the comparatively high levels of psychological deterioration among surveyed children as concerning.

Swedish psychiatrist and researcher Professor Mikael Landén, who took part in a 2021 review of the evidence base for medicalised gender change with minors, says studies in this area of youth gender dysphoria are of low quality and would not be accepted as evidence in other areas of science. He said and I quote:

> I do want the best care for each and every one.
>
> [But] we don't know [if the medical treatment for dysphoria] is good or bad. Why should you require [a] lower level of evidence for this patient group then you do for all other patient groups?
>
> You do subject people to lifelong, very strong medical treatment, even surgery. You are amputating parts of [a patient's] body.

Psychiatrist Jillian Spencer, an advocate for the cautious approach than affirmation-only treatment models for gender dysphoria, was alarmed, saying it begs the question: why on earth are puberty blockers still being prescribed?

I met with Jillian recently and was most impressed by her breadth of knowledge on the subject and her passionate advocacy. Children's Health Queensland stood her down from the state's children's hospital for speaking out. During her address on October 14 to the Royal Australian and New Zealand College of Psychiatrists, Dr Swift admitted there was much they still did not know about the improvement in medicalised gender transition and its impact on quality of life and mental health.

In saying they were still waiting for sorely needed evidence, Dr Swift claimed there was enough evidence that interventions brought benefits to some patients and, furthermore, that working with low-quality evidence was not unusual in child psychiatry. She said, and I again quote:

> 'We did lots of things that don't have robust, excellent evidence.' A reference to prescribing children and adolescents anti-depressant drugs that were researched for adults.

You only have to look at some of the past treatments that were hailed as breakthroughs by the medical profession, only for them to end up being scandals resulting in harm and costly legal action.

Despite the potential side effects, including infertility and impaired sexual function, in Australia these drugs are being prescribed 'off label' for gender dysphoria, which means no drug company has ever had to prove to a regulator that puberty blockers are safe and effective. Therefore, potential risk for litigation must be something that Australian doctors and all governments, including South Australia, must now seriously contemplate. It is already happening overseas, especially in the United States, where gender-specific law firms are gearing up for large class actions as more come forward to either detransition or who have suffered from the transition process.

A Compass poll conducted last month found that over 74 per cent of Australians oppose the use of irreversible puberty blockers and cross-sex hormones or body-altering surgeries with likely irreversible side effects, like infertility on children under the age of 18. Over 78 per cent of Australians are opposed to primary school children being taught they can change their sex and gender through social transitioning, puberty blockers, hormone treatment and surgery if they want, while 64 per cent of Australians disagree with primary school children between the ages of five and 10 being taught about opposite sex and same-sex sexual practices in the classroom as part of the curriculum.

I want to highlight this example brought to my attention only this week, an incident in a classroom at one of Adelaide's top private schools, where sex lessons under the state government approved curriculum were given to a group of puzzled nine year olds. Two were left visibly upset and

distressed by graphic images of naked men and women shown to them and the accompanying themes of the discussions.

Are their innocent brains developed enough for them to understand, while bewildered parents have no say or can question what is being taught? Is it even the right approach to sex education in our already complex and complicated school system where teachers are dropping out in droves because they cannot cope with the tide of social change and expectations?

But going back to that Compass poll, 74 per cent do not believe that boys who identify as girls should be allowed access to girls change rooms and sports teams and vice versa and 66 per cent oppose criminal charges for parents and grandparents who question their child's intention to change gender, while 77 per cent of Australians do not believe that teachers should be disciplined or lose their registration if they fail to use the preferred pronouns of a child identifying as a gender other than their biological sex.

I met with a concerned parent recently who told me his disturbing story of what was happening with his child and allow me to read what he gave me. He states:

I'd like to share with you my experience with the WCH gender clinic here in Adelaide. Between 2019 and 2021 my once very happy and girly daughter had started to become withdrawn and very conscious of her changing body, wearing baggy clothes. Nothing her older sister hadn't done—seemingly normal pre pubescent behaviour.

Around March 2021, then 10 years old, she came out as trans—identifying as a boy, wanting to use a boys name and pronouns. When I asked why she felt this way, she said it was because she didn't like the way women are treated. My concern was this wasn't about gender identity, it was a response to learning what it can mean to be a woman.

I wanted her to see a counsellor—her mother (my ex) preferred to affirm her gender and get a referral to the gender clinic because her reading told her that that's how you prevent suicide in an adolescent with Gender Dysphoria.

We saw a social worker on initial intake at the clinic. I asked for a follow up appointment for my daughter and a phone call so I could air my perspective without my daughter in the room. The appointment and that call never came.

In the first 45 min psychiatric interview 6 weeks later I raised the question of motive, of root cause for my daughter's distress. By now well aware that talking about fear of being a woman wouldn't get her what she wanted, my daughter played it down, emphasising her dysphoria. Eventually she did say she didn't like the way women are treated, especially that men rape women.

'Has anything like that ever happened to you?' the psychiatrist asked. 'Not really,' my daughter said. Did this mandatory reporter treat that as a red flag? No–she just suggested my daughter talk to her mum about it and never mentioned it again.

At the second 45 min appointment a diagnosis of gender dysphoria was announced and in front of my kid, puberty blockers were recommended. When asked for my consent I said I had concerns but was cajoled into the next appointment, trying to avoid increasing my daughter's distress. In the Gender Clinic's mind we were in a race against the clock—now approaching 12 years of age puberty was around the corner. That my daughter had flipped from identifying as a boy to being gender fluid to non-binary and was on the 3rd name change was of no concern. There was no effort to explore family dynamics, developmental history and pre-existing mental health conditions and all that other good stuff in the National Guidelines—the clock was ticking.

At the next appointment with a paediatrician the puberty blocker fact sheet was summarised for us—the only risks to be worried about apparently were bone density loss, unknown outcomes for height and a sore arm, and can you please sign here to proceed with the treatment. When I asked about the other risks on the fact sheet—the hot flushes, tiredness and mood changes, the unknown short and long-term effects on social and cognitive development—I was told there was not enough data. Why is there not enough data? Because there has never been a controlled study into the use of puberty blockers for the treatment of gender dysphoria—the drug company does not list gender dysphoria as one of the conditions the drug is intended to treat. It's use for this purpose is off label and therefore experimental.

Had enough information been divulged for informed consent? Hell no. Especially making sure the 11-year old knew what she was agreeing to.

When I asked for a treatment plan I learnt that the WCH's idea of ongoing mental health support and mine were poles apart. Once a month psychiatric appointments? [No.] Once every two months? [No.] Try an 'assessment' once every six months and we recommend patients obtain private counselling. In short, the Gender Clinic is delivering treatment for which it isn't resourced to provide the necessary ongoing support, even though they said they provide ongoing mental health support in a recent statement to a member of the SA Legislative Council.

I was excluded from the next appointment—whether by my daughter's mother or by the clinic, or both, I will never really know.

By now I had submitted in writing that I did not consent to the treatment. From my understanding of the Auspath guidelines and any information I could track down on the internet, I thought this would mean court authorisation would be needed for them to proceed. But no—the issue was escalated to the WCH Ethics Committee who authorised treatment to proceed without my consent. That's right—to stop my daughter receiving experimental treatment, I would have to take it to a federal court.

I sought legal advice and that advice was that I would be wasting my time and tens of thousands of dollars. The Family Court could be expected to request a second opinion and that second opinion would come from the [Royal Children's Hospital] in Melbourne, our foremost proponents in gender affirming care.

In the end it was me who had to sit down with [my] 11-year-old daughter and ensure she understood the risks—I read her the fact sheet line by line, took her through the drug company literature, explained what osteoporosis means, explained what it means to not be able to experience an orgasm—to an 11-year old. I told her again that there is a broad spectrum of femininity, that female puberty is daunting but transformative and that I would fully support her in that journey of self-discovery, but please don't let them use drugs to interfere with that process. In the end, the day before the first injection, my daughter decided not to proceed. Within days her sleep and anxiety levels improved, the cutting and talk of suicide stopped.

Today my daughter identifies as non-binary, goes by a gender-fluid name, her fourth name in two years, uses they/them pronouns. They continue to develop in their own unique way and I will always love them for whoever they are.

But we dodged a bullet—no doubt about it.

In October 2019 the National Association of Practising Psychiatrists wrote to the then federal health minister Mr Greg Hunt requesting a parliamentary inquiry into the treatment of gender dysphoria in Australia. In their words, not mine, the current approach to the treatment of gender dysphoria in children and adolescents under the age of 18 has become a controversial subject within the medical community. Today I call on our current federal health minister, the Hon. Mark Butler MP, to follow through on that request. Our gender clinics have allowed ideology to overtake their duty of care and the guiding principle to 'first do no harm', and our children deserve better.

I wish to table that letter as well.

Leave granted.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: There is this, from *Parents With Inconvenient Truths About Trans*, a book that is a compilation of stories from parents suffering the condition they call 'parental dysphoria' when they must confront the social and emotional challenges presented when one of their children suddenly presents themselves as transgender. This excerpt is from a chapter titled 'A tragedy in slow motion', written by the heartbroken mother of a transgender teenager. Let me quote from that text:

It is hard to imagine any other medical condition with a serious life altering treatment where the diagnosis is solely dependent on the reliability and accuracy of a child's or young persons self-report. We were supposed to accept unquestioningly, the crazy notion that our female child became a boy overnight at the age of 17 and that she needed to alter her body to match this invisible internal identity. It was to us an obvious mental health issue. Our daughter had serious mental health issues over a three year period prior to her self-diagnosis of being transgender. There were serious red flags waving. These issues, these red flags, were all completely ignored by the medical profession.

The mother then goes on to say:

Parents understand social contagion among teens. We were teens once as well. Social contagions have always existed. What has changed is that today they are influenced by thousands upon thousands on social media and misinformation on the internet…yet instead of seeing this social contagion for what it really is, the medical profession has lost sight of the Hippocratic Oath and accepted the self-diagnosis of these young people. It beggars belief.

She went on to question the motives behind government-funded organisations like ACON and TransHub Australia and said that she had been labelled an abusive and unsupportive parent by medical practitioners who did not know her. Her chapter in the book ends like this:

We are truly in a war to save our children from harm. We need to stop the harm now. We are in the midst of an enormous medical scandal.

Here is a lesson for us from that Compass poll: 62 per cent, or approximately the same number of middle Australia who voted no in the recent referendum, say they are less likely to vote for a member of parliament who supports criminalising parents and grandparents who question their child's intention to change gender.

Again, this is why it is imperative we as parliamentarians, legislators, have a responsibility to be fully informed and be able to act in the best interests of our citizens and our children and grandchildren. Like me, I hope members in this place will research widely on this very important issue and come to a conclusion and an enlightened position in supporting this motion and an inquiry. We must avoid this becoming one of the biggest medical scandals of our time. With that, I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

FISHERIES MANAGEMENT ACT FEES NOTICE

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:29): I move:

That the fees notice made under the Fisheries Management Act 2007 concerning fishery licence and boat and device registration application and annual fees, made on 20 June 2023 and laid on the table of this council on 27 June 2023, be disallowed.

Prior to the 2018 election, both major parties supported reforming the marine scalefish fishery to ensure a sustainable and economically viable industry into the future. Both parties took to the election their promise to reform the marine scalefish fishery. In fact, in an ABC News report prior to the last election the Labor government promised, and I quote, 'to buy back a third of marine scalefish fishery licences' along with zone management and quota changes, which was announced following a similar promise from the Liberal Party during that period of time.

After the 2018 election, the marine scalefish fishery sector was reformed with the clear objectives of securing biological and financially sustainable fishing practices. We were doing this. As the government of the day, we were working with the industry, ensuring communication was consistent and fishers had confidence in the process. We kept parties around the table and kept confidence in the industry.

Prior to the 2022 election, the now Minister for Primary Industries, then in opposition, the Hon. Clare Scriven, a member in this place, promised the sector an independent review into the cost-recovery policy model. She gave the sector hope that their ongoing concerns would be listened to and acted upon. Fast-forward 18 months, and on the Friday of the October long weekend the new proposed fee structure for 1 July 2024 to 30 June 2025 was sprung on marine scalefish fishers without any justification. For many their industry became non-viable overnight.

There had been no decision-making or transparency until this sudden announcement of the fee structure moving into 2024-25. Within these fees the base fee is set, and all licensees are to pay the same base fee whether or not they are a net-endorsed licence. The proposed fee structure percentage is 70 per cent for the quota, and 30 per cent is covering the base licence. The formula used to calculate the quota unit fee is the cost of managing the four quota fish species. This is then evenly divided by four.

Some species have 4,000 units whereas others have only 2,000 units. As I have said in this place previously, this creates an uneven burden on the fishers of those species with smaller units, as they are now required to pay more per unit compared with what is paid for other species. This has the real and serious risk of driving several fishermen across South Australia out of business due to the serious financial burden within the cost-recovery structure. In fact, one fisher's licence fee will be increasing by over 500 per cent from 2023-24 to 2024-25.

The industry is well underway with improved sustainability of fish stock, but according to numerous industry sources—and I say numerous—the government is about to ruin the financial component for a proportion of the industry due to those recent fee structure announcements. The industry was and is supposed to be participating in an autonomous adjustment process to assist in the continuation of the reform process. However, the government's position on the costing method has just undone a major component of the industry's autonomous adjustment capability by undermining financial confidence in the industry's future.

The Gulf St Vincent King George whiting and garfish fishers are set to pay 30 per cent of the gross value product of those species in government levies. This is simply not viable. The Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development has been sitting on the report of the independent review into the seafood sector's cost-recovery policy model for three months or longer, without any

decisions, and has now suddenly hit fishers with the new fee structure out of the blue, seemingly with little to no concern about the long-term economic viability of the sector. The level of anxiety and stress that this has caused a large number of fishers is large and absolutely completely unacceptable.

It is crucial that steps are taken to ensure South Australia has a sustainable and economically viable seafood industry, but right now industry has absolutely no confidence that the minister has the balance right. The minister must immediately release this report to key stakeholders and the public to restore trust and transparency with South Australia's seafood industry.

As the opposition we have asked repeated questions of the minister, and I asked one again only yesterday. Today, we and the marine scalefishers are yet to receive satisfactory answers on the following:

1. Why has the minister released the licence fee structure for 2024-25 without releasing the report?

2. When will the minister be releasing this report to key stakeholders and the public so they can have confidence in the process?

Given the nature of the increase in fee licences and the indicated impact on the industry, in conjunction with the failure of the minister to commit to releasing the report of the independent review into the seafood sector's cost-recovery policy model—which is to inform future fee structure decision-making—there is a desire by the opposition in this place to hold the minister to account in her failure to properly manage South Australia's seafood sector. I urge members of this chamber to support this disallowance motion to stand up for the commercial fishing industry in this state.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Bills

FIRST NATIONS VOICE REPEAL BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 1 November 2023.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (16:37): I will keep this short and sweet. Here we are yet again seeing on our *Notice Paper* a bill to repeal the First Nations Voice—something that this parliament, both houses, has already passed, is in the process of enacting, and is getting on with the job of doing.

I am a proud member of a party that voted for that, keeping our election promise. The Malinauskas Labor government also promised to have a First Nations Voice in South Australia. If we keep our promises from the Greens and the Labor Party keeps their promise, that means that the 11 votes required to ensure the First Nations Voice, in terms of a vote of this chamber, are secured. I give my assurance on behalf of the Greens, and I am sure that the Labor Party will do the same when we finally see this particular bill eventually taken to a vote, that those 11 Green and Labor votes will stand firm and that we will see a First Nations Voice. The 11 votes are simple numbers.

I also note that it is 851 days to the next state election. I suggest that those who have a policy about repealing a state First Nations Voice take that to the election, because the Liberal Party certainly did not take to the last election that they opposed a First Nations Voice. In fact, it was not even that they were silent on a First Nations Voice. They had a policy and a previous piece of legislation that they had consulted on and intended to implement, had they been the Marshall Liberal government again.

The Liberal government had tried to legislate a First Nations Voice and indeed, after the election in 2002, one of their first pieces of legislation in the other place was to continue that bid for a First Nations Voice. If they change their election policy between now and the next state election in 851 days, I imagine that the votes might reflect those moderate liberals who might be a little disillusioned that the last time they voted for the Liberals they thought they were getting something different.

Another set of numbers is that it is now 122 days before we will see the election for a First Nations Voice of South Australian Aboriginal people. That is not very long—March next year. We have one more sitting week. I suspect the member who has put this piece of legislation to repeal the good work of this parliament will not have the courage to take this particular issue to a vote, but I assure the South Australian people that those 11 votes will stand firm in this chamber.

In 122 days we will see the first election for a First Nations Voice, and in 851 days I suspect the Liberals will regret their flip-flopping on this issue and their lack of commitment to those voters who put their faith in them at the last election to keep their promises, and this will be yet another step into oblivion for the current Liberal opposition.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (16:40): I rise to place on the record our support for this bill. We, the opposition, did not support the First Nations Voice Bill back in February. We outlined our reasons for not supporting that bill at that time and those reasons remain. One of the fundamental problems with this legislation is that it rests on the notion that parliamentary democracy is not capable of representing certain minorities. This is an attack on parliamentary democracy in principle.

One of the foundations of political liberalism is that all citizens are equal in civic status, regardless of race, gender, religion, background, and the like. In fact, one of the South Australian Liberal Party's core values is to ensure that we will do everything in our power to ensure all South Australians have the same opportunities—that is, a level playing field—no matter their geographical location, social background, race, religion, gender or any other factor. Allowing effectively a fourth arm of government, one where one race will have a direct say on health, education, defence and other policy or pieces of legislation over another is undemocratic. It goes against the heart of our democracy, that is, that all Australians are equal under the law.

As Liberals we also believe not in big government but in a right-sized government. We believe in running an efficient government, one that provides essential services, a safety net and laws that form the basis of a free and fair society without unnecessary bureaucracy or wasteful spending. The functions performed by a right-sized government are those things that are necessary to protect the life, liberty, property and sovereignty of the people.

This piece of legislation will enable what is essentially a fourth arm of government, and will certainly create a fourth bureaucracy. It is another elected body that has the power of making a contribution to any piece of legislation that comes through this parliament. This is something that no other South Australian, except for those who are privileged enough to be elected to this place as part of the Westminster system, has the right to do.

This extra layer of bureaucracy will delay what is already a slow-moving government wheel, and it will do so because section 7 ensures the continuance of existing Aboriginal bodies around the state. This act will not replace or reduce an existing layer of bureaucracy; it will only add to it. If there is one thing I have learnt since coming into this place, it is that more bureaucracy generally equals fewer practical outcomes on the ground.

Ultimately, we all want to see practical outcomes for First Nations people, but this is not the way to achieve it. We should be taking the advice of Senators Jacinta Price and Kerrynne Liddle, who are calling for an audit or inquiry into the billions of dollars the South Australian and Australian government spends on Closing the Gap each year, and for more accountability on that spending.

During my second reading speech on the government's First Nations Voice in this chamber, I expressed my disappointment and frustration that the Malinauskas government was pushing this legislation through both chambers before allowing the people of South Australia to have their voices heard in the referendum.

A referendum is the purest form of democracy. Promises made during an election campaign, which were not widely disseminated in any case, cannot be appropriated by the winners as proof of endorsement of legislation such as this. The two-thirds vote for no in a referendum is proof positive that South Australians do not want it. But of course, left-wing ideological governments like this one are not all that keen on democracy.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: They are not wedded to it in the same way as the party I represent.

Members interjecting:

The PRESIDENT: Order!

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: We have heard these voices but the question remains: will the Premier and those opposite who make up the government benches listen?

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

Motions

TOURISM INDUSTRY COUNCIL SOUTH AUSTRALIA

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:45): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that the Tourism Industry Council South Australia (TiCSA) is a not-for-profit, member-based organisation with over 1,000 members that was established in 2009;

2. Recognises the important work of the TiCSA as a strong voice for South Australia's tourism industry;

3. Acknowledges the outstanding contributions by TiCSA in its advocacy and business development work in the areas of building capabilities, sustainability and bringing together South Australia's diverse tourism industry to a growing visitor economy;

4. Congratulates awards finalists and winners of the South Australian Tourism Awards for their outstanding achievements, success and contributions to South Australia; and

5. Recognises the economic importance of tourism to South Australia's economy, and the social benefits and community impact it has for the people of South Australia.

It is a great honour today to move this motion and recognise the outstanding work by the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia, fondly known as TiCSA. I have outlined on a number of occasions previously in parliament the importance of the tourism sector to South Australia. It is a great honour once again to have this opportunity to recognise the economic importance of tourism to South Australia's economy and the social benefit and community impact it has for the people of South Australia.

The visitor economy is an important driver of the state's economy. Much of the economic benefit it brings to the state flows to regional communities, and it has a positive impact on other industries, such as agriculture, wine, retail, education, real estate and transport. Tourism is a key growth sector in South Australia. The tourism industry employs around 40,000 South Australians. The total South Australian visitor expenditure for the year ending June 2023, combining international and domestic expenditure, came to $9.9 billion.

Thanks to a peak body like TiCSA and all the hardworking businesses and operators of our resilient tourism sector, we are well on track to achieve what is set out in its 2030 target of $12.8 billion. The target is adopted within the South Australian Visitor Economy Sector Plan 2030. It was with the great support of the whole of the tourism industry that the Visitor Economy Sector Plan was launched in August 2019 under the Marshall Liberal government. The plan sets a bold ambition to grow our visitor economy to $12.8 billion by 2030, generating 52,000 jobs. I am very pleased that the Labor government has also committed to this sector plan.

The motion today recognises the important work of TiCSA as a strong voice for South Australia's tourism industry. TiCSA is recognised as a tourism peak body, a not-for-profit membership base organisation which has represented over 1,100 members since it was established in 2009. Out of those members, 542 are accredited members and 120 of those are star-rated members.

Members come from 12 tourism regions in South Australia. These beautiful regions are: Adelaide; Adelaide Hills; Barossa; Clare Valley; Eyre Peninsula; Fleurieu Peninsula; Flinders Ranges and outback; Kangaroo Island; Limestone Coast; Murray River, Lakes and Coorong; Yorke Peninsula; and Riverland. Out of the 12 tourism regions in South Australia, I would like to take a

moment to highlight two regions that have received worldwide attention and that deserve to be acknowledged today.

Firstly, Adelaide. Many honourable members will feel that it is pretty cool to be living in the coolest city in Australia. Adelaide was crowned Australia's coolest city by a major US media outlet—yes, by the *Wall Street Journal*—for its world-class selection of restaurants, nearby wineries and picturesque landscapes. Of course, we have known all along that our beautiful city combines compact charm and world-class cuisine. It is great to know that Adelaide has now been recognised on the world stage.

The other tourism region that is definitely worth a mention today is Kangaroo Island. Less than three weeks ago, Kangaroo Island was named by the global travel authority *Lonely Planet* in its 2024 top regions hot list as one of the world's top destinations to visit, and Kangaroo Island is the only Australian destination to make the list.

The *Lonely Planet* list aims to inspire potential travellers to plan a holiday in 2024, focusing on trending travel sectors like ecotourism and slow travel. I take this opportunity to convey my heartfelt congratulations to everyone on Kangaroo Island for building the enviable reputation and give a big-shout out to some 130 establishments on Kangaroo Island that accommodate guests. Many of those operators are members of the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia.

As the shadow minister for tourism and hospitality, it is a great privilege to work closely with our state peak body for tourism. It is great to see the TiCSA board and the team at TiCSA, who are passionate about their work, working really hard for their members to deliver and achieve the true primary objectives, which is advocacy and business development. At each level, TiCSA provides various events and workshops, programs and accreditation, advocacy and business tools.

Leadership, Mr President, as you know, is crucial to any successful organisation, and I would like to pay tribute to a number of key leaders who have been a driving force for TiCSA. First, I would like to mention Eoin Loftus. Eoin has nearly 30 years' experience in developing and operating tourism accommodation businesses across South Australia, and he has established his own consultancy business in Loftus Business Advisory and Hotel Refurbs in 2022.

Eoin has been leading the charge of the tourism industry, most recently as CEO of South Australian owned and operated Majestic Hotels and Apartments. Eoin has for the past nine years served voluntarily on the board of the Tourism Industry Council of South Australia, serving in the capacity of chairman of the board for the past six years, including navigating the unprecedented and difficult global coronavirus period.

Since 2022, Eoin has served on the South Australian Tourism Commission board and, more recently in June 2023, has joined the Zoos SA board, incorporating the new Monarto Safari Park hotel development. As the outgoing chair, I would like to place my sincere thanks on the public record to Eoin for his passion to serve the tourism industry and acknowledge his wonderful leadership at TiCSA.

TiCSA welcomed the new chair, Siggi Frede. It was great to see her acknowledgement of Eoin's leadership in her AGM statement, as well as at the recent tourism awards night. I would like to quote Siggi. She said:

> In particular, I recognise Eoin's leadership and dedication to the board of the past nine years, with six years in the role of Chair, which has been instrumental in shaping the success of TiCSA. Just some of his many achievements include:
>
> - doubling TiCSA's membership number of his time on the board.
> - doubled our resources to deliver triple the value to industry.
> - TiCSA working effectively with all levels of government.
>
> The best thing about our industry is our people, and Eoin is one of the best and has always been working towards the greater good of the industry.

I concur with those words from Siggi. I look forward to working with the new chair, Siggi Frede, who is the managing director of Effektiver, a boutique strategic tourism consultancy company in South Australia. I am confident that the new chair will bring lots of energy to her role at TiCSA. My best

wishes to Siggi as well as vice-chair Penny Gale and all the other high-calibre board members as they undertake their roles to help deliver the great ambitions set by the Tourism Industry Council.

The TiCSA Board is well supported by the chief executive officer, Shaun De Bruyn. Shaun has been a dedicated industry advocate with 20 years' experience in delivering strong outcomes across leisure, travel and the tourism industry within South Australia. His knowledge and expertise, combined with his diverse skills and genuine passion for the industry, has enabled Shaun to take on the role as CEO of TiCSA since 2015.

He is doing a fantastic job to build relationships with members as well as other important stakeholders, including government ministers and shadow ministers. The Hon. David Speirs, Leader of the Opposition, and myself enjoy working closely with Shaun and his team. We deeply appreciate his knowledge, his advice and advocacy work for TiCSA. Through Shaun's leadership and with the support of his friendly and professional team, they are doing a remarkable job promoting TiCSA's mission and the organisation is recognised as a strong industry body.

Some of the key advocacy efforts and business development programs by TiCSA include the Quality Tourism Framework, which combines tourism accreditation, star ratings and the Australian Tourism Awards program into a single pathway for business development. They have also been very successful in organising the Tourism Awards Program gala dinner, the State Tourism Conference, training and workshops, and Talking Tourism networking events.

TiCSA has been and is a key advocate for tourism businesses and it delivers so many activities to support the industry. As we all know, South Australia offers stunning landscapes, world-class food and beverages, immersive experiences and experiential accommodation. Adelaide offers the sophistication of a global city while maintaining an ease of access which is the envy of more congested cities.

I now turn my attention to the prestigious South Australian Tourism Awards, which are proudly presented annually by the Tourism Industry Council. This year, once again, the South Australian Tourism Awards celebrate and acknowledge tourism businesses that have demonstrated outstanding achievement and success throughout the year.

I would like to convey my personal congratulations to this year's 31 category winners, four Hall of Fame inductees, and the silver and bronze medallists recognised at the gala dinner that was held on Friday 3 November. It was a great honour to attend the awards gala, along with the Governor of South Australia, ministers, the Leader of the Opposition, the Hon. David Speirs, and the member for Hammond, Adrian Pederick. It was a spectacular evening to celebrate the success and achievements of all those outstanding awards recipients.

I take this opportunity to mention a few of them today. Congratulations to Monarto Safari Park for winning the top prize in the Major Tourist Attractions category as well as the Voters' Choice Award. Monarto was recognised for the unparalleled experience it provides as the largest safari experience outside of Africa and for its support of the tourism industry in the surrounding region. It was fantastic to catch up with Elaine Bensted, CEO of Zoos SA, and Peter Clarke, director of Monarto Safari Park, at the Tourism Awards night to personally congratulate them and their team for their most amazing work.

The Voters' Choice Awards, determined through the enthusiastic support and votes from their visitors, local communities and supporters, added an exciting layer to the evening's celebrations. With an impressive tally of nearly 20,000 votes cast across all finalists, two standout winners emerged. Monarto Safari Park claimed the coveted Voters' Choice Award for Experience and/or Service. BIG4 Renmark Riverfront Holiday Park received accolades as the Voters' Choice Award Winner for Accommodation.

I also had the pleasure of catching up with Mark Koolmatrie and his family on the night. Everyone who was there would remember Mark's speech most fondly because it was heartwarming and delivered in Mark's very unique style that no-one can ever emulate. Mark is the founder and operator of Kool Tours, which won the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Island Tourism Experiences category. Kool Tours is a family-owned and operated business delivering unforgettable immersive Aboriginal experiences with complete cultural authority throughout Fleurieu Peninsula and Kangaroo

Island. It was really great to catch up not only with Mark but his family on the night—a very ecstatically happy family who certainly operate an amazing tourism business in South Australia.

I would also like to give a special shout-out to Ian Horne, former CEO of AHA(SA). The Outstanding Achievement Award was fittingly bestowed on Ian Horne, the dedicated CEO of the Australian Hotels Association SA, who retired this year. The award recognises his unwavering commitment and leadership spanning nearly four decades. Ian has made a significant impact on the tourism industry and has been a source of inspiration, influencing advocacy and leadership at the industry, government policy and sector level. It was wonderful to see Ian on stage, articulating the achievements of the tourism industry through his eyes and his personal journey of lifetime dedication to the tourism industry. It was a very well-deserved award for Ian.

Among the standout moments of the evening were the well-deserved inductions into the South Australian Tourism Awards Hall of Fame. Four outstanding business across the state earned this esteemed recognition for securing the global medal in their respective categories for the third consecutive year. The distinguished inductees into the Hall of Fame include The Cedars Hahndorf in the Cultural Tourism category; Bendleby Ranges, for their exceptional contributions to adventure tourism; Woodhouse Adventure Park, for its unique accommodation offerings; and Naiko Retreat, for excellence in self-contained accommodation.

It is truly an honour and a privilege to highlight the work of TiCSA today in parliament. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

UNITED NATIONS ASSOCIATION OF AUSTRALIA (SA DIVISION)

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:03): I move:

That this council—

1. Notes that Australia's relationship with the United Nations (UN) dates back to its formation, with Australia as one of the founding members that ratified the UN Charter in 1945;

2. Recognises the important work of the United Nations Association of Australia (UNAA) as a not-for-profit organisation that promotes the aims and ideals of the United Nations throughout the Australian community;

3. Acknowledges the outstanding contributions by the president, committee, sponsors, supporters and volunteers of UNAA (SA Division) in South Australia;

4. Congratulates UNAA South Australia for its commitment to organise the United Nations Day Dinner 2023 in Adelaide, which features a vintage fashion theme to raise awareness about the value of sustainability and sustainable fashion; and

5. Notes UNAA South Australia holds a wide range of events each year to raise awareness about important international issues from human rights to peacekeeping, celebrating the work of the United Nations and advocating for a more peaceful and just society.

It is a great honour for me to rise today to speak about the United Nations Association of Australia (SA Division) and to recognise that Australia's relationship with the United Nations dates back to its formation, with Australia as one of the founding members that ratified the UN Charter in 1945. United Nations Australia (UNAA) is a not-for-profit organisation that promotes the aims and ideals of the United Nations throughout the Australian community. These ideals include global development and respecting the principles of equal rights and the self-determination of all peoples and international cooperation in solving economic, social, cultural and humanitarian problems around the world.

UNAA is represented in every state and territory through its divisions and the national body that collectively runs 150 events throughout the year. The national programs and many events the UNAA hold help educate Australian citizens and leaders about the United Nations' vital work.

In South Australia, through the most tenacious UNAA SA president, Lidia Moretti, and her committee, many interesting and meaningful events are being organised each year. Those of us who have the pleasure of knowing and working with Lidia Moretti would know that she is incredibly persuasive and tenacious, and it is difficult to ever say no to her requests. UNAA SA is greatly

supported by their patrons, which include the chief patron, Her Excellency the Hon. Frances Adamson AC, Governor of South Australia, as well as patronage from Sister Patricia Pak Poy.

UNAA SA is passionately led by its president, Lidia Moretti, whom I mentioned before. For those who may not know Lidia, she has a teaching background and was a lecturer at the University of South Australia for over 25 years. She taught English at Huizhou University, China, and was coordinator of a food and wine study tour of South Australia for the University of Gastronomic Sciences in Italy. She has led delegations to the Terra Madre Salone del Gusto, and been an adviser to the Australian Slow Food Management Group and co-leader in South Australia.

Lidia hosts a weekly information and interview radio food program on 5RPH (Vision Australia) and is a board member of 5RPH. She has been an ambassador for the OzHarvest food rescue program since 2011 and helped to establish the organisation in South Australia. She is a committee member of the Australian Committee for UN Women, Adelaide Breakfast, an active member of the Italian community, and a justice of the peace. Lidia seems to have more time; she can pack more things into a day than most people. She really does everything so well and passionately, and it has been a great privilege to work with her over the years.

I also want to take this opportunity to congratulate all the UNAA SA committee members for supporting Lidia in this work, particularly working in partnership with the business sector and not-for-profit organisations, where they sponsor many events and art installations to boost awareness of the UN Sustainable Development Goals.

The flagship event for UNAA SA each year is the United Nations Day celebration dinner. This year, the 78th anniversary UN Day dinner was held on Sunday 5 November at the National Wine Centre. It was a great honour to once again join Lidia Moretti and other distinguished guests, including the former Governor of South Australia the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC and Mrs Lan Le, the Hon. Mira El Dannawi MLC, attending her first official event, and Councillor Quin Tran from the City of Charles Sturt, as well as many, many other community leaders.

This year's UN Day dinner had a vintage theme, with Amanda Blair as the master of ceremonies as well as the keynote speaker, focusing on sustainability and the value of vintage fashion. While Amanda Blair may not require much introduction because she is a well-known Australian radio broadcaster who was also a former columnist with the *Sunday Mail*. She is also a former member of the Social Inclusion Board, and has been a board member of the Adelaide Festival since 2004, it is worth acknowledging her work, because not only does she do a lot in the media space, she also uses her talent to give back to the community.

For example, she produced an event, *Comedy for a Cause*, as part of the Adelaide Fringe Festival in 2004, 2006 and 2008. Those shows raised significant money for homeless charities. While Amanda is a household name in South Australia, she started her radio career in Melbourne in 1996, when she made an appearance on *The Richard Stubbs Breakfast Show* on Triple M to promote her book *The Essential Pauline Hanson*. She was promptly signed with Austereo, and that turning point made her pack her bags to come to Adelaide to co-host the breakfast show on SAFM with Paul Gale and James Brayshaw in March 1998. The show then secured number one position in the market by the end of that year and maintained it until the show completed its session in July 2003.

In 2007, after a three-year break from radio, she began work at FIVEaa, hosting the afternoon program. She later resigned from FIVEaa in May 2012 to spend more time with her family. Of course, when she spent more time with her family and had more time up her sleeve, she started a philanthropic adventure, which is Dulcie's Bus. It became Australia's first mobile vintage clothing bus. It started off 13 years ago as a fundraiser for the Hutt St Centre and Centacare, but three years ago, Amanda moved the collection into a shop and now focuses on the environmental disaster that is fabric waste and the production of fast fashion.

She tries to keep clothing out of landfill by encouraging the old values of repair, re-use and recycle. Amanda was very passionate on the night when she presented herself as the keynote speaker. She highlighted the important concept of Dulcie's and how we can all do our bit to eliminate fabric waste by making better purchasing decisions. The main feature of the dinner was a vintage fashion parade, with many of the models wearing various vintage dresses designed by Amanda Blair's Dulcie's Shop of Real Opportunity.

Unfortunately, in some way, Lidia Moretti twisted my arm and I became one of the models on the night as well. I joined the other familiar faces, which included Robyn Ann Layton AO; Jill Collins, the state director of DFAT; Genevieve Haese, former Lady Mayoress; Thi Kim Hoan Nguyen; Ada Scalzi; Janitha Perera; and Debi Zechevich. They all participated as models for a good cause that night. We were well supported by Rosemary McLeod and Tiziana, who volunteered to help us and coached us that day to be models.

The gown I was wearing was to commemorate that this year marked the 50th anniversary of the end of Australia's involvement in the Vietnam War, so I had chosen a glorious Vietnamese gown, a replica of a bygone era from the great Nguyen dynasty of Vietnam. The exquisite gown I wore is known as an ao nhat binh, which literally means 'square-collared attire'. It represents the noble dress that was worn by empresses and princesses of the Nguyen dynasty. It was borrowed from the personal museum collection of Michael Nguyen, a Vietnamese veteran based in South Australia.

Michael has an impressive collection of artefacts of significance that represent his proud homeland of Vietnam. I want to thank Michael and his wife for allowing me to borrow the gown for this special occasion. It was really perfectly suited to the dinner's theme of sustainability and recycling old traditional clothes. This particular gown has always been on display and borrowed by many Vietnamese volunteers during the Vietnamese New Year festival. It showcases the timeless beauty and pride of Vietnamese heritage as well as the strength, resilience and courage of its people, including as refugees who travelled into our land during those darker days of the Vietnam War.

Once again, it was a great honour to be involved in the UN Day celebration dinner. I want to congratulate Lidia Moretti, the president, as well as her committee for putting on a spectacular show. I want to thank them for all their work for the United Nations and also Amanda Blair for the passionate and philanthropic work she does for our community. With those remarks, I commend the motion.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

YOUNG OFFENDERS ACT REGULATIONS

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. R.A. Simms:

That the general regulations under the Young Offenders Act 1993, made on 3 August 2023 and laid on the table of this council on 29 August 2023, be disallowed

(Continued from 27 September 2023.)

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:15): I was not actually anticipating speaking on this—I do not know how that happened—but I rise to indicate that I will not be supporting the motion on the basis of the advice that has been provided to me by the government and particularly the Attorney-General with respect to this issue. I do so on the basis that it is my understanding that notwithstanding any good intent on the part of the honourable member and whether or not you agree with it or not there are also a number of potential unintended consequences. I am sure the Attorney will speak to these shortly.

They have been outlined in a letter that I, at least, have received from the Attorney in recent days. That letter basically spells out, I guess from the government's perspective, the consequences of a disallowance via this instrument, which they describe as a blunt instrument. The reason they do so is that they say we are unable to disallow a single regulation but would have to disallow all of the regulations in their entirety, and there are a number of regulations in the regulations that are the subject of this disallowance motion that, if we were to disallow, would have a number of consequences.

I am going to let the Attorney elaborate on what those consequences are, but as I say we have all had the benefit of that advice. Regardless of whether we agree with the underlying intent of what the honourable member was trying to achieve, my position is that I agree with the Attorney: it is a blunt tool and to disallow the regulations would therefore result in disallowing all of the regulations, which we cannot afford to do.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (17:18): I rise on behalf of the opposition to voice our concerns regarding the proposed disallowance of regulations, which are crucial regulations that govern our approach to handling young offenders, particularly in regional and

remote areas, and to place on the record that we, too, will not be supporting the honourable member's disallowance motion.

I think we need to consider the practical implications of removing these regulations. Regulation 9, the ability to detain youth in police prisons or approved stations in rural areas, should be protected. This is not just a procedural hiccup; it is a matter of public safety and juvenile welfare. By denying local facilities we risk leaving these young individuals without appropriate alternatives, forcing them to travel considerable distances to Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre. This is not only impractical but potentially harmful to the youth involved.

Moreover, in situations where youth are engaged in harmful criminal behaviour, swiftly removing them from the case is crucial. This immediate intervention, often facilitated by local police stations, is not just about youth enforcement but about protecting the community and the youth. The disallowance of these regulations would hinder the ability to make these necessary and immediate interventions.

Disallowing these regulations with a broad stroke could lead to unforeseen consequences. For instance, disallowing regulations 4 to 7 would strip the Training Centre Review Board of vital procedural guidance. Regulation 8's disallowance might leave certain youths inadequately supervised under the terror oversight regime. The absence of regulation 11 would lead to confusion over handling surrendered items, creating legal ambiguities and potential disputes.

It is crucial to understand that disallowing these regulations does not simply tweak the system, it dismantles vital components of it. This is not about being soft on crime; it is about being intelligent and pragmatic in our approach to youth justice. We need regulations that reflect the complexity of these cases, especially in rural and remote areas where resources are already thinly stretched. We must aim for a system that balances the need for justice with the practical realities on the ground, always considering the best interests of the youth and the communities we serve.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector) (17:21): I rise to indicate that the government will not be supporting this motion. As other speakers have said, we understand the reasons behind the disallowance motion—and the consistency, I must say, in which the Hon. Robert Simms has approached these issues—but I will outline why the government will not be supporting this disallowance motion.

The Young Offenders Regulations 2023 replace the Young Offenders Regulations 2008 and set out a range of procedural matters to give effect to the scheme of the Young Offenders Act 1993 and facilitate the administration of justice for youths in this state. The government does acknowledge, I think as the Hon. Robert Simms has mentioned in the past, that the detention of children is and should be an option of last resort. This year's Training Centre Visitor Annual Report outlines that no 10 year olds were detained in Kurlana Tapa for a second year and that there was the lowest proportion of 10 to 13 year olds in the daily centre population since the program of reporting began.

Section 15(1) of the Young Offenders Act 1993 provides that if a youth is not granted bail under the Bail Act 1985, the youth must be detained at the Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre. In the event that the youth is arrested in an area specified in the regulations as being more than 40 kilometres from the GPO and it is not practical to detain the youth at Kurlana Tapa, the youth must be detained in a police facility—that is, a police station, lock-up, watch house or police prison. If a youth is detained in a police facility, the person in charge must take steps to keep the youth from encountering an adult detainee. If it becomes reasonably practical to detain the youth at Kurlana Tapa, such as upon arranging suitable transport, there is no power to continue the detention in a police facility.

The regulations were remade as part of the government's regulation expiry program, with input from relevant agencies. I understand, as I have stated before, that the Hon. Robert Simms' primary concern relates to regulation 9, which is the one I have outlined in relation to the 40 kilometres from the GPO and detention of youths in police facilities. However, and I think as the Hon. Connie Bonaros mentioned, if the council supported the disallowance that I understand is the primary concern of the Hon. Robert Simms, the entire set of regulations would be disallowed, as is the way that disallowances proceed.

If the regulations were disallowed, there would be other consequences; for example, regulations 4 to 7, without those there would be no guidance as to meeting procedures for the Training Centre Review Board, no requirement for the registrar at the Youth Court to provide information to the board, and the board would no longer be required to give consideration to recommendations made by the manager of the training centre for conditional release from detention. For the members' benefit, the Training Centre Review Board effectively operates like the Parole Board for youth that are detained.

The disallowance of regulation 8, I am advised, may result in certain youth falling outside the definition of a terror suspect and are therefore not subject to the oversight regime for terror suspects. With no area prescribed by regulation 9, youths cannot be detained at a police facility, and this would particularly be of concern in country or remote locations with significant distances to travel and the ability of youth to be removed from a situation to ensure their safety or the safety of the community.

Without regulation 11 there would be no scheme for dealing with surrendered items, and that may cause disputation. The other legal risk arises in relation to judgements of the Youth Court without these regulations. Again, although I understand and acknowledge the consistency with which the honourable member puts forward issues relating to the detention of young people to this chamber, we cannot support the disallowance of all these regulations.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (17:26): I thank honourable members for their contributions to this debate: the Hon. Connie Bonaros, the Hon. Nicola Centofanti and the minister, the Hon. Kyam Maher. I am, however, disappointed that there is not support for this chamber and for this disallowance motion from the Greens. I note the Leader of the Opposition referred to the term 'intelligent and pragmatic solutions'. I do not think locking up children is an intelligent or pragmatic solution—surely we can do better than that.

To briefly draw to the attention of the chamber some key statistics, in 2021 a study from the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare revealed that South Australia detains children at a higher rate than the national average. In 2022, a report from the Commissioner for Children and Young People noted that children were arrested or detained in SA Police cells or watch houses 2,030 times between 2020 and 2021. Of those admissions, 43.8 per cent were Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander young people.

In 2023, on 21 June, the ABC reported that child detainees were suffering in isolation at Kurlana Tapa Youth Justice Centre. The article stated that children spent 21 consecutive hours locked in cells on 31 May and 1 June 2023. On 3 August, new young offenders regulations were gazetted. A particular concern to the Greens, as the Attorney-General has acknowledged, is regulation 9, which is the regulation that provides that children as young as 10 can be detained in adult facilities if they are taken into custody further than 40 kilometres from Adelaide's GPO.

The government had an opportunity to change those regulations and they have not taken it up, they have not done so. The government's case seems to be, 'Well, if this regulation is removed, then all the others fall away.' Surely, the government can then step in and fill the gap if necessary. I am very concerned about the welfare of these children, and those concerns were only heightened when on 31 October this year the training centre visitor report was tabled in this parliament. I will read from some of those key statistics.

That report showed that in 2022-23, 39 young people under the age of 14 were detained. For the first time since 2019, two 10 year olds were detained, that is, children of primary school age. Ninety per cent of young people detained on an average day were on remand, so only alleged to have committed a crime, and in 2022-23 there was an 11 per cent increase in the number of individual young people admitted compared with the previous year, that is, 324 young people. One in two of those children are First Nations young people (53 per cent) and 25 per cent of young people at the Youth Justice Centre have a known diagnosed disability.

Surely, we can do better by those young people in 2023. Surely, there is a better solution for these young people than locking them up in adult prisons. It is immoral, and I think the government has an obligation to do something about this. The Greens are very concerned that this issue is being pushed off into the never-never. There needs to be action taken on this sooner rather than later, because it is very clear from the reports that have been raised by the Training Centre Visitor that the

situation is dire, and we need some leadership from the government on this urgently. I want to indicate to members that I will be calling a division, so that their views are on the public record.

The council divided on the motion:

Ayes 2
Noes.....17
Majority 15

AYES

Franks, T.A.	Simms, R.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.
El Dannawi, M.	Game, S.L.	Girolamo, H.M.
Hanson, J.E.	Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.
Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.	Maher, K.J. (teller)
Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.	Pangallo, F.
Scriven, C.M.	Wortley, R.P.	

Motion thus negatived.

SOUTHERN OCEAN WIND FARM

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. C. Bonaros:

That this council—

1. Expresses its concern over the extension of the proposed Southern Ocean offshore wind zone off the coast of South Australia following the consultation announcement made by Federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy, the Hon Chris Bowen MP, on 27 June 2023.

2. Notes offshore wind developer BlueFloat Energy has already lodged plans for a 77-turbine wind farm off the coast of Port MacDonnell, South Australia's most southerly town.

3. Recognises the potential for more wind farms should the proposed zone be proclaimed, with no benefit to South Australia.

4. Expresses its concern at the sheer size and footprint of each wind turbine which measures up to 350 metres above sea level and requires about 700 to 1,000 tonnes of concrete and steel to be fixed to the ocean floor.

5. Expresses its concern about the destruction of critical habitat and migrating seabirds and mammals.

6. Notes the proposed BlueFloat Energy windfarm:

   (a) will provide no net energy benefit to South Australians;

   (b) will result in very few jobs for South Australians;

   (c) will exclude recreational and commercial fishing boats from important fishing areas; and

   (d) has the potential to decimate Port MacDonnell's fishing and summer tourism industries and cause extensive job and business losses in those industries.

7. Acknowledges the southern zone rock lobster fishery of South Australia generates more than $250 million of economic activity annually and supports at least 1,200 jobs.

8. Recognises the proposed zone exacerbates the stress and anxiety the rock lobster industry has endured in recent years due to trade issues with China.

9. Recognises the overwhelming concern of the Port MacDonnell community that the proposal threatens to wipe out the township and create long-term uncertainty for individuals and businesses.

10. Calls on the Premier and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to register South Australia's objection to the wind farm zone encroaching past the Victorian border and advocate this in the strongest possible terms.

11. Calls on the Premier and the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development to personally meet with the federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy to convey this message.

(Continued from 13 September 2023.)

The Hon. S.L. GAME (17:35): I rise to support the honourable member's motion to prevent BlueFloat Energy's offshore wind farm zone from encroaching into South Australian waters. The proposal has met strong resistance from Port MacDonnell residents who will be most affected. Where the local economy relies on commercial fishing and seaside tourism, there is real concern that the proposed area for the wind turbines—eight to 20 kilometres offshore—is where many local fishers catch their lobster.

Locals are anxious that any exclusion zone placed around the turbines would make fishing areas inaccessible. There is also concern about the potential environmental impacts on lobster, and there have been no studies conducted to assess these impacts. Locals need assurances that the large exclusion zones expected to be placed around the turbines will not restrict boat access to lobster grounds and disrupt their habitats.

There are no tangible benefits to South Australia if this proposal drifts into our waters. The Malinauskas government has indicated that it opposes this development, but for this small coastal community in regional South Australia, this may not be enough to stop it going ahead. The Port MacDonnell community needs certainty that this proposed offshore wind farm off the state's South-East coast will not receive federal approval.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (17:36): I rise to speak briefly on this motion on behalf of the Greens, and make some reflections on the motion, but also tilting at windmills. The world is facing a climate emergency. It is now beyond all doubt that human-induced climate change is having a profound effect on our planet. It is changing the environment irretrievably and it is sending species extinct.

Climate change risks the world's food production capacity. It impacts hardest on the poorest communities with the lowest resilience. Climate change is also increasing the frequency and severity of extreme weather events, which affect us all. Protecting the environment, living more in harmony with nature, caring about social justice and future generations are all universal values, I would hope.

This climate emergency is an existential threat. It is the greatest moral challenge of our time, but thankfully there are things we can do. We have the knowledge, we have the technology, and we have the overwhelming bulk of the community on our side, on the side of climate action. If we have political will, we can take real and effective action to address climate change and to minimise the harm that it will cause to people and the environment on which we all depend.

The climate crisis is caused by mining and burning coal, oil and gas. These elements are heating up our planet and, if we do not phase them out, the world is going to be a more dangerous place to live. By phasing out coal and gas power plants, investing in offshore and onshore wind, solar and energy storage, and rewiring Australia with a 21st century electricity grid, we can repower our economy and society with clean energy.

By shifting to renewable energy and electrifying everything, we not only drive carbon pollution to zero, but we can lower home energy bills and industry costs while creating jobs right around the nation. So I ask those in the chamber today: what practical solutions are they putting forward to ensure that our state is not left behind when it comes to renewable energy?

Indeed, my previous colleague, the Hon. Mark Parnell, an environmental lawyer and a champion of climate action, had a lot to say on this matter previously. For the benefit of the council, and some of the newer members, I will repeat some of his words today. He said back in 2018, in a previous debate on wind farms:

> I am yet to meet a single person who does not profess to agree that we need a cleaner, greener, more sustainable and fairer world.

It feels times are a little different right now. Nick Xenophon may be gone, but his anti-wind legacy remains. SA-Best have a long history of misquoting and overexaggerating data on the impacts of wind farms. They moved their latest motion about wind farms after the state government had already

made an announcement, and indeed the very World Health Organization report their argument was based on had in fact been misinterpreted.

We know, and research has told us very clearly, that wind farms are currently the cheapest source of large-scale renewable energy. Technological advances in the sector mean that wind turbines are now larger, more efficient and make use of intelligent technology. Wind was Australia's leading source of clean energy in 2020, supplying 35.9 per cent of this country's clean energy and 9.9 per cent of Australia's overall electricity. To quote Kane Thornton, the CEO of the Clean Energy Council:

> In South Australia, the wind energy sector currently employs hundreds of people, provides steady income for landholders and local governments, and benefits broader communities through the numerous community enhancement funds in operation.

I spoke earlier about the solutions to climate change—solutions to ocean acidification, sea levels rising, the millions of deaths each year from air pollution, damage to the Great Barrier Reef, increased frequency and seriousness of fires, floods and storms, and thousands or millions of species going extinct. If there is a better solution, I would certainly love to hear it and I am sure many others would too. It is clearly no surprise that the Greens are pro wind farms. However, we do not approve of those private projects steamrolling our regional communities.

We do support this motion; however, we question why it was put up after the issue had already been addressed by the Malinauskas government and why we are even voting on it today. But we want those renewable projects to go through an appropriate and normal process. We want the public to have the right to challenge projects and it is not about whether you like the project or not; it is about having an appropriate decision-making pathway.

Wind energy generation investment in South Australia must progress within the context of a mature planning regime that aligns with international standards, and an industry that observes responsible community engagement practices and lets South Australia set the standard. With that, I question why we have this motion today, but we will support it while wondering what the true motivations are.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (17:41): The government will also be supporting this motion. The state government has made a submission to the federal Department of Climate Change, Energy, the Environment and Water (DCCEEW) consultation process, outlining its concerns regarding the proposed declaration of an offshore energy zone off the coast of Victoria and South Australia, with the western portion of the proposed zone situated off the coast of Port MacDonnell.

The proposed offshore wind zone generated significant concern for communities across the Limestone Coast, where the southern rock lobster industry supports over 1,000 jobs and, on average, over the past 10 years has contributed $187.5 million annually to the state's economy. In its submission, our government indicated that it considers the risk of the proposed offshore energy zone and installation of over 70 wind turbines of the coast of South Australia as being too great to established industries in the region as well as to biodiversity, ecosystems and wildlife.

The risks to the rock lobster sector include impacts of noise and vibration, loss of habitat, disruption to spawning and the loss of highly productive fishing grounds within marine fishing area No. 58, where the wind farm is proposed in its entirety within waters off the coast of South Australia. All of those potential risks are of great concern. If the proposal were to go ahead, it could potentially lead to increased fishing pressure in other fishing areas to compensate for the loss of fishing grounds and lead to increased difficulty for the government to manage the fishery effectively.

Risks have also been highlighted for a range of species which either call this area home or migrate through the area, as well as impacts on the important Bonney Upwelling, which sustains a number of marine species and is one of only 12 well-known areas worldwide where blue whales come in relatively high numbers to feed.

Limestone Coast communities have been very clear that they do not want to see this occurring and cannot accept the risk that it presents to some of their key industries that support jobs

and the local economy. Indeed, South-East residents are rightly concerned about whether a project proposal such as this one can have any direct benefits for their communities.

While it is the case there is an indirect benefit in terms of increased renewable energy to the National Electricity Market, the direct benefits for impacted communities are difficult to quantify. They are rightly very proud of their iconic southern rock lobster industry and the numerous other fisheries operating in the area, as well as the rich natural biodiversity and picturesque beauty of the region that draws tourists in from near and far, further supporting the local economy and way of life.

I am pleased that our government has taken action on this important issue and note that many of the items called for within the motion have either already been actioned or are currently being actioned through the course of the state government's submission to the DCCEEW process and follow-up. We support renewable energy, but we cannot support something that puts at risk existing industries and environmental considerations.

The Hon. J.E. HANSON (17:45): I have a couple of amendments that I would like to move standing in my name:

Paragraph VI.:

'Leave out subparagraph (a).

After paragraph XI insert new paragraph as follows:

'XII. Supports the decarbonisation of Australia's electricity sector.'

Obviously, the first amendment is in regard to 'no net energy benefit to South Australians'. The sorts of projects that we are talking about here may have high levels of support within local communities as such if they directly provide benefits to that community, such as, for instance, obviously electricity supply, as has been recently pointed out. There are, of course, indirect benefits, in terms of the National Electricity Market, hence the reason for the amendment in order for it to be, if you like, 100 per cent accurate.

In regard to the second amendment, each year the commonwealth government provides a South Australian greenhouse gas inventory, which includes a dataset dating back to the 1990 financial year. The most recently released data shows that our state currently emits around 21.5 million tonnes of greenhouse emissions every year. This means our emissions have reduced by 42 per cent since 2005.

Over the next about seven years, we will need another 8 per cent drop to achieve our state's target of at least a 50 per cent reduction in emissions by 2030 from its 2005 levels. To set us on track to a net zero by 2050, we need to act as a result to achieve this target, as well as lay the foundations, if you like, for longer term reductions.

The South Australian government declared the climate emergency, as I have previously said, in May 2022. This signalled our intention to take the action and now it is about reaffirming the state's commitment to building science-based policies that can prepare South Australia for the realities of what we are going to see, which is extreme weather climate shifts and increased global warming.

South Australia continues to be committed to building the world-first hydrogen plant this year. Our government is going to keep on moving and these amendments are directed in that regard.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:47): At the outset, I thank all honourable speakers on this motion: the Hon. Nicola Centofanti, the Hon. Ben Hood, the Hon. Sarah Game, the Hon. Tammy Franks, the minister and the Hon. Justin Hanson. I thank everybody for their contributions, and I would like to echo many of the sentiments that have just been expressed. I would also take this opportunity, very briefly, to address some of the points that were just made by the Hon. Tammy Franks.

I, for one, enjoyed my previous debates in this place with Mark Parnell on the issue of wind farms and I, for one, am exceptionally proud of every Xenophon legacy I have pursued in this place, especially given that I was here working for him when he pursued those issues. For me it has been a continuation from my days as a staffer.

That said, I have also always made it very clear, particularly during my debates with the Hon. Mark Parnell in this place, that my position has never been to oppose wind farms per se. I have always acknowledged the valuable role they play in terms of our renewable energy and the valuable role they play more broadly. There are more than 2,000 megawatts in stored capacity in onshore wind farms in South Australia across the state and we have proposals now for offshore wind farms.

If you were to ask me about offshore wind farms, I would say I think they are still a bit of a pipe dream. Notwithstanding that, I have certainly never criticised wind farms in terms of the important role they play. What I have criticised, and what I will continue to criticise, is where they are placed and the impacts they have on, in this instance, local communities. If we want to talk about existential threats, the township of Port MacDonnell as we know it stands to be decimated if this proposal were to go ahead.

The Hon. Tammy Franks also raised the question, somewhat curiously, as to why I moved this motion despite the fact that the government had issued the statement it had. My lobbying with the government preceded that statement. Everybody knew that motion was coming here, regardless of the fact that that statement was released on date it was released.

I had been doing my lobbying directly with the government on this issue prior to the day they introduced that statement in this place, so I was exceptionally happy when that statement came to this place, but that was not going to stop me from moving this motion. The reason it was not going to stop me from moving the motion was that the statement, in and of itself, was not enough.

That is one point. I wanted to ensure that the Malinauskas government was bound by what it said in that statement and would take active steps, which is what the motion calls for. It calls on the Malinauskas government to continue to take active steps to meet with the federal Minister for Climate Change and Energy and to convey that message to them in terms of where we stand on this issue.

It was also important for the people of Port MacDonnell—because they are the ones I gave my word to—that I continue to pursue this motion here, notwithstanding that they also knew at that time, after that lobbying, that that statement was released, that they wanted a position from this parliament because, regardless of what the Malinauskas government has done, the decision federally is yet to be made.

They wanted to ensure there was a strong message sent not just from the government but from this parliament to our federal minister that we were not going to stand idly by as the township of Port MacDonnell was decimated in the process of an approval for offshore wind, and that we all now know—as the minister herself has acknowledged, in her hometown—what the impacts would be. Those are the reasons this motion was moved.

I am not going to suggest for one moment that I know what the opposition's motivations were in terms of this. I know they support the motion, and I am very grateful for that support. However, the work that I, for one, was doing on this predated the government's position, and certainly was intended not only to ensure they continued that lobbying of the federal government but, as I said, on behalf of the township of Port MacDonnell and everybody impacted by this proposal, to ensure that a loud and clear message was sent by the South Australian parliament as a whole to our federal counterparts, who are yet to make a decision with respect to this proposal.

On that issue—I note we will be dealing with this, and I asked some questions on this earlier today—one of the points of contention that has been raised time and time again by me on this issue, again with the Hon. Mark Parnell, is not only the locality of these wind farms, which we all accept are good, and we all accept—

The Hon. C.M. Scriven interjecting:

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Wind farm proposals—not this one, this one is bad, but wind farm proposals in general, which we all accept are good. There is also the archaic nature of the approval process when it comes to those wind farms. When it comes to onshore wind farms, one of the issues has always been that we traditionally—historically, up until now—place them close to infrastructure, which inevitably means they are close to townships and inevitably means there are impacts on those townships.

I advocated on the wind farm in the Flinders Ranges, which was a topic of contention with the Hon. Mark Parnell at the time, because nobody wanted a 250-metre tower 500 metres from their front door. It is not the issue of whether we support wind farms or not: the issue is our laws simply have not kept up with the technology of wind farms.

These things, we know, are monsters in size. They are huge. In this instance, when we are talking about protecting our natural environment, we are also talking about pouring up to 1,000 tonnes of concrete into the seabed for each turbine that would be proposed. How that does not impact our pristine waters at Port MacDonnell and our environment at Port MacDonnell, never mind the impact that it has on the fishing industry, to be fair, is absolutely beyond my comprehension.

It is for those reasons that this motion was moved. I have had feedback from the community of Port MacDonnell, letting them know that this was going to a vote today. In that, I let them know what the government's position was and certainly what the opposition's position was, and they intend to use that when they go back to the federal government, waiting for that response in terms of what the outcome will be for their township. This is critical for them, so there was every reason to ensure that this parliament showed its clear intent when it came to opposing this wind farm for all the right reasons.

With all that said, I am very glad that the Hon. Tammy Franks on behalf of the Greens has supported the motion. I understand the differences of opinion we have had with respect to wind farms, but there was nothing mischievous about this motion. It was designed to do the things that I have just outlined, and I thank everybody for their support on that motion. I have indicated to the government already that there are two amendments, wrapped into one I think, that have just been proposed by the Hon. Justin Hanson. It is my intention to support both of those amendments.

Amendments carried; motion as amended carried.

CITY OF PLAYFORD BY-LAWS

Orders of the Day: Private Business, No. 102: Hon. C. Bonaros to move:

That by-law No. 3 of the City of Playford concerning local government land, made under the Local Government Act 1999 on 23 August 2022 and laid on the table of this council on 6 September 2022, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:58): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

CITY OF PLAYFORD BY-LAWS

Orders of the Day: Private Business, No. 103: Hon. C. Bonaros to move:

That by-law No. 7 of the City of Playford concerning roads, made under the Local Government Act 1999 on 23 August 2022 and laid on the table of this council on 6 September 2022, be disallowed.

The Hon. C. BONAROS (17:58): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; order of the day discharged.

Sitting suspended from 17:59 to 19:45.

Bills

GAS (BAN ON NEW CONNECTIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 7 September 2022.)

The Hon. H.M. GIROLAMO (19:46): This is a relatively simple bill and one that requires only a simple answer: we do not support this bill. I am the lead speaker from the opposition, and this bill should be dealt with swiftly and sent straight to the rubbish bin. This bill continues the honourable

member's obsession with turning South Australia into little Victoria, and whilst we in this place cannot save Victorians from themselves, we can seek to protect our state from the politics of Victoria sweeping into South Australia.

In a cost-of-living crisis the opposition chooses to back the choice of those who work hard and are aspirational to save for a house to choose how they wish to connect to the energy system in this state. In a cost-of-living crisis the opposition chooses to back the choice of many home owners who believe that with greater choice comes the ability to choose the cheaper option. In a housing crisis we do not need to limit the choices of those who are seeking housing by making it more expensive. It will only affect those most vulnerable in our community, something we all thought even the Greens would be able to understand and would have been against.

The honourable member stood in this place recently and acknowledged the greatest housing crisis in a generation, but it is very shortsighted to see the impact this bill would have on the market and the hurdles it would put in the way of those trying to buy a house in this state. The proposed Greens' bill would serve to threaten the security and diversity of energy supply and remove customer choice from the market. Former member the Hon. Mark Parnell brought a number of similar bills, to remove the mandatory application of gas connections to new housing estates, for example, but they did not go very far, and I very much hope this bill is the same.

This bill is incredibly shortsighted and overlooks the importance of renewable gas to the nation's energy transition. Future renewable gas sources such as green hydrogen or biogas are being investigated to replace natural gas right now, providing a pathway for a carbon neutral gas to home in the future. This bill seeks to hobble those houses of the future. Literally, houses being built 18 months from now will not be open to the forthcoming energy transition, which I would have thought is something the Greens party, the supposed party of the environment, would have supported.

I have visited the site of LMS Energy, a great innovative company in South Australia. It is Australia's leading biodiversity and emissions reduction company, which turns waste from landfill into biogas. My question to the honourable member is: would you like to see the end of these projects, which are literally diverting waste from landfill from our community and turning it into energy? These future renewable sources of energy are net zero carbon and provide new and reliable sources of energy, which can be utilised in the same way as natural gas is today.

To say we are talking about the same houses is not too much of a stretch. Under the former Liberal government, Hydrogen Park SA in Tonsley generated green hydrogen from a 1.25 megawatt electrolyser. This green hydrogen was blended into the natural gas network in a trial of some 700 homes in Mitchell Park. At present, the blend contains 5 per cent hydrogen. The trial began in May 2021 and is believed to be the biggest trial in the world blending hydrogen into a suburban gas supply.

Australian Gas Infrastructure Group has indicated the trial has been a success and is looking to expand it. As old gas pipelines are being replaced, the Australian Gas Infrastructure Group is upgrading the new pipelines to be capable of supporting these higher concentrations of hydrogen. A transition to greater percentages of hydrogen will occur over time, with the Australian Gas Infrastructure Group aiming to offer 100 per cent green hydrogen to new housing estates by 2025—at the same time that this bill would come into effect and have houses with no ability to connect to the future energy source.

I hope that this council will not even entertain this bill today. Looking at Victoria, a report by Northmore Gordon, which was commissioned by the Greens in Victoria, showed that gas would begin to endure a shortfall of supply in 2027. It went on to note that there is sufficient time for policymakers—for some of us of the parties of government in this state—and the energy market to respond. The Northmore Gordon report talks about solving the problem of gas shortages by reducing demand, which is what I am presuming the honourable member is seeking to do today.

The report even states the burden on families, advocating for 600,000-plus ducted gas space heating units in Victorian homes to be replaced with reverse-cycle air conditioners. The cost of this ranges between $6,380 for a working family to $8,270 for those with a larger house. If this is taken as a once-off cost, it is a huge whack for households who are already struggling with their bills.

Put simply, the Greens in Victoria have advocated for Victorian families to foot the bill for changes they need to make to their homes, and even then the emissions will likely increase as a result of the change of the mix in the grid. Households will be forced to pay higher electricity bills, as natural gas cooling and heating in the home is cheaper and more efficient than electricity-powered units. This report does not even contemplate other household costs families are asked to take on, including replacing gas hot water systems, gas cooktops, and better insulation.

In summary, the Greens want working families to potentially pay a minimum of $7,000 to increase emissions for the household by 400 per cent. In closing, we on this side stand with those who have a house, who want to own a house, who want a choice in the market and how they heat their home and water and provide food to their family, who want choice in the energy options they will pay for, especially for those who want to be able to barbecue. I hope the Greens are not looking to ban the barbecue next.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING PRESIDENT (The Hon. J.E. Hanson): Order! I know that barbecues are very important to Australians, but right now we can move on to the Hon. Mr Pangallo.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO (19:53): I rise to say that I will not be supporting the bill, but I will give the Hon. Robert Simms 10 out of 10 for trying it on again. It is quite obvious that we in this country are going to be reliant on gas for decades. Gas is still a relatively cheap fuel source. It is used everywhere. It keeps industry going. Domestic dwellings rely on it. Maritime operations, defence, you name it—aviation. It is worth a lot of export dollars to this country and will continue to be, the demand is so high.

Gas keeps the lights on and it keeps the air conditioners on. It will keep the air conditioners on in the hot summer predicted by the Bureau of Meteorology and other climate changers, who say that we will experience not only heatwave conditions but also the likelihood of environmental events like bushfires. Factories will be dependent on it, ships have to keep sailing, planes flying. Relying simply on wind and solar is not really going to cut it. I see that AEMO has issued warnings of blackouts in South Australia this coming summer, and that we will be reliant on supplies from particularly Queensland, which is still having to use coal.

The net effect of trying to get rid of a fuel source like gas will be to put more pressure on power bills—not just power bills for consumers, domestic dwellers, but also industry. The wholesale prices will be affected by that. The Greens have great social justice policies, particularly with the housing crisis, so they would be the first to understand that Australians are hurting out there, but doing something like this will only hurt Australians even more, unfortunately.

Investors are also being scared off from putting money into big energy projects in this country as well because of the state of the economic climate globally. Also, we have the current federal government, with its energy market influence and what it is trying to do to meet net zero in 2030. The rest of the world is not doing the crazy things that Anthony Albanese and Chris Bowen want to do to achieve their renewable energy policies, and this fantasy of thinking they can get to net zero in six years' time. It is just impossible.

Recently, airbus Albo flew to China but said nothing about all the coal power stations that China is continuing to build. Not only are they continuing to build those coal power stations but they are offering financial incentives to keep them operating virtually 24/7. The Chinese are still building them—they are not moving away from coal. Yet, we had the Prime Minister there, beating his chest in Tuvalu to save them from climate change. He goes to China and does not say anything about China's policy of continuing with coal. In fact, he spent more time talking to Xi Jinping about Kung Fu Panda and panda bears here in Adelaide.

I point out a trip I did recently to Moomba with the Natural Resources Committee, where we visited Santos. Santos is one of South Australia's great companies. As we know, it is in the business of gas and oil exploration. What we saw there was truly commendable in what they are trying to do in their industry to combat climate change and reduce those carbon dioxide gases. They are currently in the throes, almost halfway through, of building a $200 million US carbon capture storage facility,

which will capture the CO_2 from the emissions of their production of gas and oil. They will capture that, liquify it and then it will be stored underground in their empty gas wells.

It is a bold, ambitious project, but it is one that the company has decided to take on and invest quite a bit of money in. It just goes to demonstrate that they, too, have policies and an incentive also to be able to reduce these carbon gases and try to achieve net zero emissions. It is a company that is showing a lot of responsibility. However, we as a country are still relying on their product, and we will be for some time.

To sum it up, I think that getting rid of gas will only drive up other energy costs, particularly electricity. It will harm the very people who are hurting right now, and these are low-income families especially. If they cannot have access to gas in order to maintain their gas cooktops, their heating and other needs, they will end up having to pay enormous amounts for the use of energy that is supplied on the grid through other sources. It is a type of energy source that supplements what is already out there.

Everybody obviously wants to get to net zero as quickly as we possibly can, and also to utilise the renewable energy sources that we have out there—wind and solar, hydro, and hydrogen perhaps, if that ever happens. Let me tell you about hydrogen. This is an interesting thing. While we were at Moomba, I was talking to some of their geologists about the prospect of using hydrogen and producing enough of it for our needs and also for export. Gas, as we know, can be liquefied and then transported on ships that are designed to take LPG. To liquefy natural gas, you have to get the temperature down to, I think, -146° centigrade.

I asked them about hydrogen: -246° centigrade. It is going to take enormous energy to get to the point where you can liquefy hydrogen. I said to them, 'How are we going to ship hydrogen to export markets?' Well, there is no way yet, because they have not designed ships that are able to transport large amounts of liquid hydrogen and if you do, by the time it gets from one port to the other half will have dissipated. It gives you an idea that trying to make gold out of hydrogen may not be a cheap option. It may be very expensive. I do not think it is going to be the pot of gold at the end of the rainbow, as everyone seems to think it is, because it is going to cost so much to produce it.

In saying that, as I said, we are going to have gas with us for a long time. We are going to be cooking with gas for a long time. Like the Hon. Heidi Girolamo, I certainly do not want to get to a situation where I have to get rid of my Weber Q and the gas with it and have to find somewhere to plug it in and hope that there is electricity supplied by wind turbines that are still blowing.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (20:03): There is no legislation in South Australia which mandates gas connections be installed to newly built buildings. Whether or not a gas connection is installed is a matter of consumer choice, and any ban would reduce consumer choice. A ban on new connections would diminish opportunities for development also of the hydrogen industry. The hydrogen industry is one of the biggest economic opportunities to ever emerge for South Australia, but banning gas connections would risk hamstringing the industry from achieving the scale in the domestic market which many would argue is a prerequisite for seizing the opportunity of potentially creating a hydrogen export sector.

Reducing hydrogen demand would also risk devaluing solar generation, and this is because South Australia frequently has excess solar generation, which has to be curtailed to maintain stability in the electricity system. Hydrogen manufacture creates the avenue for that excess solar, and excess wind at coincident or other times, to be harnessed productively and therefore valued.

Now, already, Hydrogen Park SA (HyP SA) produces renewable hydrogen at the Tonsley Innovation Precinct, and blends this into the reticulated gas supply to approximately 4,000 homes and businesses in Mitchell Park, Clovelly Park and parts of Marion. The HyP SA project has trialled the technical side of the 5 per cent blend and consumer response. Consumer surveys for the project owner, Australian Gas Infrastructure Group (AGIG), and subsidiary Australian Gas Networks (AGN), have found households generally support the change, with 94 per cent positive or neutral.

The success of HyP SA has been instrumental in AGIG adopting a corporate strategy that its distribution network will deliver a 10 per cent renewable carbon-free gas by volume by 2030, and

that the network will be fully decarbonised with a stretch target of 2040 and a deadline of 2050. We should be encouraging this transition, not thwarting it. A ban on new gas connections would risk creating unintended and undesirable impacts, including cost burdens on consumers, an increase in overall greenhouse gas emissions and a less resilient energy system.

Gas was being supplied to more than 453,000 residential customers in South Australia as at quarter 3 of this year. The Australian Energy Regulator (AER) estimates the current 2023-24 capital asset base of Australian Gas Networks is about $1.8 billion. For the current five-year regulatory period of 2021-26, the AER determined AGN's allowable revenue at $1.122 billion. This included recovery of capex of $512 million and opex of $356 million.

Any ban to new gas connections would create a future risk that there would be a reduced customer base to cover costs of similar magnitude in the years ahead. This would worsen cost-of-living pressure on the legacy customers as their gas bills increased. This would be the case whether the gas was natural, a renewable blend or had successfully transitioned to 100 per cent hydrogen. Many of these legacy customers would be lower income households, as they are often the ones with the least capacity to move home and to purchase new household appliances, and the added cost burden on the most vulnerable customers should be unacceptable to this parliament.

Further, given the impending electricity transmission connection of South Australia to New South Wales, adding to the existing connections to Victoria, a gas connection ban would risk increasing the greenhouse gas footprint of South Australian consumers. Banning gas connections would transfer that energy requirement for households on to the electricity system.

The source of electricity generation varies considerably by time of day. Self-evidently, solar generation peaks during the middle of the day, but ceases at sunset. Residual demand—that is, demand for grid-supplied electricity once rooftop solar is subtracted from the total demand—peaks in the early morning and the evening.

Residential gas usage is not metered by time of use, but it is common sense that this peaks in the morning and again in the evening when households use gas energy for cooking and for heating water and the home. Therefore, fewer residential gas connections will increase electricity demand at precisely the times when there are already steep peaks. This will have the effect of increasing wholesale electricity prices, and it also risks increasing South Australian demand to draw energy from New South Wales and Victoria.

Given that New South Wales remains reliant on black coal, and Victoria on brown coal, South Australians could be swapping gas for the far more polluting technology of burning coal. Over the next couple of decades, these coal-fired power stations will close; however, gas-fired power generation is likely to remain in place for many more decades. At that stage, South Australians would be swapping burning gas at home for gas being burned at the power station to generate electricity, which is then transmitted and distributed—losing some energy along the way—to the home.

These energy and greenhouse gas implications would have to be fully calculated and verified to justify any decision to ban gas connections. Consumers also expect and demand a resilient and reliable energy system. Having a household being supplied by gas and electricity creates a dual option, so that if one source is curtailed the house can still function relatively normally. Given electricity outages are far more common and are likely to worsen as climate change drives increasing ferocity of damaging storms, this benefit should not be underestimated.

Gas pipelines are generally underground, whereas electricity lines are strung overhead, a vulnerability that could only be overcome by massive capital investment and further, as explained earlier, cutting gas will increase electricity demand at peak times outside solar generation periods. Electricity supply at these peak times will require increasing use of grid-scale batteries, but when used to supply energy rather than ancillary services, commercially viable batteries can be drained within hours and increasing demand on these batteries means the system will be less able to cope with dunkelflaute events. For those who do not know, dunkelflaute events are extended periods where it is dark and still. That creates a risk of more blackouts in a less reliable electricity system.

This bill has some superficial appeal as a catchcry in the campaign to address climate change, but unintended risks, worse cost-of-living pressures, potentially more pollution and worsening reliability are all reasons to oppose this bill.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (20:11): I think Socrates would not be able to turn this one around, based on the feedback I have heard from my colleagues. It is a shame we cannot make renewable energy from the hot air that I have heard in the chamber tonight during this debate. It is disappointing to hear once again the Labor and Liberal parties clambering over themselves to support gas and dirty fossil fuels. One of the most erroneous arguments that we have heard I think during this debate is the ongoing suggestion that gas is somehow cheaper. We know, of course, that that is simply not the case.

I want to refer the chamber to a report that was released just a few days ago by the Monash Climate Change Communication Research Hub, which reviewed and brought together leading electrification research and looked at the impacts of electrifying the residential sector with more affordable energy efficient appliances. As part of that, the report found that in almost all contexts, electricity would cut household energy bills and that electrifying Australia's entire residential sector would save households $4.9 billion in total annual energy costs.

The author, whose name is Amelia Pearson, said that there was a time not long ago that using gas to heat our rooms, water and stovetops was the cheaper choice. Those days are now behind us and electric appliances are both more efficient and cost effective. As gas prices continue to overtake the cost of electrification, electrification only makes more financial sense for Australian households, she says. The report looked at the yearly energy savings that could come from four primary sources: gas network connection fees, electrifying hot water systems, electrifying heating and induction cooking appliances.

What the report found was that on average wholesale gas prices increased by 234 per cent over the past decade compared to 137 per cent for electricity. Gas rose an average of 6.37 per cent a year compared to 3.77 per cent for electricity, so the constant refrain made by the Labor and Liberal parties that banning gas connections for new homes is going to hike up energy prices is a pure fiction. It is not supported by the evidence.

It is disappointing that the two major parties in our state are hooked on gas, because it is bad for carbon emissions and it is bad for community health and wellbeing. A few weeks ago, we saw the universities of Adelaide and South Australia merge; now we are seeing the Labor and Liberal parties merge on this question and it is very, very disappointing.

You have other jurisdictions around the world, other states around the world, that are showing leadership on this and banning new gas connections. The ACT has done it and Victoria has done it—another Labor government—but here in South Australia you have the Labor government in the arms of the gas companies and in the arms of the fossil fuel industry and it is profoundly disappointing. The Labor Party needs to do a lot better. I will call a division so you can all justify your position to your constituents in the middle of a climate emergency.

The council divided on the second reading:

Ayes 2
Noes.....15
Majority 13

AYES

Franks, T.A.	Simms, R.A. (teller)

NOES

Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.	El Dannawi, M.
Girolamo, H.M.	Hanson, J.E.	Henderson, L.A.
Hood, B.R.	Hunter, I.K.	Lee, J.S.
Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.	Ngo, T.T.

Pangallo, F. Scriven, C.M. (teller) Wortley, R.P.

Second reading thus negatived.

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (INDUSTRIAL MANSLAUGHTER) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 May 2022.)

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS (20:20): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

Motions

RESTAURANT & CATERING AUSTRALIA

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. J.S. Lee:

That this council—

1. Notes that Restaurant & Catering Australia (R&CA) is the peak industry body representing over 57,000 restaurants, cafes and catering businesses across Australia;

2. Congratulates R&CA on celebrating its 100th anniversary in 2022 and notes that it has been supporting and advocating on behalf of owners and operators within the hospitality industry since its establishment;

3. Acknowledges the social and economic contributions of South Australia's hospitality industry; and

4. Recognises the valuable work by R&CA Board and its Awards for Excellence program to give restaurants, cafes, and caterers well-deserved recognition for their hard work, exceptional food offerings and outstanding service in the industry.

(Continued from 1 June 2023.)

The Hon. R.B. MARTIN (20:20): The Restaurant & Catering association has been a fierce advocate for the nation's restauranteurs for more than 100 years. The association represents our restaurants, cafes, catering businesses and function centres. These businesses make a significant contribution to South Australia's economy and lifestyle.

The economic contribution of the food and beverage services sector has bounced back from the COVID pandemic, with the industry's gross value 9 per cent higher in 2022 compared with June 2020 but we cannot discount the difficulties the industry is facing. Rising costs, interest rate increases, and chronic labour shortages are all having an impact on the hospitality sector's ability to do business. However, if we know one thing about the industry it is the sector's incredible resilience and positivity. To get through the difficult years of the COVID pandemic and to continue to thrive beyond that shows the grit and determination of the industry.

The Malinauskas government came into government with a strong commitment to support small and family businesses to grow and succeed. The government has launched South Australia's Small Business Strategy, which includes a set of 20 initiatives designed to help futureproof South Australia's small and family businesses. The Small Business Fundamentals Program will increase the skills, capability and capacity of small businesses and their workforces by 11 partner organisations. The Cyber Uplift Program is designed to help small businesses improve their cyber capabilities and resilience, and there will also be a Mental Health Wellbeing Program and a Small Business Sustainability Support Program.

I take this opportunity to thank the Hon. Jing Lee for this motion, and note that it is so important to take this opportunity to celebrate the association's achievements, because they really are significant, especially considering the challenges they have faced in recent years. I commend the motion.

The Hon. J.S. LEE (Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (20:22): I would like to thank the Hon. Reggie Martin for his great contribution in recognising Restaurant & Catering Australia as well as highlighting some of the challenges they have faced, but the industry has continued to demonstrate strong resilience. With those remarks, and with support from the government, I commend the motion.

Motion carried.

Bills

HYDROGEN AND RENEWABLE ENERGY BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Simms–1]—

Page 8, line 35 [clause 4(1), definition of *commercial purpose*]—After 'include' insert:

generating hydrogen for residential use or for

This amendment would prevent hydrogen being used for residential purposes. We understand that the government intend to blend up to 20 per cent hydrogen with methane gas into residences. They claim that this is to support gas users to decarbonise; however, the Greens are concerned that this also provides a pathway to perpetuate methane gas use. For this reason, we are seeking to strike it out of the bill.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government opposes this amendment because it actually would not prevent the generation of hydrogen for residential purposes, according to my advice. Indeed, if accepted this amendment would mean that the proposed Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act would not license hydrogen generation for a commercial purpose where there is residential end use and, as a result, these activities would be authorised under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.

Furthermore, the blending of hydrogen into domestic gas networks is covered separately by the Gas Act 1997. Hydrogen blending enables the state to transition to a lower emissions future through the decarbonisation of the existing gas network. Licensing hydrogen generation for a commercial purpose where there is residential end use under the HRE Bill ensures a fit-for-purpose regulatory framework exists to license and construct these projects that can provide the necessary ongoing monitoring, compliance and safety considerations in such projects.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that the opposition will not be supporting the Hon. Rob Simms' amendment to this clause.

Amendment negatived.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Simms–1]—

Page 9, line 36 [clause 4(1), definition of *generating hydrogen*]—Delete 'processes such as the electrolysis of water or the reformation of natural gas' and substitute:

the process of electrolysis of water

This amendment excludes hydrogen derived from methane gas—that is, blue hydrogen. The government has publicly stated they support blue hydrogen or are agnostic around the question of blue hydrogen, but the Greens have argued consistently that we want to see a green hydrogen industry in our state consistent with the position that the Labor Party took to the last election as part of their green hydrogen plan. I indicate, to save members' time, that I will call a division on this and the next amendment, which also relates to fossil fuels.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I indicate that, again, while we appreciate Mr Simms' amendment, the opposition will not be supporting it.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government opposes this amendment also. According to my advice, this amendment would also not prevent blue hydrogen being generated in South Australia. The amendment would mean that the proposed Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act would not license blue hydrogen generation, and as a result it will be authorised under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016. As a result, there would be no dedicated regulatory framework in place to cover the safe creation and storage of blue hydrogen, which would expose the state to unacceptable risks.

As mentioned in earlier contributions, the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill is agnostic to the technology used to generate hydrogen. This legislation will enable the market to determine commercially viable hydrogen projects based on all technologies available to it, including green hydrogen, from the electrolysis of water using renewable energy, and blue hydrogen, from the reformation of methane combined with carbon capture and storage.

All types of hydrogen generation will contribute to building the necessary infrastructure required in the transition to a future clean hydrogen industry. Allowing all hydrogen types encourages the industry to develop and test economically feasible technologies, which will ultimately bring down the cost of hydrogen production. It is the role of other legislation to determine how South Australia and the country more broadly will meet our decarbonisation goals. If this amendment was to be accepted it would limit the state's ability to decarbonise and would also prevent a sensible market-based transition to a green hydrogen economy.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 2
Noes.....16
Majority 14

AYES

Franks, T.A.	Simms, R.A. (teller)	

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.
El Dannawi, M.	Girolamo, H.M.	Hanson, J.E.
Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.	Hunter, I.K.
Lee, J.S.	Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.	Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Wortley, R.P.		

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Simms–1]—

Page 10, after line 2 [clause 4(1), definition of *generating hydrogen*]—Insert:

but does not include operations for the creation of hydrogen by a process that utilises fossil fuels

Just to assist members, I will call a division on this amendment. As I have indicated previously, the Greens are concerned about the potential for blue hydrogen to be facilitated by this bill. Blue hydrogen is derived, as we know, from fossil fuels through the reformation of methane gas. We want to make it very clear that that should not be allowable under this bill. My amendment would make that clear.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government opposes this amendment on similar reasons: if the amendment was accepted it would limit the state's ability to decarbonise and it would also prevent a sensible market-based transition to a green hydrogen economy.

The amendment would not prevent blue hydrogen being generated. Instead, it would mean that it would be authorised under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act and, as a result, there would be no dedicated regulatory framework in place to cover the safe creation and storage of blue hydrogen. That would expose the state to unacceptable risks.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that the opposition will not be supporting the Hon. Mr Simms' amendment.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 2
Noes.....16
Majority 14

AYES

Franks, T.A.	Simms, R.A. (teller)

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	Centofanti, N.J.
El Dannawi, M.	Girolamo, H.M.	Hanson, J.E.
Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.	Hunter, I.K.
Lee, J.S.	Maher, K.J.	Martin, R.B.
Ngo, T.T.	Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Wortley, R.P.		

Amendment thus negatived.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros–2]—

Page 11, after line 14 [clause 4(1), definition of *owner* of land]—After paragraph (f) insert:

(fa) the holder of an aquaculture lease or aquaculture licence under the *Aquaculture Act 2001*; or

This is a standalone amendment, but I will speak to it in relation to the other amendments I am moving as well, because effectively they all deal with the same issue, namely, to ensure that there is provision for compensation for those holders of licences or leases under our Aquaculture Act and under our Fisheries Management Act. This specific amendment deals with the Aquaculture Act. We have spoken today about the offshore wind farm proposal in Port MacDonnell and the impacts that would have on that community but also on those individuals who have access rights and authorisations in waters where these wind farms are proposed.

Whilst aquaculture is dealt with a little differently under this bill from what fisheries is, because fisheries were not dealt with, it is certainly my intention to ensure that, even though we have gone about it in two different ways, those with aquaculture authorisations and those with fisheries management authorisations, which we will get to a little bit later, firstly, have a prescribed right to compensation, subject to a number of qualifications similar to those we are already familiar with—for instance, under the marine parks legislation—in terms of being able to establish displacement and impact in terms of catch levels and economic impact.

The purpose of this is to amend the definition of 'owner of land' to ensure that it also covers the holder of an aquaculture lease or aquaculture licence under that act and ensure that they are captured by the subsequent provisions which would otherwise apply to onshore proposals. That is about it. I commend the amendment to the chamber.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In regard to stakeholder consultation, can the member please give the chamber—it does not need to be specific names—an indication of the stakeholders that the member has consulted with in regard to her amendment?

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I think the member would know that there are peak bodies in this jurisdiction which I would obviously consult with. The South Australian seafood association is one of those. The Port MacDonnell situation at the moment should speak volumes in terms of the general views of those who fall within both the aquaculture and fisheries management acts and industries. These are issues that they have been advocating for for a very long time, so it is a well-established view amongst those various associations across the state, which we are all familiar with, that this is something they are particularly keen on seeing incorporated into the bill.

In short, yes, I did consult with all the usual bodies in this space. I reiterate that this is a long-held view of theirs. As I said during the second reading debate, we are also dealing more generally with wind farm proposals specifically. It might not be a wind farm proposal. It might be something else, but one of the things that I did speak to in this bill during the second reading was the fact that this bill does allow for those offshore wind farm proposals.

Regardless of what the proposal is, the intention is to effectively treat those who fall under those in the same way that we would treat land pastoralists or landholders. There is no rhyme or reason as to why we should treat them any differently. They have authorisations, they have leases, they have licences, which they pay a hell of a lot of money for each and every year, and there is absolutely no doubt that they would like a prescribed protection in the act, particularly as opposed to having something left to regulation. That is the genesis, if you like, of these amendments.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I thank the member for that information. With that, I am certainly happy to indicate that the opposition will be supporting the honourable member's amendment.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that ordinarily aquaculture leases will already be captured by the definitions of 'land' and 'owner of land' within the bill, so it is implicit. However, this amendment makes it explicit. That is absolutely fine and so the government will be supporting this amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I indicate that the Greens will not be supporting this amendment, or indeed any amendments advanced by the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 15, after line 7 [clause 6(4)]—Insert:

and

(d) take into account—

(i) the objects of the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* of the Commonwealth; and

(ii) the objects of the *Native Vegetation Act 1991*.

The bill specifies a number of acts that the minister takes into account. So that the hydrogen and renewable energy projects do not diminish the natural environment, this amendment adds a specific requirement for the minister to take into account the Native Vegetation Act 1991 and the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The acts that are currently referenced in clause 6 are listed in order to ensure that they can operate in conjunction with the new Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act. The new act does not impact on the operation of the Environment Protection and Biodiversity

Conservation Act and the Native Vegetation Act. On that basis, we will not be supporting this amendment.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: The Greens will be supporting this amendment advanced by the opposition. It does add in some important environmental protections into the act, but I do indicate the Greens will not be supporting the other amendments advanced by the opposition.

The council divided on the amendment:

Ayes 8
Noes.....9
Majority 1

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Franks, T.A.	Girolamo, H.M.
Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.
Pangallo, F.	Simms, R.A.	

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J.
Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)	Wortley, R.P.

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.	Game, S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.
Martin, R.B.		

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister outline to the chamber the reasons as to why the minister would explore for a renewable energy resource?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the reason would be so that government can explore on freehold land to better understand the resource or if required for something such as needing access to a road. The government will be initially targeting only Crown land, but it is accurate that the government can also explore on freehold land.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Would the government be using this clause to interfere if there was a dispute between a landowner and an energy company who are at an impasse?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that in the case of a dispute, as mentioned by the honourable member, the formal dispute resolution process would be the appropriate one and that is where the minister can be involved in mediation, and if that is not resolved through that process could then potentially go to the ERD Court.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: In regard to authorised persons, can the minister give an indication as to how many authorised persons there may be that this clause may give powers to?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the bill does not prescribe a number, simply that it can be the minister or the authorised persons.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister define an 'authorised person' for the chamber please?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I refer the honourable member to the interpretation section and the definitions. 'Authorised person means a person authorised by the Minister under section 7(1) to

explore renewable energy resources'. I am further advised that 'person' has the usual meaning in such legislation, so that can include an individual person or other entity or company.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I apologise that I missed the beginning of the opposition leader's question, but just generally can the minister outline how this exploration will work in practice and will it extend to industry also undertaking investigations?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that a person, which could include industry, can also carry out their own investigations outside of release areas if authorised by the minister.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Going back to the authorised person, can the minister indicate how many authorised persons are expected with this clause and whether any specific qualifications are required for those authorised persons?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there have not been estimates made of the numbers of authorised persons. In terms of qualifications, given that the authorised persons are appointed by the minister, it would be for each particular circumstance for that to be determined.

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: What is the current process for gaining a feasibility permit?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The purpose of the renewable energy feasibility permit is to authorise construction of infrastructure for feasibility activities on areas of land that are not designated land. This means any land other than pastoral or Crown land.

Unlike a renewable energy feasibility licence, a permit will not confer an exclusive right to undertake feasibility activities. This is because it is not considered appropriate for potentially large areas of freehold land, for example, to be exclusively allocated or banked, given the comparatively small area required to set up fixed structures for collecting feasibility data. Feedback indicated that the permit structure is more akin to the early development stages of projects on freehold land which the government is seeking to preserve.

In terms of process, the proponent must negotiate land access with the landowner before a permit is issued by the minister responsible for the HRE Act. Further, a permit will allow fixed structures, such as meteorological masts, to be constructed, operated and maintained for the purpose of assessing the feasibility of generating renewable energy. A permit will also require such infrastructure to be decommissioned in a responsible manner.

Additional information is that a permit cannot be issued by the minister until the applicant has negotiated land access with the landowner.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister confirm that that process is the same no matter the technology—wind, solar, etc.?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that is for all renewable energy technology for infrastructure.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I have a question that probably relates to clauses 8 and 9, just in terms of the time frame around those permits, namely up to five years. What is the rationale for the permit periods that have been prescribed, and why did the government land on the five years?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the term of five years is considered to provide sufficient time for proponents to collect the feasibility data to inform their final investment decision. Again, it is for construction of renewable energy infrastructure.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Can the minister just confirm if those terms were designed in consultation with industry when it comes to that period?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, yes, that is the case.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Just in relation to maximum penalties, how were those figures arrived at and why is there a discrepancy between (7) and (8)?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that that outlined in subclause (7) refers to the permit holder, so the licensee, and therefore it is appropriate to be a higher penalty. They have been granted a licence, and if they contravene that that is clearly most inappropriate. The one referred to in subclause (8) can be any person who, without lawful excuse, is obstructing or hindering the holder of an energy feasibility permit in the reasonable exercise of rights.

The Hon. F. PANGALLO: Why are the figures so high?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that they were based on the mining and petroleum act and therefore have similar penalties.

Clause passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Following on from my previous question, can the minister clarify whether, in addition to allowing sufficient time to conduct activities, one of the incentives also was to remove or at least decrease as far as possible the risk of land banking activities?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That is correct. I think I may have referred to that in an earlier question, but just for a little bit of extra information, I am advised that licence and permit terms within the bill have been designed in consultation with industry to achieve a balance between current practices and requirements and to avoid land banking by developers. The terms are intended to allow sufficient time to conduct the necessary activities under the relevant licence by removing the risk of land banking.

Clause passed.

Clause 10.

The ACTING CHAIR (The Hon. R.B. Martin): There is an amendment in the name of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: If I am able to ask a question of the minister before I move my amendment, can the minister explain why there is no legislative requirement to consult with pastoral lessees or the Pastoral Board before awarding a successful tender?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Can you just ask the question again?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I am happy to repeat the question. I asked whether the minister can explain why there is no legislated requirement to consult with pastoral lessees or the Pastoral Board before—sorry, not awarding a successful tender, but declaring a release area.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised there will be a number of parties that will need to be consulted with under the act that will be prescribed in the regulations. We will be opposing the amendment if it is moved by the honourable member because, by listing only the Pastoral Board and pastoral lessees in section 10 of the act, it may give the wrong implication that these two groups are the only groups to be consulted with. But I can certainly commit that a requirement to consult with the Pastoral Board will be in the regulations.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Can the minister confirm how release areas will be identified? I appreciate that she has just said that there will be a regulatory regime around that, but what will be required before declaring a release area?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the identification of release areas will be informed by formal consultation requirements with co-regulators, native title holders and other landowners, including pastoral lessees and impacted communities. A pre-competitive multicriteria analysis will ensure the most appropriate areas of pastoral land and state waters for renewable energy development are identified in consultation with native title holders, pastoral lessees and other landowners.

This process will consider existing land uses as well as environmental, heritage and cultural sensitivities. Consultation will identify potential social, environmental and economic impacts, including benefits and risks, and provide an opportunity for stakeholders to share thoughts on what renewable energy development can mean for them. In terms of the consultation that will be required

before declaring a release area, which I think is also a matter of interest for the honourable member, the minister is required to undertake consultation in a manner that is prescribed by regulations.

The intention is that consultation will be undertaken with landowners, including native title holders, pastoral lessees and resource tenement holders and other persons with an interest in the relevant land to ensure that their views and impacts are properly considered. This will provide an opportunity for early communication of key issues. It will also help to inform the criteria against which tenders within the release area may be assessed and the terms and conditions that will be applied to licences in that area.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: Given what the minister has just said, and if we go back to one of the first provisions in this bill in terms of the objects, there is a general theme in the bill in terms of that community benefit, environmental benefit consultation, and that will inevitably include and incorporate all those who are impacted by anything that is proposed. Is that a fair summation of what we are doing in the bill?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, yes, it is a fair summation of that.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 18, after line 17—Insert:

(6a) The Minister must, before declaring a release area, if any part of the proposed release area comprises pastoral land, consult with—

(a) the Pastoral Board established under the *Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989*; and

(b) the holder of a pastoral lease in respect of the proposed release area.

Whenever an action is undertaken by the state government under the framework of this bill relating to pastoral land, the Pastoral Board must be consulted. Additionally, the amendments make it a requirement that consultation with pastoral lessees is explicitly required if a release area or licence is to occur on their pastoral lease.

We do think that this amendment is worth putting forward to ensure it is a legislative requirement that the minister, before declaring a release area, if any part of the proposed release area comprises pastoral land, must at least consult—and it is certainly and absolutely not saying that the consultation should be limited but at the very least—with the Pastoral Board and the holder of the pastoral lease with respect to the proposed release area.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I indicated, the government will not be supporting this amendment. I would just like to reference what the honourable member has said with regard to it needing to be a legislated requirement. The minister in the other place has committed to consultation with the Pastoral Board and pastoral lessees being in the regulations, as have I, again, tonight in this place. Regulations, of course, are legislative requirements.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 6
Noes.....11
Majority 5

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.
Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.	Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.
Franks, T.A.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)

Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.

PAIRS

Lensink, J.M.A.	Game, S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.
Martin, R.B.		

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 11 to 16 passed.

Clause 17.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Whilst referring to the minister to whom the Pastoral Land Management and Conservation Act 1989 is committed and to seek the concurrence of the minister for whom the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993 is committed, can the minister explain why she would not refer to the Pastoral Board itself?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the Pastoral Board would have already been consulted at the release area stage. This would chronologically come afterwards in terms of granting the renewable energy feasibility licence. That is my advice.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: After seeking the concurrence of the minister for whom the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993 is committed, what balance does the minister for the Harbors and Navigation Act 1993 have, and what if there is a disagreement between the ministers? I might just note that at the moment they are the same person, but they may not be in the future.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, whilst the minister must seek the concurrence of the minister to whom the Harbors and Navigation Act is committed, in the event that that minister did not agree, the minister responsible for the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Act would have the ability to proceed in any case. However, it is considered to be most unlikely that would occur. Seeking the concurrence means that the goal is to have agreement.

Clause passed.

Clause 18.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister advise under this clause how many renewables would be allowed? Will there be a threshold with the number of times that someone can renew a licence? Is there a limit to that, or can they just continue to renew a licence?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised there is no limit to the reviews, but it is all subject to the minister's approval. Therefore, if there were ongoing renewals, they would not necessarily be granted. The minister would have that prerogative.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Is there any concern about the potential for holding of those rights in regard to those licences without any moves to act or improve on?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that, given that we do not want land banking, which I mentioned in an earlier answer this evening, there would have to be a demonstrated good reason as to why it should be renewed if nothing had progressed, as the honourable member outlined.

Clause passed.

Clause 19 passed.

Clause 20.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Given that I think the default term of a renewable energy infrastructure licence is 50 years, if it is longer or shorter how is that determined by the minister—under what situation or circumstance?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the purpose of that provision is to provide flexibility so that the individual circumstances of particular projects can be taken into account. Given that we do not know the exact types of projects that might be proposed, this gives the flexibility while

still providing a guide that the default—as the honourable member used that term—would be 50 years, but the minister can make amendments to that, granting a shorter or longer term as may be appropriate.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Given that prior to this bill the terms of renewable energy infrastructure licences are 40 years, can the minister outline to the chamber why the change? Why the difference in 10 years?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that the change was made in response to consultation with industry, but because there is that opportunity for the minister to grant a shorter or longer term that still provides additional flexibility.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Finally, again, what is the minister doing, or what is being done, to prevent land banking?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that once the licence is granted a work program is put in place. If they fail to meet any of that work program, the licence can be revoked.

Clause passed.

Clause 21 passed.

Clause 22.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: What is the minister's view of an appropriate initial term for a renewable energy research licence?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that there is no term nominated within the bill because the nature of research is that it can be very, very different and therefore be decided on a case-by-case basis.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Would there be a maximum term and, if so, would that include renewals?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that it is on a case-by-case basis and the minister can make that determination.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can I ask the minister why there is not a term set out at all, and at least a maximum given? I hear the minister's comments about research and it being a case-by-case basis, but surely there has to be at least a maximum or at least a time that is required for them to then seek a renewal?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that because this is a research licence only it does not give any rights to the owner of that licence to, for example, construct infrastructure, and therefore there is no risk, for example, of land banking, which is one of the reasons for having the limit on other types of provisions in this bill. The nature of research is you might have a relatively small research project or a vast one, and therefore it needs to be flexible to meet those requirements.

Clause passed.

Clause 23 passed.

Clause 24.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I have similar questions regarding clause 24 as I had at clause 22 around the fact that there is no appropriate term set in this clause for an associated infrastructure licence. I guess my questions would be to the minister again, and I am pretty sure I am going to know what the answers are, but what is the minister's view of an appropriate initial term, and why is there no maximum?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the infrastructure licence does not confer any right to construct, for example, wind farms or natural projects. It is simply the infrastructure, which could be, for example, transmission lines. Further common sense would dictate that the infrastructure required is going to be directly linked to what the actual renewable energy project is, and therefore it would not be necessary or appropriate to prescribe a time in the act as it will be linked and, in any case, the minister will be making the final determination.

Clause passed.

Clause 25.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I might ask a couple of questions of the minister before I move my amendment. Can the minister please advise what would constitute an example of a project of major significance?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Whether a project is of major significance to the economy of the state will depend on the nature and scope of the project and the value and benefits it will provide to South Australia. The threshold assessment will take into account multiple factors, which may include considerations otherwise outside of the HRE Act's scope. The Governor will decide whether an activity proceeds on advice from cabinet.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Is that the usual process for the Governor to decide?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised it is modelled on similar provisions in the Mining Act for a special mining enterprise licence.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister confirm to the chamber that, despite a major significance to the economy-type project, this bill has no powers to seek to compulsorily acquire land and that the landowners will still retain ownership?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is that, yes, I can confirm that the special enterprise licence is not compulsory acquisition. A special enterprise licence confers rights to access and use land to facilitate regulated activities. It is not intended to permanently acquire or extinguish any rights and interest in land, including native title. Like other licences granted under the HRE Act, activities under a special enterprise licence are intended to coexist with other land uses to the extent that is possible.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister elaborate on that last statement: 'to the extent that is possible'?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: One of the goals of the act is to be able to have multiple land uses and to have activities to coexist. Therefore, the special enterprise licence may be exercised as a last resort to enable appropriate enterprises to proceed where access to the relevant land or waters is not able to be agreed.

A proponent who is seeking agreement with the minister for the grant of a special enterprise licence must as a first step initiate consultation with the minister by an application, which is the concept phase. The minister must, among other things, be satisfied the proponent has taken reasonable steps to obtain any permissions, authorisations, consents or other approvals of an owner of land, including the authorisation of the native title holders in a native title agreement or the grant of a right or interest from a freehold landowner.

If the minister advises the proponent that the matter may proceed, the proponent will be entitled to make an agreement with the minister in relation to the grant of a special enterprise licence. The minister will be required to consult with owners of land, including native title holders and freehold landowners on receipt of an application and to have regard to matters specified in any guidelines.

Any agreement between the minister and a proponent for the grant of a special enterprise licence will only be effective if the Governor ratifies the agreement, and before this can occur the Governor must be satisfied that an enterprise is of significance to the economy of the state and it is in the state's interests to grant the licence.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I am not sure that the coexisting of special enterprise and farming land is occurring all that well over in Victoria. Can the minister give an assurance to the chamber that what she has outlined in terms of the bill having no powers to seek to compulsorily acquire land applies to the whole of the bill in that the whole bill does not have those powers to compulsorily acquire land?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Yes, I am advised that this bill does not have any powers to enable compulsory acquisition.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 30, line 38—After 'access to' insert 'designated'

This amendment alters the framework of the special enterprise licence to only be applicable to designated land as defined in the interpretation. This amendment has the effect of not allowing the minister to grant a special enterprise licence on freehold land.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government does not support this amendment. The special enterprise licence should not be limited to designated land only, because it is an appropriate power of last resort over all land. It is worth noting that it is a lesser intervention than is currently provided for under other legislation such as the Electricity Act 1996 and, again, to emphasise unlike an ordinary power of compulsory acquisition, the grant of a special enterprise licence has been designed so as to not extinguish the rights of the landowner. Therefore, the wording in the existing bill is considered appropriate.

The CHAIR: The Hon. Mr Simms?

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I indicated at the start we would not be supporting any of the amendments.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 6
Noes.....11
Majority 5

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.
Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.	Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.
Franks, T.A.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.	

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.	Game, S.L.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Martin, R.B.		

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 26 and 27 passed.

Clause 28.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Before moving my amendment, I would like to ask a question of the minister. Can the minister indicate what, if any, limits are put on the ministerial powers under this clause?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The special enterprise licence requirements have already been outlined. My adviser and I are not clear exactly what the honourable member is asking about, other than what has already been stated and stated in the bill as to what is required for a special enterprise licence to be granted. That includes final approval by the Governor.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Is the minister confirming that it is only under the requirements of economic significance?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: My advice is, yes, under economic significance.

The CHAIR: Are you going to move your amendment?

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I will not be moving amendment No. 4 standing in my name. This is consequential to amendment No. 3.

Clause passed.

Clause 29.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 4 [Simms–1]—

Page 33, line 33 to page 34, line 14—This clause will be opposed.

This opposes the clause that allows the minister to exempt social licence holders from any provision of the act. Just so that members are clear on the particular provision, the special enterprise licences are established under the bill. The government have indicated that this will be a licence of last resort. However, we are concerned that the minister, at their discretion, may make these licence holders exempt under any provision of the act. This is an issue that was raised with the Greens by the Law Society. It does give the minister sweeping powers and that is why we are opposed to it.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that the way this clause has been characterised by the honourable member is incorrect and that this allows exemption only from other parts of this act under the special enterprise licence.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: Sorry, I thought that was what I said: exempt from any provision of this act.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Possibly I misheard the honourable member. Clause 29 is mirrored on section 56C of the Mining Act 1971 as part of the special mining enterprises provisions under part 8A to allow flexibility. The aim of this clause is to allow an appropriate level of flexibility to the development of projects of major state significance, allowing the legislative framework to adapt to an evolving and constantly changing sector. Further, retaining this clause will provide for regulatory consistency across similar frameworks, which will aid regulators in administering the scheme.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: By way of clarification, maybe I misspoke. What I thought I had said is that it is my understanding that this gives the minister discretion to make the special licence holders exempt from any provision of this act, not any piece of legislation, so I apologise if I misspoke. In any case it is not being supported, so it is a moot point.

Clause passed.

Clauses 30 to 35 passed.

The CHAIR: The next indicated amendment is in the name of the Hon. N.J. Centofanti to insert new clause 35A.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate I will no longer be moving this amendment given it is consequential to my amendment No. 2, which was lost.

Clauses 36 to 40 passed.

Clause 41.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 6 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 38, after line 35 [clause 41(2)]—After paragraph (b) insert:

(ba) rent payable by a licensee for use of land in the licence area;

The current wording of the bill does not preclude pastoral lessees from being able to negotiate other benefits such as rent; however, it is not explicit in this bill. This amendment makes a further provision for an access agreement to address the payment of rent to the pastoral lessee as one of the matters required.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government will not be supporting this amendment, as the policy position is to provide for compensation only under access agreements. Rent is not a matter to be provided for in an access agreement. It is not a rental payment to the pastoral lessee in any event because the pastoral lessee is not the owner of the land and they are not conferring a right to access the land.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 6
Noes.....11
Majority 5

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.
Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.	Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.
Franks, T.A.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.	

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.	Game, S.L.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Martin, R.B.		

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 42 to 59 passed.

Clause 60.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Franks–1]—

Page 50, lines 22 to 24 [clause 60(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

(1) The Minister must, for the purposes of this Division, assess the environmental impact of authorised operations against the following criteria (the *environmental impact assessment criteria*):

(a) the following principles of environmental policy as set out in the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment:

(i) the precautionary principle;

(ii) intergenerational equity;

(iii) conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity;

(b) any commonwealth or state government plans, standards, agreements or requirements about environmental protection or ecologically sustainable development;

(c) any relevant environmental impact study, assessment or report;

(d) the character, resilience and values of the receiving environment;

(e) the best practice environmental management for relevant authorised operations;

(f) the financial implications of complying with the matter set out in paragraph (e);

(g) the public interest;

(h) any other prescribed matter.

Amendment No 2 [Franks–1]—

Page 50, lines 27 to 31 [clause 60(3)]—Delete subclause (3) and substitute:

(3) The Minister must, in undertaking a review of the environmental impact assessment criteria, consult with persons or agencies prescribed by the regulations in a manner prescribed by the regulations.

(4) In this section—

Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment means the agreement made on 1 May 1992 between the Commonwealth, the States, the Australian Capital Territory, the Northern Territory and the Australian Local Government Association.

Note—

A copy of the Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment is in Schedule 1 of the *National Environment Protection Council (South Australia) Act 1995*.

Amendment No. 1 [Franks-1], as I mentioned in the second reading debate, is an amendment that includes the environmental impact assessment criteria in this legislation, not leaving it to the minister to determine by regulation. It is putting this important facet of the bill in the act rather than waiting for the delegated legislation.

The amendment is quite comprehensive, and it is something we have already signed up to, so one would have thought that there would not be an aversion to placing this within the act, rather than telling us that the regulations will sort it out down the track. It is very similar to the legislative requirements in Queensland and built on that Intergovernmental Agreement on the Environment.

I note that, given the high-impact nature of hydrogen projects and their potential to negatively impact our cherished landscapes, unique wildlife and cultural heritage, there is no reason for these particular considerations to be left out of this bill when it becomes an act and, indeed, left to the power of the minister to make under regulations. We need to ensure as a parliament that we put into law a framework for promoting sustainable development and safeguarding ecosystems for present and future generations.

Speaking to amendment No. 2 [Franks-1], that certainly looks at the environmental impact assessment criteria, which is consequential to the first amendment and imposes obligations on the minister to undertake consultations with relevant parties on the criteria outlined in the first amendment. I commend the amendments—they are very good.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government will be opposing these amendments. Environmental impact assessment criteria will be developed by the minister in consultation with persons or agencies prescribed by regulations and gazetted prior to the approval of any environmental impact report and statement of environmental objectives.

Being an objective, risk-based regulatory regime, as opposed to a prescriptive regime, allows for the regulators to ensure that industry is continuously improving and adopting leading practice for environmental protection. Prescribing these principles in legislation removes the necessary flexibility to adapt to changes that ensure that leading practice is maintained.

Amendment No. 2 [Franks-1] is consequential upon amendment No.1. As we are opposing amendment No. 1, it is important that the original provisions within the bill remain as currently structured to provide a process where consultation will occur on both the establishment of criteria and reviewing the criteria.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Minister, what is the problem with ensuring consultation with regard to this particular provision?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: As I just outlined, there is consultation on these matters.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that we unfortunately will not be supporting the Hon. Tammy Franks's amendments.

Amendments negatived; clause passed.

Clauses 61 to 72 passed.

Clause 73.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Bonaros–4]—

Page 58, after line 34—After subclause (9) insert:

(10) In this section—

prescribed body means—

(a) the Minister to whom the administration of the *Aquaculture Act 2001* is committed; and

(b) the Minister to whom the administration of the *Fisheries Management Act 2007* is committed; and

(c) the Minister to whom the administration of the *Livestock Act 1997* is committed; and

(d) any other body prescribed by the regulations for the purposes of this definition.

This amendment relates to matters set out in clause 73 of the bill. The Leader of the Opposition might be particularly interested to hear about this one insofar as it relates to the consultation process that the minister has to undertake. Of course, the minister has told us that it is envisaged that there will be consultation with relevant groups who fall under whatever piece of legislation they fall within.

I mentioned earlier that there is a general theme to the consultation that applies throughout this bill. Because I have added explicitly aquaculture and then there are further provisions around fisheries management, regardless of the fact that this is going to occur in the regulations, to provide some certainty for those watching as this bill progresses I have listed at least three bodies that would fall within the scope of the consultation.

I think it is worth noting though, and I will ask the minister to confirm this because it is something that I omitted to think of when I was drafting this, that my understanding is that the regulations will also apply to the Pastoral Act. The catch-all that I drafted when we did this was to ensure that we have 'any other body' prescribed by regulation for the purposes of this definition.

I am going to ask the minister to confirm that that will include the Pastoral Act. The three that I have listed are the Aquaculture Act, Fisheries Management Act and the Livestock Act, but I would again ask the minister to confirm that those regulations will also cover the Pastoral Act and, indeed, any other body that needs to be consulted with.

I do this in contemplation of the previous amendment that I already moved and also in contemplation of the next amendment that I move to make it explicit in the bill that those groups that I have identified are actually captured within these provisions.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I can confirm, according to my advice, that that will include the minister responsible for the Pastoral Act and so on in the regulations.

The CHAIR: Minister, are you indicating how you are going to vote or not?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government will be supporting this amendment.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Can the minister confirm that the government is supporting the consultation provisions in this clause, yet did not want to put it into the act in the previous clause that we just debated and was happy to wait for that consultation process to be done in the regulations? Just so I am getting this right.

The Hon. R.A. Simms interjecting:

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I cannot imagine why this would be.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: There are two different amendments. I have indicated the government will be supporting the amendment moved by the Hon. Connie Bonaros.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 74 passed.

New clause 74A.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Franks–1]—

Page 59, after line 6—Insert:

Subdivision 7—General duty of care

74A—General duty of care

(1) A person undertaking authorised operations must take all reasonable measures to prevent or minimise any harm to the environment within the licence area.

Maximum penalty: $250,000.

(2) For the purposes of subsection (1)—

(a) harm includes—

(i) a risk of harm, and future harm; and

(ii) anything prescribed by the regulations to be harm to the environment; and

(b) harm need not be permanent but must be more than transient or tenuous in nature; and

(c) in determining what measures are required to be taken, regard must be had, amongst other things, to—

(i) the nature of the harm; and

(ii) the sensitivity of the environment that may be affected and the potential impact of the harm environmentally, socially and economically; and

(iii) the practicality and financial implications of any alternative action, and the current state of technical and scientific knowledge; and

(iv) any degrees of risk that may be involved; and

(v) the significance of the environment within the licence area to the State and to the environment and economy of the State; and

(vi) the need to protect biodiversity in the environment within the licence area; and

(vii) any measures required to mitigate the effects of climate change; and

(viii) the extent to which an act or activity may have a cumulative effect on the environment within the licence area; and

(ix) insofar as is reasonably practicable and relevant, any assessment undertaken under this Act of potential harm to the environment within the licence area as a result of the relevant action or activity, and the extent to which any such harm was intended to be prevented or minimised by—

(A) licence conditions; or

(B) a statement of environmental objectives; or

(C) an operational management plan.

(3) A person will be taken not to have contravened subsection (1) if the person is acting in circumstances prescribed by the regulations.

This amendment will insert a general duty of care clause to provide protections against both risk of harm and future harm to provide additional statutory protections for biodiversity, mitigate the effects of climate change and further protect environmental harm. We must hold project proponents to the highest standard of care, and we need to ensure our lands and waters are protected for future generations. There cannot be any activity that causes harm, and all reasonable steps need to be taken to prevent this.

This will also insert a maximum penalty for contravening the provision. The maximum penalty will mean that a person can be prosecuted for an offence or that the breach can be subject to the suite of compliance and enforcement measures provided for in part 7, which includes compliance directions and enforceable voluntary undertakings.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government will be opposing this amendment. Authorised activities under the bill are recognised to have an impact to the environment as infrastructure projects. Our framework is designed to identify, manage and minimise those impacts up until rehabilitation at end of life. The Environmental Impact Report, the Statement of Environmental Objectives and operational management plan within the bill will identify the specific risks and impacts of individual projects subject to consultation requirements, and provide the procedures and legislated requirements a licensee must undertake to minimise and manage impact to the environment.

The drafting of a general duty of care with the specificity included regarding preventing harm could severely limit the activities that could be undertaken under the bill and create uncertainty for licensees, who will not be able to rely on compliance with their statement of environmental objectives and operational management plan.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise on behalf of the opposition to say that the opposition will not be supporting this amendment by the Hon. Tammy Franks.

New clause negatived.

Clause 75 passed.

Clause 76.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS: I move:

Amendment No 5 [Simms–1]—

Page 60, line 11 [clause 76(5), definition of *owner of land*]—Delete 'the holder of a licence under this Act.' and substitute:

—

(a) the holder of a licence under this Act; and

(b) an owner of land that is adjacent to the licence area.

This amendment would ensure that adjoining property owners receive the same notifications as landowners. It is based on feedback received from the Law Society. As the Greens indicated in our second reading remarks, we do believe it is important there is community consensus around hydrogen projects and indeed renewable energy projects, and we felt it was appropriate that adjacent landholders be given some notification.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that the opposition will be supporting the Hon. Rob Simms' amendment. We feel that it is entirely appropriate, when it comes to notice of entry, that the owner of the land that is adjacent to the licence area also be included in these notification processes, particularly given this provision can relate to special enterprise licences.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government does not support this amendment. The proposed amendment to include an owner of land that is adjacent to the licence area is a major change that is not incorporated in existing resource legislation within the state, either the Mining Act 1971 or the Petroleum and Geothermal Energy Act 2000.

If the amendment were to pass, it would cause significant inconsistencies across resource extraction frameworks that often interact and coexist within the same areas of land. Such inconsistencies could lead to ineffective and inconsistent regulation due to varying requirements and expectations on landowners.

All affected parties will be consulted as part of the environmental assessment process—and I would point out that all affected parties necessarily includes the owners of land adjacent to the licence area—to ensure potential impacts are appropriately managed to the satisfaction of the minister and coregulatory agencies.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes 7
Noes.....10
Majority 3

AYES

Centofanti, N.J.	Franks, T.A.	Girolamo, H.M.
Henderson, L.A.	Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.
Simms, R.A. (teller)		

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.
Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.	Maher, K.J.
Ngo, T.T.	Pangallo, F.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Wortley, R.P.		

PAIRS

Game, S.L.	Hood, D.G.E.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Martin, R.B.		

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

New clause 76A.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I move:

Amendment No 7 [Centofanti–1]—

Page 60, after line 11—Insert:

76A—Notice to pastoral lease holder

(1) A licensee must, if any part of the licence area comprises pastoral land, at least 42 days before entering the licence area, give to the holder of a pastoral lease in respect of the licence area a written notice in the form required by the regulations of the licensee's intention to enter the area.

(2) A notice under subsection (1) must set out the measures that the licensee will undertake, or has undertaken, to satisfy the requirements under any other Act or law relating to the management and prevention of biosecurity risks in the area.

(3) The holder of a pastoral lease who is entitled to receive a notice under subsection (1) may, by written notice, reduce the required period of notice.

(4) A licensee is not required to give a notice under this section to the holder of a pastoral lease who is otherwise entitled to receive a notice if the licensee has entered into an access agreement with the holder of the pastoral lease in accordance with Part 4 Division 3 Subdivision 6 that addresses the matters required to be set out in the notice required to be given under this section.

(5) In this section—

licence area includes—

(a) the area of land on which an activity is authorised to be undertaken under section 7; and

(b) a permit area;

licensee includes—

(a) a person authorised to undertake an activity under section 7; and

(b) the holder of a renewable energy feasibility permit.

The act is silent on issues of biosecurity when it comes to accessing land. I note previous comments by the minister regarding statements of environmental objectives and environmental impact reports, but in our opinion there should be a legislative requirement that any proponent when accessing land is required to comply with all relevant biosecurity requirements, including any reasonable requirements of the landowner and/or pastoral lessee. This is critically important to keeping out endemic pests and diseases, many of which have serious economic implications.

Therefore, this amendment has been drafted, which seeks to include a new clause 76A addressing the matter of biosecurity. It also includes amendments to clause 78—amendment No. 8, which will be consequential—to extend the right of objection to pastoral leaseholders.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government will be opposing this amendment on the grounds that the management and prevention of biosecurity risks are already addressed through the environmental impact report and the statement of environmental objectives process.

The role of a statement of environmental objectives is to outline the obligations for a specified activity and area. It will establish particular objectives regarding the management and prevention of biosecurity risks to ensure that landholders are protected from any incursion. A statement of environmental objectives is developed through an open, consultative process, including with affected pastoralists.

There is nothing in the Hydrogen and Renewable Energy Bill that seeks to override existing biosecurity legislation and requirements. All activities must be conducted in accordance with existing frameworks, along with the requirements of access agreements and approved statement of environmental objectives.

The committee divided on the new clause:

Ayes 6
Noes.....11
Majority 5

AYES

Centofanti, N.J. (teller)	Girolamo, H.M.	Henderson, L.A.
Hood, B.R.	Lee, J.S.	Pangallo, F.

NOES

Bonaros, C.	Bourke, E.S.	El Dannawi, M.
Franks, T.A.	Hanson, J.E.	Hunter, I.K.
Maher, K.J.	Ngo, T.T.	Scriven, C.M. (teller)
Simms, R.A.	Wortley, R.P.	

PAIRS

Hood, D.G.E.	Game, S.L.	Lensink, J.M.A.
Martin, R.B.		

New clause thus negatived.

Clause 77 passed.

Clause 78.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that I will not be moving [Centofanti-1] amendments Nos 8 through 14, as I understand they are all consequential on amendment No. 7.

Clause passed.

Clause 79.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister please confirm that legal assistance will be included in this clause, particularly in relation to compensation?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that clause 79(3) provides that compensation may include an additional component to cover reasonable costs incurred by an owner of land in connection with any negotiation or dispute. This clause is mirrored in the Mining Act and is a well-established principle to cover costs that might arise during negotiation. That of course includes legal costs.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Can the minister confirm to the chamber that that is in addition to the compensation provided for any economic loss, hardship or inconvenience suffered by the landowner?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I am advised that clause 79(1), which talks about economic loss, hardship or inconvenience suffered by the owner in consequence of authorised operations, includes the type of expense that we just referred to.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: When this amendment was moved in the other place, the minister in the other place said, as I alluded to in my second reading speech, that they did not vote for this amendment because they did not want to limit the amount of compensation that a landowner could recover. Can the minister confirm that that is the case?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I was under some confusion because I thought we were referring to the Bonaros amendment, but I think the honourable member is referring to the amendment that was moved in the other place. The answer is that the government does not wish to set a cap, which is not considered desirable. I think that is the essence of what the honourable member was asking.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: Are we able to clarify my previous question, in terms of you confirmed that legal assistance is included in that compensation? That question again is: would the legal assistance be in addition to the compensation provided for any economic loss, hardship or inconvenience suffered by the owner?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: Legal costs would be a component of that economic loss, hardship or inconvenience suffered by the owner in consequence of authorised operations, so it is a component of it.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: But there is not necessarily a maximum payment?

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: That is correct.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I inform the chamber that I will not be moving amendment No. 15 standing in my name.

Clause passed.

New clause 79A.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Bonaros–2]—

Page 63, after line 28—Insert:

79A—Compensation for material diminishment of rights

(1) Subject to this section, a person who holds a relevant authority is entitled to receive compensation from a licensee for any loss suffered by them in consequence of authorised operations that have materially diminished the rights of that person (and the onus of proving this matter is on that person).

(2) The amount of compensation under subsection (1) is to be determined by agreement between the person who holds the relevant authority and the licensee, or in default of agreement, by the ERD Court.

(3) For the purposes of subsection (1), authorised operations will not be taken to have materially diminished the rights of a person who holds a relevant authority merely because—

(a) those operations were undertaken on an area of land on which the holder of the relevant authority had a right to undertake activities pursuant to that authority; and

(b) of such matters of a kind prescribed by the regulations.

(4) Regulations made for the purposes of this section may prescribe—

(a) the matters to which a person or the ERD Court (as the case may be) must have regard in determining whether or not there has been material diminishment of the rights of a person who holds a relevant authority; and

(b) the matters that may be taken into account in assessing the amount of compensation payable to a person under this section; and

(c) limitations on the amount of compensation payable to a person under this section, including limitations that may apply if the person is entitled to receive compensation under another provision of this Act or any other Act or law.

(5) In this section—

relevant authority means an authority under the *Fisheries Management Act 2007*.

Members will recall that at clause 4 I moved an amendment to ensure that it is explicit in the bill that 'owner of land' includes those with authorisations and licences under the Aquaculture Act, which was the government's intention, and, as such, they will fall within the provisions that are outlined in clause 79 of the bill, which deals with compensation.

New clause 79A, which is a new insertion, takes a slightly different approach and, indeed, adopts the method outlined in the Mining Act, and rights that apply under that piece of legislation when it comes to the conferral of compensation rights for those individuals with relevant authorities and licences under the Fisheries Management Act.

In essence, it is the same in terms of prescribing in the bill an entitlement to compensation subject, of course, to being able to show displacement or loss of effort and economic impact. It is just a different way of doing it, and because we are dealing with another piece of legislation here—and I note that, based on the discussions that I had with the relevant minister, there was absolutely to be no suggestion, and there is no suggestion, that this confers any property rights on those that fall under the Fisheries Management Act, but it does confer on them a prescribed entitlement to compensation if they suffer loss in consequence of authorised operations that have materially diminished the rights of that person, and of course the onus of proving that is on the person themselves.

Further to the questions that were just addressed by the minister, the provision then sets out a further framework in relation to the role of the ERD Court where there cannot be agreement reached between the individual impacted and the licensee. So, in essence, it is the same as what we are doing in clause 79, but it is just a different way of doing clause 79. It is absolutely clear we are not conferring any property rights, and it is absolutely clear that aquaculture will fall within compensation offered under clause 79, and compensation entitlements for those that fall under the Fisheries Management Act will be captured by this new clause 79A on the basis of material diminishment of rights, which is consistent with those provisions that already exist under the Mining Act.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The government is happy to support this amendment.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to say that the opposition is also happy to support this amendment.

New clause inserted.

Clauses 80 to 113 passed.

Clause 114.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Franks–2]—

Page 85, after line 31—After subclause (5) insert:

(5a) A regulation may not be made under this Act except in accordance with a resolution passed by both Houses of Parliament.

This amendment provides that a regulation may not be made under this act except in accordance with a resolution passed by both houses of parliament. This takes delegated legislation and regulations and it ensures that the parliamentary scrutiny that should be applied to those pieces of legislation is actually applied. In this case, given so many of the things that the Greens have raised in terms of environmental protection and other aspects of this bill are going to be put in regulation, we think it is only fit and proper that this parliament have proper scrutiny of that.

We know that we are one of the few jurisdictions in the country where, should we seek to disallow regulations, as we have had debated today, we have to either do the entire regulation or none at all. We cannot pick the particular offending pieces out as other jurisdictions are able to do and simply disallow those parts. Indeed, once we are presented with the set of regulations, it is the whole set or it is nothing.

We also know that the legislative load of bodies such as the Legislative Review Committee do get the burden of looking at this, but it is certainly not the entire parliament. When we are saying we want this legislation to be setting the standard, world leading, taking us where we have not gone before, being bigger and better, then why not ensure the parliament's scrutiny of the regulations that we have been promised are going to be so great is actually done by the parliament?

With that, I commend this amendment and I note that I look forward to it probably being opposed by all sides and note that every single time we have raised another issue in this debate we have been told it will be done in the regulations. Well, bring the regulations back to the parliament, then we will have the proper debate that should have been had today.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: This amendment is opposed as the making of regulations in South Australia is appropriately covered by the Legislative Instruments Act 1978. Prescribed within that act are appropriate checks and balances for the making of regulations. The ordinary means by which parliament retains control over the exercise of regulation-making powers is through its ability to disallow regulations.

In addition, parliament can amend the legislation under which the regulations are authorised. Parliamentary counsel has confirmed that no such power exists in any legislation in South Australia. As such, the government considers that the Legislative Instruments Act 1978 appropriately provides the necessary rigour and is the established and consistent process for the making of regulations in South Australia.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: Time and time again, I have heard debates about regulations where it has been bemoaned that we have to either pass the whole lot, accept the whole lot, that we cannot pick out the offending bits and that, 'Isn't it terrible that we have stuck with this system?' Time and time again, we have also been told that we are going to set the pace with this legislation.

Just because it has not been done before in this parliament does not mean it cannot be done in this legislation. I thought this legislation was meant to lead the way, be better for democracy and reflective, indeed, of parliamentary democracy, rather than continuing to put things into delegated legislation where appropriate scrutiny is never going to be as high.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: The suggestions that the honourable member makes in terms of being able to disallow parts of regulations would be more appropriately addressed through changes to the Legislative Instruments Act 1978.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI: I rise to indicate that I certainly appreciate the honourable member's frustration. We, too, on this side have had a lot of frustration in regard to executive and government continually relying on more and more bits of legislation through regulations or pieces of delegated legislation, so I can absolutely understand the reasoning for the honourable member putting forward this amendment. However, I do rise to indicate that we will not be supporting this amendment, only because I think doing it in this manner has the potential to set a dangerous precedent in regard to parliamentary process.

The Hon. C. BONAROS: I note the advice that has been given by the government, but I also note the point that has been raised by the Hon. Tammy Franks because it is a point that we

have all harped on about in this place for a very long time. I am a member of the Legislative Review Committee and deal with this frustration on a daily basis and so I do understand that much.

My point in relation to this—and I appreciate what we have said, that just because we have not done it before does not mean we should not do it. My concern is I have sought some advice on this prior to now and given that it is a new concept, if you like, I am not quite sure how it will work or whether indeed it is workable.

Whilst I do not disagree with the intent of what the member is doing, I am concerned about whether or not this is actually a workable solution or whether, as many of us have raised in this place time and time again, we should be looking at other changes in this place that address this issue more systemically and across the board.

I do not know if it is a dangerous precedent. I do not think any of us know if it is dangerous. I do not think any of us know if it is workable. I do not think any of us know if it is unworkable, but that is what we are being asked to decide with this amendment and I think that this is one of those times where this is an issue that we revisit outside of the scope of this bill and more generally across the board.

The Hon. T.A. FRANKS: I would just add that if people think this is dangerous, that it is dangerously democratic, then I am a bit concerned that people in this place are worried about democracy.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Remaining clause (115) and schedule passed.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN: I seek leave to table some answers to questions that were taken on notice during the morning sitting today, asked by the Hon. T.A. Franks.

Leave granted.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (22:49): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The Hon. N.J. CENTOFANTI (Leader of the Opposition) (22:49): I rise to make a small contribution, noting that most of our concerns have been expressed during my second reading contribution. I do think it is important, though, to again place on the record that we the opposition believe it entirely appropriate for a bill of this magnitude, that has the ability to have huge impacts on a number of landholders and licensees, to be scrutinised by this parliament. It is disappointing that the motion by the Hon. Robert Simms was blocked today and that this government has continued to push this piece of legislation through this chamber.

That said, overall, stakeholders the opposition have spoken to understand the importance of decarbonising their operations and they recognise the ability for decarbonisation to be a facilitator in diversification of income streams, particularly given the often cyclical nature of farming operations. It is our understanding that many of these stakeholders have also been given assurances by this government that many of their concerns will be addressed in the regulations. As the minister in this place pointed out, the minister in the other place, when asked directly about these concerns, stated that that would indeed occur.

The opposition certainly hope and trust that this is the case and we certainly will be scrutinising those regulations when they do come through. Because of these reasons, we certainly will not be opposing this bill, but again stress that the opposition does have significant concerns about this bill and the potential implications it will have on landholder rights into the future.

The Hon. R.A. SIMMS (22:52): I want to make some final concluding remarks on behalf of the Greens. From our perspective, we find ourselves in a disappointing position tonight because we wish we had a bill that we could support enthusiastically. Indeed, we have done everything we can to try to improve this legislation. We have moved a series of amendments to try to do so, in particular to try to prevent the use of blue hydrogen from methane gas and to try to wean South Australia off gas.

We have also tried in vain to refer this bill on to a parliamentary committee so that we were able to consider the implications of this proposal and to provide members the opportunity to conduct more consultation with their communities. This is a big opportunity for our state and there was a big opportunity for the government to do things differently and to focus purely on green hydrogen and renewable energy. That said, we recognise that there are some benefits in the legislation and we will not be opposing the bill.

The Hon. C.M. SCRIVEN (Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, Minister for Forest Industries) (22:53): If we pass this legislation in a moment, it will be a world first. We can expect international policymakers to look carefully at what we have achieved here today. In terms of renewable energy uptake, we are already world leaders. We should be proud of again demonstrating our leadership in the uptake of renewables. I commend this bill to the house.

Bill read a third time and passed.

ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY BILL

Final Stages

The House of Assembly agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the House of Assembly desires the concurrence of the Legislative Council:

No. 1. Page 22, after line 21, insert new Clause No. 41 as follows:

41—Adelaide University Research Fund

(1) The *Adelaide University Research Fund* is established and must be maintained in perpetuity.

(2) The assets of the Fund belong to the Crown.

(3) The Fund will consist of—

(a) the prescribed amount to be paid into the Fund on the commencement of this section; and

(b) money paid into the Fund at the direction or with the approval of the Treasurer; and

(c) income and accretions from investment of money from the Fund; and

(d) other money required to be paid into the Fund under any other Act.

(4) The Fund will be invested with the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia in accordance with the Fund guidelines

(5) The following provisions apply in relation to the application of the Fund:

(a) payments will be made to the University from the Fund, in accordance with the Fund guidelines, to be applied towards-

(i) research that aligns with the University's objectives and strategic plans, and with the State's research and economic development priorities; or

(ii) supporting research at the University of a kind approved by the advisory committee;

(b) during the prescribed period, the Treasurer must make an annual payment to the University from the Fund of $8 million to be applied by the University towards the matters specified in paragraph (a)(i) or (ii);

(c) if the market value of the Fund (not including the value of any amounts paid into the Fund under subsection (3)(b) or (d)) is below the prescribed amount—

(i) the Treasurer must not make any additional payments to the University from the Fund other than—

(A) the payment required under paragraph (b); or

(B) in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Treasurer in a particular case; and

(ii) any income and accretions from investment of money from the Fund must be applied towards restoring the market value of the Fund to an amount that is of or above the prescribed amount;

(d) administrative costs and other expenses related to the management, operation and investment of the Fund may be paid out from the Fund in accordance with the Fund guidelines.

No. 2. Page 23, after line 19, insert new Clause No. 42 as follows:

42—Adelaide University Student Support Fund

(1) The *Adelaide University Student Support Fund* is established and must be maintained in perpetuity.

(2) The assets of the Fund belong to the Crown.

(3) The Fund will consist of—

(a) the prescribed amount to be paid into the Fund on the commencement of this section; and

(b) money paid into the Fund at the direction or with the approval of the Treasurer; and

(c) income and accretions from investment of money from the Fund; and

(d) other money required to be paid into the Fund under any other Act.

(4) The Fund will be invested with the Superannuation Funds Management Corporation of South Australia in accordance with the Fund guidelines.

(5) The following provisions apply in relation to the application of the Fund:

(a) payments will be made to the University from the Fund, in accordance with the Fund guidelines, to be applied towards-

(i) facilitating access to the University, and addressing equity considerations, for people within the community who have experienced disadvantages in education, or in access to education, or who are under-represented in education; or

(ii) programs developed by the University in accordance with paragraph (c); or

(iii) a purpose related to supporting students at the University approved by the advisory committee;

(b) during the prescribed period, the Treasurer must make an annual payment to the University from the Fund of $4 million to be applied by the University towards the matters specified in paragraph (a)(i), (ii) or (iii).

(c) the Fund guidelines must provide that at least $20 million of the Fund is dedicated towards supporting payments from the Fund to be applied by the University towards programs addressing access to the University and equity considerations for people residing in regional and outer metropolitan areas who have experienced disadvantages in education, or in access to education, or who are under-represented in education;

(d) if the market value of the Fund (not including the value of any amounts paid into the Fund under subsection (3)(b) or (d)) is below the prescribed amount-

(i) the Treasurer must not make any additional payments to the University from the Fund other than-

(A) the payment required under paragraph (b); or

(B) in exceptional circumstances as determined by the Treasurer in a particular case; and

(ii) any income and accretions from investment of money from the Fund must be applied towards restoring the market value of the Fund to an amount that is of or above the prescribed amount;

(e) administrative costs and other expenses related to the management, operation and investment of the Fund may be paid out from the Fund in accordance with the Fund guidelines.

No. 3. Page 27, line 1, insert new Clause No. 52 as follows:

52—Exemption from land tax

Any land in respect of which the University would, but for this section, be liable to pay land tax is exempt from that tax.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. K.J. MAHER: I move:

That the House of Assembly's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

At 22:57 the council adjourned until Thursday 16 November 2023 at 14:15.

Answers to Questions

SA PAROLE BOARD

In reply to **the Hon. F. PANGALLO** (14 September 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services has advised:

Mr May is a well-respected legal practitioner who has never been subject to any disciplinary proceedings, nor has he ever been charged with a criminal offence. He served as the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner for 8½ years with distinction, he is a man of good repute and well regarded within the legal profession and the general community. It was appropriate to appoint him as a deputy member of the Parole Board having regard to his professional qualifications and his reputation.

ESTABLISHMENT OF ADELAIDE UNIVERSITY

In reply to **the Hon. R.A. SIMMS** (18 October 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Minister for Innovation and Skills has advised:

1. The One Nation education policy was not considered as part of its negotiations with One Nation with regard to the university merger; and

2. The federal Higher Education Support Act 2003 includes a definition of academic freedom. All table A providers, including South Australia's three public universities, are subject to this legislation. Following appropriate approvals, the new Adelaide University will be a table A provider and will be subject to the Higher Education Support Act. Given the definition exists in federal legislation, the government sees no reason to include any additional requirements for free speech or academic freedom in university establishing legislation.

VAILO ADELAIDE 500

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (19 October 2023).

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Aboriginal Affairs, Attorney-General, Minister for Industrial Relations and Public Sector): The Premier has advised:

1. The Premier is provided regular updates in relation to the Adelaide 500. However, the SA Motor Sport Board function is to consider and investigate options that continue to improve the event and attract more attendees and visitors to South Australia.

2. Section 23 of the South Australian Motor Sport Act states:

(1) The Board must, in performing its functions—

(a) take all reasonable steps to consult with—

(i) any relevant council or any person having a right of occupation of land within a declared area; or

(ii) any person occupying land immediately adjacent to a declared area; or

(iii) any other person whose business or financial interests might, in the opinion of the Board, be adversely affected by the operations of the Board; and

(b) take into account and, to such extent as is reasonably consistent with the performance of its functions, give effect to any representations made by any such person.

(2) The duties imposed by subsection (1) do not give rise to any cause or right of action against or any liability in the Board.

3. I am advised that the SA Motor Sport Board did engage the Adelaide City Council in relation to this proposal.

(4) There are currently no plans to amend the South Australian Motor Sport Act.