

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 12 February 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

Bills

ELECTORAL (PRISONER VOTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Conference

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:01): I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

Members

MEMBERS FOR CHELTENHAM AND ENFIELD, RESIGNATION

The SPEAKER (11:01): I can advise the house that I have received letters of resignation from the Hon. Jay Weatherill, member for Cheltenham, and the Hon. John Rau, member for Enfield, on 17 December 2018. I have since issued writs for by-elections to take place on 9 February 2019 to fill both those vacancies, and I table a copy of an announcement of those vacancies for the seats of Cheltenham and Enfield that I made on 2 January 2019 for the purposes of the Electoral Act.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:02): I move:

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

The SPEAKER: There is an absolute majority. Is the motion seconded?

An honourable member: Yes, sir.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:02): I rise in opposition to the suspension of standing orders. This is a stunt, pure and simple. How can we possibly debate a motion that the opposition was given less than half an hour ago? When we started the parliament last year, after the Premier's election victory, the manager of government business and I reached an agreement that there would be no surprises. Here we are again, 12 months later, with the same thing again.

There are practices and procedures in this place, and courtesy afforded to the opposition would have been a telephone call, a copy in advance of the motion and the reasons why the motion took precedence over the other pieces of legislation. As thin as it is, at the very least the government could have had the courtesy to inform the opposition. They did not.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members! Order! The member for West Torrens is entitled to speak.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is being done on the run. It is a breach of convention. Convention states quite clearly that the opposition is informed well in advance of these matters. Indeed, I understand the government has many speakers on this motion already prearranged to take up most of the day's agenda. I have to say: given the obvious political interest in the royal commission, how can we possibly debate this motion when minister Speirs has so many questions to answer to this parliament? This is—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, member for West Torrens. One moment.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member is the father of the house; he knows not to refer to members by their names.

The SPEAKER: Yes, that is the case. I do see where this is going.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right, be quiet. The member for West Torrens does know better.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I apologise. I will address the minister by his future title: the member for Black. It is a stunt and a cover-up by an inept government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —that has run out of steam and agenda only 11 months after being elected. I think that the media and the public will see through this for what it is: a desperate attempt to cover up what is going to happen over the next three days in question time. There are serious questions that need to be answered about the way the government has maladministered its roles in managing water resources, and this motion should not be debated.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, please do not provoke the government. Members on my right, do not respond. Is the member for West Torrens finished? You are. Minister for Education.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:05): The member's comments would sound a lot less precious and less churlish were they not following 16 years of the Labor Party in government regularly moving motions without prior notice—regularly. As the leader of opposition business for a period of time—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —this is something that happened from time to time. We would have a discussion with a staff member from the Labor Party and then an hour later all of a sudden everything has changed.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The convention that the member for West Torrens speaks of—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: So you don't want to debate the Murray?

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —is certainly not in jeopardy. The idea of a motion where we could debate the River Murray, something that is so utterly important to every South Australian given the full weight of debate—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —in the House of Assembly, the representative chamber of the people of South Australia—surely, what could be a higher priority for all South Australians? What better way to give it that priority than by giving it a debate in the House of Assembly? The member

says 'cover-up': it is an extraordinary claim. It is a laughable speech, and this motion is worthy of the house's support.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
 Noes 16
 Majority 8

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	Marshall, S.S.	McBride, N.
Murray, S.	Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.
Pisoni, D.G.	Power, C.	Sanderson, R.
Speirs, D.J.	Teague, J.B.	Treloar, P.A.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.	Wingard, C.L.

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E. (teller)	Close, S.E.	Cook, N.F.
Hildyard, K.A.	Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.
Malinauskas, P.	Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.
Piccolo, A.	Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.
Wortley, D.		

Motion thus carried.

Motions

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:12): I move:

That this house—

- Notes the following reports:
 - the Productivity Commission inquiry report dated 19 December 2018, 'Murray-Darling Basin Plan: five-year assessment'; and
 - the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission Report.
- Supports the Premier's request to the Prime Minister for a meeting of COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers to consider these reports and a response to their findings and recommendations.
- Endorses the South Australian government's position that the commonwealth, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, the Australian Capital Territory and South Australia must continue to work together in a genuinely bipartisan way to implement the current Murray-Darling Basin Plan in full.

Today, I am asking this parliament to demonstrate that South Australia is capable of participating, in a politically mature way, in the major affairs of our nation—that we want to contribute constructively and practically to the resolution of issues of great and wide public importance. That is the purpose of the motion I have just moved.

It calls on the commonwealth and the basin states to continue to work together to implement the basin plan the former South Australian Labor government was party to negotiating: the plan the former government hailed as a great victory for South Australia, the plan strongly criticised by the royal commission called by the former government. Despite that criticism, my government stands behind the plan negotiated by its predecessor.

Accordingly, there can be no justification for the opposition in this house to do anything but fully support this motion. To fail to do so would be an act of extreme political cynicism, wilfully blind to the state and national interest—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for what is at stake is the health of our nation's most important river system, the Murray-Darling Basin. South Australians understand how critical the Murray-Darling Basin is to our state and to our nation. I believe they understand, as well, that it is a system that cannot be managed in five discrete parts and that it is a vital natural resource, shared between five state and territory jurisdictions and the commonwealth, that requires regulation by law enacted by the federal parliament.

These regulatory arrangements resulted in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan being finalised in 2012 with the bipartisan support of the major parties. The plan ended more than 125 years of argument, squabbling and bickering over basin water reform. The three years it took to negotiate the plan exhausted river communities because water is their life. It energised political rivalries, but ultimately agreement was forged. I put this proposition to the house today: do we want to turn back the clock to the bad old days when this great river system was managed in five parts by greedy governments, blind to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —national interests, when the basin declined through rampant expansion of irrigation water upstream, or will we accept that full and effective implementation of the existing basin plan is the very best way to secure the ultimate delivery of a healthy, thriving system—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier be seated for one moment, please. I have allowed a fair bit of latitude for both sides for this debate. We are 15 minutes in. In order to protect the decorum of the house, I will be calling members to order if these interjections continue. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I will go back to the critical point. Do we want to turn back the clock to the bad old days when this great river system was managed in five discrete parts by greedy governments, blind to national interests, when the basin declined through rampant expansion of irrigation water upstream, or will we accept that full and effective implementation of the existing basin plan is the very best way to secure the ultimate delivery of a healthy, thriving system for the benefit of the environment, communities and industries across the basin? The choice is a stark one. It puts great responsibility on us as legislators to make the right choice, for the decisions that we make in this parliament will affect not only those we serve but many other people, communities and businesses beyond our jurisdiction.

The Murray-Darling Basin covers more than one million square kilometres of Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, South Australia and the Australian Capital Territory. Within the basin are four major rivers and many other rivers and tributaries. The basin drains one-seventh of the Australian continent. It provides habitat to hundreds of species of birdlife, fish, mammals, reptiles and amphibians. It is home to 16 separate Ramsar-listed wetlands.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It sustains agriculture, horticulture and viticulture industries of world significance for the food and wine that it produces. The basin is a major lifestyle and tourism destination. It is a huge economic artery, giving life to thousands of businesses that depend on irrigation. It supports tens of thousands of jobs in high-value industries. The basin contains 40 per cent of all Australian farms and 65 per cent of our farms that depend on irrigation. More than two million people call the basin home and rely on its valuable water supply and produce.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is called to order.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is also called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: These are people who thought that their communities and businesses had been delivered certainty by the Murray-Darling plan. We must not let them down, even if the challenge to balance apparently strongly competing interests remains a daunting one. This motion underlines the need to continue bipartisanship to meet the challenges ahead. My government indicated its determination to do things this way during our very first week in office.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: My government indicated its determination to do things this way during our first week in office. The Minister for Environment and Water is being mistakenly maligned by members opposite. I will say more about that later, but in his first week in the job the minister travelled to Canberra. There, he met federal ministers Littleproud and Ruston.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is called to order. Members on my left, you will have your go.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But he also sought out federal shadow environment minister, Tony Burke, the minister responsible for finalising the basin plan on behalf of the commonwealth back in 2012, because my minister wanted to demonstrate that South Australia was back at the table in a bipartisan way to help deliver the basin for our nation. That is how—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —my government is determined to continue. As this motion highlights, we want to work with the commonwealth and other basin jurisdictions because we believe that is the best way—the only way—to get every drop of the 3,200 gigalitres of—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —water this plan is meant to deliver for our environment.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You had a royal commission finding against him.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for a second and final time. It would give me great pain to have to remove him so early in the day. The Premier has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right, please!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: However, if required, we would never hesitate to fight for what is right for our state, for what South Australia deserves because of the contribution that we have made over many years already to restore our basin to health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated for one moment. The member for Playford, you can leave for half an hour under 137A for leading that outburst.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let us not forget that this year—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —marks the 50th anniversary of capping water use from the Murray in South Australia. South Australia led the way in seeking to end overallocation of water and in continuous improvement in irrigation practices. We have the most—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —efficient irrigators in the basin.

Ms Cook: Make the others get efficient.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As the state at the end of the system, we have the most to lose from failure. Enough water will not flow through to South Australia for the environment if we make unnecessary enemies of those upriver who are able to divert it. That is why we must continue—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: He's your boat anchor; when are you cutting him loose?

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is called to order. He has been doing it all day.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is why we must continue to demonstrate leadership in how the basin is managed. My motion refers to two recent reports. Let me first discuss the Australian Productivity Commission's review of the implementation of the basin plan over the past five years. The baseline of the plan, when agreed in 2012, required the return of 2,750 gigalitres of water from consumptive use to the river system by 2019 to ensure that water in the basin is shared between all users, including the environment, in a sustainable way.

There was a further program to recover an additional 450 gigalitres by 2024 to bring the total to 3,200 gigalitres. I will come back to that additional water amount later. The Australian Productivity Commission has reported that significant progress has been made so far in implementing the basin plan. In fact, about 20 per cent of the water that was available for consumptive users a decade ago is now dedicated back to environmental flows. About \$6.7 billion has been spent to recover approximately 2,000 gigalitres, delivering benefits to the environment already.

Water recovery is within 5 per cent of the July 2019 target. The Australian Productivity Commission has further advised that arrangements for managing environmental water are working well, with evidence of improved ecological outcomes at the local and system-scale level. At the same time, the commission has identified challenges going forward in continuing to deliver the plan. Accordingly, it is proposed that basin governments, rather than the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, should take responsibility for leading implementation of the remainder of the plan, and South Australia agrees.

In all, the Productivity Commission's report released late last month covers 418 pages. It makes 29 findings on progress to date and 37 recommendations on actions required to ensure effective achievement of basin plan outcomes. The findings and recommendations deserve careful and considered analysis by all parties to the basin plan. I look forward to being able to discuss the findings and recommendations of the Productivity Commission with the other basin states at the meeting of COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers that I have asked the Prime Minister to convene.

I now turn to the royal commission report. It is a report of 746 pages with 111 findings and 44 separate recommendations.

Mr Malinauskas: And one minister.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It focuses on events, actions and decisions which, with one notable exception, occurred when the Liberal Party was not in office in South Australia. Very few of the recommendations are within South Australia's remit to pursue alone. They are targeted at basin governments, either collectively or individually, as well as at the commonwealth, the basin authority and other bodies such as the commonwealth Auditor-General. In South Australia, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet is leading development of a full government response to this and the Productivity Commission's report in conjunction with the Department for Environment and Water and the Attorney-General's Department. The response will be made public when it is completed.

I note that the royal commission found that the federal Water Act upon which the basin plan is founded is constitutionally valid. This was the legislation introduced by the Howard government back in 2007. However, the royal commission has cast doubt on the validity of aspects of the basin plan while revealing that there are conflicting legal views about this position. It should be noted that the federal Coalition and Labor governments have both stated that they have received separate legal advice that the plan is lawful and was lawfully made.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is incredible that they are laughing because it was negotiated—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To educate those opposite, it was actually negotiated between a federal Labor government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe and the member for Hammond are called to order.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: You have short memories.

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Maybe they did need to prepare for this debate, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As we all know, the decline in the condition of the basin's water-dependent ecosystems has occurred over many decades. Redressing this decline is a long-term process. While we are seeing some improvements in the basin's environment already, this will take some time to take full effect. I have referred to the Productivity Commission's advice about evidence of improvement in the health and resilience of the ecosystems and ecological functions of the basin, but remaining water recovery and environmental equivalents are required to deliver the full intended benefits envisaged in the basin plan. A full review, after 2024, is therefore the appropriate time to critically assess this while, in the meantime, work continues—

Mr Malinauskas: So why change the plan?

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to implement the current basin plan in full.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition has been warned and will have his chance, and the Deputy Premier will cease interjecting and she is called to order.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Who even came up with this strategy?

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are going through the implementation process laid down in the basin plan. Any major legislative or policy changes at this stage would have a potential to impede implementation and undermine achievements of real enhanced environmental outcomes. Findings that question the policy or legal basis of the basin plan create more uncertainty and potentially open up the plan to legal challenges and major delays in implementation. This is the last thing that our river communities want, after what they have been put through in the original development of this plan. It would be counterproductive for South Australia as the downstream state that has the greatest need for increased environmental flows delivered under the basin plan.

The South Australian government's position to the royal commission reasserted that the basin plan and the sustainable diversion limits enshrined within are valid and allow a reasonable transition to full implementation of the plan which will deliver equivalent environmental outcomes to water recovery of 3,200 gegalitres per year.

In reaction to the royal commission report, I note that no other jurisdiction is proposing a major renegotiation of the current plan. That is the position of the commonwealth, while the Victorian Labor government—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: They got what they wanted.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, you are on your last reminder.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That is the position of the commonwealth, while the Victorian Labor government has also said that it does not support effectively starting again and that it has no doubt that the plan is legal. Honourable members will recall that when the former South Australian government foreshadowed this inquiry, its entire focus was actually on compliance issues. We were told by the former premier:

We cannot sit back and allow the Liberal Party and National Party to turn a blind eye to the evidence of this water theft and corruption...

I am not aware of any evidence having been produced that could justify such assertions effectively of government connivance—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for West Torrens having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Perhaps the former government knew this, because subsequently the terms of reference for the inquiry were broad-ranging, rather than narrowly focused on alleged water theft. They amounted to a fundamental review of the basin plan and its legislative underpinnings. I note the royal commission's subsequent relatively brief consideration of enforcement and compliance issues concluded that existing powers under the Water Act are adequate, while there is need for more effective monitoring and metering. This is consistent with the conclusions of a number of other reviews of compliance and enforcement.

I finally turn to the 450 gegalitres of water provided for in the basin plan, in addition to the baseline of 2,750 gegalitres. This is of significance to South Australia because its benefits are needed to ensure the return of the lower river and the Coorong—a South Australian icon. In addressing this issue, let me make quite clear at the outset that South Australia is entitled to this water, even if it has not been guaranteed, but because it has never been guaranteed we have to continue to negotiate with other parties to the basin plan. To do so is not to capitulate—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Negotiate or surrender?

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the other parties; it is to do what is inevitably required in the absence of any guarantee. Both the former—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. A. Piccolo: The only guarantee is that you are going to surrender and capitulate. That's not a guarantee.

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Both the former South Australian premier and his water minister made public statements at the time to the effect that this water had been 'locked in' by the commonwealth legislation on the insistence of the South Australian government—that is what they said. That is what they told the people of South Australia, so let's just take a look at what it actually says in the royal commission report. The royal commission had a very, very different view from what those opposite have been putting forward for a long period of time. Let me—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment. The member for Lee can also leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let me quote from exchanges between the royal commissioner and senior counsel assisting, Mr R. Beasley SC, on the opening day of the inquiry on 18 June 2018. Mr Beasley:

...450 gigalitres itself is reflected only in a note to the Basin Plan.

Mr Walker:

That note, even if it's part of the statute, it doesn't seem to impose any obligation.

Mr Beasley:

No, it's not mandatory...as you have seen through the travel through the Basin, at least as far as the information provided to you, there is no appetite for these programs at all.

Mr Walker:

It depends where you are in the river system.

Mr Beasley:

Well, there is none in Victoria. I didn't hear any in New South Wales.

Two weeks later, the commission—

Mr Odenwalder: What was the page, Jayne? 414?

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Two weeks later, the commission returned to this issue in public hearings on 4 September when senior counsel assisting said, in relation to securing the additional water for the environment, that a new strategy is required. This is the situation that my government inherited from those opposite: a need for action to unlock the unwillingness of the upriver states to put forward efficiency measure projects on farm and off farm that will contribute to the recovery of the additional 450 gigalitres.

These measures are intended to provide enhanced environmental outcomes in the southern basin, including watering larger areas of flood plains, higher stream flows and meeting specific objectives for the Coorong, the Lower Lakes and the Murray Mouth. These are vital outcomes for our state, but they require the cooperation of the upstream states to provide most of the additional water, because its delivery is absolutely not mandated in the plan.

As the royal commission identified at its commencement of public hearings, New South Wales and Victoria were not putting forward projects. When the commonwealth launched the efficiency infrastructure—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: When the commonwealth launched the efficiency infrastructure program in the middle of 2018, New South Wales and Victoria refused to participate in the on-farm component unless socio-economic criteria were broadened to protect their regional communities. Late last year, the commonwealth consulted regional communities. This consultation confirmed serious concerns about the cumulative socio-economic impacts of individual on-farm efficiency measures. As a result, the commonwealth drafted a new set of socio-economic criteria for consideration of the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council at its meeting last December.

The council reached agreement to broaden the consideration of community impacts. This led to New South Wales and Victoria accepting both on and off-farm efficiency measures. Contrary to what is being said, this is actually a big win for South Australia because without it there was no way, simply no way, that the additional 450 gigalitres of environmental water regarded as vital to restoring the health of the lower river and the Coorong would ever be delivered to South Australia. As a result of the agreement, the upriver states are bringing forward efficiency measures that will release additional water for the environment for South Australia.

As part of this agreement, my Minister for Environment and Water also secured other benefits, including funding of \$70 million for initiatives to improve the health of the Coorong—congratulations—agreement by the commonwealth to invest in specific initiatives in each jurisdiction to help accelerate return of the 450 gigalitres and also an agreement to proceed with addressing constraints to greater environmental water flows, an issue the royal commission identified as being of key importance to the successful delivery of the entire basin plan.

Mr Malinauskas: Fish need water, not money.

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, please!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The Minister for Environment and Water made a full public announcement about this decision at the time it was made at the ministerial council. There was no attempt to hide it whatsoever, and there was actually also no criticism at the time from those opposite.

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is called to order.

Mr Malinauskas: That is completely untrue—completely untrue.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Do you want to move a substantive motion that I have misled the house?

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call. Leader of the Opposition, if this continues someone else will be lead speaker on your side the way this is going. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There was no criticism, sir, from those opposite. There was also no attempt by the royal commission to contact the minister to seek information about the reasons for reaching this agreement with the other basin states. My government has fully cooperated with the work of the royal commission. It provided a substantial—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, this is now a farce. You are on your last warning. If this continues, you will be leaving the chamber.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. My government has fully cooperated with the work of the royal commission.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We provided substantial input to the inquiry. This included a formal submission, with a minister providing—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You protected your federal colleagues from scrutiny. That's what you did.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Well, he did. They did. They protected their federal colleagues from scrutiny.

The SPEAKER: The member for Light can leave for half an hour under 137A immediately. The members on my left will have their chance to speak. Premier, please continue.

The honourable member for Light having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. We provided substantial input into the inquiry. This included a formal submission, with the minister providing further information requested by the royal commissioner. Officers from the Department for Environment and Water gave evidence at the public hearings, and they also provided further information requested by the commission. The royal commission report refers, at page 219, to:

...detailed and engaged submissions from the South Australian...Department for Environment and Water...both in writing and in person during the public hearings...

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I also note that senior counsel assisting the commission said in open hearings:

...any person or entity that may be the subject of criticisms or adverse findings [would be provided with] procedural fairness in spades.

Even though my minister has not been subject to a specific finding by the commission, he has been subject to criticism, completely—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —unjustified criticism—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Giles is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and has not received procedural fairness.

Ms Stinson: He's not accused of anything but you think it's unfair.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, please, I would like to hear the Premier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned. The Minister for Primary Industries is also warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, even though my minister has not been the subject of any specific finding of the commission, he has been subject to criticism—completely unjustified criticism—and he has not received in any way, shape or form procedural fairness.

Between the time the ministerial council decision was announced by the minister and the completion—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and application of the royal commission report, there was no attempt by the commission to accord the minister procedural fairness by contacting him and seeking his reasons for the decision. The commission report states that when the minister did—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left, please! You will have your go.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The commission report states that what the minister did, and I quote:

...is almost certainly a breach of at least cl 2.5 of the South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct...

With due respect to the royal commission, that is a ludicrous and nonsensical comment. That particular clause—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That particular clause—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —requires a minister—

Mr Hughes interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Giles is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to give:

...due consideration to the merits of the matter at hand and the impact the decision is likely to have on the rights and interests of the people involved and the citizens of South Australia.

That is what it says, and that is exactly what our minister did. The manner in which this issue has been dealt with—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left and right, the Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The manner in which this issue has been dealt with and commented on by the royal commission has given opponents of the government their seven seconds of political sunshine from seven sentences in a report of 746 pages.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Much of the report is critical commentary of how the Murray-Darling Basin Plan was developed and negotiated, leading to the conclusion that the current plan was unlawfully negotiated and that at least parts of it remain unlawful. And we all remember who negotiated it. The commission has criticised my minister personally—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: The royal commission report has criticised my minister personally for a compromise arising out of the need, identified by the commission—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —as well as my minister, to develop a new strategy for securing one aspect of the plan: the additional 450 gigalitres of water for the environment. But, interestingly, it has not personally criticised any of the ministers involved in the negotiation of the entire plan despite being so critical of the outcome.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Where is the consistency? Where is the fairness in that? My minister was not at the table of the ministerial council during the 20 meetings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that were held between 2009 and 2017 while this plan was being negotiated—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurua!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and implemented.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He has done nothing—absolutely nothing—to undermine the basin plan that my government inherited from the previous regime. He has done everything he can to help all parties to the plan and bring all parties to the plan to the table.

Mr Picton: Everything he can to help New South Wales.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurua is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is absolutely nothing that he has done that could possibly be construed as a capitulation to other interests, yet he is the only minister singled out for personal criticism relating to the plan.

Ms Stinson: It's incredible, isn't it?

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe! The Premier will be seated for one moment, please. The member for Badcoe can also leave for half an hour under 137A.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: For the reasons stated at the beginning of my speech, the need for genuine bipartisanship—

The SPEAKER: The Premier is summing up by the sounds of it, please.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to continue the implementation of a plan to restore the Murray-Darling Basin to health is absolutely essential. To achieve this, compromise within the law is inevitable.

The federal minister responsible for negotiating the plan, Mr Burke, told the parliament in November 2012, 'We have compromised on the way of getting there.' South Australian Senator Penny Wong said soon after the plan was agreed, 'This government has to balance not only the environmental outcome but also community outcomes.' The former South Australian minister for the

environment has described the plan as 'a compromised position because it was fiercely fought by New South Wales and Victoria'.

If my minister merits personal criticism by the commission, then so do many others who have had a part in the development and the implementation of this plan. The biggest compromise of all was made by the former premier of South Australia. For much of the—

Mr Picton: Oh, what rubbish. Read the report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: Oh, please, he stood up for South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The Member for Ramsay is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It is a matter of public record that for much of the time the plan was being negotiated he maintained that he would not accept anything below 4,000 gigitalitres per annum being returned to the environment. That was his stated position. He threatened High Court action if South Australia did not get its way. Inevitably, he—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: He was standing up for South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Environment and Water is called to order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left and right!

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Police is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Inevitably, he compromised, accepting 20 per cent less water for the environment that he personally had long insisted was the minimum needed for South Australia. It is being blind to reality to believe that sustainable management of the Murray-Darling Basin can be achieved without compromise along the way. What we must do is ensure that this process is conducted—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay, please!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —transparently, fairly and responsibly. The only way of doing that is for all the basin states to agree to continue the implementation of this historic plan in a genuine bipartisan way. That is my intention and that is the intention of the motion and I commend it to the house.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (11:47): I, too, rise to speak on this incredibly important motion that the Premier has brought to the chamber today. Water or no water: those were the two options facing our River Murray. The Marshall Liberal government has forged a pathway to real water flowing down the river across the border to the Lower Lakes and to the precious Coorong. Labor had no plan, just political games, and that means not a drop of extra water—not a drop of extra water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Since I became—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna, please!

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Since I became South Australia's Minister for Environment and Water in March 2018, I have done everything possible to deliver real, practical action and results for our state and our state's environment. That is the mandate required—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —by our Premier and that is what this government is focused on— practical outcomes. Nowhere has this been more important than in our precious River Murray and the delivery of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. To do this, it was critical that I broke the deadlock strangling progress and preventing the delivery of further real environmental outcomes. My first step was to restore shattered relationships across the basin states. It had been blatantly apparent to me—

Mr Picton: They're friends with me now, yay!

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is on two warnings. If he continues, he will be departing the chamber as well.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It had been blatantly apparent to me in the years leading up to the change of government that our state's approach was not working. It was not working for our state's economy, it was isolating our state's communities and businesses, particularly regional communities, and it was failing to deliver for our precious natural environment, including the River Murray, the Lower Lakes and the Coorong. The 'us against the world' strategy, propounded by the Weatherill government on so many fronts, had us characterised as a whingeing, irrelevant distraction.

Opportunities were being lost, investment was not being made, grants were being withheld and, in the case of the River Murray, water was not flowing. One of my first acts as minister was to reach out to my colleagues across basin states. Within hours of becoming minister I had spoken to federal minister David Littleproud, Labor's Lisa Neville, in Victoria, and Niall Blair, in New South Wales. I let them know that the games were going to stop under the Marshall Liberal government. South Australia was back at the table and we were determined to deliver outcomes for the river.

My motivation for getting back to negotiations was crystallised with an early realisation that the 450 gigalitres of additional water, negotiated by Jay Weatherill in 2012, was little more than an oft-touted figure, the central protagonist in a fake fight, but a destination without a plan takes you nowhere. The previous government had no road map towards delivering that 450 gigalitres of critical environmental water.

In fact, despite a pool of funding being in place to fund projects to deliver the 450 gigalitres, barely any water had been delivered. In fact, when the government changed in March 2018, Labor had delivered how much? One gigalitre of the 450 gigalitres. That is less than one-quarter of 1 per cent of the 400 gigalitres delivered under the failed Labor government—

Mr Teague interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —an indictment of that government's complete capitulation to political games—

The SPEAKER: The member for Heysen is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —complete capitulation—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana is on two warnings.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and baseless activism and gains at the expense of the precious River Murray.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The screaming and swearing had got us nowhere; we were at an absolute stalemate. Given this stalemate and lack of progress that Labor had made towards the 450 gigalitres in the months leading into the December ministerial council meeting, it became clear to me and my departmental officials that there were two options for our state: more of the same—Labor's way—or a fresh, constructive approach that would meaningfully progress the plan and develop a real pathway to the 450 gigalitres. No water, or water: the choice was stark.

Back in 2007, Mike Rann—and we do not often quote him on this side of the house—said:

I've always said that, in order to get the best outcome for the river, it's better to talk rather than issue ultimatums.

He went on to say:

The long-term health of the River Murray must be placed before politics or elections.

The approach outlined by Mike Rann is one that can and will see South Australia benefit from building relationships and cooperating with our state and federal colleagues, and the Murray-Darling Basin deal, struck on 14 December 2018, is a powerful example of what Mike Rann was advocating.

The agreement to robust, fair, socio-economic criteria against which to assess water-saving projects across the basin removes a significant amount of fear from participation in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. It reassures regional communities, not just in South Australia but in New South Wales and Victoria, that they will not be unfairly impacted by water efficiency strategies, and it secured the involvement of sceptical states in the next stage of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan's implementation, including on farm as well as off farm for the first time, Victoria and New South Wales agreeing to on farm as well as off farm water-saving strategies.

A moment ago, the member for Hurtle Vale yelled across the chamber and said, 'You need to make them more efficient.' That is exactly what we were doing. If the Labor opposition understood the plan and understood the 450 gigalitres—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —they would not be screaming and making a noise; they would be supporting New South Wales—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please do not respond to interjections.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It was about five minutes ago, so—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Let's get on with it, thank you.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: If the opposition understood the plan and understood what the Riverland in South Australia has achieved over the last couple of decades, they would understand that, with the right culture and the right effort, that is possible to achieve in New South Wales and Victoria.

Make no mistake, New South Wales and Victoria would have walked away. With them gone, the plan would have collapsed. With no plan, South Australia, a victim of geography, has the most to lose. No plan—that is what the Labor opposition wanted. The shouting, the screaming, the noise—that is great, but it kills the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, and that is the only structure, the only framework, that we have to deliver water from those other states across the border, down the river, to our irrigators, to our city, to the Lower Lakes and to the Coorong.

Of course, we got more from the ministerial council than just that critical pathway towards the 450 gigalitres of water. We secured a constraints package to provide critical funding to remove constraints to get water flowing down the river. The royal commissioner spent a lot of time concentrating on the problem of constraints. That is when you want to get water held in particular by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder down the river to areas that are in particular stress or to irrigators but you cannot increase the river flows because there are constraints in place. Those constraints could include bridges, they could include infrastructure, and it is necessary to remove those constraints.

At the ministerial council meeting, for the first time we got a constraints funding package to enable us to undertake those works so that in the future we can get water down the river. As the Premier said, there was no mention of that from the Labor opposition on 14 December when this was publicly announced. In fact, did we hear anything from the Labor opposition on 14 December?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: They clearly didn't understand it.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: They didn't understand it. They do not understand the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. They do not understand the way the basin works and they do not understand regional communities, particularly in South Australia.

The commonwealth also agreed to provide funding to accelerate SDLAM projects—another clear pathway to more water. This was getting money on the table, saying to New South Wales and Victoria, 'Here is money. Undertake these efficiency projects, the projects the Labor opposition don't want to occur. Undertake these projects and we will be able to get water from the farms in New South Wales and Victoria for the first time—real water into the river.'

It is fundamentally my view that if we can get New South Wales and Victoria to participate in some of these projects—the sorts of projects that have been underway in the Riverland in South Australia for many, many years—if we can get New South Wales and Victorian communities doing these projects, that will change the culture, the fear will diminish and more will come. But unless we have a starting point, unless we get there, nothing will come. Again, two pathways: a road to water or the road preferred by the member for Kaurana—no water.

Of course, we also struck an important agreement with the commonwealth and basin jurisdictions that secured the delivery of \$70 million towards a range of projects.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurana can leave for half an hour under 137A, thank you.

The honourable member for Kaurana having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you for your much necessary protection. I am not sure I have heard someone say 'capitulation' so much. The member for Kaurana did not even know what that word meant until last week.

The SPEAKER: Minister, the member for Kaurana has left the chamber. Let's get on with it, minister. Thank you.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We struck an important agreement with the commonwealth and the basin jurisdictions that secured this additional \$70 million towards a range of projects to strengthen the resilience and vitality of this internationally recognised Ramsar-listed wetland. This was a bucket of money that was available to states to essentially put forward projects. That money was not coming to South Australia. It was not flowing to South Australia under the previous Labor government. It was one of those examples of pig-headedness and political games holding us back from getting it.

The opposition rightly say that the Coorong needs water. That is why we have delivered a pathway towards 450 gigalitres of additional water—that pathway they were not able to get. They were the ones denying water from flowing across the border and down to the Coorong. They did not have the pathway. The Coorong before anything else needs water.

Under the previous government, it was demonstrated during the Millennium Drought that a range of manufactured environmental outcomes and particular focus on environmental areas could

strengthen the resilience of those landscapes. That is what we want to do to the Coorong. We want to invest in science and research. We want to invest in technological outcomes. We want to create conservation programs that strengthen the resilience of the Coorong, and we want to connect with communities in Salt Creek, Meningie and Goolwa, around the Lower Lakes, to bring them on board as well.

Much work was undertaken during the Millennium Drought. Those dormant community networks are ready to come alive and work with this state government to deliver for the Coorong. The Coorong funding was—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: And none of it will be without the water coming. That's got to be the key thing here.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: None of it will be delivered without water, and that is why we have a pathway to deliver 450 gigalitres. Previously, we had one gigalitre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The Coorong funding was delivered following a six-month long project to establish priorities for this wetland, secure scientific consensus around what should be delivered and bring the commonwealth government on a journey towards a better understanding of this significant Ramsar-listed wetland. Of course, the best thing for the Coorong is additional water and, as I have said a number of times, that is why securing the 450 gigalitres of real water is so critical. But the Coorong is a fragile landscape and it does need that additional money to give it that much-needed resilience.

Securing this funding is a huge win for South Australia, yet it is a shame that, despite lamenting the condition of the Coorong, the royal commission's report makes no mention of this funding nor our strategy around the constraints, program of funding, nor the pathway towards the 450 gigalitres of real water when compared to the one-quarter of 1 per cent of that target that was achieved under the previous government. The games and noise, the Facebook rants and bullying tweets, the slogans and logos and T-shirts and hats, the simplistic sound bites and the glib media releases—none of these delivers a single drop of water for the River Murray, the Coorong or the Lower Lakes.

The royal commissioner may have a view, but that is one view. His title does not elevate him to an untouchable deity. His report and its recommendations should and will be taken seriously by this government. They will be analysed and a government response provided to the people of South Australia in due course. They should, however, be viewed in conjunction with the Productivity Commission's report and considered in partnership with other basin jurisdictions and the federal government. The royal commission should also be subject to critique and to challenge. Where comments are made within a vacuum, they should be given context; where ideology trumps pragmatic leadership, this should be called out; and where procedural fairness is denied, a defence should and will be provided.

I stand 100 per cent behind the decisions I took on 14 December 2018. For the first time, we have a clear pathway to the extra 450 gigalitres of water that we know are so critical to our River Murray's health. That pathway ensures the survival of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. There is no plan B. It builds pragmatic working relationships across the political and geographical spectrum of Australia. It ends the games, and it will deliver real water across the border flowing through South Australian communities to the Lower Lakes and to the precious Coorong. It was a fair deal, a sensible deal and it was the right deal. I commend the motion to the house.

The SPEAKER: Are there any speakers on my left?

Mrs Power: They are too busy in the media headline. They don't really care about the river.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder is called to order. Therefore, I call the Minister for Primary Industries.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:04): I rise today to support this motion, and I cannot emphasise how important

this motion is not only to this state but to the machinations of the Murray-Darling Basin. Let's take a little step back in history.

From many of us, we have heard today about the state of play. We have had the royal commission and we have the basin plan, which has been delivered in part. If we look back to 2012, when the basin plan was legislated, it was legislated to achieve the sustainable diversion limits (SDL) of 2,750, with a review in 2019. We are in 2019. The Murray-Darling Basin Authority will have that review on 31 June. Of course, there was then the negotiation of the 450 gigalitres of upwater that sat alongside the 2,750, bringing the total to 3,200.

In South Australia, we are in the unique situation of being at the bottom of the system, at the bottom of the Murray-Darling Basin. What that means is that we are supporting a number of environments that no other state is. We support the delta of the basin, which is the shallow flood plains of the Murray-Darling Basin. We do not have the mountain ranges or the large catchments that the other states have. What we do have is a large set of wetlands reliant on river flows and good environmental flows that come into our state for the health of our forests, wetlands, native plants and native trees that have been there since time began.

We also have to understand that we are the guardians of the Murray Mouth. The Murray Mouth is obviously something that is very important to the river. Over time, there has been a lot of conjecture about the Murray Mouth being opened, the Murray Mouth being closed, human intervention and having to dredge it.

In any given year in South Australia we have an allocation of 1,850 gigalitres of entitlement that comes across the border. We also have unregulated flows that come into the state. They are environmental flows, convenience water, there to sustain the 540 gigalitres or thereabouts of consumptive water that comes in for the communities, the irrigators, our exporters and our farmers. Just as importantly, they are part of a working river and a working river is sustained by the environment.

There is no-one in existence who works better with our river system and wants it to be healthy than the irrigators and their communities. They are the eyes and ears of the River Murray. In all the basin state jurisdictions, there are a number of organisations that are the custodians. There are the conservation groups, the local action planning groups, the friends of the river groups, who are all part of the guardianship process.

In South Australia, we have a government determined to make sure that we have a basin plan delivered in full and on time to make sure that we have a healthy, working river and to make sure that we have a river for our future that we can be proud of. Be aware, the world is watching. A royal commission has come out in the last couple of weeks and, taking a step back in time, a basin plan was also developed.

I remember, as the chairman of the South Australian Murray Irrigators, flying to Canberra, meeting with the then minister for environment, Malcolm Turnbull, and the prime minister, John Howard. I took over a set of sums that showed that there was more water for consumptive entitlement in that year than there was in storage. Alarm bells were ringing loud and clear. That is why the then prime minister used \$10 billion from the proceeds of the sale of Telstra to put on the table a reform package to save the Murray-Darling Basin.

Along the way, there has been much conjecture. Many, many river communities have burned the books, burned the plan, had sleepless nights, been through drought and been through the reform package, but by and large they have been a part of that process. They have been a part of that process because they know they have to be the custodians and be a part of the solution. It is not just about governments coming in and wanting to compulsorily acquire water. That is not the answer.

In the royal commission, Mr Walker categorically said that the best way for taxpayers to support the basin is to acquire water or buy back the water. We have seen what the buybacks have done to the river communities. We have seen what they have done to many of the environmental assets that we have, particularly in South Australia: right across the basin there are dead properties everywhere. We are now seeing a form of recovery, and it is driven by efficiency gains. Those efficiency gains have, by and large, been the saviour of our basin communities. The basin

communities are not only the people, the irrigators and the communities who are giving up the water: they are the advice to government.

Initially, Senator Wong came to South Australia, and it was her first regional trip dealing with her new portfolio within water and the environment. I asked her to come up to the Riverland and have a look at some of the efficiencies that our irrigators had achieved, some of the world-class showpieces where she could see firsthand what South Australia was doing, leading by example, so that she could benchmark what she should be trying to achieve for the Murray-Darling Basin.

On that trip, I saw that she had come a little unaware of just how it all worked, but she learnt very quickly. Thank goodness, she was replaced by Tony Burke, who I think is one of the great politicians who understands the basin. He came to the Riverland a number of times, and I met with him many times to discuss ways that we could bring the community with us. It was about just that: understanding that, if we were going to have a successful basin plan, it was to be something put down in the history books as reform that was history making—history making within the world's river systems—and that is exactly what he did.

I know that still today he holds that initiative very dear to his heart. Every day, every waking moment he, like many other water ministers, is very concerned about the basin plan continuing to survive and continuing to move forward, but we continue to have this political interference. We saw the royal commissioner's review: his opinion, his commentary, was more political interference. A previous state government came in and used the river as nothing more than a political tool—nothing more.

We saw logos on trucks. I know that the premier promised truck drivers that he would get the state more water if they allowed him to put his logos on their trucks. Many people were wearing T-shirts with logos saying, 'We will fight for the river.' However, what he forgot to tell people was, 'We will not be delivering any water for the river because we are out there for political gain and we are out there for political gain only.' What the previous government forgot to mention was that South Australia has a number of issues, constraints by and large, and those constraints are structures or natural landforms that get in the way of river flow. We have six locks in South Australia, which all support some of the great environmental assets that we have: the Ramsar sites on our river corridor.

Some of the projects that we have had the opportunity to look at, to understand and to bring to the table are ones that the previous government ignored. I note that the last water minister in the previous government continued to deny the scoping study and some of the initiatives that we needed for our environmental assets.

We have been so focused on numbers within the basin plan that we have actually forgotten what the bigger picture is. That bigger picture is outcomes, environmental outcomes. As communities within the Riverland, within the river and within the irrigation sector, we are giving up that water to make sure that we have a healthy environment, but we also have to understand that governments have a responsibility to make sure that those environmental assets that we have are second to none and that we put environmental outcomes into the Lower Lakes, the Coorong and all our wetlands.

If we work our way into South Australia, by and large some of the great environmental assets that we have are in South Australia. We will start at Lock 6, the Chowilla wetland. The Chowilla wetland is what I regard as the ancient forest of the Murray-Darling Basin. We have some trees, 500 or 600 years old, that are still surviving because of environmental flow.

If we go to Lock 5, we have the Pike River project and the Margaret Dowling projects. These are environmental projects that are gold plating the infrastructure that was previously there. I might add that the majority of the infrastructure that was previously there was put there by irrigators. It was put there by government departments in conjunction with those irrigators and those communities, because the irrigators know how the flows work. They know when the flows are coming and how the structures will best serve the environment.

The Katarapko project that is currently underway at Lock 4 is another great environmental work and measure to make sure that we deal with the environmental flows, as is the Banrock wetland at Lock 3. Every river system has points in it now with structures. They are the locks, but every structure has a bypass. The Chowilla wetland is the bypass to Lock 6. The Pike River and the

Margaret Dowling projects are bypasses to Lock 5. At Lock 4, there is the Katarapko project. These are all bypasses that go around the locks to make sure that we sustain a healthy environment.

What we are doing now, through the basin plan, is making sure that those environmental structures are in place for another 100 years. The basin has seen, to its detriment over the last 100 years, overallocation, government mismanagement and environmental mismanagement, but we are now putting a plan in place so that we can tend to the needs of the environment.

Again, I do not want to harp on the 3,200 figure, but I do want to harp on the works and measures that this state has been denied through a previous government walking away from its responsibility because of no political gain or political capital in putting connections from the Lower Lakes into the Coorong. We want to make sure that we wet and dry some of our wetlands, that some of those environmental projects are for the benefit of the health of the river and that we have a healthy working river.

I make note of the great projects that have been achieved over the course of time. The 3IP project that came into South Australia with \$265 million was a great initiative—a really great initiative. That was about efficiency gains, not about buying the water back. We saw what buyback did to the Riverland communities. It had a Swiss cheese effect right around our communities, and we saw dead blocks everywhere.

The minister was up in the Riverland recently and I showed him the comparison between on one side of the road a buyback property and on the other side of the road a green thriving state-of-the-art property that had taken up the initiative to give back some of their water allocation in return for taxpayers' money to make sure that their business was sustainable for the future. It is about making sure that they are not only water efficient but that they grow a product that the world is looking for. What we saw was the comparison of buyback versus efficiency gain.

Two hundred and eighty-one projects or efficiency programs have been achieved in South Australia. I am parochial: most of those projects have been achieved in the Riverland. A majority of the water given back as part of our contribution to the basin plan has come out of Riverland irrigators' allocations but, by and large, South Australia has worked collaboratively. I know that the lower end of the river has given up large amounts of water, particularly through the dairy sector. They have done that for efficiency gains.

They have done that to make sure that those irrigators and those properties are there for the future. Once you have sold the water back, there is no future unless efficiency gains give an irrigator the opportunity to come back in and rebuild that property, making sure that it is sustainable while also working with the health of the river. Those 281 projects have allowed the communities and the irrigators to adjust to growing more with less water. They have also allowed the basin plan to be successful. It has allowed the programs that have been put in place to achieve environmental water.

We know that about 2,150 gegalitres of water have been achieved for the environment. Again, all this water that communities and irrigators are giving up is specifically for the health of the river, specifically for the environment, so that we work in a healthy environment but also on a river that is a working river. That is very important to note.

I will just touch on the commissioner's report, which is very, very concerning. When the minister came up to the Riverland on the Friday after the report was released, what we saw on that Friday—and this is the comparison—was minister Speirs visiting the Riverland and visiting irrigators. He visited the Irrigation Trust, he visited the environmental groups, and he listened and learnt more.

However, further down the river, at Waikerie, we saw the Leader of the Opposition down there with Labor Party members. None of them were irrigators, not one of them gave up water—not one of them—but he was there having a photo opportunity with his Labor mates while minister Speirs was upriver speaking with the irrigators, with the Irrigation Trust leaders, with the community, better understanding why buybacks were not the answer. He was there understanding why water efficiency programs were the saviour of the Riverland communities.

They are the answer for the success of the basin plan. The 450 gegalitres that minister Speirs has sat around the table with is something those opposite could never achieve. We had a foul-mouthed minister, with expletives at other ministers, walking away from the negotiating table because

he was fighting for South Australia, fighting to achieve nothing, fighting so that he could fight, for the sake of standing up for South Australia but achieving nothing, absolutely nothing.

We have seen environmental works, missed opportunities. Minister Speirs was able to get \$70 million, something the previous government never achieved. All they wanted to do was fight, all they wanted to do was have a perception, all they wanted to do was have this political stoush that achieved nothing, not a thing. For the \$265 million that came to South Australia, who gave up the water? The irrigators and their communities gave up the water. They gave up the water because they know they need a healthy river, they know they are the future of South Australian river communities, they know they are part of an export program and they know they are doing the right thing.

The 450 gigalitres would never have been achieved under a previous regime. We now have the basin states at the table, and they are saying, 'We are looking to South Australia as an example. How do we achieve the 450?' The four 3IP programs, or the rounds of the 3IP programs, have been a great success, and we now look to the COFFIE programs. We now look at future ways of delivering environmental water, making sure we have economic outcomes, making sure we have a healthy working river for South Australia to be proud of.

For long periods of time we have stood up and said that we are the most efficient irrigators in the world, but we cannot just sit back and rest on our laurels. We have to prove to the world that we continue to strive for those gains and we actually have to commend the people who are doing the hard work. The people who are doing the hard work are the people who are negotiating at the table, negotiating with the other basin states, the irrigators, to continue to look for more efficiencies, making sure they are part of the solution.

I remember the political interference from day one. Since 2007, when I first met a politician for the betterment of the river, there has been political interference day and night. The river communities are tired. They are tired of the political interference. They are doing the heavy lifting and the politicians are getting in the way of that process.

Minister Speirs has demonstrated his ability to negotiate, the Premier has demonstrated his ability to be a good leader, and this side of the chamber, this government, the Marshall Liberal government, will fight for South Australia. We will deliver the 3,220 gigalitres of water for a healthy working river.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:24): I am proud to acknowledge this motion that was raised by the Premier in regard to a response to the recent Productivity Commission inquiry into the River Murray and also the royal commission into the Murray-Darling Basin. Obviously the history of the Murray-Darling Basin and the changes that have been implemented mainly in the last 120 years or so, with the infill of barrages, locks and weirs, have dramatically changed the river from what it was when it was a free-flowing river system. It has been dramatically changed.

That has had to happen because of the needs of communities right throughout the river. We know that the Murray-Darling Basin begins up in Queensland, flows through New South Wales and Victoria, and then here we are at the bottom end of the system in South Australia. I represent the electorate at almost the bottom of the system—I did represent right through to Goolwa until the recent election, last year—so I am very cognisant of what we need to make this river flow and keep it alive for the health of all South Australians.

Certainly I take that from being a previous shadow minister in this role and also the Millennium Drought. If that did not light your mind on what was happening in regard to the River Murray, nothing else would. I note that on the 2006 Melbourne Cup Day there was that meeting with John Howard and basin states lead ministers on where the river system was going. We had endured a dryland drought as well that season, which obviously impacted on inflows into the Darling and the River Murray systems.

During the recent debate that has captured the nation and further afield, we have seen the fish deaths up at the Menindee lakes, and we have had the dry season, with drought throughout the Eastern States of Australia. It brings back to mind what was going on during those years between 2006 and when the river finally recovered in September 2010. It just goes to show that we still have a long way to go from that inaugural meeting in 2006 to making sure that we get those plans in place,

and we get those billions of dollars that John Howard pledged—that \$10 billion—to go into the Murray-Darling Basin Plan to make sure we get those efficiency outcomes to make the river work.

We cannot have a system that is just there for the environment. Yes, the environment is front and centre—that is absolutely right—but there are two other critical needs and critical users of this water that is coming out of the Darling and River Murray systems. Obviously, there are the irrigators right throughout the system, and I must commend the South Australian irrigators for the work they have done over 50, 60 years plus in ensuring that they have the best irrigation systems in the world. They are using the latest technology.

They have gone from some of the areas with channels to sprinkler-based technology then through to drip technology to get that ultimate amount of production out of every drip of water because we are at the bottom of the system. In fact, in terms of consumptive use of the river there are only a few hundred giganlitres at this end of the river that we actually use for irrigation. We obviously need a lot more—thousands of giganlitres—to transport that water through and to make sure the river functions.

The other vital function of the river that people need to remember is critical human needs. Critical human needs are what really lit a lot of people up. Obviously, the environment was front and centre as well during the Millennium Drought, but there was a risk that Adelaide would run out of water. There was what I think was and what I always thought was a bizarre plan by the former government, and I note that the member for West Torrens, the member for Light and the member for Mawson were all there at the time. They wanted to build a weir at Wellington, yet here we are all these years later.

The Labor opposition are bleating about all the work they have done or think they are doing for the River Murray, yet all those years ago they were going to destroy the river. They were going to destroy it by building a \$200 million rock wall between Pomanda Island and Wellington Lodge at the River Murray's outlet to Lake Alexandrina where all the silt from New South Wales and Queensland builds up. The only good thing that would have come out of building that weir was that they would have cleared all the limestone out of my district.

The issue was that it would have been a sinking structure. It would have sunk forever into that silt. It would have belted the lower half of my electorate and killed off that community. Do not get me wrong: there was severe water loss in my region. Everywhere below Lock 1 the water dropped about two metres. There were a lot of interests. Goolwa came into my electorate with the redistribution of 2010, and I really wondered how I was going to get on down there. Obviously, it was belting the community of Goolwa very hard for the recreational use of the river, for water access to their properties and for flooding dry land throughout the dairies.

The houseboat industry and other users just wanted the water at the normal level these days of 0.75 of a metre above sea level, which is how the barrages have controlled the level since they went in all those years ago in the early 1900s. There were a lot of upset people. We must remember that there were well over a million people not just in Adelaide but in the regional areas of South Australia. I am on one of the pipes, the Keith pipeline, relying on River Murray water for our farm and our livestock. That pipeline services communities all the way down at Keith.

Through my insistence on our side of the house in opposition at that stage, we managed to fight the weir. I commend all the community groups and community people who fought that Wellington weir proposal. I had what I think was the first and last bipartisan meeting with the water minister at the time, former member for Chaffey Karlene Maywald, and the head of SA Water at the time. She said, 'What's your option, Adrian? You don't want the weir. What will we have for water for Adelaide?' It was an absolutely serious question. I said, 'Just lower the pumps.' The minister looked at me and said, 'How do we do that?' I said, 'It's an engineering solution. I'm not an engineer, but surely you can lower the pumps a few metres, and we can make sure that those vital supplies get through.'

Well, that is exactly what happened at the end of the day, after all that carry-on over building a rock wall at Wellington that would have just sunk out of sight over time. They tried driving piles down there years ago. They were going to build a lock there nearly 100 years ago, but multiple piles just disappeared into the silt. One good outcome was that they lowered the pumps so we could get that vital water. We also saw the carnage caused by the previous Labor government by putting bunds

at Narrung, Clayton and Currency Creek. Hundreds and hundreds of tonnes of dirt were carted into those areas and have still not been dredged out from the bottom of the river and lakes system.

That is a bit of history. I am a little bit bemused, more than anything, to see this feigned outrage from the other side of the house on the health of the river. Similar to the current member for Chaffey and minister for agriculture, I have a bit of respect for Tony Burke, the federal shadow environment spokesman. It was interesting listening to him briefly on the radio this morning. He was focused only on water buyback to pull back the 450 gigalitres. I know that Tony Burke knows better than that. I know that he knows that infrastructure upgrades will put much-needed water back into the system.

Here we see both the state and federal Labor opposition playing games. We hear the federal opposition talking about lifting the 1,500-gigalitre cap on buybacks. I do not dispute that buybacks have not been part of the necessary things that needed to happen, one of the necessary programs to get water back into the system.

What the Labor Party have so conveniently forgotten, and I almost cannot believe it—in fact, I do not think Tony Burke has forgotten; he knows that it just does not suit his speaking notes about their policy announcement today—is that infrastructure upgrades are vital to the system and they always have been. The plan was developed in 2012 and we have been working through that plan ever since.

It was obvious that given what South Australia has done over the decades, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland would have to do the heavy lifting. I have been on trips through the southern basin and the northern basin. I was in the Coleambally district in New South Wales and they were showing me what they thought was very flash infrastructure, and all it was was an electronically opening channel gate. That was their infrastructure upgrade; I mean, seriously. We want to have some water-saving programs. There is much work that can be done in all these areas.

The Mulwala Canal at Deniliquin goes for almost 160 kilometres. It is a pretty big channel, and that channel could be lined. At the end of the channel, to deliver approximately two to three gigalitres of stock water, they have to send nine gigalitres of water. That is the amount of loss just to get that vital stock water at the end. That just shows what needs to be done to get that delivery through those inefficient channel systems.

Regarding infrastructure, I want to talk about a project that Murrumbidgee Irrigation announced on 7 December 2018. Their media release, entitled 'Gunbar Water Pipeline locks in future for next generation of farmers', talked about what infrastructure upgrades can do in the system. To quote from the media release:

[The] Pipeline was officially launched near Hay this week, locking in a bright future for the next generation of farmers in the Wah Wah district.

This was the final step before Murrumbidgee Irrigation...hands over ownership of the pipeline to Gunbar Private Water Supply District on 31 December.

The new 270km pipeline will supply filtered pressurised water to 62 properties in the Wah Wah district, which covers 310,000 hectares from Carrathool to Hay in the south, and from Gunbar to Booligal in the north.

[Murrumbidgee Irrigation] Chief Executive Officer, Brett Jones, said that there was no future in the previous gravity fed system.

Listen to that: 'No future in the previous gravity fed system.' He continues:

'The key driver for this project was to lock in the future of the stock and domestic area with a sustainable, modern and reliable water supply capability,' he said.

And this is the telling point:

'The gravity fed system required 12,000 megalitres of water to deliver around 2,000 megalitres of allocation and you cannot justify the waste of such a precious resource. In the current climate of water efficiency and productivity the change to the pump and pipeline solution was an absolute must do.'

With the new pipeline Wah Wah farmers will benefit through improved levels of service, with year-round access to the river and bores, pressurised water supply and measured water use, which can be remotely monitored.

This is exactly what we want right throughout the Murray-Darling Basin. We want monitoring, we want piping and we want pressurised systems to save these massive amounts—over 80 per cent efficiency just in this pipeline as well. The media release goes on:

Chairman of the Gunbar Water Steering Committee...was excited about what the new pipeline meant for the district.

'The Gunbar Water pipeline was never about individuals it was always about what was best for the whole area,' he said.

That just shows what can be done if you are serious about putting water back into the system. The 450 gigalitres gets talked about a lot. We saw none of that put back in by the former Labor government. All we saw was the outrage, the hate and the angst. In fact, the former member for Cheltenham of precious memory, the former premier Jay Weatherill, what could he care about the regions? He quoted that there were no votes in the regions. Sorry about that for the few hundred Labor voters in Hammond or anywhere else in the state: you do not count for the other side.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: It's good for you, though. You work for them.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, it's great, absolutely. I work for every constituent in my electorate. Really, for all the feigned outrage, the Labor Party just do not care. They do not care if they suck water out of regional communities. It would not just be New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria that would be hit if we did not have a reasonable program, which minister Speirs has negotiated to put that water back into the system.

If we have to give up more water in South Australia, that will absolutely destroy our irrigation right throughout the state. We already have some of the most efficient systems in the world. How much water can you squeeze out of South Australia? Sure, we can always improve and incremental improvements can be made. I have just indicated from one program in the Murrumbidgee how you can save 10,000 megalitres out of a 12,000-megalitre program, and that is just amazing. It is not so much amazing but just shows the practicality of what can be done to get things right.

We talk about the Coorong and \$70 million going there, which minister Speirs negotiated. This will be a fantastic win for South Australia because we do need to have a look to see if the interconnector between Lake Albert and the Coorong stacks up environmentally. I think it will be great. I am not a scientist, as I said before, and I am not an engineer, but I think that is a far better solution than the one the previous Labor government peddled for years, pulsing hundreds of gigalitres of water—and I say hundreds—through the neck at Narrung to try to lower the salinity in Lake Albert. It just does not work. To me, it is a complete waste of hundreds of gigalitres of water for so little result and such a small reduction in salinity in Lake Albert. It took years for Lake Albert to recover after the Millennium Drought, and it is still recovering. This project needs a really good, hard look so that we get the right outcome.

South Australia has been on the right track for a long time, but we have a lot to do. We have other issues in the lakes. We obviously have the long-nosed fur seals or, as some would call them, the New Zealand fur seals that have invaded the lakes and the Coorong. They are decimating the fishing populations and upsetting that industry, and people need to have a good look at the decimation they are causing of the native animals, the fairy terns and the pelicans, where they just rip them to bits to get a feed, but most of the time they do it just for fun. I know that we have a committee inquiring into them, and we need to take a good hard look at this. It has always been my firm belief—and this is no surprise to this house or the state—that, as part of an overabundant native species management plan for seals in the Coorong and lakes, there needs to be a cull, just as for the corellas.

What we must do as far as water is concerned is make sure that we work towards projects, like the Gunbar irrigation district did in the Murrumbidgee, and get them online so that we can put water back in the river. It assists not only our irrigators but also our critical human need supplies, which we vitally need for all our community needs down here. But the most treasured piece of all is to make sure that we get those environmental outcomes right through South Australia, right down through lakes Albert and Alexandrina and into the Coorong.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:44): The Murray-Darling Basin is one of the most important natural assets that we have in our nation, on our continent. One-seventh of our continent is covered by the Murray-Darling Basin. It is not something we can take chances with, it is not something we can play games with, it is not something that should be taken lightly and it is certainly something that governments, state and federal of all political persuasions, should be working very hard on.

Back in 2007, the Howard government put the legislation in place. There was an expectation that, following that, all the states would come together in around 2012 to work cooperatively, collaboratively, in the best interests of south eastern Australia with regard to this Murray-Darling Basin Plan. The agreement that was reached at the time (the plan) is the agreement that was reached at the time. It was never expected to be something that would just die in exactly the same way that it was born.

The states did the best they could at the time. We saw from the South Australian Labor government their normal trick of jumping up and down, saying that they were going to fight against the rest of the universe, trying to make it sound as if the whole world was against them, when actually the other states were sitting there ready to come to an agreement. Of course, they had their must-haves and they had their wants and their desires clearly on the table, but they were ready to do a deal.

The former South Australian Labor state government made it look as if they were going to fight the universe, and then they came back to South Australia trying to pretend they had saved the universe. That was not very helpful or productive, and the proof is in the pudding because the 450 gigalitres of environmental flows, which we were told we would receive on top of the 2,750 gigalitres of flow down into South Australia, have not materialised. By definition, the trumpeting of a success, which former premier Weatherill and former water minister Hunter talked about, just did not materialise.

When there were allegations of water theft in the upstream states a couple of years ago, that needed to be taken very seriously—absolutely. No-one in South Australia should put up with that possibility. It needed to be considered and it needed to be looked into, so on that basis the former state Labor government appointed a royal commissioner—a very carefully hand-picked royal commissioner, I have to say—to undertake this work, apparently because we needed to investigate the allegations of water theft from the upstream states.

That commissioner has handed down his report, and that report includes 44 recommendations and 111 key findings. Fair enough, we have the report. We are all reading it, we are all learning from it, we are all analysing it and we are all entitled to share our opinion of the royal commissioner's findings. He is entitled to make his findings and his recommendations. We are entitled to assess them and share our views on the findings and recommendations. The central themes of the report are:

- the need for increased transparency;
- a new determination of the environmental sustainable level of take;
- modification of the sustainable diversion limit adjustment mechanism;
- the need to redo the Northern Basin Review;
- better recognition of Aboriginal people;
- the need to factor climate change into the plan;
- recovering the remaining water through buybacks from the market;
- using compulsory acquisition to deal with constraints to environmental water delivery;
- the role and performance of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority; and
- establishment of an independent audit function.

That is a pretty good summary of what this report has delivered to us in its key themes.

Does the Labor opposition want to talk about those things? No, they do not. The Labor opposition want to talk about something entirely different. They are not interested in the river. They are not interested in the report. They are not interested in the findings and the recommendations or the key themes delivered to the state by their very carefully hand-picked commissioner. They do not want to talk about those things. They want to talk about something that was not a finding and not a recommendation.

There are a couple of reasons for that. One is that the actual findings reflect very poorly on the state Labor government, which entered into the plan with the former federal Labor government. The report does anything but flatter the former state Labor government on the way that they have gone about their business, so of course they do not want to focus on the recommendations or the findings or the themes. They want to focus on other things that they have been running around hunting up and looking for in the deep dark depths of the report. They want to pretend that the main criticisms of them do not exist and they are looking for other things to talk about instead. That is just disgraceful.

This is the Murray-Darling River that we are talking about. This is one of the most valuable and priceless—and it should be one of the most protected—natural assets in our entire nation. While it does not directly benefit people in the Northern Territory or Tasmania or Western Australia, I am confident that people in those states and that territory would agree that it is an extraordinarily important asset in our state and that it deserves protection.

I would like to turn to a report that was done on behalf of this parliament by the Natural Resources Committee. Mr Speaker, you would probably remember that this report was delivered to this parliament on 28 March 2011 and you will remember that because you were a member of that committee and did very good work. This was a Labor-controlled committee. The members of that committee were four Labor MPs, including the Presiding Member, two Liberal MPs and two Independents. This report was done in a bipartisan way, I would have say as a participant, on behalf of the parliament, but by a committee that was controlled by Labor MPs at the time.

In the Presiding Member's foreword, the former member of this place, the former member for Ashford, the Hon. Steph Key, who was herself an education minister and a very genuine contributor to this place for a long time, wrote:

The Committee believes that in its current form, the Basin Plan does not meet the objectives of the Water Act 2007 and does not meet the social, economic, cultural and environmental needs of South Australia and South Australians. Significant amendments are needed and key pieces of additional work are still required.

For example the Committee is recommending that the Basin Plan should include:

- salinity targets for Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert...
- water height targets for below Lock 1...
- targets that never allow water height downstream of Lock 1 to fall below mean sea level...

Those three things that I have just read out of the report are all about the Lower Lakes and Coorong, and I will come back to that in a minute. The executive summary states:

Recent impacts of over allocation compounded by drought have been extreme for many regions, especially for South Australia in which sit the lower and most vulnerable reaches of the River. The consequences of continuing with a 'business as usual' model are unacceptable.

Another excerpt is as follows:

In undertaking this Inquiry the Committee has held to the following principles:

1. The Basin Plan is not about the environment versus sustainable communities: it is about both.

Also, listed as principles are:

3. Equity considerations must play a role in developing the Basin Plan.

4. River systems die from the mouth up. The Committee is firmly of the view that restoring the Basin requires a Plan that considers the system from the mouth up.

Again, quoting from this report, from 'Recommendations':

The committee has concluded that in its current draft form, the Basin Plan meets neither the objectives of the Water Act 2007 nor the social, economic, cultural and environmental needs of the state of South Australia.

The committee recommends that the South Australian Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation should lobby the MDBA to ensure that the Basin Plan includes...

There is then a list. This page of the report includes some of the things that I have already read, plus a chapter describing the adaptive management framework that will be adopted and how this provides flexibility to adjust the basin plan through time as more is learnt about social, economic, cultural and environmental needs. Another one of the points on this list is:

7. preliminary terms for the 2015 review, including how social, cultural, economic and environmental impacts and benefits will be measured. This should also outline what actions will be taken if the targets and environmental outcomes are not being met or will not be met with the proposed environmentally sustainable level of take.

Why do I share that information? Firstly, it was provided to this parliament. It was a huge body of work that was done by the members of the committee in a very genuine, serious and bipartisan way. Secondly, it makes very clear a difference between what that committee recommended and what the Labor government shortly after that actually delivered. Thirdly, there has been criticism—unfair criticism—of the Minister for Environment and Water, although the majority of that criticism was focused on the fact that he took other considerations into his view, his mind and his process when coming to an agreement with the upstream states.

Why did he do this? Firstly, as the report forecast might well happen, the water was not flowing downstream. The environmental water was not being delivered. We know that, of the 450 gigalitres of water that was meant to come down, only two has actually been delivered so far, so not only has the plan failed but a new government needs to do something. We cannot just leave it the way the old mob left it to us. We need to do something. We need to make sure that the other states stay at the table. If the other states walk away from this deal, there is no deal. It was imperative that the Minister for Environment and Water came to an agreement that not only suited South Australia but was genuinely an agreement.

What did he deliver? Through his negotiations with the other states, he delivered that the full 450 gigalitres would come down the river. Secondly, he negotiated—and this is a very important issue that is not often talked about—the removal of constraints in the Murray-Darling Basin, being typically infrastructure or sometimes other things, that, even if there was a will to deliver water in certain ways, would not be possible without the removal of those constraints.

Thirdly, he got \$70 million for South Australia towards improvement in the Coorong, and I said I would come back to this. The same things that this parliament said were most important about protecting South Australia and protecting the river from the mouth up, starting with maximum salinity targets, minimum lake level targets and flows through the Murray Mouth, etc., are exactly the things that the Minister for Environment and Water is delivering for this state.

Removing the constraints is important. Getting the upstream states to agree and to have a mechanism for delivering the 450 gigalitres of water is absolutely critical—absolutely critical. By any fair account, the Minister for Environment and Water has done exactly what he was expected to do. The fact that the very carefully hand-picked commissioner chose to write a couple of lines criticising the minister I think is very unfortunate, but the commissioner is entitled to write the report as he sees fit and we are entitled to consider it and comment on it as we see fit.

To me, it is absolutely disgraceful that the current Labor opposition would ignore all the findings and recommendations in an effort to smear a minister—absolutely disgraceful. The Labor opposition were wreckers in government when they got this all so wrong. They are wreckers in opposition. We are trying to get it right and they are trying to stop us. Minister Speirs and the Marshall government are doing an outstanding job in this area.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

*Bills***SENTENCING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

HEALTH AND COMMUNITY SERVICES COMPLAINTS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (DOMESTIC VIOLENCE) BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

TOBACCO PRODUCTS REGULATION (E-CIGARETTES AND REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (LIQUOR OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

ROAD TRAFFIC (EVIDENTIARY PROVISIONS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN EMPLOYMENT TRIBUNAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Assent*

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PARLIAMENTARY SUPERANNUATION) BILL*Message from Governor*

His Excellency the Governor, by message, recommended to the house the appropriation of such amounts of money as might be required for the purposes mentioned in the bill.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today year 12 students of Concordia College, who are hosted by the Minister for Industry and Skills. I hope you enjoy your visit to parliament.

*Petitions***SERVICE SA MODBURY**

Ms BEDFORD (Florey): Presented a petition signed by 5,000 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government not to proceed with the proposed closure of the Service SA Modbury Branch announced as a cost-saving measure in the 2018-19 state budget.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

The following reports have been received and published pursuant to section 17(7) of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991—

Public Works Committee—

10th Report entitled North-South Corridor Regency Road to Pym Street Project

11th Report entitled Modbury Hospital Upgrades and Additional Services Project

12th Report entitled Women's and Children's Hospital Upgrade Sustainment Program

Auditor-General—

Land Services Commercialisation Project Report 12 of 2018

[Ordered to be published]

State Finances and Related Matters Report 1 of 2019

[Ordered to be published]

Local Government Annual Reports—

Adelaide Hills Council 2017-18

Adelaide Plains Council 2017-18

Adelaide, City of 2017-18

Berri Barmera Council 2017-18

Ceduna, District Council of 2017-18

Copper Coast Council 2017-18

Holdfast Bay, City of 2017-18

Kangaroo Island Council 2017-18

Kimba, District Council of 2017-18

Light Regional Council 2017-18

Marion, City of 2017-18

Mitcham, City of 2017-18

Mount Barker District Council 2017-18

Mount Gambier, City of 2017-18

Naracoorte Lucindale Council 2017-18

Norwood Payneham and St Peters, City of 2017-18

Peterborough, District Council of 2017-18

Port Augusta City Council 2017-18

Port Pirie Regional Council 2017-18

Prospect, City of 2017-18

Renmark Paringa Council 2017-18

Robe, District Council of 2017-18

Roxby Downs, Municipal Council of 2017-18

Salisbury, City of 2017-18

Southern Mallee District Council 2017-18

Streaky Bay, District Council of 2017-18

Tumby Bay, District Council of 2017-18

Victor Harbor, City of 2017-18

Wakefield Regional Council 2017-18

Wattle Range Council 2017-18

Whyalla City Council 2017-18

Yankalilla, District Council of 2017-18

Yorke Peninsula Council 2017-18

Ombudsman SA—Annual Report 2017-18 [Ordered to be published]

Lease made under the following Acts

Adelaide Park Lands—Park Lands Lease Agreement—Alkyona Pty Ltd

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme, South Australian—Report by the Independent Assessor July 2018

Regulations made under the following Acts—
State Procurement—Procurement Operations
Work Health and Safety—Asbestos Air Quality

By the Deputy Premier (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Disability Inclusion—General
Housing Improvement—Prescribed Minimum Housing Standards

By the Attorney-General (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Legal Practitioners Education and Admission Council—Annual Report 2017-18
State Coroner—Annual Report 2017-18
Summary Offences Act 1953—Road Blocks Authorisations Report for Period 1 October 2018 to 31 December 2018
Regulations made under the following Acts—
Casino—Prescribed Day
Child Safety (Prohibited Persons)—General
Criminal Procedure—General—Costs
Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery—Civil Debt Recovery
Gaming Machines—Prescribed Day
Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates Court—
Civil—Amendment No. 23
Criminal—Amendment No. 69
Supreme Court—Civil—Supplementary—Amendment No. 11
Youth Court—Adoption—General

By the Minister for Education (Hon. J.A.W. Gardner)—

National Education and Care Services Freedom of Information and Privacy Commissioner and Ombudsman—Annual Report 2017-18
Regulations made under the following Acts—
SACE Board of South Australia—Miscellaneous
Teachers Registration and Standards—Prescribed Offences

By the Minister for Industry and Skills (Hon. D.G. Pisoni)—

Training Advocate, Office of the—Annual Report 2018

By the Minister for Energy and Mining (Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products—
Fees
General

By the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development (Hon. T.J. Whetstone)—

Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2017-18

By the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Firearms—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Environment and Water (Hon. D.J. Speirs)—

- Natural Resources Management Board—
 - Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Annual Report 2017-18
 - Alinytjara Wilurara Annual Report 2017-18
 - Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2017-18
 - Kangaroo Island Annual Report 2017-18
 - Northern and Yorke Annual Report 2017-18
 - SA Murray-Darling Basin Annual Report 2017-18
 - South Australian Arid Lands Annual Report 2017-18
 - South East Annual Report 2017-18
- State of the Environment—Annual Report 2018
- Water Corporation, South Australian—Charter January 2019
- Regulations made under the following Acts—
 - Environment Protection—
 - Variation of Act, Schedule 1—Waste Reform
 - Waste Reform
 - Radiation Protection and Control—
 - Fees—General
 - Ionising Radiation—Fees No. 2

By the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

- Local Grants Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2017-18
- Regulations made under the following Acts—
 - Local Government—Boundary Adjustment
 - Motor Vehicles—Miscellaneous No. 2
 - Real Property—Calculation of Transfer Fees
 - Road Traffic—
 - Declared Hospitals
 - Road Rules—Seatbelts
 - Safe-T-Cam
- Local Council By-Laws—
 - District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 - No. 2—Moveable Signs
 - No. 3—Roads
 - No. 4—Local Government Land
 - No. 5—Dogs
 - No. 6—Foreshore
 - District Council of Peterborough—
 - No. 1—Permits and Penalties
 - No. 2—Moveable Signs
 - No. 3—Roads
 - No. 4—Local Government Land
 - No. 5—Dogs
 - No. 6—Cats
 - Mid Murray Council—No. 8—Camping and Mooring Variation

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

- Regulations made under the following Acts—
 - Development—Waste Reform
 - Planning, Development and Infrastructure—
 - Accredited Professionals—General
 - Fees, Charges and Contributions—General

*Ministerial Statement***STOLEN GENERATIONS REPARATIONS SCHEME REPORT**

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: A few moments ago, I tabled the report on the South Australian Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme by the independent assessor, the Hon. John Hill. In doing so, I commend Mr Hill, who is in the gallery today with some members of the stolen generations, for the thoroughness of his work and the content of his report. He was appointed as the independent assessor in April 2016.

A total of 449 applications for individual reparations were received under the scheme, and the independent assessor met with more than 300 of the applicants who wanted to share with him the story of their removal: 312 of the applicants, almost 70 per cent, were deemed to meet the criteria for a reparation payment. The former government initially set the individual payment at \$20,000. The scheme also offered community reparations: 27 projects were approved for the community reparations, totalling \$1.65 million.

The community reparations projects included creating memorials in various sites and making improvements to important places, like the Colebrook Reconciliation Park and the stolen generations memorial at Andrews Farm. They also supported a range of healing activities, including facilitating more sophisticated family history research, creating photographic archives and supporting various arts activities that tell the story of the stolen generations in South Australia.

Since the election, it has become the responsibility of my government to determine what to do with the balance of just over \$3 million left in the scheme. After discussion with a range of Aboriginal people and organisations, the government has decided to use the balance of the funds to pay an additional \$10,000 to each successful individual applicant for reparations. This will bring the total individual payment to \$30,000 for each of those 312 applicants. The government believes this is the fairest way to allocate the remaining funding. In our generation, we acknowledge the hurt, the devastation and the wrongs of removal and offer some closure to those who were removed.

I turn now to the independent assessor's report. Mr Hill has found that, while many stolen generation survivors have a sense of grief after enduring physical and mental torture, he observes that most of them also have a generosity of spirit. This speaks eloquently of the resilience of Aboriginal people. They remain a very proud people despite some of the harrowing episodes in our shared history for which no amount of reparations can ever compensate. I commend to all members of this parliament and the wider community that they read Mr Hill's report for, as he says:

There is much for government and society, in general, to reflect on and learn in relation to the policies and practices that produced the Stolen Generations...

We cannot undo the wrongs of the past, but we can do the right thing now and recognise what was done then, and this parliament has done that. In dealing with this issue, the parliament has worked at its bipartisan best to acknowledge an historic wrong. In 1997, this was the first parliament in the nation to say sorry.

In 2010, the Hon. Tammy Franks (also in the gallery today) introduced the Stolen Generations Reparations Tribunal Bill. This led to a parliamentary inquiry into a reparations scheme. The issue was taken up by my party when in opposition through the introduction of legislation in 2014 to implement the committee's recommendations. Ultimately, the former government established the reparations scheme which has become the responsibility of my government to complete.

I will leave my last words on this to those Mr Hill recorded in a meeting with one of the applicants for reparations. She was taken from her mother when aged three years and nine months. In fact, over time, she lost much more than her mother. As she told Mr Hill, and I quote:

...I still feel that I am unloveable.

And I still feel like I don't belong.

And I feel completely caught between two cultures.

And I have trouble comprehending how or why my children would even love me.

I really have trouble understanding the concept of love.

I commend the independent assessor's report to the house. This is an important report, and the government wants to give all honourable members an opportunity to make comment about it.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and thank you to the chamber for the opportunity to say a few words. I thank the Premier for his remarks.

In November 2015, the Weatherill government announced a Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme, including ex gratia payments for members of the South Australian stolen generations. It followed recommendations by the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee. Under the Next Steps—Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme, South Australian members of the stolen generations who were forcibly removed from their parents became eligible for an ex gratia payment of up to \$50,000.

Applications are made to the independent assessor and individuals can meet with and speak directly to the independent assessor about their experiences. The government, as the Premier alluded to, set aside up to \$6 million for individual reparations. The second part of the scheme extended to the broader Aboriginal community with a \$5 million whole-of-community reparations fund.

It was a notable day in this parliament when the former government introduced the Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme. The scheme had bipartisan support and followed a series of events around the nation that demonstrated a growing understanding of the depth of loss suffered by stolen generations. That loss cannot be measured in dollars. It is measured in fractured culture, heritage and community. In my mind, it was best summed up by the former prime minister Paul Keating in his Redfern speech of December 1992. Prime minister Keating said:

We simply cannot sweep injustice aside. Even if our own conscience allowed us to, I am sure, that in due course, the world and the people of our region would not.

There should be no mistake about this—our success in resolving these issues will have a significant bearing on our standing in the world...

There is no more basic test of how seriously we mean these things.

It is a test of our self-knowledge.

Of how well we know the land we live in. How well we know our history.

Keating said that for Australia to progress as a nation we have to recognise that one culture deposed and displaced another. He said, and again I quote:

We took the traditional lands and smashed the traditional way of life.

We brought the diseases. The alcohol.

We committed the murders.

We took the children from their mothers.

We practised discrimination and exclusion.

Prime minister Keating's decision to establish the National Inquiry into the Separation of Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Children from Their Families resulted in the Bringing Them Home report, tabled in federal parliament in May 1997.

We should be proud that as a state parliament we took immediate steps to advance the notions of apology, acceptance and reconciliation. Just two days after the release of the Bringing Them Home report, the then South Australian minister for Aboriginal affairs, Liberal Dean Brown, led this parliament in saying sorry. He told this house:

...to the children who were taken from their mothers and fathers, to the mothers and fathers who watched in pain as their babies and children were taken from their side or taken from their schools. To those people, we apologise.

Profound words from Dean Brown. It would be another decade before the federal parliament did the same thing. Eleven years ago this week, former prime minister Kevin Rudd said:

The hurt, the humiliation, the degradation and the sheer brutality of the act of physically separating a mother from her children is a deep assault on our senses and on our most elemental humanity.

So, after much consultation with Indigenous communities, this parliament introduced another step in the direction of facing up to the past wrongs, hence the Stolen Generations Reparations Scheme. This was the right thing to do. It was something that was endorsed, as the Premier said, in a bipartisan way.

When we talk about the importance of white settlement some 230 years ago, can you imagine having a culture that stretches back for literally thousands of generations? It is the oldest living culture on the planet. As an Australian, I am proud to walk together with our Aboriginal brothers and sisters, and I support the comments of the Premier today.

In my office, one thing that has pride of place on my wall is a framed front page of *The New York Times* that was delivered to US citizens the day after prime minister Rudd gave the apology to stolen generations. I have a framed copy and it is signed by Kevin Rudd, so there is something with Kevin Rudd in my office, believe it or not. He signed the front page of that paper.

What it said to me, as someone who was on the east coast of the US at the time, was that we did not just do something that was good for Australia: we did something that was good for the world. It was worldwide news. It was on the front page of *The New York Times*—Australia owning up to its past, Australia having the courage to recognise what we did wrong.

Ultimately, that apology is only as powerful as the actions that followed. I am very proud that this parliament in a bipartisan way took that apology and put some actions behind it with this scheme—a scheme that those opposite deserve as much credit for as those on this side of the chamber. It is an example of what we can do when we work together. I commend the Premier's words to the house.

Parliamentary Committees

SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (14:24): I bring up the 41st report of the committee, entitled Review of the Operation of the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013.

Report received.

Question Time

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier repeat his statements regarding the royal commission's Bret Walker SC outside parliament that he made earlier today?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26): I am not sure what the Leader of the Opposition is concerned about. We have made a statement—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please be seated for one moment. I call the following members to order for interjections already. The Premier is entitled to be heard in silence. The question was asked in silence, therefore I call to order the following members: the member for Reynell and the member for West Torrens. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. I thought I made myself extraordinarily clear today. We don't believe for one second that the criticisms levelled against the Minister for Environment and Water have any justification whatsoever. Let's be very clear on this. This is a—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —decision that was made by the cabinet. This is one that we stand right behind because, unlike those opposite, we care about our river communities in South Australia. We care about the health—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —of the River Murray and the Lower Lakes and the Coorong here in South Australia. And, unlike those opposite, who—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —had carriage of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and they had their fingers—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —almost on the original determination of the plan back in 2012, and then the carriage of the implementation thereafter, they achieved nothing, nothing whatsoever in terms of the upwater. By contrast, we've got people back at the table talking about how water is going to be delivered for South Australian communities. Whilst those over there want to jump on their soapbox, wave their arms around and pick their fake fights, we will deliver—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kurna is called to order and warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —to the people of this state. The comments that were made that there may be a breach of a ministerial code of conduct are ludicrous and nonsensical—absolutely 100 per cent.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call the following members to order: the member for Ramsay and the member for Kurna. The member for Kurna is also warned, as are the member for Lee and the member for Mawson. The member for Wright is called to order. I also call to order the leader and the member for Badcoe. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier arranged an urgent meeting with the Prime Minister and COAG, regarding the Murray-Darling Basin, to consider the royal commission report? If so, when is the meeting scheduled for?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28): This is all a matter for the public record. Of course we have requested that meeting. We have had an acceptance from the Prime Minister, who is setting about trying to organise that meeting now. Every single one of those first ministers who is involved with the Murray-Darling Basin needs to have time to consider the report. I notice that those opposite didn't have time to consider the report and contribute to the debate in this parliament this morning.

I know they were very busy with their by-election activities, working very hard to save seats that they have never lost in the history of their party, but they didn't bring themselves to turn their attention to a very important report. It was, in fact, two reports and that is why we, of course, as we said we would for a long period of time, came straight into this parliament, tabled those reports—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and sought a bipartisan approach to sorting out the problems that we inherited from those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We won't shirk. We won't shirk our responsibilities to this state. We were left a complete mess. It was in 2016 that the then minister for the environment, Ian Hunter, came into this building and made it very clear that people had vacated the playing field. New South Wales had left. Victoria had left. What did they actually say they were going to do about it? That's right: more fake fights and name-calling. There was name-calling in Leigh Street here in South Australia. Now, tell me how much did the arm waving and the name-calling actually deliver for the Murray? Absolutely zero. By contrast, a practical government, getting on, delivering for the people of South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —have got the other states back to the table because our plan is very simple: we will deliver for the people of our state.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, everyone be seated for one moment. Member for West Torrens, whilst you have been redeemed this morning, I will have no hesitation in removing you if I need to in order to return decorum to this house. I call to order and warn for a second and final time the member for Kaurana and the member for Lee. If I see any props, everyone will be upgraded.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is again to the Premier. Will the special urgent COAG meeting occur before the next ministerial council meeting that is scheduled in June? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: In a media release on 31 January this year, the Premier stated he would 'write to the Prime Minister to request a meeting of the COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers'. Prime Minister Scott Morrison stated publicly the next day that the federal government would meet with the states about the Murray-Darling Basin Plan 'in due course as part of the normal schedule'.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Five months later.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is on two warnings.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:32): We have requested the meeting. The Prime Minister has accepted this request and we will announce the date as soon as it is set. For a party that wants an urgent discussion about this, you would think they might have read the report. You would think they might have got up this morning and thought, 'We've got—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —something to contribute.' What have we heard from the opposition so far? Nothing.

DEFENCE SHIPBUILDING

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier update the house on the formal signing of the \$50 billion Future Submarines contract and what this project will mean for South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:32): What a happy day it was for South Australia yesterday when I was in Canberra for the signing of the strategic partnering agreement between Australia and the Naval Group, between Australia and France, between the people of this state and the people of France. What a great outcome for our state. I thank the member for King for her excellent question. We are on the precipice of an unprecedented flow of work to South Australia, and the only reason this work is coming—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know those opposite hate to hear good news. They hate to hear about jobs coming to South Australia. It's a disaster for them and I will tell you why. It's because when they were in power for those six messy, messy years they did not commission one single solitary vessel for the people of this nation, causing a massive hiatus in the work down at Osborne. They conveniently forget that.

There are plenty of people on the benches opposite who were in the government at the time. I ask them to point to their speeches in *Hansard* where they were advocating for more work for our state and for our nation. Zero vessels were commissioned under the Rudd/Gillard/Rudd debacle. How many have been delivered by the Coalition? Is it 10, 20, 30, 40 or 50? Fifty-four separate vessels have been commissioned by the Coalition and they will create a huge amount of work coming to South Australia. It will come for generations to come, and this is very, very good news for the people of our state.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And I know they hate it. I know they hate good news. I know they hate jobs coming to our state, but we love it. We absolutely love it. In fact, yesterday, signing the strategic partnerships agreement was a signature for a \$50 billion plan, and that's only part of the work which is coming to South Australia—a total of \$90 billion. That's why we are doing every single thing we can.

Only in the last two weeks, I have been down to Osborne—you know where that is, over there? I have been down to Osborne. That is the epicentre of happiness in this state because there are a huge number of new jobs going in in construction down there at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They say, 'Where?'

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They say, 'Where?' It's actually in one of their seats. You should go and visit it. Construction work is underway at the moment on the massive frigates yard, and the work has already been decided to build a massive subs yard. So more than a billion dollars' worth of construction work is underway down at Osborne and they say, 'Where?' It beggars belief.

The member for Port Adelaide should hang her head in shame. She has not educated her colleagues. I'm sure she knows about what is going on. Wouldn't it be a mess if she didn't know what was going on? Clearly, she hasn't done her job in advocating for the people of her electorate, educating those opposite about the fantastic work which is being done fixing up the mess—the valley of death—created by those opposite. We have set to work.

I can tell you now that the Minister for Industry and Skills has worked very hard to make sure that we have the requisite skills in place—20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships being delivered—so that we can actually deliver those very important programs. The yard is underway. The Naval Shipbuilding College—a fantastic new facility—is underway so that we can prepare for the jobs of the future and the skills for the future. I'm really looking forward to the great news. Those opposite aren't; we don't care.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, unfortunately I have to intervene. I am going to ask the member for Lee to depart the chamber for half an hour under 137A for constant interjections, thank you.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I also call to order the following members and warn the member for Giles, the member for Ramsay and the member for Mawson, and I call to order the member for Elizabeth. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:37): So everyone on the government's side is well behaved? Okay. Thank you, Mr Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, if that happens again, I will throw you out.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to—

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Premier. What recommendations of the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission will the Premier accept or rule out?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:37): Thank you very much for this question. We have already made it clear that this is a very substantial report, in excess of 740 pages and 111 findings and dozens and dozens and dozens of recommendations. We have made it clear in all of our public statements that we will not be doing a rule-in rule-out at this point in time. We want to have consideration, as you would be aware—sorry, as the Leader of the Opposition would be aware, sir, but you would also be aware because you are a very learned man.

The SPEAKER: Indeed.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Most of the recommendations are not recommendations to the South Australian government; in fact, they deal with other jurisdictions, both individually and collectively. They deal with the federal government. They deal with the federal Auditor-General. The thing about this report is that it's quite different from what was promised by the opposition when they were in government as to what this report was about, but what we've got—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: That's the thing about royal commissions: they're independent.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, please!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —is a very significant body of work that needs to be dealt with very effectively. What I do find interesting, though—and I am wondering whether the Leader of the Opposition might offer something to the house today or maybe this week; he's got plenty of time to think about it—is it seems to me that as we are meeting in this parliament the federal parliament is meeting and they are considering something very serious, that is, basically lifting the lid, if you like, the upper limit on the water buybacks.

It would be very interesting to know from the Leader of the Opposition this week whether or not he supports compulsory water buybacks in South Australia. I know that we are not interested in compulsory water buybacks in South Australia that damage our local communities and would devastate our river communities, who have already done so much of the heavy lifting in this area. This sort of recommendation doesn't sit well with us. What I am interested in, though, is: how does it sit with the Labor Party in South Australia?

Are they going to back the people along the river communities in South Australia, or back their fellow travellers in Canberra—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. I will hear the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the Premier is questioning our Labor Party policy: (1) it's debate.

The SPEAKER: Debate, and how the Labor Party policy is related to the question. The Premier must stick to the substance of the question. It was a very broad topic. I will be listening carefully. No, he has finished. He has finished his answer. There's a supplementary and then I will move to my right. Supplementary, leader.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Supplementary question to the Premier: given the Premier's previous answer, will the Premier rule out reversing the deal his minister agreed with the upstream states, as called for by the royal commissioner Bret Walker SC. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: The royal commissioner states, on pages 414 and 415 of his report, and I quote:

...no Minister acting reasonably could consider these changes to the criteria to be anything but totally antipathetic to the interests of South Australia, and the South Australian environment. South Australia's agreement to these changes should be immediately reversed.

The SPEAKER: There's a fair bit in that. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:40): There was, sir, and most of it incorrect because—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call. The member for Giles is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: If there's just some chance I might be able to answer the question, I can explain to those opposite. The Leader of the Opposition said, 'Will you rule out the recommendation of the royal commissioner?' This was not a recommendation of the royal commissioner.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: It's a conclusion.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: And now the guy who wants to be the leader thinks it was a finding. Look, the reality was—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is called to order, as is the Minister for Education.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I know those opposite, busy with those by-elections, had no chance to actually read a report that was so critical to our state, nor the Australian Productivity Commission report. We did. The reality is that there are 111 findings.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We have read it: 111 findings; none of them related to that issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There were dozens of recommendations; none of them related to that issue. Read the report.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It's bigger than one page.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education will cease interjecting. The member for Colton has been patiently waiting and has the call. I will come back to those on my left.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO AGED CARE QUALITY AND SAFETY

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:41): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General provide an update to the house on the aged-care standards royal commission?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42): I thank the member for Colton for his question and important interest in this inquiry.

Mr Malinauskas: Are you going to cooperate with this one? Are you going to shut this one down?

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, please! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety preliminary hearing about the operation of the commission was held in Adelaide on 18 January, at which time the commissioners set out their vision for the operation of the commission. It is now operating out of the offices of 11 Waymouth Street; however, hearings will and continue to be heard in the Roma Mitchell Commonwealth Law Courts Building at 3 Angas Street.

Public hearings, as many would know, commenced in Adelaide last Monday (yesterday) and will continue until Wednesday this week, and are also scheduled for Monday 18 February to Friday 22 February this year. The royal commission will also hold public hearings in each capital city and in some regional centres. As we can all remember in great detail, the former government oversaw the absolute tragedy at Oakden—something we wish we will never experience again. Looking after our aged residents both in and out of state-run homes, of course, is integral.

In 2017-18, the Aged Care Complaints Commissioner received 5,779 complaints. The majority (75 per cent) related to residential aged care. I am very proud that Adelaide is the home of the royal commission, with our advocates, families, social services and agencies able to participate in future reform. The royal commission has announced that the first of the hearings will inquire into the following:

- key features of the aged-care quality, safety and complaints system, about how that system works in practice and at a general level;
- key features of the aged-care quality, safety and complaints system at the level of the federal government, including how that system has operated, monitored and regulated prior to 1 January 2019, and how it is expected that system will operate, be monitored and regulated following the establishment of the new Aged Care Quality and Safety Commission;
- the changing demographics of the Australian population and the implications this has for the aged-care system;
- the nature and meaning of 'quality' and 'safety' within the Australian aged-care system, as those concepts are understood from a variety of national perspectives;
- key issues affecting the functioning of the Australian aged-care system identified from the perspectives of the representative bodies referred to above and from the experience of people receiving and seeking aged-care services.

To update the parliament, and as many would also know, in the evidence given this week we have heard from Ms Barbara Spriggs; Mr Clive Spriggs; also Mr Ian Yates AM, CEO of COTA Australia; and Professor John McCallum, the CEO of National Seniors Australia. Notably, Ms Spriggs, whose late husband, Robert, suffered mistreatment at the Oakden Older Persons Mental Health Service, spoke frankly about her experiences and the issues they thought required urgent attention.

I thank Ms Spriggs for detailing those no doubt traumatic experiences in the public arena for the greater resolution of aged-care related issues and to ensure that we never again see a failure like we did in Oakden. This is not the first time she has stepped forward and stepped up with this information, and I thank her sincerely.

Government agencies, as we have seen, play a huge role in the provision of services for our aged-care residents. Under the Attorney-General's Department, a statewide response team is being developed to properly respond to the royal commission. I have remained constantly updated by this group and, as such, they have alerted me that it is anticipated that the evidence heard over the Adelaide hearings will raise important themes, including whether the current aged-care system is failing to meet community expectations and in what ways; issues relating to the changing demographics and what that means for the aged-care system; the special clinical issues that arise in caring for older people, including the skills required of doctors, nurses and personal care attendants; creating an aged-care—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier's time has expired. Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I don't need that commentary, please.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: When the members on my left are finished, I will call the deputy leader.

The Hon. R. Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Child Protection is called to order. The deputy leader has the call.

WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:46): My question is to the Minister for Environment. On whose advice did the minister agree to changes in the socio-economic criteria for water irrigation efficiency in December last year?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:47): Mr Speaker, could I ask the deputy leader to repeat the first part of the question?

The SPEAKER: Repeat the entire question, please.

Dr CLOSE: On whose advice did the minister agree to changes in the socio-economic criteria of water efficiency in December last year?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I thank the deputy leader for her question. I received considerable advice from many different parties in the lead-up to the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker, as I was saying, I received multiple sources of advice. That advice came from my departmental officials, that advice came from food producers across our state, that advice came from academics, that advice came from former—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —ministers for water for this state, some of whom may have sat under a Labor cabinet. I draw on many sources of advice. When I went to the June ministerial council, an agreement was made that we would look at the socio-economic criteria. This was not a surprise to anyone. The Labor opposition didn't notice it, of course. They didn't notice it when it was announced on 14 December 2018 at the second ministerial council. This was a bolt from the blue for them. No questions, nothing. Just silence. Welcome to the environment, deputy leader.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Welcome to the environment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The fact of the matter is that I have received and relied on multiple sources of advice, but that advice gave me two pathways. I could follow a pathway towards water, looking for a consensus and negotiating with the other jurisdictions, or I could follow what the Labor Party had done for 16 years: fake fights from the sidelines.

Stand up for South Australia,' they said. If standing up for South Australia was successful, 450 gigalitres of water pledged, how much slowed one-quarter of 1 per cent? Just one gigalitre, and where did that gigalitre come from? Did it come from New South Wales? Did it come from Victoria, the ACT, Queensland? It came from here. They offered up one gigalitre of water. I had advice, and I had good advice, and I chose to negotiate for South Australia. Now—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members are my left!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Listen to the noise, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: I am.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The noise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It's just examples of—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You're a traitor!

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, I ask him to withdraw the comment, 'You are a traitor.'

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I withdraw the comment, 'You are a traitor.'

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr Picton: You're a disgrace!

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana, you can leave for half an hour under 137A, thank you. Minister, please wrap it up.

The honourable member for Kaurana having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. I will wrap up by simply saying this: the noise, the games, the gimmicks, the gestures, the slogans—they delivered one gigalitre.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Practical, pragmatic negotiations will deliver real water. They might cleave to seven sentences in a royal commission but we will deliver a pathway to real water.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I'm not going to tolerate the shouting that is going on. Member for West Torrens, you are now on two warnings. The member for Kaurana, I have dealt with. I also call to order and I warn the member for Wright and the member for Elizabeth. The deputy leader has the call.

WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): My question is again to the Minister for the Environment. Did the minister receive specific written advice from his department, that he should agree to the changes to the socio-economic criteria, in December last year?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:51): As I have already said, I received advice from multiple sources, including from my department. The departmental advice presented—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —two pathways: more of the same or a pathway to consensus with the other states, which in turn would deliver water. I stand 100 per cent behind the decision to go down that track because that will deliver water to South Australia.

WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:51): Supplementary: will the minister release all written advice he received from the department about the socio-economic criteria?

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education is warned.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:52): Thank you, Deputy Speaker. Where appropriate, I am happy—

The SPEAKER: I'm not the Deputy Speaker.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker, I'm getting confused. Mr Speaker, it's so unusual for the deputy leader to ask me any questions that I'm getting confused.

The SPEAKER: Minister, let's get on with it, please.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: It's such a shock to me, Mr Speaker—such a shock—so I do apologise.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I apologise for offending you.

The SPEAKER: Alright.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: A considerable amount of that advice will be subject to cabinet confidentiality. However, if there is material that I can provide the deputy leader, I will make every attempt to do so.

DEVELOPMENT ASSESSMENT PATHWAYS

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Planning.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Dr HARVEY: Can the minister update the house on the government's statewide planning reforms and explain how the recently released draft assessment pathways will benefit residents?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:53): I thank the member for Newland for his question. I know he is somebody who wants to see our state—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —grow and prosper and is part of a good government that wants to achieve that. This is certainly a very important question. I note that this works off the back of a bipartisan approach that this parliament took in 2016 to help provide a new framework for improving our state. We took to the election, and our Premier took to the election, a strategy that is going to deliver growth, jobs and a deregulatory environment for businesses and households across our state. It is very much this Liberal government's and this Premier's mantra to help drive investment forward and, in that spirit, we as a government want to do what we can to get our state moving and to drive investment here in South Australia.

To do that, we need to improve the way our planning system operates. We on this side of the house, through our last budget, have shown that we are committed to delivering investment in public infrastructure in our state—\$11.3 billion worth of money invested across the forward estimates to improve public infrastructure. Whether that be hospitals, whether that be schools, whether that be roads, we are here to drive investment in public infrastructure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —right across our state. But we also want to—and this is maybe something that the former government didn't understand—drive private investment across our state, the idea that we can actually also have private money invested in projects right across our state.

To do that we know that we need to get our planning system unlocked to unlock investment right across our state. Can I tell you that, over the four years before the election, talking to my community, talking to businesses and households, the frustration—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —at the inability to get projects underway was immense. I had, for instance, a small food manufacturer who simply wanted to extend her premises. It took 18 months to be able to get that approved. There are jobs on the table and it took 18 months to get an approval on a simple, small food manufacturing facility. A cellar door, would you imagine, in the broader Barossa region took 2½ years to get approval. This is ridiculous and simply not good enough, and it is why the system needs to change, and that is something that will change as a result of the draft regulations that we have out at the moment.

There is a huge level of variability in the way that our councils make decisions and the timeliness of how they make decisions, and I would like to put on record my congratulations to some of the councils that do really good work. I would like to pay particular attention in relation to complying development applications. The Adelaide Hills Council and The Barossa Council, with zero median days to approve complying developments, which I think is pretty good. The Charles Sturt council, one of our largest, has an average of four days. Also, Light Regional Council, Prospect and Victor Harbor councils are all able, within a matter of a few days, to give a tick to things that need to get on and be delivered across our state.

There are other councils, which I will not name today, that do a far worse job and need a system that pushes them to do a lot better. In that regard we need to see quicker time frames. So, under our new development regulations we are going to see complying developments having to be assessed within 10 days—10 days for a simple house to get ticked off and get moving. But for more complex situations, instead of the year or two years it takes to get things assessed, we are putting in place a system that is going to say 'in a matter of months, three months', for noncomplying developments to see those things assessed so that we can create jobs here in South Australia, that we can bring private investment here into South Australia, and that we can build and drive investment and growth in our beautiful state.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the deputy leader, I warn for a first time the members for Wright, Reynell, Badcoe and Ramsay. The deputy leader.

WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:57): My question is to the Minister for Environment. When did the minister make the decision to agree to the changes in the socio-economic criteria?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:57): I thank the deputy leader for her question. This was a series of negotiations and work which took place over a lengthy period of time. At the June ministerial council, it was made clear publicly, as I have said—and there was no noise about that at the time—that these socio-economic criteria would be looked at, and a period of time would be spent between senior officials establishing what those criteria could look like before they were presented.

As I have said, I had two options: a pathway towards water or a pathway towards protest. I chose to move towards water. I worked with the senior officials, with academics, with food producers. I worked with many stakeholders across the basin in South Australia as I sought correct advice and canvassed what direction we would head in, and I sought to preserve the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, because we know there was no plan B.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: And what do Labor want to do? They want to blow up the plan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Do you know who benefits when you blow up the plan? Do you know who benefits? By blowing up the plan you capitulate to New South Wales and Victoria. We need that plan. Because of the tyranny of the geography South Australia needs the plan, because the plan guarantees that critical water flow. Preserving the Murray-Darling Basin Plan—something that the Labor opposition are not interested in—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —will be a key priority of the Marshall Liberal government.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN MINISTERIAL COUNCIL

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Who were the public servants who accompanied the minister into the room in the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting on 14 December?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader and the Deputy Premier are warned. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Transport is warned. The Minister for Environment and Water has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:59): It is all very confusing today. The buck stops with me. I am the minister. I will not be talking about the conduct of public servants today. I am the minister, and I will not be discussing which public servants I worked with along the way.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

SERVICE SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure, Local Government and Planning. What precipitated the move of responsibility for Service SA from the Department of the Premier and Cabinet to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure? Was the decision to close Modbury, Prospect and Mitcham offices made prior to that transfer of responsibility? If those closures go ahead, how many more metropolitan offices will be in danger of closing, or has that decision already been made?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:00): There are a number of components to that question.

The SPEAKER: There are.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So 1 July last year was when Service SA was transferred back from Department of the Premier and Cabinet to my department. That decision was made because a lot of the transactions that are actually undertaken at Service SA centres relate back to regulation that I have carriage for. In fact, there is a lot of interaction between DPTI and Service SA in relation to how those things need to operate. It makes eminent sense that under the machinery of government changes that that was to occur.

In relation to decisions made about centres, those decisions were made as part of the 2018-19 budget process. That budget was handed down on 4 September last year. Decisions were made around that in the lead-up to that process.

I do want to put on the record the fact that there have been those in the community—members opposite—who go out there and scare their communities by saying in their local papers that Service SA centres are going to shut. They are not going to shut. What we have seen consistently is a group of people who are willing to scare communities who are in no way impacted to simply grab a headline. It is disgusting and disingenuous.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What we did in the lead-up to the budget was be honest with people. We didn't try to hide what were tough decisions in that budget. We took to the election a commitment to deliver balanced budgets. That comes with it responsibility. That comes with it the fact that we need to make some tough decisions.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Notwithstanding the fact that \$12 million as a savings task that Service SA had actually relates to decisions that were taken before we came to government.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Industry is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Notwithstanding the fact that \$12 million worth of those cuts—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —came from the former government's savings task, we have taken the tough decision that we need to make these changes. But can I say this, and I have to repeat this over and over again to counter the scaremongering from those opposite: these centres will not close.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright can leave for half an hour under 137A. Thank you.

The honourable member for Wright having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: These centres will not close until we have—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay and leader!

Mr Malinauskas: They're closed.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The Leader of the Opposition says the centres are closed.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That's news to me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Primary Industries is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think it's also news to the people who are probably lining up inside them right now. But here is the other point I want to make to the house: it is not like the current service that is provided by Service SA, a service that was provided in the way that the Labor Party put it together, is a great service. It is not like it was a great service. As we roll out our strategy over the coming weeks and months, what South Australians will come to realise is that there is actually a better way of doing these things.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There is a way to bring the Service SA transactions into the 21st century and to actually be able to provide better ways for people to be able to transact. I know it is difficult for those opposite, who have only ever run union offices as opposed to having run small business, that there is such a thing called a customer service culture. I think that—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Torrens is called to order.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —what we will see as our strategy is rolled out is that South Australians will come to realise that there is a better way to be able to do what needs to be done. Those opposite are going to look pretty foolish trying to drag us back to the 20th century.

SERVICE SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:04): Supplementary: has any work been done—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Florey has the call.

Ms BEDFORD: My question is again to the Minister for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. Has any work been done on privatising or outsourcing the motor registration function?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:04): I think you would actually have to ask the former treasurer that question because, as we know, there was a secret \$80 million payment as part of the sale of the Lands Titles Office that forces us to look at the privatisation of the motor registry. It forces us to have a look at that. In fact, if we don't do that we have to pay 80 million bucks back to the people who bought the Lands Titles Office.

So, yes, we are. I think you should have asked the member for West Torrens, when he was the treasurer, about why he did it and kept it secret from South Australians. What we are doing is our level best to protect taxpayers' money, who are potentially on the hook for 80 million bucks because of a disgusting decision taken by the former treasurer.

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite.

TENNIS

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:05): Thank you very much, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr DULUK: It's your clock we are winding down. My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government's investment in tennis will grow grassroots participation across the state?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:06): I thank the member for Waite for the question. It's good to be delivering for South Australia. Those on the other side wouldn't understand, but it's very good to be delivering for the people of South Australia, and the member for Waite knows how important sport is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —at a grassroots level, right through to an elite level.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is back!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The Blackwood Tennis Club and the Netherby Tennis Club are in his electorate, and I hear from people who attend that club that they think the member for Waite is just ace. They think he is just ace. The Marshall government supports sport.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We support participation at the grassroots level, and that's also why we have actually increased the sports vouchers to \$100 from \$50. We know how important it is for junior athletes, young people, to get involved in sport in their community clubs, to play and be healthy, and we are very keen to implement that. We are keen to grow the number of young people, too, who take up these vouchers. That's why we have included dance as well, to get young people active and out there in our community.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: On that side, they are talking about no funding. They left no funding for the sports vouchers. We doubled the sports vouchers. Isn't that funny? They cannot add up on that side of the house.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are very proud of our policy, and we will be supporting grassroots sport and making sure young people are playing.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Reynell might not like young people—

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —playing sport. She is interjecting and she may not like people playing grassroots sport, but we support youngsters on this side of the chamber. When we talk about tennis—

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —as the member for Waite did, we want to make sure that there is a pathway for young athletes as well. We want them playing and we want them active but, if you can believe it, South Australia in the City of Adelaide did not have an undercover tennis venue. It hasn't had one for decades. We have been the laughing-stock of all the states. So, as young tennis players have developed, where do they go and train? There is nowhere to train undercover. In the winter months, when it's raining and it's cold, there is nowhere for them to go.

Well, there is now because we are going to put a roof on Memorial Drive. This is a fantastic investment, and it is creating a pathway for our young tennis players, and they have been neglected for a long, long time. This will create jobs, too, in the construction phase and will also give us another precinct on the Riverbank, an entertainment precinct for the Fringe and for many other activities, and I am sure that other sports and other activities will be looking to utilise this event.

The other thing it does is guarantee us an ATP and a WTA tennis tournament right here in South Australia. For more than a decade, the previous government turned its back on tennis here in South Australia. We are bringing back the ATP tournament.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for West Torrens may not like it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —because he ignored it for years, but it is bringing back an ATP tournament. Better than that—and let's see what we hear from the member for Reynell right now—we are bringing a WTA tournament to South Australia with the best women players in the world. We've got the golf this week as well. It's fantastic. We had the Tour Down Under, and the women were outstanding there as well.

We are bringing some of the world's best athletes right here to South Australia. They are talking to Serena Williams and they are talking to Simona Halep, and we want to see them here in our great state. Of course, we know as well that in the Fed Cup yesterday Australia went into the semifinals beating the USA. Ash Barty was outstanding. They are the sorts of athletes we want to get here in South Australia. I just want to point out also a couple of young athletes: Charlotte Kempenaers-Pocz—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —Amber Marshall and Edward Winter, three young athletes who will have this roof on that stadium. They will be able to aspire to be the greatest tennis players they can be. Lleyton Hewitt is absolutely over the moon. This is where he began his career and he knows that, with this development that we are doing, it will give young tennis players a chance to follow in his footsteps and be at the elite level. I will finish with a quote from John Fitzgerald:

This announcement probably is the most impactful announcement I can ever remember for tennis in this state...

He has been around a while and he knows tennis. I hope they are supportive of this on the other side as well. The member for Reynell can tap her glass and wind me up, but she should support tennis in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister. The minister will be seated.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the deputy leader, I welcome to parliament today members of the North East Residents Action Group, who are guests of the member for Florey. Deputy leader.

*Question Time***WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA**

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:10): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Did the minister sign a letter to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission, attaching a submission that stated that the socio-economic criteria already in the plan need not change to deliver the 450 gigalitres?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, let's settle down or some of you will be leaving. The Minister for Environment and Water.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:11): I certainly did provide a response to the royal commission. At that point, we were working through our position on the socio-economic criteria. As I have made very clear, the further we went down this track the more I realised that something needed to change.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Environment will be seated for one moment. The leader can leave for 20 minutes under 137A.

The honourable member for Croydon having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order—

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition will leave for 20 minutes under 137A. I have been more than tolerant today.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —on indulgence, sir: the previous leader of the opposition often was given much more indulgence than the current Leader of the Opposition. I would ask you to reconsider, sir.

The SPEAKER: I have reconsidered and I have not changed my mind. If you pull that again, you will be leaving as well. I have been more than tolerant today. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that information was provided to the royal commission because that was our position at the time. 'But what changed your mind?' they ask. My mind changed because the strategy that was being pushed by the former Labor government was not delivering. It wasn't delivering at all. It is worth reflecting on that 450 gigalitres of additional water and the royal commissioner's view on that situation. From reading those seven or so sentences in his report, it would appear that, in his view, my decision to change tack and to go down that different pathway towards the 450 by working through a robust set of socio-economic criteria somehow prevented the 450 gigalitres of water ever happening, in his view. However, he made that statement very late in his report—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and did not award me any procedural fairness.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: However, from reading those isolated sections of the report you would think that, in his view, at that moment in time, I had caused the 450 to become completely unattainable. However, he had made various other dated—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens and the deputy premier will cease this, whatever it is, opposite the chamber. I am trying to listen to the minister. Thank you.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: He had made several other dated statements much earlier in the piece that the 450 gigitalres, in his view, appeared to be in strife.

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader has a point of order.

Dr CLOSE: As you have given me so many times today, Mr Speaker. Our point of order is debate. This is not germane to the—

The SPEAKER: With all respect to the deputy leader, thank you, I have the point of order. There was so much interjecting there, I will allow the minister some scope, but I will be listening very assiduously. Minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am just wrapping up, but it is important to put on the record that the royal commission's views on the 450 gigitalres and whether they could be obtained or not changed over time. Making the statement that somehow on 14 December the decision that this government took to negotiate with New South Wales and Victoria derailed the 450 is completely inconsistent with his earlier statements in the plan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I'm finished.

The SPEAKER: The minister has completed his answer.

WATER RECOVERY SOCIO-ECONOMIC CRITERIA

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:15): Supplementary: was this same position put forward to the Productivity Commission in their consideration of the plan?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:15): I thank the deputy leader for her question.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: That didn't have the same terms of reference.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, please! I'm trying to listen to the answer.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: A range of advice was also provided to the Productivity Commission—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and I will take that on notice because I am not sure. Because these two bodies of work occurred at separate times, I will have to find out if the same advice was given to the two bodies.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I can hear the member for West Torrens. He is close to the edge again. Member for MacKillop and then the deputy leader.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister advise the house how the Regional Growth Fund is supporting economic development in the South-East?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:16): I thank the member for MacKillop for his very important question. Yes, the state government are delivering for regional South Australia and I can tell you that the 10-year commitment that we put as an election commitment—\$150 million over 10 years—is being delivered. The Regional Growth Fund has been closed. The competitive round has been run and it has been assessed.

I was recently up at Mount Gambier, close to the member for MacKillop's home, and we were able to make a very, very important announcement and that is that we put \$10 million towards the Mount Gambier regional community and recreation hub. I think it's an outstanding achievement. It was a collaborative effort, by both the federal government and the local government, and with the state government's commitment to regional South Australia.

The investment is not only for the South-East and Mount Gambier. It will be a recreation hub for the South-East of the state. It will go towards investing in a \$39 million project. I think it's an outstanding commitment on behalf of the state government, the federal government and, by and large, the council there. I met with the deputy mayor and she is absolutely elated. It has been 30 years that they have been lobbying for this project—30 long years—and we have now delivered for them. We have given them certainty and they can now move forward with it. I know the local member was absolutely delighted to be there with the deputy mayor for the announcement because he, too, has fought long and hard for this project.

What I will say is that this is going to create a vibrancy in the South-East that they have long wanted, particularly with the sale of the forward rotations of the forest. That was a serious blow to their confidence and their economic viability. This is a project that is great for the community and great for confidence within the area. It will allow them to host national sporting events. It will allow them to host conferences and the like down at Mount Gambier.

It is an area that we as a government would like to build as a regional city. We don't have a regional city in South Australia. The regions have been forgotten for such a long time, particularly for the last 16 years. We are going to change the focus and govern for all of South Australia. What I will say is that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: —as part of the Regional Growth Fund, it is also about supporting population growth in the regions. For too long we have seen an exodus out of our regions. They are moving out of the regions because of centralisation—a government's small-minded thinking. People moved to Adelaide for services and to look for jobs.

This is an opportunity now for the regions to grow. It's about an opportunity for the regions to prosper. There are two other Regional Growth Fund commitments, including the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project, which allows Indigenous groups to undertake property management planning for infrastructure and enable land in the north-west to be brought back into production. This is about increasing our herd numbers—our capacity to increase the red meat sector—so that we can grow our exports and create more jobs. It's unlocking potential here in South Australia.

This is as well as the Coolanie Water Scheme project. That is a project that was put forward by the Franklin Harbour area council on Eyre Peninsula. It's a project that will deliver 22 farms with water for their livestock. It's a project that will give them a capacity to again unlock potential here in South Australia. It's about unlocking that potential, particularly for the red meat sector, one of the largest sectors in the state, and the state's economy—\$5.4 billion. It will now have the opportunity to expand and prosper. And remember, hashtag #RegionsMatter.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:20): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Why didn't the minister inform the royal commission that his position on the criteria had changed, given the earlier submission?

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: He didn't get asked.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:20): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the deputy leader for her question. The answer is quite straightforward: I wasn't asked, just like I wasn't afforded procedural fairness in any aspect of the royal commission.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Where are the lawyers? Where's the Attorney-General?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens! The member for West Torrens is talking to himself. The deputy leader has the call. The deputy leader and then the member for Heysen.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:21): Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Before the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting in December last year, was the minister's department aware that the minister was going to agree to those criteria?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:21): Thank you, Mr Speaker, and I thank the deputy leader for her question. In fact, a very significant thing has happened: she has today asked me more questions than she asked me for the whole of 2018—for the whole of 2018! I have to apologise to the Minister for Education for taking all this time.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please do not provoke the opposition.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Please!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —my department was absolutely aware. I worked alongside them, as I have said a number of times during today, both in my contribution this morning and during question time today. I have made it very clear—

Ms Hildyard: What, 'I'm not going to stand up for South Australia; what do you think?'

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —that I had two pathways presented to me, and I worked through those with advisers within my department. Those pathways are a pathway to water and a pathway to no water, a pathway that delivers water, or a pathway to games, gimmicks and grandstanding, which is what we had for many years leading up to the change of government. Did that deliver for South Australia? Did that deliver for Riverland communities? Did that deliver for the Coorong, the Lower Lakes and the Murray basin within our state? No, it didn't. It delivered one-quarter of 1 per cent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —of the 450 gigalitres of vital water that is required for the health of that river. We now have a pathway, and the opposition can make a lot of noise, and they can get their T-shirts and their hats, and their tweets, etc., but at the end of the day, we now have this clear pathway with New South Wales and Victoria back at the table, with real water being planned today. While the opposition make a lot of noise—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Mr Speaker, while the opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —make a huge amount of noise, there are farmers in New South Wales and Victoria—

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

The SPEAKER: Minister for Education!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —who are planning to deliver water—real water. There is now real water—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated for one moment. The member for Reynell can depart for half an hour under 137A, as can the member for Hammond.

Mr Pederick: Seriously?

The SPEAKER: Yes, you. Half an hour, thank you. I'm trying to listen to the Minister for Environment and Water.

The honourable members for Reynell and Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, Mr Speaker, for your protection. We have a pathway towards real water: previously, we didn't. The River Murray and Murray-Darling Basin agreement are incredibly complex, but in some ways it's very, very simple: there's a pathway to water and a pathway that doesn't lead to water. Those opposite don't want water; they want games and gimmicks and grandstanding. We want water, which will sustain Riverland communities—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —sustain tourism and sustain our precious natural environment in the Coorong and the Lower Lakes. It is a straightforward argument, and we are about practical outcomes and delivering for South Australia.

SKILLING SOUTH AUSTRALIA

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:24): My question is to the Minister for Industry and Skills. Can the minister update the house on new projects being delivered under Skilling South Australia?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills) (15:24): Thank you for the question, and I know that the member for Heysen is very interested in young people here in South Australia and the opportunities that they have under a new skilling regime here in South Australia. Under Skilling South Australia, the state government is delivering new training and employment opportunities. The Department for Industry and Skills is agile.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: What about the skill of delivering a speech without reading it?

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We respond to industry needs, developing with industry and business custom projects. Thirty-three projects developed with businesses have been approved already.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: Run your finger under the word as you move onto the next one.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, please!

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Sixty-four businesses are currently being co-designed at this stage. Let's put that into perspective. We are working with businesses. They are coming to us with requests.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: They are identifying what are the obstacles for them in taking on trainees and apprentices. We are working with them to remove those obstacles and make sure that we are tailoring the funding we are delivering in Skilling South Australia for those businesses so they can get on and deliver for South Australians. \$8.5 million has been approved for project and quota activity: the Motor Trade Association automotive apprenticeship pathway.

The Aboriginal apprenticeship initiative—and I know this is something that the Premier is very interested in—is run by the department at a value of \$848,000. Civil Train, a pre-apprenticeship program with 61 places for the Monarto Zoo project, \$513,000, and primarily for Aboriginal jobseekers. The package includes mentoring, workplace support and employer networking. These are all key elements that help deliver successful training outcomes. Zancott Recruitment—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Salisbury Heights.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —Indigenous defence industry and manufacturing training for apprentices, 68 places to support apprenticeships in the defence and manufacturing sectors. There is exposure to a range of apprenticeship-related areas, including engineering, mechanical, fabrication in the welding sector, computer-aided design, IT and cybersecurity. The project includes structured industry rationale work placements, business buddies, aligned mentoring support and employer networks. Again, that is very important for these projects to work.

Workskil Australia—25 current and new workers commenced traineeships in youth work, disability, community services, leadership and management, and IT. The support—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison: This is after you cut all the job supports.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member for Ramsay interjects 'cuts'. The RoGS report shows that in their last year of office they cut \$11.8 million from training—\$11.8 million they cut from training. Crocodile tears from the Labor Party. We put \$203 million, with the federal government, into training—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —here in South Australia. There was a 66 per cent drop in training and apprentice outcomes here in South Australia under Labor over the last six years. We have arrested the decline and we are building the workforce here in South Australia, and it's needed. It's needed for the defence contracts—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —that are coming our way, that are starting to roll out as we speak. We heard the Premier in Canberra, there for the signing for the \$50 billion of spending with Naval Group. It's a very exciting time for South Australia. It's our job as a government to make sure that we are more than just an assembly plant. We want to have the highest skilled people in the country here in South Australia so companies come to South Australia and build their businesses here in South Australia so we can value add to the opportunities that the federal government have delivered here in South Australia.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You can walk out on parliament, but you can't walk out on a royal commission.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I have already kicked him out once today. I hope this changes for the rest of the day, honestly; it's not a good look. The member for Lee.

Grievance Debate

MINISTER FOR ENVIRONMENT AND WATER

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:29): It has been many years since there has been such a damning finding into the conduct of a member of executive government as we have had in the last two weeks from the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission Report. You would have to cast your mind back to the Clayton report into the Motorola affair and its findings against former premier John Olsen, findings that led to his resignation. The commissioner's remarks about the minister's decision in December last year raise several questions about the competence and the priorities of this Liberal government.

We are enjoying getting to the heart of these issues in this place. We do so despite the government today cooking up a bogus motion, remarkably calling for bipartisanship. We do this despite their failing to notify us about this or even honour pair agreements this morning. What is also extraordinary is the cavalier and arrogant behaviour of the Minister for Environment and Water, the member for Black. It is extraordinary because it seems that he made the decision that the interests of upstream communities in New South Wales and Victoria are to be served above the interests of South Australian communities. He went off to a ministers' meeting and was comprehensively outplayed by his interstate colleagues.

Is there any acceptance or recognition that he got this one wrong? Of course not. Instead, he and his Premier have launched a scathing and repeated attack on the royal commission and the royal commissioner. Let me quote the member for Black, who only earlier this morning said:

The royal commission should also be subject to critique and to challenge. Where comments are made within a vacuum, they should be given context; where ideology trumps pragmatic leadership, this should be called out; and where procedural fairness is denied, a defence should and will be provided.

This behaviour of attacking a royal commission is extraordinary, but it is not unexpected from the member for Black. You see, Mr Speaker, the member for Black has form in this regard. He has long made it clear to this place that he sees himself as the smartest guy in the room. His performance last December in the council meeting where he sold out our state is further evidence that he believes he is beyond the advice of his agency and he is beyond the advice of those with a deep understanding of the Murray-Darling Basin. He and he alone, according to the member for Black, knows the right decision to be made.

The minister has always decried those who are charged with advising ministers. He has long been a critic in this place of the public sector, of public sector executives and of public sector leadership. He made it clear in his contributions in 2014, in 2015, in 2016 and in 2017. He has even been a longstanding critic of those employed by ministers to advise them. Remember this contribution:

Usually underqualified and overly confident, largely aged [between] 25 [and] 35, characterised by having the log-in details of multiple fake Twitter accounts stored in the notes sections of their iPhones. They read InDaily, drink at small bars, enjoy fatty and sugary foods and [they] have the physical characteristics associated with enjoying fatty and sugary foods. They often interbreed, leading to a reduced gene pool, and are loved only by their mothers.

I do not think that is fair on ministerial advisers. Many of them are excellent on both sides of politics. By the member's own standards, I think instead what we have there is an uncannily accurate description of several of the participants in the current Premier's office. The member for Black cannot stand ministerial advisers, in addition to senior public servants and executives and public sector leadership.

We also remember his office demanding a proscription list of former ministerial advisers from his department, an act unparalleled in the canon of Western political experience since the days of Caesar Augustus. What was his justification? He said instead, 'I love ministerial advisers. I actually want to employ more of them.' Rubbish. This is a vexatious minister who thinks he knows best. It is lucky for those former ministerial advisers, too, given the payment that needed to be made to his former electorate office staff. It has not been a good start to his career.

This is the disdain that the minister brings to contemplating advice provided to him, so is it really surprising that we have a junior minister who sets off to a ministerial council meeting and then takes his own counsel to sell our state up the river? The commissioner's comments on this are clear:

It is so contrary to the interests of South Australians that the decision by the Minister responsible is almost certainly a breach of at least cl 2.5 of the South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct.

Is there any justification from him? The only one we have heard to date is that he wanted to restore shattered relationships. The commissioner describes it as:

...a capitulation to the interests of the current commonwealth government and those of Victoria and New South Wales.

The behaviour cannot be justified. It is outrageous, and he will stand accountable for it.

AUSTRALIA DAY

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:34): I would like to talk about Australia Day. I rise to talk about the contribution of those residents in my electorate who made Australia Day such a wonderful celebration. This year, I had the honour to celebrate Australia Day at the beautiful grounds of Carrick Hill. Guests enjoyed a Welcome to Country by chairman of the Blackwood Reconciliation Group, Mr Allen Edwards. There was live music by local South Australian talent Camryn Jordans and also the wonderful sounds of the Mitcham City Brass band. As always, the Rotary clubs of Brownhill Creek and Mitcham prepared a wonderful breakfast.

This year, 85 people from 20 different countries living in the City of Mitcham became Australian citizens during the citizenship ceremony. I say this at every citizenship ceremony, but the smile and the look on the faces of those 85 people who were becoming new Australians on Australia Day was truly a beautiful thing.

The Mitcham Australia Day Citizen of the Year award was presented to Mr Ian Steel OAM, who has made an outstanding contribution to our community. Mr Steel is the CEO of KickStart for Kids, which he founded in the belief that 'every child, regardless of their social or economic background, should have an equal chance to succeed'. KickStart for Kids facilitates this belief by running breakfast and lunch programs, mentoring programs and providing clothing and healthcare support in South Australian schools as well as the latest venture of Camp KickStart.

In my electorate of Waite, four of my constituents received the highest honour that can be bestowed on any Australian, that is, to receive and have conferred on them an Australia Day award honour. They were Geoffrey Thomas OAM, David Gray AM, Ian Wall AM and Dr Robert Wight OAM. I would also like to make a special mention of someone who many of us in this chamber would know, and that is Stan Evans OAM, who received an OAM for his services to parliament and his work in the community.

Receiving this award is a wonderful acknowledgement of what these people do for our communities. Geoffrey Thomas has worked with the South Australian Grain Industry Trust, the Institute of Agricultural Science and the South Australian department of agriculture for many years. He is truly a champion of all things in that space. Tommo, as many know him in our community, is currently the chair of the Motor Neurone Disease Association of South Australia. MND is a terrible disease which, sadly, took his late wife, Mary, not long ago. To Tommo for his great work in that community, thank you very much.

David Gray has given significant service to veterans and their families through Legacy Australia and the Department of Veterans' Affairs. Ian Wall is a generous benefactor of the Burnside Hospital, the Adelaide Symphony Orchestra, Novita Children's Services, the Carrick Hill Trust and the National Trust of South Australia, amongst many other organisations. He is truly a well-deserved recipient of the AM in this year's Australia Day awards. Dr Robert Wight has been involved with the Australian Medical Association, Baptist Care South Australia and Metropolitan Domiciliary Care for so many years. Congratulations to him.

In the time that I have left, I would like to touch on the debate we are having around Australia Day at the moment. Every year, there seem to be more and more calls for the date of Australia Day to be changed. For some parts of the community, I can see why this argument is held. We live in such a diverse and wonderful country. For me and, I think, for so many Australians, it truly is a day

when we can all come together, a day when we can recognise our past—and not all our past has been beautiful. I think that it is also important for us to recognise and continue to discuss, debate and acknowledge the past sins of our nation.

It is also a wonderful opportunity to get together on Australia Day and celebrate so much that is good and the wonderful Australians in our community, the everyday Australians who go about making a fantastic contribution. I think that is the most important thing we have to celebrate on Australia Day. Aboriginal elder Robert Issacs recently said, and I quote:

It [Australia Day] brings the community together, it brings the Australian people together and it celebrates the good this country has provided for everyone.

As we celebrate and go on in the year 2019, it is always important to celebrate what is so good in our country. Once again, I would like to congratulate those local champions in my community who have made Waite and the Mitcham council area such a wonderful place to live.

ENVIRONMENT AND WATER DEPARTMENT

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:39): I rise on grievance today because I am appalled at the treatment of public servants in the Department for Environment and Water by their minister. I was one such public servant, and in fact the minister was a public servant in another department and ought to know better. As we have noted already, thanks to the member for Lee, the minister has form in mocking public servants from within this place and when in opposition. He caused consternation in the department when his staff asked for a list of people who had previously worked as public servants for a Labor minister, and he is slashing the budget of the department.

He has openly disagreed with his chief executive on radio when challenged on the email that was sent out to all staff rebadging the department as being primarily an economic development agency. I quote from 891 and David Bevan:

So Mr Schutz got that wrong?

The minister:

I don't want to criticise that...on public radio but absolutely.

Really? Did the minister really not have a conversation with the chief executive that led that chief executive to make that statement? We will see. The truth has a way of coming out. But, most disturbingly, the minister has implied on public radio that the decision in December he made to comply with the Eastern States over their socio-economic criteria—the decision that has been so devastatingly criticised by the royal commission—was supported by those experts who had previously advised that they were not supportive of those criteria, yet magically in December the department, according to the minister on radio, changed its mind. Again, I am quoting David Bevan:

No, no, no; it's a straightforward question—did your department change its advice?

Minister:

Absolutely; well, I'm not sure they ever told us not to do that, I can't recall that, but they certainly said...this is okay, we can work with this. My department absolutely endorsed us negotiating on—

and I will correct his grammar—

[those] criteria.

Naturally, the question from David Bevan was:

But what made them change their mind between December and the previous June?

That is when we had the submission that the minister signed off on. The answer was:

I've got no idea.

So here we have the minister seemingly unaware of the department's advice that it was to not change the criteria, despite signing the cover letter, and unaware then of any reason they would have changed that advice, but he is certain that they endorsed his negotiations. Well, again, we will see.

The other place will soon consider a select committee looking into exactly what was decided and on what advice. If that select committee is formed, the public servants who the minister has said endorsed the criteria in December will have the chance to speak. All we have on record from the department is the following statement made last week in writing to ABC Riverland radio. This has come from the department:

It has always been the role of the public service to provide expert advice and support to ministers in their role as decision maker. Officers from the Department for Environment and Water worked closely with minister Speirs during the MDB Ministerial Council in December 2018.

That is hardly a statement of endorsement of those socio-economic criteria to which the commissioner objected so strongly and on the advice of experts. What we know is that water experts outside the department who are free to speak, including the former commonwealth environment water holder David Papps, who is now in the Wentworth Group of Concerned Scientists, were very clear that any change to the existing legal framework for the efficiency measures to deliver our water would ensure that that water never came.

I will be surprised if water experts in the department hold any different kind of view, but at present the only person allowed to speak is the minister. I look forward to having the advice and the testimony from the experts in the department about what this minister has done, because what he said is that it was impossible to get water out of those other states under the broad criteria that only required the irrigators to be involved. He is saying that, by making those criteria more complex and more onerous, we will get that water.

That is magical thinking. That is the kind of thinking that a partisan politician trying to please Canberra might come up with, but I cannot believe that a decent water expert in the department would come up with it, and I look forward to hearing from the select committee should it get up in the other place.

KING ELECTORATE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (15:44): I rise today to take the opportunity to thank my local constituents whom I have met and had conversations with while doorknocking so far this year. Listening to my local residents' views and delivering for them on the issues they raise is really important to me.

During the lead-up to the 2018 state election, I knocked on doors in every street in King and had a wideranging series of conversations with local residents and businesses about their local issues and priorities. I have continued to doorknock since my election and am always excited when I knock on a door and see a familiar face. I am equally excited when somebody opens the door and it is someone I have not had the chance to talk to yet.

I felt honoured on Sunday when one resident was excited to see me again and had been waiting for me to get to her door because she had seen my signs were out. She is passionate about education and children's futures, and I am so grateful for the time she gave me to share with me her experience, professional experience and insight about options for achieving better educational outcomes.

When I meet with my constituents, I ask how my community members are feeling about how the state government is travelling so far, and I ask them again what are their most important local and state priorities. Cost of living, high council rates, and healthcare concerns continue to be priorities raised. It is terrific to be able to update residents on the positive progress our government is making to deliver our promised investments, especially at Lyell McEwin Hospital and Modbury Hospital, and discuss the real changes coming soon to energy prices.

In addition, on council rates, I am providing information about the local government review that the Minister for Local Government is conducting, which has a heavy focus on lower costs and enhanced financial accountability as well as efficient and transparent local government. I will certainly be advocating strongly for our local councils to reduce debt and to deliver the lowest possible rates moving forward.

Hillbank is a unique area. It is one of the quietest locations in King and the households are becoming very multicultural. On Sunday, one Bhutanese family had a big celebration at their house

with a very grand, colourful display set up in their driveway to welcome guests. I commend the Bhutanese community for continuing to recognise their traditional new year in February and for gathering their family and friends together. I wish everyone in this community good health, happiness and good luck for the year ahead.

I am being told that better public transport services is also a pressing issue for the Hillbank community, and I am passing on these specific concerns and ideas to our transport minister. In addition, I am hosting a community forum with the Minister for Transport in King on 21 February at the Village Tavern to provide King residents an opportunity to voice their concerns in person with the minister so that our community can hear directly from our government about plans to improve roads, safety and our public transport system.

During my most recent doorknocking, I had an important conversation with a local resident who outlined just how important public transport is for the migrant community living in the area and seeking local employment. Creating jobs in South Australia is crucial for our state's future. Providing a transport system which makes these jobs accessible is another high priority of this government.

The Marshall government is also committed to providing a public transport system that will benefit as many people as possible. The response to the North East Public Transport Study has been sensational. The community consultation process, which sought feedback online, face to-face in shopping centres, in writing and over the phone was excellent and gave many of my constituents a real opportunity to tell the government exactly what their needs are now and moving forward.

My community tell me they want to be involved in the process of creating better services, and they want to have a real say in how their taxes are spent. That is why I am doorknocking, holding weekly coffee catch-ups and shopping centre listening posts, and hosting community forums with ministers. I will never be one of those politicians who only knock on doors six weeks before an election. I am here to serve the community. I want to thank all the Hillbank residents whom I have spoken to this year, and I look forward to knocking on more doors on the weekend.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN ROYAL COMMISSION

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:49): The health of the River Murray is of great importance to all South Australians. Judging by recent actions, however, that is all South Australians minus the Minister for Environment and Water, the Premier and his cabinet.

In 2017, the Weatherill Labor government established the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission. We did so because the community had lost faith in the federal Liberal-National government, the Eastern States and the Murray Darling Basin Authority to protect the Murray. We have seen the *Four Corners* episode that detailed case after case of upstream irrigators stealing water from the river system: water that was meant for environmental flows to ensure that world heritage sites such as the Coorong are protected for generations to come; and water that would ensure communities like Goolwa, Murray Bridge and other river towns could continue to thrive.

We always knew that the Eastern States would not stand up for South Australia and the Murray, but what nobody at the time ever expected was that the biggest traitor of our interests would be the new Liberal South Australian government. Led by the Minister for Environment and Water, this government has completely capitulated to the Eastern States. Here is what the independent commissioner, a New South Welshman no less, said:

The South Australian Government's agreement to changes to the socio-economic criteria for efficiency measures should not merely be described as ill-advised. It is nothing short of a capitulation to the interests of the current Commonwealth Government, and those of Victoria and New South Wales. It is so contrary to the interests of South Australians that the decision by the Minister responsible is almost certainly a breach of at least cl 2.5 of the South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct in that no Minister acting reasonably could consider these changes to the criteria to be anything but totally antipathetic to the interests of South Australians, and the South Australian environment.

I ask the minister charged with protecting our water supply: was this a point of weakness, was this being gutless in standing up to the Eastern States, was he poorly advised, or was this just plain stupid? To be a member of parliament is a privilege—to be a minister, even more so—but it is also a duty. The Minister for Environment and Water has so utterly failed in his duty to our state that he needs to do the only honourable thing that is left, and that is to resign.

A day does not go by without somebody in my electorate of Hurtle Vale talking to me about the Murray-Darling. It is disturbing. Almost every single person says the same thing: that we need to keep fighting for the Murray. Only the other day, I was at a function where there was a number of Liberal-voting (well, no more) Barossa Valley residents in the member for Schubert's electorate who were horrified about this current mess, horrified about the capitulation of the minister, and they will be acting in the lead-up to the next election against their Liberal Party.

How is it that the entire community understands this but not the Minister for the Environment? How is the minister disciplined? Well, the Premier stands up and says that he has the full support of cabinet: the full support of cabinet to capitulate to the Eastern States; the full support of cabinet to sell out South Australia; and the full support of cabinet to act, and I quote:

...so contrary to the interests of South Australians that the decision by the Minister responsible is almost certainly a breach of at least cl 2.5 of the South Australian Ministerial Code of Conduct...

Does the minister even understand the plan? The decision to allow the Eastern States to replace the original schedule 5 criteria that allowed willing sellers to sell their water back to the commonwealth is stupid policy designed entirely by the National Party in New South Wales to screw South Australia and the entire Murray-Darling Basin. It is not just the Murray that this minister does not understand. This same minister sacked 110 staff in the 2018 budget. He could not stand up for South Australia on the Murray and he could not stand up to his own Liberal Treasurer to protect the staff in his own department.

The whole public spat with his chief executive has been played out in public. We have listened to him on radio. We have listened to him change his mind and, as our deputy leader talked about, we have listened to the conversation he had on ABC 891. We have listened to him backtrack when asked about his chief executive's edict that the department is transitioning to an economic development agency. Well, minister, as you said yourself, they have got it wrong. You need to stand up to the environment first.

HEALTH AND HOSPITAL CARE

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:54): Since coming into government, the Marshall Liberal government has been cleaning up disasters left for us and the people of South Australia by the former Labor government, and there is almost no greater example of where the new government is cleaning up Labor's mess than in Health.

In fact, just yesterday we heard from administrators tasked with fixing the mess describe the Central Adelaide Local Health Network as the most broken organisation they had ever witnessed, both financially and culturally. This is an organisation haemorrhaging \$300 million in the last financial year and operating at almost 30 per cent above the national efficient price. Think about what \$300 million could do for Health, what it could do for our schools and what it could do for our transport networks instead of being wasted by poor financial management and through a very poor culture. This is indeed a disgraceful legacy left to us and the people of South Australia by those opposite.

Of course, in the north-east and the nearby Adelaide Hills region, the new government is fixing up Labor's mess at Modbury Hospital. It was certainly very exciting to be at the unveiling of the designs for the \$96 million redevelopment of Modbury Hospital with the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, my friend and colleague the member for King and, of course, the member for Florey.

The community have made their assessment of the Transforming Health cuts of the previous Labor government abundantly clear: white-hot anger at downgrading and ripping out services from Modbury Hospital and also a great sense of betrayal, as so many residents have made the point to me that they chose to live in the area because they believed they would be living near a hospital that would provide the services they need if they are in trouble.

The Marshall Liberal team went to the election committed to reversing Labor's cuts and restoring key services to Modbury Hospital and now that is precisely what the new government is doing. The \$96 million upgrade includes a new purpose-built palliative care ward. Palliative care will be brought down from the fourth floor to the ground floor, where it will have dedicated external access, a private garden area and 20 individual rooms with ensuites. This is an already wonderful

service. In fact, I have never heard a bad word said about the service. It is full of caring and very committed staff who will now be backed up by a modern, purpose-built facility.

There is also a new short-stay general medical unit, a 26-bed unit for patients who need longer than 24 hours but less than 72 hours, reducing the number of transfers to Lyell McEwin Hospital; an extended emergency care unit with eight additional beds created for patients who do not require admission but who can be assessed and treated for up to 24 hours; and an expanded surgical unit, a total redevelopment of the surgical floor. The expansion will include four theatres, a purpose-built surgical suite and additional procedure rooms, dramatically increasing capacity. This will mean that more people will be able to have their surgery and recovery closer to home.

This also includes space for a four-bed high dependency unit. A working group charged with developing the model of care for this high dependency unit has already begun its important work that will ultimately enable the greater complexity and range of procedures to be performed at Modbury Hospital. The upgrade will also include the relocation of the outpatients department to allow more streamline access in a more efficient location, and also external infrastructure work on the facade to modernise and, in fact, stop bits falling off from the outside and ultimately make it safer. All this work will start this month.

Modbury Hospital is a community hospital that is very much loved by our community. Where the previous government cut services from Modbury Hospital, we are bringing services back. The Marshall Liberal government is undoing the damage done under Labor's Transforming Health cuts and ensuring that our local community in the north-east has access to the health services that we need and deserve.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:58): By leave, I move:

That Mr Brown be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. J.R. Rau SC (resigned).

Motion carried.

STANDING ORDERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:59): By leave, I move:

That Mr Picton be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. J.R. Rau SC (resigned).

Motion carried.

STATUTORY OFFICERS COMMITTEE

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:59): By leave, I move:

That Mr A. Koutsantonis be appointed to the committee in place of the Hon. J.R. Rau SC (resigned).

Motion carried.

Motions

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Adjourned debate on motion of Hon. S.S. Marshall (resumed on motion).

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:59): I rise today in support of the motion that this house supports the Premier's investigation into the royal commission. The importance of the River Murray to South Australia has been well documented. It is one of Australia's most valuable environmental resources and sustains our productivity and all South Australians who rely on it. In the context of South Australia, it sustains a great many wetlands and their associated biota and a significant range of horticulture and viticultural businesses, from the border to the barrages, as well as a thriving tourism industry based on ecotourism and recreation.

The River Murray, of course, is linked to the Ramsar-listed Coorong, a significant environmental asset for my electorate of MacKillop, important internationally for migratory birds and locally for tourism, fishing and its significant cultural and heritage values. The health of the river and its wetland has been a high priority for South Australia since Federation. The priority of the Marshall Liberal government is to secure the environmental sustainability of the river for today and for future generations. This priority is not one we will walk away from.

The strong action of our government will deliver for the river and the people of South Australia. Maintaining this priority for our government means making sure that we continue our role in ensuring the Murray-Darling Basin Plan is implemented to ensure the delivery of critical human water needs, the ongoing sustainability of water-dependent industries and the communities that depend on them, improved cultural and social outcomes and a sustainable ecological future for the river, its flood plains and reliant ecosystems.

Environmental water: the delivery of the 450 gigalitres is critically important to South Australia for improving the environmental health of the Coorong, Lower Lakes and River Murray flood plain. This water will help maintain water levels in the Lower Lakes at the right levels, flush salt through the Murray Mouth and increase the frequency and volume of water released from the barrages. This will in turn help keep the Murray Mouth open for longer and improve water quality in the northern lagoon for the Coorong.

In the worst drought years, we saw how water levels dropped to dangerously low levels in the Lower Lakes. This put at risk the environment and water supply for our communities. There are other significant benefits to South Australia in dry conditions, when the environment is put under greater pressure. The additional 450 gigalitres of water will help avoid low water levels, acidification and riverbank collapse along the river, Lower Lakes and Coorong. These are just a few of the reasons that making sure the environmental water requirements of South Australia are being met is so important.

Mismanagement of the plan: the members of the government who have spoken before me have spoken and well covered the context and agreed flow requirements under the basin plan, so I will not repeat this context. Under Labor, we know that the 450 gigalitres was never going to be delivered, and that is why our government has needed to show strong leadership on the management of the River Murray. Our government stands by the delivery of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and is taking steps to make sure that we move forward with the other states to ensure its delivery.

A key step to this end has been taken by our Premier, who has written to the Prime Minister to bring together the COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers to consider the royal commission report and the Productivity Commission's 'Murray-Darling Basin Plan: five-year assessment'. The royal commission's report provides key directions on which collaborative approach needs to be taken across the basin states, including the need for increased transparency. This is an area that needs greater attention to restore faith between basin state partners and the communities of the basin. It is an indictment of the way the basin plan has been managed that it took a *Four Corners* investigation to throw light on the theft of water by individuals in upstream states.

In South Australia, our record on water accounting and transparency is clear: we have a water accounting system that has operated for a long period and we ensure we hold our water users to account. South Australia was the first state to cap the volume of water on licences for irrigation in the 1960s and is well known for its leadership on improvements to irrigation efficiency.

Other areas of recommendation have included the need for a new determination of the environmentally sustainable level of take and the modification of the sustainable diversion limit adjustment mechanisms and the need to redo the Northern Basin Review. Other key themes include the need for better recognition of Aboriginal people, the need to factor climate change and its extreme variability into the plan, the recovery of the remaining water through buybacks from the market, and using compulsory acquisition to address constraints to the delivery of environmental water.

I look forward to our government's response to the report, which I understand will be a well-considered assessment that will provide a basis for pursuing discussion with the federal government and other basin states. The remarks from the commission, relating to the role our environment minister took in the recent negotiation of additional socio-economic criteria for the

assessment of efficiency measures projects, are unfounded. The minister has been in this position for only 10 months, and it is a long stretch to place on his shoulders the accusation that he has not advocated in the state's best interests.

The minister has taken a mature and responsible approach to the basin plan negotiations and acted in the best interests of our state to ensure the delivery of the 450 gigalitres. Again, this is something that the other side could not manage to deliver. The minister has moved us collectively past the statement that was holding back the full implementation of the plan. While Labor made a lot of noise about the basin plan, the minister of the time (Hon. Ian Hunter) succeeded only at times to act like a bull in a china shop. He was unable to broker an agreement to ensure the delivery of 450 gigalitres, hence why we are talking as we are today.

Rather notably and unfortunately, he delivered a rambunctious dummy spit, presumably about his frustration at his own ineffectiveness. We only saw whingeing, no real outcomes, government spin and fake fights. There were no outcomes, and there was no pathway or practical approach to implement these flows. There were no projects from upstream states on the table because of Labor's noisy, ineffective overtures. This positioned the full implementation of the basin plan at risk as its implementation slowed to a crawl.

We know that the achievement of the final 450 gigalitres of environmental flows under the basin plan requires the full participation of New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT. We can also move forward now understanding that the December agreement brokered by our minister broke the deadlock, when South Australia, Victoria and New South Wales finally agreed to participate in the full range of water-saving projects, which could deliver the 450 gigalitres.

This included New South Wales and Victoria agreeing to fully participate in the commonwealth's water infrastructure program, and investment by the commonwealth in specific initiatives in each jurisdiction to help accelerate the return of the final 450 gigalitres. This will facilitate the delivery of water to South Australia.

Notably, it also enabled South Australia to secure the \$70 million investment for the Coorong and the acknowledgement by all basin ministers of the importance of the Coorong to the overall health of the basin. This project will focus on restoring the Coorong's health and vitality and visitor experiences that can be had by visitors to the Coorong. The natural beauty, abundant wildlife and unspoilt coastline make it one of South Australia's greatest treasures.

Key to this project will be initiatives to preserve the ecological diversity of the Coorong. These initiatives would not have been possible without the foresight and negotiation of our minister. These are steps that provide optimism and commitment that the basin states are moving forward with the implementation of the basin plan. It is interesting that the other side is seeking to make distance on the negotiations initiated by our minister. The *Collins Dictionary* defines 'Negotiations' as:

...formal discussions between people who have different aims or intentions, especially in business or politics, during which they try to reach an agreement.

Agreement requires compromise. The basin plan negotiations under Labor were a political compromise. In opposition, we supported the political compromises that the Labor government made on their assurance that what was agreed to was the best political deal for South Australia.

Without negotiation, we know that we would not have had the 450 gigalitres on the table and enshrined in the basin plan. It is galling to hear the criticism of the minister from the other side for showing the leadership to negotiate and compromise to find a way forward to ensure the delivery of the 450 gigalitres and the survival of the basin plan. The timing is right, now, for us, given the break in the stalemate, to move forward as a state to ensure the delivery and accountability by all states for basin plan delivery. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:10): I rise to speak on the motion and am very pleased to support the same. First, I will address the Productivity Commission report, which was prepared in late January. It was a report considering the halfway point of a 12-year implementation program of the basin plan, which is required under the legislation. It provided 29 findings on the progress of the plan to date and 37 recommendations.

Interestingly, they did record that around 2,000 gigalitres of water had been recovered for the environment as part of their findings within the plan, that is, 20 per cent of the water available for consumptive users than a decade previously. That was heartening to read. They also made recommendations about the Murray-Darling Basin Authority, which was the new entity established under this whole new model of management since the passage of the Water Act back in 2007. In doing so, they suggested that it should split up its implementing and enforcement powers and operations in relation to the authority's work. That is a matter that obviously can be considered.

The Productivity Commission also made it clear that the basin states themselves, notwithstanding this new structure that had been established, must take responsibility for implementing the \$13 billion plan rather than just the Murray-Darling Basin Authority. I think that was an important signal—it certainly was to me and I would hope other members of the house—of the significance of ensuring that all the parties to this agreement, that is, the member states and the commonwealth, stay at the table and ensure that they monitor and manage the responsibility of making sure this whole plan works.

We must remember that this plan was established under the premise that, instead of just having states make the decisions about the process, there be 13 valleys established across the whole region, that there be an authority put in place to supervise that and able to report where there were breaches of the obligations contrary to each of the plans within each valley. Largely, the Productivity Commission is encouraging in the sense of progress and has provided some useful recommendations.

A few days later, another report was published by Mr Bret Walker on 29 January 2019 pursuant to his commission of investigation into the Murray-Darling Basin and, in particular, pursuant to the commission of our Governor back in January 2018. It was instigated to essentially investigate the operation and effectiveness of the plan arrangements. It was established in the wake of there being allegations of illegal water take in the upstream, in particular in New South Wales.

The former government's decision to action this matter was to initiate a royal commission. It was not uncommon in the history of that government to have royal commissions into matters when they thought things were going wrong. Notwithstanding the instruction and the terms of reference that were presented to Mr Walker, he determined that he would not actually be investigating the alleged larceny. He made it quite clear there were other authorities to do that so, notwithstanding his instruction, he published material to confirm that he would not be doing that.

On that matter, notwithstanding that this appeared to be an impetus upon which there would be some inquiry and that he declined to exercise sections of his instruction in that regard, I did write to him on 18 January. I said as follows:

To a more important matter, you have previously indicated that although you would receive any submissions in respect of illegal take of water, the Commission would not be interfering with any police investigation or State based prosecution. Given that you have now finalised your inquiry, I would appreciate your advice as to whether or not you have referred any matters to investigative or prosecutorial agencies; and, if so, whether there is any action the Government should be taking.

His response on that matter was:

I advise that allegations were received on a few occasions during the public submissions phase of the Commission's work. All of them had also been made known to State law enforcement authorities and no further action is therefore required in relation to them.

I am pleased to report to the parliament that at least that has occurred. I am advised, and I think this is as accurate as I can record, as I have made some inquiry on it, that five irrigators have been charged with offences in relation to water larceny in New South Wales. If they have stolen water, they deserve the full force of the law, and that is to be acknowledged.

We did not need a royal commission to do that, but I make the point that there are agencies to deal with these matters. To anyone who suspects that there has been tampering with meters, bypassing of meters, sucking water out of the river without a meter—anything—let's get on with the proper authorities investigating those matters.

The other aspect of this report I bring to members' attention is that the commissioner made a number of recommendations, and we thank him for that, including that the Water Act is

constitutionally valid. I am pleased about that because it is one aspect that has been under consideration. Others have supported that position and he has confirmed it, and I think that is good. He did, however, cast doubt, from his point of view, on the validity of aspects of the plan. That is the basin plan itself, including the setting of the environmentally sustainable level of take, the associated long-term average sustainable diversion limit, the amended SDLs, the SDL adjustment mechanism and the Northern Basin Review.

He has made some recommendations on the amendments to legislation. Those matters are all under consideration by the Crown Solicitor's Office, with actioned assessment of that. I think it is important that, even though there is a different legal opinion floating around in respect of these matters, Mr Walker has considered these matters and put in his recommendations. We will investigate and assess those, in particular, if sections 21 or 23 of the Water Act have not been properly implemented, what amendments may need to be progressed.

The findings are there for everyone to read. I hope that members will all take the time to do this because every one of our members here in this house has people somewhere in their electorates who drink, bathe in or rely on water from the River Murray, so I would encourage them to really take a serious interest in this, particularly the newer members.

One of the matters that came up during the course of the operation of this commission was the question of whether the issuing of subpoenas against public servants, including those in the CSIRO and other agencies of the commonwealth, was enforceable. Members might recall that the former member for Cheltenham, former premier Weatherill, tabled a royal commissions bill in 2017. I had a copy of it here in front of me, but, in any event, it was tabled, not introduced, and he did not ever progress it.

The appointment of Mr Walker and the establishment of the commission were done by presentation to His Excellency, and there was no requirement for there to be legislation. However, the former premier did table a bill purporting to ensure that the Royal Commissions Act had the full extent of extraterritorial legislative power of the parliament; that is, it was able to actually act in respect of its application outside the state of South Australia. He did not progress that, for whatever reason. I do not know what advice he received at the time, but I am assuming it is the same advice that I subsequently had, confirmed by Mr Walker, that that was completely unnecessary, that the issue in relation to the enforcement of subpoenas did not require a remedy in the Royal Commissions Act 1917, our South Australian law.

Notwithstanding that, for whatever light-bulb idea moment the member for Port Adelaide had, last year she introduced her own bill with the same provision, that is, to amend the Royal Commissions Act once there had been an issue established in the High Court relating to another matter. Notwithstanding my saying repeatedly to the member for Port Adelaide that she had obviously missed the point that this was not the issue, that the issue in the High Court really related to the whole question of who should be investigating matters such as the enforcement or proprietary of an intergovernmental agreement, not the subpoena issue. Notwithstanding that, she just pressed ahead anyway. Obviously, that fell foul by vote of this parliament.

The commissioner addresses this in his report. I urge members to read between pages 31 and 38, where there is an interesting summary of 'South Australia's interest and co-operative federalism'. It raises two issues; one is the issue about what he says:

Early queries were also raised about the capacity of a South Australian Royal Commission to compel evidence from out of the State. Some of them, echoed by bush lawyers, seemed to be based on a very bleak and savage notion of the relationship between the polities that are members of the Federation.

He then goes on to quote the law and say that these laws:

...leave no doubt that compulsory processes of this Royal Commission could be enforced in other States and Territories of the Commonwealth.

He goes on to explain what happened with respect to action taken in the High Court, the withdrawal of that matter. He then gives a very comprehensive list of why, he suggests, it is important to recognise the need to deal with intergovernmental agreements and who should be keeping an eye on them, who should be able to enforce them and who should be able to investigate them. He gives a helpful contribution on that.

I do not necessarily agree with Mr Walker that the former member for Cheltenham or the member for Port Adelaide are bush lawyers, but obviously it is his description of the view of those who perpetuated that process. Nevertheless, it is for them to answer why they would progress that. He has made absolutely clear in his report what the legal position is in relation to that. So I hope, finally, that the member for Port Adelaide will read that and desist from those sorts of stunts in the future.

The final matter relates to the Royal Commissions Act itself. Mr Walker and his senior counsel during the course of the commission did provide me with advice in respect of the royal commission's legislation generally, and I have taken that on board. I have placed on record my appreciation to have that advice. It is a matter that we are looking at. Certainly, the state of Victoria has upgraded its royal commissions law in recent years, and I understand it is now operating very effectively.

For anyone who has actually read the Royal Commissions Act 1917, it is a very short document, and the contemporary law in relation to royal commissions is one which, if one looks at the Victorian model, is a much more comprehensive model of how these should apply. I want to indicate to the house that we are looking at how we might modernise our legislation in that regard. When we do, I will make sure the member for Port Adelaide gets a special briefing.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:23): I rise to support the motion. I welcome the opportunity that the motion brings to consider in this parliament the important issue of water for the Murray-Darling Basin. As all South Australians know, the River Murray is hugely important for our community, for our economy and for the very basics of day-to-day life.

I welcome the opportunity to consider particularly today the issue of the allocation of water to be recovered, and in particular the 450 gigalitres, because it provides an opportunity—as we urge on all those present to continue what has been a bipartisan effort to implement the Murray-Darling Basin Plan in full—to reflect on some of the challenges that have faced largely previous governments and the former Labor government in this state in endeavouring to implement the changes with a view to putting in its proper context the decision that has been made at the recent ministerial council and by our state's water minister in December.

I propose to go about this in somewhat of a portmanteau fashion. It is an approach that the royal commissioner has taken in his report, and in reading the report it is clear that it is divided into a number of, as it were, almost independent episodes, but first some context. I turn to the transcript of the royal commission hearings at its outset on 18 June last year where the proper characterisation of the 450 gigalitres is provided by senior counsel assisting the commission, Mr Beasley, who said at line 38 of page 31 of the transcript:

Commissioner, the plan has sometimes been called, in error, a 3200 gigalitre plan by adding 450 gigalitres to 2750 gigalitres. The 450 gigalitres for the enhanced objectives for South Australia forms a note to the legislation. There is a Commonwealth program with funds for what are called efficiency measures in the plan and for this proposed 450 gigalitres volume of water equivalency.

That is a reasonably good encapsulation of how the 450 gigalitres fit in in the context of the plan, that is, in addition to the 2,750 gigalitres that are the subject of the plan as agreed in 2012.

Taking a step back from the commission, and ultimately a reflection on some of its findings, it is important to note that, back when the previous Labor government was going about the process of negotiating the plan, back in 2011, the previous Labor government had reference to information, including the Goyder Institute recommendation, that water flows of the order of 4,000 gigalitres would be desirable or necessary in order to achieve necessary and sustainable outcomes.

It was against advice of that nature that the former Labor government went ahead and endeavoured to negotiate for flows for South Australia. The result of those negotiations was 2,750 gigalitres, and, as we know, Labor governments—state and federal—in 2012 implemented the plan with the provision included. As I have just quoted from senior counsel assisting the commission, the plan had a footnote to it that South Australia would endeavour to obtain an additional 450 gigalitres.

In the course of the debate today there has been some reflection on the way in which that 450 gigalitres was described by the former premier and others who were in the government at that

time, including words to the effect that it was locked in and that it was mandatory. As the passage I have just read out, among others, illustrates, that was certainly not the case. It was a matter for negotiation. It was that from the outset, and it created a task, particularly for those who were endeavouring to achieve the best possible outcome for South Australia, to go about negotiating with the basin states and territory with a view to the delivery of the 450 gigalitres.

Over the several years that followed—and all in the context, I might emphasise, of a bipartisan approach to the implementation of that plan—we saw in South Australia very little, in fact negligible, progress towards the delivery of the 450 gigalitres. It has been said repeatedly in the course of this debate today that, of the 450 gigalitres that were the subject of that footnote to the plan, we have seen next to nothing delivered.

The amount of one gigalitre that has found its way to South Australia as part of the 450 gigalitres has been entirely delivered in South Australia. In terms of a plan to deliver an additional and necessary component of the water to be earmarked for delivery to the river system, the 450-gigalitre component has simply not progressed. That is also against what must have been an extraordinarily frustrating backdrop for the previous Labor government in this state that, as of July 2017, half a billion dollars had been set aside in relation to this allocation, yet there had been no progress—just one gigalitre, all from South Australia.

At the end of 2017, at the regular meeting of first ministers in this regard—the now infamous Rigoni's meeting that the commissioner referred to in the course of his report—one might observe that the then Labor minister for water may well have been mightily frustrated at the lack of progress—almost none. At the end of 2017, we saw an unfortunate episode, an unfortunate expression of that frustration by the then minister for water. In what was really quite silly and embarrassing behaviour, we saw the minister really give up the game, give up the argument, give up the negotiation and, rather, resort to exclamations of his frustration.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Disgraceful behaviour.

Mr TEAGUE: It was disgraceful. It was disgraceful behaviour, and it certainly was not going to achieve further progress towards delivery of the 450 gigalitres—quite to the contrary. But there is more that illustrates the combination of inaction, frustration and lack of progress on the part of the former Labor government, because subsequently we all learned about what appeared to be substantial noncompliance with the plan emanating further up the river and allegations of water theft contrary to allocation and so on. They were serious allegations that warranted investigation.

I put it to honourable members in this house that Labor's response to that on the eve of an election fast approaching, calling a royal commission to investigate in relation to these matters, might be seen as in part motivated by this evidence of noncompliance. I put it to honourable members for their consideration that this was a step by the former Labor government that expressed the height of frustration after many years of not being able to achieve anything really.

When confronted with yet another episode on top of the minister's capitulation back at the end of the MinCo meeting, giving up, spitting the dummy, we have reports of noncompliance. The former Labor government gave up and said, 'Alright, we'll call a royal commission. We won't have to talk about it anymore. We'll hand it over and see what happens from there.' I suggest to honourable members that that is the proper context in which we came to have the royal commission, which has now gone about its work.

So there has been no progress by the former government, unfortunately, on the 450 gigalitres, and that is important in the context of the recent report, which was received on 29 January from the royal commissioner and published on 31 January. There has been some passing opinion expressed about steps that have been taken by the new state Minister for Water in relation to attempting to achieve delivery of the 450 gigalitres.

It is against the background of an observation consistently throughout the course of the commission hearings that under the regime that has prevailed until the end of last year there was, in the words of a witness, Ms Beer, no possible way that the 450 gigalitres could be delivered. She said that she could not see any possible way that they were going to get to the 450, and the commissioner agreed no. That was on 28 August.

On 4 September, senior counsel assisting the commission made the observation that there was, in fact, no hope of it being achieved. He observed that scientists had given evidence and expressed the view that 'there's no hope of achieving enhanced environmental outcomes from the so-called 450 gigalitres of up-water related to the efficiency measures'. Tellingly, on 5 September—that is, a long time prior to the December MinCo that has been the subject of some recent consideration—we heard from Mr David Papps, who relevantly is also quoted in the commission's report.

That is important because Mr Papps is the former commonwealth environmental water holder. On 5 September 2018, Mr Papps told the commission that there was no chance of the 450 gigalitres being delivered. In fact, he was quite emphatic about that. I quote, and he was in turn quoted in the commissioner's report as saying, 'I would put my house on it that there won't be 450 gigalitres.' In September last year, Mr Papps said that he would put his house on there being no return on the 450 gigalitres.

This is all in the context of a plan of longstanding, a plan that has been in place for many years at this stage. The commission had multiple witnesses, including, in particular, Mr Papps, who were all indicating that there was not going to be any delivery on the 450 gigalitres. The commission had ample evidence through the course of the body of its hearings that the story of the delivery on the 450 gigalitres over the period of five years or more since the basin plan was introduced was a story of failure and a story of no progress.

Later on 5 September, the commissioner himself made the observation that so certain was the likelihood that there was not going to be any delivery that he expressed the view that you would have to be 'off with the fairies' to think that this 450 gigalitres, or any of it, was going to be delivered in the context of the way that this was being negotiated at that time.

Members interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: The overwhelming evidence that came to the commission month after month after month was that the years—

Members interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —that had transpired since the implementation of the plan had led to—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! Member for Light, you will have your opportunity to speak on this motion if you desire.

Mr TEAGUE: It is in that context in a new government—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Member for Light, this has been a very respectful debate this afternoon and I would like that to continue as I am in the chair.

Mr TEAGUE: Dare I say, Mr Acting Speaker—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I call the member for Light to order.

Mr TEAGUE: —the royal commissioner had ample evidence of the complete lack of progress that had taken place over many years. What we have seen in December—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: And the conclusion was your minister sold us down the river.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The member for Light is warned for the first time.

Mr TEAGUE: —is a change of approach, a change to an outcomes-driven approach, a change to a delivery of water approach and a change of which this government and the people of South Australia can be proud. I commend the motion.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (16:43): South Australia is a basin state within the meaning of the commonwealth Water Act 2007. Members will know that a basin plan was made under section 44(3)(b)(i) of the act and that South Australia is a party to the Murray-Darling Basin Agreement, referred to as the basin agreement, which forms schedule 1 to the act. Long before there was a plan or the act, South Australians had grappled with the task of sharing water from the basin. Since the 1860s, there have been plans in place for managing basin water. A River Murray commission was formed in 1917. The Murray-Darling Basin Authority describes early measures to manage the basin in the following terms:

The economic value of the Basin's water resources for agriculture and industry led to the development of a highly regulated river system not only on the River Murray but throughout the Basin. With increased regulation and surface water extraction, together with a severe drought in the late 1960s, environmental impacts were starting to emerge. Water quality had deteriorated to the point that the first benchmark study of salinity took place in 1970.

The authority goes on to say:

From the 1970s through to the 1990s, state governments undertook initiatives to sustainably manage land and water, however the interconnected nature of the rivers of the Basin was much better understood than 100 years ago. An intergovernmental approach was needed and in 1987 the first Murray-Darling Basin Agreement was reached, which established the Murray-Darling Basin Commission (MDBC).

Leading up to the new millennium, there was significant progress in the reform of water sharing, including the development of water markets and salinity management, however the fundamental issue of too much water being used remained.

That issue was felt painfully and consistently in South Australia. The act and the basin plan, which I outlined earlier in my remarks, are designed to deliver a system of water sharing. I now turn to the royal commission.

The commission's terms of reference required the commissioner to inquire into and report on 13 matters. I emphasise clause 3 of the terms of reference, which required the commissioner to examine whether the basin plan in its current form, its implementation and any proposed amendments to the plan were likely to achieve the objects and purposes of the act and plan as variously outlined in sections 3, 20, 23 and 28 of the act and the enhanced environmental outcomes and additional 450 gigalitres provided for in section 86AA(2) and (3) of the act respectively. My friend the member for Heysen has forensically and ably detailed the history of the 450 gigalitres and I refer to his remarks.

On 18 June 2018, the opening day of the royal commission was held. On that day, counsel assisting the commission, Mr Richard Beasley SC, made remarks. These remarks have also been recorded by the Premier, but I think it is important and necessary to emphasise them again. Mr Beasley:

...450 gigalitres itself is reflected only in a note to the Basin Plan.

Mr Walker:

That note, even if it's part of the statute, it doesn't seem to impose any obligation.

Mr Beasley responds:

No, it's not mandatory...as you have seen through the travel through the Basin, at least as far as the information provided to you, there is no appetite for these programs at all.

Mr Walker:

It depends where you are in the river system.

Mr Beasley:

Well, there is none in Victoria. I didn't hear any in New South Wales.

In early December 2016 in the other place, the then minister for water said:

There have been no projects from Victoria and New South Wales forthcoming whatsoever. I understand there was a vague commitment by New South Wales to participate in a pilot program that went nowhere. No pilot program eventuated, I am advised. We have seen nothing of it. Certainly, not even Victoria even pretended that they had an interest in delivering a pilot program. For them, it was a push back to the never, never.

In other words, there had been no real plan from the former government, or at least not one that they could deliver to achieve sufficient water for the environment in the basin and particularly for South Australia; however, in December 2018, an agreement was struck between the basin states and the commonwealth. Importantly, a path was opened up to deliver the 450 gigalitres. Let me briefly make some further observations. Twelve months earlier, under a different government and a different minister, no real agreement was reached. The communiqué from MinCo (Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council) in 2017 says in part:

Ministers were not able to agree on the immediate implementation of efficiency measures, but have committed to further discussions...

The previous government had failed to deliver the 450 gigalitres and that fact had been reduced to ministerial statements. As far back as 1 July 2014, section 86AG of the Water Act had provided the means for the 450-gigalitre program to commence. As of July 2017, more than half a billion dollars was set aside for this purpose under the Water Act—or rather, for the purpose of giving effect to environmental and other matters under the act.

All we had to show for it was one gigalitre. If that is not failure in this space, nothing is. That is absolute failure—total and complete failure—by the previous government. Nothing could be more shameful or disgraceful. Nothing could be more disappointing for the people of South Australia. Nothing could be more disappointing for us than to have to sit here and listen to the increasing sound bites—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order, Member for Kavel!

Mr CREGAN: —from the other side. It is completely unacceptable. The Minister for Environment made reference to games and noise, Facebook rants and bullying, tweets and slogans, logos and T-shirts and hats, simplistic sound bites, sophistry and politics and nothing else—nothing, yet the minister on this side, the new minister, has acted to open up a plan to deliver 450 gigalitres.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The member for King.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (16:51): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You just got warmed up. You just got warmed up; come on, more.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Member for King, resume your seat, please. Member for Light, the Speaker previously had good reason to evict you in question time and I would hate to—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: Not question time; it was this morning.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): This morning. We probably should have evicted you during question time as well. You would hate to be kicked out twice on the same debate. Please listen to the member for King in silence, as per the standing orders.

Ms LUETHEN: Thank you for the opportunity to support the Premier's motion on the Murray-Darling Basin. Our minister has been focused on achieving practical outcomes for South Australia from day one. Within hours of being elected, the minister reached out to colleagues to get these important negotiations happening again, because there was a real threat that we could run out of water.

Since we have been elected, the delivery of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan has been secured, with state and federal governments agreeing on terms about how environmental water will be returned to river. Up to 450 gigalitres will be returned to the environment. I have learned today that 450 gigalitres is equivalent to the amount of water in the Sydney Harbour.

The strong action of the Marshall Liberal government will deliver for the river and South Australians. We are not interested in political game playing. Under Labor, we were never going to get the 450 gigalitres. While Labor were making lots of noise, not one drop of water had been delivered by upstream states for the 450 gigalitres, and they had no plan. Because of Labor's inaction and immaturity, Victoria and New South Wales had all but walked away from the basin plan.

Labor do not understand regional communities or how to get things done. We have shown national leadership taken strong, pragmatic action to get a pathway to the delivery of the 450 gigalitres. We are now calling on all sides of politics to come together and put the interests of the state and basin ahead of political games and to do what is required to see the Murray-Darling Basin Plan delivered in full. There is no justification for the opposition to do anything but fully support this motion.

Why is this outcome so important? The River Murray is our nation's most valuable environmental resource, and it sustains our productivity and all South Australians who rely on it. The river's health has rightfully been a high priority for South Australian political leaders of all persuasions since before Federation.

By securing the environmental sustainability of the river, the implementation of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan provides many benefits, including the delivery of critical human water needs, the ongoing sustainability of water-dependent industries and communities that depend on them, improved cultural outcomes and improved water quality. After all, a healthy river is in everyone's long-term best interests. We are choosing to take real action to protect our communities and our environment.

I turn to the royal commission report. The South Australian government received the royal commissioner's report on 29 January 2019 and publicly released the report on 31 January. The 746-page report contains 44 recommendations and 111 key findings. The report largely focuses on events, actions and decisions that occurred during a period when the Liberal Party did not hold office in South Australia.

Central themes of the report include the need for increased transparency, the need to redo the Northern Basin Review, better recognition of Aboriginal people, the need to factor climate change into the plan, recovering the remaining water through buybacks from the market, using compulsory acquisition to deal with constraints to environmental water delivery, the role and performance of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and the establishment of an independent audit function.

It is important to note, as the commissioner himself recognised, that very few of the recommendations made in the report can be actioned by the South Australian government in isolation from the other basin jurisdictions. As a result, the Premier has written to the Prime Minister to request a meeting of the COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers to consider the royal commission report and also the recently released Productivity Commission 'Murray-Darling Basin Plan: five-year assessment'. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet will coordinate the preparation of the South Australian government response to the report as a basis for pursuing discussion with the federal government and other basin states.

I note that the criticism directed towards our minister is unjustified and illogical. The Premier has already outlined to this house the government's view that the brief commentary found on pages 414 and 415 of the report is illogical, unfounded and unjustified. The minister has at all times acted in the best interests of our state, and the agreement reached in December finally provides a pathway for the practical delivery of the 450 gigalitres where, under Labor, the 450 gigalitres was not going to be delivered.

Working closely with his departmental officials, the minister has played a leadership role in strongly negotiating a package to break the stalemate that occurred under the previous government and was threatening full implementation of the plan. The commission's personal criticism of the minister, while not criticising ministers involved in the past negotiations of the entire plan, is inconsistent and unfair. The minister has done everything possible to keep the plan moving forward.

The minister has worked constructively with other parties to reach outcomes that improve the overall health of the river and deliver much-needed water to South Australia. The criticisms towards our minister are unjustified and his actions do not in any way deserve to be tarnished with words like 'capitulation'. The minister has acted strongly for our state and the basin as a whole.

Furthermore, as we have heard in this house today from the Premier, the minister did not receive due process. Senior Counsel Richard Beasley proclaimed in the final public hearing:

Any person or entity that may be the subject of criticisms or adverse findings by you has had procedural fairness in spades.

Despite this statement, neither the commissioner nor his senior counsel made any attempt to contact the minister to seek further information or justification following the December ministerial council meeting.

The commissioner failed to provide adequate or appropriate opportunity for the minister to be able to explain to him how South Australia has now finally taken the lead in negotiating a holistic package that will bring the basin plan out of the wilderness and put it back on track for South Australia. Additionally, there appears to be a sudden change of logic in how the commission dealt with the 450 gigalitres. Through the public hearings it has been disappointing that both the commissioner and Mr Beasley made very clear and rather pessimistic statements about the 450 gigalitres.

Today, I wish to make clear that Labor left South Australians with no pathway to the 450 gigalitres. Although 450 gigalitres of vital environmental water had been promised by Labor, not one drop had been delivered from interstate. There was no pathway and no practical agreement on implementation, and all the while, despite the noise, petty politics and slogans, no plan for delivery.

Although the previous government claimed that the 450 gigalitres was locked in, this appears not to be the case. Indeed, the royal commission had a different view that securing the additional water for the environment was not mandatory under the plan. Negotiation is required to ensure the 450 gigalitres is delivered. Thanks to Labor's political games, fake fighting to draw media attention and a lack of maturity, South Australia's reputation has suffered and other basin jurisdictions are walking away from the table. There were no projects from upstream states on the table as a result of Labor's failures.

It is clear that under Labor the implementation of the full basin plan had slowed to a crawl, placing the long-term interests of South Australia, our environment and the entire basin in jeopardy. Upstream states had not agreed on the full suite of measures to drive efficiency projects for the 450 gigalitres. The achievement of the final 450 gigalitres of environmental water flows under the basin plan requires the full participation of New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT.

December's agreement broke the deadlock, and now there is a pathway. In December 2018, an historic agreement was struck between the basin states and the commonwealth. In a significant moment for our state, Victoria and New South Wales finally agreed to participate in the full range of water-saving projects that could deliver this water. If you ever needed a comparison of the difference between our two governments, it is this: Labor preferred to protest and whine, whereas we led, negotiated and got the basin states moving forward, agreeing to practical actions to deliver real outcomes for the Murray.

We broke the deadlock. We did it by bringing all the states to the table, and this led to the development of a package that will lead to actual water being delivered back to the river. As well as a pathway to get water flowing again, South Australia secured \$70 million towards transformative work at the Coorong and broke the deadlock on a range of other environmental measures that were threatening the entire plan. This is best described by a simple comparison of before and after.

Before the ministerial council meeting, not one drop of water had been contributed by upstream jurisdictions to deliver the 450 gigalitres, and New South Wales and Victoria refused to participate in any on-farm efficiency measure projects. Afterwards, New South Wales and Victoria had agreed to fully participate in the commonwealth's water infrastructure program, one of the key mechanisms to deliver the final 450 gigalitres required under the plan. In addition, the commonwealth has agreed to invest in specific initiatives in each jurisdiction to help accelerate return of the 450 gigalitres.

Before the ministerial council meeting, there was no pathway forward to turn around the declining condition of the South Lagoon of our iconic Coorong. After the ministerial council meeting, we had secured \$70 million of investment for the Coorong and acknowledgement by all basin ministers of the importance of the Coorong to the overall health of the basin.

We care about the Murray. When in opposition, we took a bipartisan approach and supported premier Weatherill's push for a better basin plan. All we had to show for Labor's plan was a return of

over just one gigalitre from South Australia, which is under 1 per cent of the required water. As always with the previous government, it was overpromising to South Australians but not delivering very much at all. The plan had stagnated, nothing was happening and something needed to be done, and our minister took charge.

Where to from here? Recovery of the final 450 gigalitres remains non-negotiable. The program criteria agreed at the ministerial council in December provided a pathway by which it can actually be recovered. In the meantime, we will be watching like a hawk the progress of other states on the 450 gigalitres and other key components of the plan. If there is evidence of obstruction or bad faith, then we expect the commonwealth to withhold incentive payments to the upstream states, as spelled out in the Littleproud-Burke deal that facilitated parliamentary support for key basin plan amendments last year.

We also expect basin first ministers to take action, which is why the COAG meeting in the coming months will be so important. What we need as South Australians and as Australians is strong bipartisan support and leadership to deliver this agreed basin plan and achieve the environmental and social outcomes that are in the best interests of South Australia and the broader community.

Project Coorong is focused on restoring the health, vitality and visitor experience of this precious place through environmental projects to get the Coorong back on track as well as initiatives to boost ecotourism, focusing on Coorong National Park. The Coorong is a national treasure with natural beauty, abundant wildlife and unspoiled coastline, making it one of South Australia's most loved and visited destinations. This is why the South Australian government is taking action to restore its health and get the Coorong back on track for the future.

In opposition, we supported the establishment of a royal commission because, like the government of the day, we were concerned about water theft and the integrity of the basin plan implementation. We have and always will put the basin above politics. I commend the Premier for raising this motion and I commend the minister for gaining a genuine agreement to secure the delivery of 450 gigalitres of water for South Australia.

The River Murray is our nation's most valuable environmental resource and sustains our productivity and all South Australians who rely on it. A healthy river is in everyone's long-term best interests, and this is certainly an initiative that requires both sides of this house to work together for the benefit of all South Australians. I ask the opposition to stop building fake fights.

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (17:07): I rise today to wholeheartedly support this motion from the Premier and support the Marshall Liberal government's work to ensure the long-term sustainability of the Murray-Darling Basin system from both an economic and environmental standpoint. The Murray-Darling river system is one of the world's great river systems and is critical to our state and, indeed, our nation's prosperity. Australia's history has seen squabbling between states for more than a century over how water should be allocated between jurisdictions. However, as a result of geography, South Australia stands to lose the most from a lack of cooperation between basin states.

In South Australia, the river is critical for agriculture, horticulture and viticulture, but it also forms a large proportion, and in some years as much as 80 per cent, of Adelaide's drinking water, and it is also an important source of drinking water for many of our regional centres across the state. Equally, the Murray and Coorong systems also provide enormous opportunities for tourism.

Within my own electorate, there are small food producers who access River Murray water from local Adelaide Hills tributaries on the path to reservoirs. In fact, the first River Murray pipeline to serve Adelaide, the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline, ends within my electorate at the Anstey Hill water treatment plant down the hill, and it also helps to feed a number of the local reservoirs.

The health of the River Murray is critical to South Australia and, as such, securing the best possible deal in a mature manner is essential for our state. It is important that the house notes both the Productivity Commission's 'Murray-Darling Basin Plan: five-year assessment' and the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission Report as well as supports the Premier's request to the Prime Minister for a meeting of the COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers to consider these reports and respond to them.

It is important that this occurs and occurs with the support of the opposition, which I hope shares the Marshall Liberal government's steadfast commitment to ensuring the health of the Murray-Darling Basin and our commitment to work with all basin plan governments to deliver the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, including for the recovery of the full 3,200 gigalitres.

Fostering a cooperative and genuinely non-partisan relationship with the commonwealth and other basin states is in the best interests of South Australia, and in fact very few of the recommendations of the royal commission report and the five-year assessment are within the sole remit of the South Australian government. This government, and minister Speirs in particular, have already demonstrated a genuine capacity to negotiate real outcomes and benefits for the river in South Australia.

Whereas the previous Labor government had been more interested in grandstanding and fake fights, the Marshall Liberal government is behaving as a grown-up government interested in delivering tangible benefits for the people of South Australia rather than testosterone-charged chest beating that delivers nothing.

While Labor were creating a lot of noise about the River Murray and claimed that the 450 gigalitres of critical environmental water to be delivered by upstream states into South Australia was 'locked in', barely one drop of water was actually delivered during their time in office from upstream states. In reality, Labor's immaturity and focus on political gains had led New South Wales and Victoria to all but walk away from the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, which would have been an absolute disaster for our state.

In December 2018, an historic agreement was struck between basin states and the commonwealth, with Victoria and New South Wales finally agreeing to participate in the full range of water-saving projects that could deliver the 450 gigalitres of environmental water. Unfortunately, though, the royal commission report did not consider the broadening of the socio-economic criteria within the full context of the package of the agreements that was reached by the ministerial council in December last year. The package included:

- an agreement to proceed with addressing constraints—an issue the commissioner identified as being of key importance to the success of the basin plan;
- an agreement to provide \$70 million to improve the health of the Coorong;
- an agreement by Victoria and New South Wales to participate in the commonwealth's Water Infrastructure Program, which will help deliver the 450 gigalitres required under the plan; and
- an agreement by the commonwealth to invest in specific initiatives in each jurisdiction to help accelerate the recovery of the final 450 gigalitres.

The 450 gigalitres committed to under the basin plan is so important for the long-term health of our environment, particularly the Coorong, and ultimately the economic sustainability of the river system. Under the plan the efficiency measures used to recover the 450 gigalitres must not have a negative socio-economic impact on communities. The plan assumes, if a water user voluntarily participates in the efficiency measures, there must not be negative socio-economic impacts.

However, there had been concerns in regional communities that this only looks at the impacts at an individual level and does not consider the broader community. These concerns were such that New South Wales and Victoria refused to participate in the on-farm component of the commonwealth's Water Infrastructure Program when it launched in mid-2018. The on-farm component is critical for the recovery of the full 450 gigalitres, and so it was vital that these on-farm measures were renegotiated.

That minister Speirs was able to negotiate to revive on-farm measures, and by extension the full recovery of the 450 gigalitres, is a testament to his skills as the Minister for Environment and Water and his ability to work in the best interests for South Australia and is to be commended. I commend this motion to the house.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (17:13): I rise to speak in support of this motion. The River Murray is arguably the state's most important natural resource. The future of South Australia depends on a

healthy river system that supports a flourishing natural environment and ecological systems, sustainable irrigation industries, vibrant river communities and critical human water needs in Adelaide and in towns from Paringa to Ceduna.

South Australia, however, cannot manage this highly complex river system by itself because most of the Murray-Darling Basin lies outside its borders. We are very much dependent on the cooperation, agreement and goodwill of state and territory governments that represent the farmers, communities and other stakeholders upstream of South Australia. This has been the reality for our state for well over a century. This reality has not changed in 130 years. This reality is not going to change in another 130 years, yet this is the reality that has essentially been ignored by the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission.

For many years now, commonwealth, state and territory governments have been developing and implementing that which has never been attempted before. The Murray-Darling Basin Plan has presented an unprecedented opportunity to legislatively enshrine the cooperation, agreement and goodwill of upstream jurisdictions that South Australia desperately needs for a healthy river system and our long-term future.

This initiative breaks new ground on a national scale, affecting millions of people, to address complex issues that have plagued our federation for more than a century. It is, therefore, something that was never going to be easy and which was never going to be particularly satisfying for any stakeholder. Here we are, seven years after the basin plan was legislated and 12 years after the passage of the Water Act 2007, still arguing about it. Worse still, in South Australia we are arguing amongst ourselves.

During the plan's development, there was much compromise to achieve an outcome and an agreed plan. The state minister for the Murray River at the time, Paul Caica, did a great job in sitting down to reach an agreement; unfortunately, only two months after the plan was finalised he was forced to resign from that role for factional reasons, to be replaced by a minister threatening to pull out and scream slogans from the sidelines while other jurisdictions remained talking at the table.

Their political games risked the additional 450 gigalitres per year required for environmental purposes under the Water Act by 2024. The only development that saved the basin plan and the 450 gigalitres was the election of the Marshall government: finally there were adults in charge making decisions in the best interests of South Australia. However, because the Marshall government has done that, at a recent Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council meeting in December, Labor was once again playing political games.

The Premier has outlined to this house the government's view that the brief commentary found on pages 414 and 415 of the report is illogical, unfounded and unjustified. The Minister for Environment and Water has, at all times, acted in the best interests of our state, and the agreement reached in December provides a pathway for the delivery of the 450 gigalitres, whereas under Labor that 450 gigalitres was not going to be delivered. Working closely with his department officials, the Minister for Environment and Water has played a leadership role in strongly negotiating a package to break the stalemate that had occurred in the previous government and that was threatening the full implementation of the plan.

The commission's personal criticism of the minister while not criticising ministers involved in the negotiation of the entire plan is inconsistent and unfair. The minister has done everything possible to keep the plan moving forward. He has worked constructively with other parties to reach outcomes that improve the overall health of the river and deliver much needed water to South Australia.

The criticisms directed towards the minister are unjustified. His actions do not in any way deserve to be tarnished with words like 'capitulation'. The minister has acted strongly for our state and for the basin as a whole. The Premier has made it clear that there are significant questions as to whether the minister received procedural fairness.

Additionally, there appears to be a sudden change of logic in how the commission dealt with the 450 gigalitres. Throughout the public hearings both the commissioner and Mr Beasley made very clear and rather pessimistic statements about the 450 gigalitres. During the course of 2018, prior to December's ministerial council meeting, the commissioner and senior counsel were openly saying

that there was no hope but then apparently, months later, it became dead again. This lack of logic and due process undermines this section of the report and all those who try to use these seven sentences for their base political purpose.

Although 450 billion litres of vital environmental water had been promised by Labor, not one drop of water had been delivered from interstate. There was no pathway, no practical agreement on implementation and, despite the noise, the petty politics and slogans, no plan for the delivery of the 450 gigalitres, only a stalemate. Although the previous government claimed the 450 gigalitres was locked in, this appears not to have been the case. Indeed, the royal commission had a different view, that securing the additional 450 gigalitres for the environment was not mandatory under the plan. Negotiation was required to ensure the 450 gigalitres was delivered.

Thanks to Labor's political games, fake fighting to draw media attention and lack of maturity, South Australia's reputation had suffered and other basin jurisdictions were walking away from the table. It was clear that under Labor the implementation of the full basin plan had slowed to a crawl, placing the long-term interest of South Australia, our environment and the entire basin in jeopardy. Upstream states had not agreed on the full suite of measures to drive efficiencies projects for the 450 gigalitres. The achievement of the final 450 gigalitres of environmental water flows under the basin plan required the full participation of New South Wales, Victoria and the ACT.

December's agreement broke the deadlock and now there is a pathway to the 450 gigalitres. In December 2018, an historic agreement was struck between the basin states and the commonwealth. In a significant moment for our state, Victoria and New South Wales finally agreed to participate in the full range of water-saving projects which could deliver the 450 gigalitres.

It is important to note that 12 months earlier under a different government and minister, no agreement was reached, setting the 450 gigalitres back 12 months. In fact, the communiqué from the Murray-Darling Basin Ministerial Council in 2017 states:

Ministers were not able to agree on the immediate implementation of efficiency measures but have committed to further discussions...

If you ever need a comparison of the two governments, it is this: Labor preferred to promise and whine, whereas we led and got the basin states moving forward to deliver real action for the Murray. We did it by bringing all states to the table and leading the development of the package that will lead to actual water being delivered back to the river while ensuring regional communities are not ripped apart, just as the original plan from 2012 demands.

As well as a pathway to getting the water flowing again, South Australia secured \$70 million for transformative work at the Coorong and broke the deadlock on a range of other environmental measures that were threatening the entire plan. The Finnis electorate, which includes the Murray Mouth—

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr BASHAM: —well, that is in dispute with the member for MacKillop—Hindmarsh Island and Goolwa, is the gateway to the Coorong. We have a vested environmental, social and economic interest in the health of this national icon. Numerous businesses are operating in the area, such as tours from the Spirit of the Coorong cruises and Big Duck Boat Tours showing visitors this incredible natural feature of the basin and our coast. There is even Goolwa PipiCo, working in partnership with the Indigenous community to sustainably harvest a unique local delicacy of cockles or pipis from Goolwa beach.

There are Finnis constituents who have worked on the environment projects in the region for decades. There are irrigators, too, extracting water from the Murray itself or from its last tributaries, Currency Creek, Finnis River and the Tookayerta, which is the only creek in South Australia which flows all year round.

They all have a stake in the health of the river and they all have fair and equal consideration. The basin plan is the best possible chance they have. Too much focus has been on a couple of pages in the commissioner's report and not on others. I would like to address a section in the old guide to the proposed basin plan released by the Murray-Darling Basin Authority in 2010. It goes to the heart of necessary adjustments needed to gain the support of jurisdictions and stakeholders

required to deliver the basin plan. I am sure you remember several copies of this document burning in the streets of Griffith in New South Wales. It was because it proposed cutting local water entitlements of the Murrumbidgee by two thirds.

Overall, it suggested the recovery of up to 7,600 gigalitres per year to achieve the Water Act's environmental aims with a 'high degree of certainty'. Imagine that. It would have been a cut of 55 to 64 per cent if you only took into account surface water. Does anyone seriously believe all jurisdictions and stakeholders would have agreed to support a plan removing more than half and perhaps two-thirds of the water available to irrigators and river communities? That is why there was a rapid retreat from such ridiculous numbers. You would never have got the plan up in the first place.

This is the challenge that South Australia faces every single day—ensuring that we maintain the support of the other basin states. It means that we must always be at the table, talking and negotiating and keeping them on side. Make no mistake, there are powerful interests in those states always looking for a way to short-change South Australia. We must never give them an opportunity like Labor did.

In both my current and former roles, I have been all over the basin talking to communities and stakeholders about the basin plan. Many will say it is not good enough, but for very different reasons. Dairy farmers in Echuca will say it is not good enough because it hurts their businesses and their local economy, and we have seen it directly impact on water recovery in towns along the river system: shops shutting, jobs lost, families leaving and schools closing. At the same time, some people on the Lower Lakes say it is not good enough because it is not providing sufficient water to reduce salinity and keep the Murray Mouth open.

We have seen the enormous environmental damage when there is not enough water in the Lakes. It is a shame the royal commission only focused on the environment. This is something I have seen on my farm. You need to focus on all parts—the environment, the economy and the social impacts. Without focusing on those, you cannot afford to invest in the environment. This is not a luxury policymakers can afford. It is not a luxury South Australia can afford. I have always supported a balanced approach to water reform in the basin. I am confident that a balanced approach will deliver positive outcomes for all water users: the environment, irrigators and communities.

I am proud to be part of the Marshall government that recognises the critical need for this approach to ensure all jurisdictions continue to support the basin plan. I support a basin plan that delivers 3,200 gigalitres a year, as agreed by the former Labor government of South Australia after it made compromise after compromise for the benefit of upstream states. We are extraordinarily fortunate those states remain in support. The alternative, no basin plan, is simply not an option for our state. I commend the motion to the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): The member for Narungga.

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (17:28): Thank you, Acting Speaker. Can I say what a sterling job you have done so far this afternoon.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Trained monkeys could only do half the job.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Order! I warn the member for Schubert.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: I haven't been called to order yet.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): I call the member for Schubert to order and warn him. The member for Narungga.

Mr ELLIS: Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I rise today to support the motion before us and particularly the suspension of standing orders to provide over-arching priority of business today for such an important motion. The importance of the river and its health is a top priority for this state for the simple reason that, without a healthy river, our state and our nation cannot exist in the way that it does right now.

I fully support the Premier's request to the Prime Minister for a meeting of the COAG Murray-Darling Basin first ministers to consider all associated reports before us that are to guide all future decision-making on this critical issue. I also endorse the South Australian government's

position that the commonwealth, Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria, the ACT and our state must continue to work together in a genuinely bipartisan way for there to be any hope of implementing the decisions required to ensure sustainable long-term health of our nation's biggest river system that does not belong to any one particular state. It serves all of us and must be maintained for it to continue to be the lifeblood it is for future generations across the country.

As a person who has lived in a regional area all my life, as have four generations of my family before me, I and my fellow regional South Australians can well attest to what it feels like to be treated in a second-class way by city-centric governments, particularly in the last 16 years, before the Marshall Liberal government came to power, to have to continually fight to be heard for policymakers to understand that the needs of people outside the metropolitan area are just as important as the needs of people living in the more densely populated suburbs of Adelaide.

It appears that this was the issue that the previous Labor government got a taste of previously. They got to experience how it feels to be a secondary consideration, to be penalised for being small. The reaction of previous minister Hunter was well publicised. He made headlines in 2016 over what was described as an expletive-riddled tirade aimed at other water ministers. So with this issue, the metropolitan-centric Labor government learned a little bit about what it has been like for regional South Australians for so many years.

Comparatively small SA is on the end of a big river line, and the previous Labor ministry got a taste of what it can be like to be treated in such a secondary manner by the bigger states around the table arguing that their needs are greater than ours. It is well publicised how the Labor Party handled this situation with cursing, name-calling, storming out and walking away from the table. There is no doubt that this issue is challenging for all and that frustrations are understandable, but the Marshall Liberal government, including my respected colleague the Hon. David Speirs, the Minister for Environment and Water, well understands that such anger is useless to the cause.

Walking away from the table offers nothing. It has been made clear under these actions by Labor that we were never going to get the 450 gigalitres. In fact, as has been clearly stated throughout today's proceedings, South Australia received only one measly gigalitre of water. That one measly gigalitre did not even come from New South Wales or Victoria. While those opposite were replete with slogans, fake fights and other bravado, they delivered very little for South Australia. I would argue that is consistent with their entire term in government—overpromising and severely underdelivering for South Australians.

Only a year ago (last February), the whole process was unravelling, with South Australian Labor minister Hunter publicly stating he was prepared to launch High Court action over the issue, and New South Wales and Victoria were both threatening to walk away from the basin plan altogether. Imagine if all parties had walked away from the negotiating table due to the notoriously short fuse that the previous minister possessed combined with his absolute unwillingness to pragmatically negotiate a better deal for South Australia. All bets would have been off. The states upriver would have been taking all the water they desired, and we would have been even further away from the 450 gigalitres we are now that much closer to getting, thanks to minister Speirs.

It is imperative that we not only stay at the negotiating table but that we lead discussions on finding a solution. This is a critical topic, perhaps the most important topic that may come before parliament this term, and sitting on the sidelines doing nothing is simply not an option. The only option is forging a path of open, transparent, mature dialogue of negotiation based on mutual respect and knowledge that all jurisdiction ministers want the same thing: a healthy river that delivers critical human water needs and also protects our unique environments, birds and fish, vegetation—the lot.

I remind members again that the Murray-Darling system takes in 23 rivers, supports more than four million people and stretches across South Australia, Victoria, New South Wales and Queensland. We can have no more unnecessary delays. Useless squabbling is damaging the river and actual action is now required and cooperation by everyone. We all saw the dead fish. We in this house must be as one on this issue. Genuine partnerships are vital.

It is just as when in opposition the Liberals in 2017 supported the Weatherill government's decision for a royal commission to get to the bottom of the allegations of water theft in New South Wales and the reports of serious compliance issues. Also, when in opposition we supported all efforts

from premier Weatherill for a better basin plan, even though many may have judged him to have capitulated back in 2017 when he first fought for the return of 3,500 to 4,000 gigalitres, but eventually agreed to settle for a mere 2,750. Mr Acting Speaker, I put to you that that is a real capitulation, leaving thousands of gigalitres on the table that could have been flowing to South Australia.

This motion makes a clear statement that this parliament stands behind the plan that was negotiated by previous federal and state Labor governments. The South Australian government received the state Labor-instigated royal commissioner's report on 29 January 2019 and publicly released the report two days later. It is a pity that public commentary centred around the commissioner's views of negotiation efforts from minister Speirs in the last couple of months and not on the key findings and recommendations of the 746-page report about actions and decisions taken years before minister Speirs was in office. It genuinely makes one wonder whether they have even taken the time to read the other pages of the report or only taken the opportunity to read seven sentences from one page.

The people of South Australia would also surely be interested in the commissioner's views about the need to factor in ever-changing climate, recovering the remaining water we need through buybacks, using compulsory acquisition to deal with constraints to environmental water delivery, the recommendations to redo the Northern Basin Review to provide better recognition of Aboriginal people, to relook at the role and performance of the Murray-Darling Basin Authority and, finally, to establish an independent audit function.

As stated by the commissioner, very few of the recommendations in his report can be actioned by the South Australian government in isolation, and I strongly support Premier Marshall's swift action in communicating with Prime Minister Morrison to request a meeting of the COAG Murray Darling Basin first ministers to consider not only the findings of the royal commission but also important review of the recently released Productivity Commission 'Murray-Darling Basin Plan: five-year assessment', the requirement under the Water Act 2007.

I commend the actions of my colleague minister Speirs because his efforts have broken a deadlock and started a process of our actually receiving the 450 gigalitres of water that the water experts say our end of the river vitally needs. The December 2018 agreement is an historic one, struck between the basin states and the commonwealth, and it is significant that, after such a long, costly, potentially environmentally and economically dangerous stalemate, Victoria and New South Wales have finally agreed to participate in the full range of water-saving projects that can deliver the 450 gigalitres.

This means that SA is back at the table, but it is stressed that recovery of the final 450 gigalitres remains non-negotiable. This is due to the responsible actions of this government and the leadership of minister Speirs on this issue. Looking ahead, the program criteria agreed at the ministerial council in December provide a pathway by which 450 gigalitres can actually be recovered—not just talked about being recovered but actually delivered to our state.

We will now be watching the other states' progress on getting us this water, and the COAG meeting in the coming months will be exceedingly important. I would like to commend this motion to the house, congratulate minister Speirs on the terrific work he has done getting all states back to the negotiating table, thank all members on this side of the house for their potent submissions on this motion and bemoan the fact that those opposite have not seen fit to contribute to this motion and support the wonderful work minister Speirs is doing.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Duluk): Member for Narrunga, I remind you always to refer to members by their electorate or their title in the house and not by their surnames.

Mrs POWER (Elder) (17:38): I rise today to support the Premier's motion and the importance of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. As the member for Elder, my electorate is certainly farther away than others from the actual river, but the reality is that all South Australians are impacted by the health of the Murray River and the way in which the Murray River basin is managed.

As South Australians, we live in one of the driest states in the driest inhabited continent in the world. The River Murray is the lifeblood of our state, providing essential water for irrigation,

industry, domestic and recreational use, cultural connection and our precious wetlands and flood plains.

The Murray-Darling Basin is the largest and most complex river system in our country. It covers one million square kilometres of south-eastern Australia, spanning across New South Wales, Queensland, Victoria, Australian Capital Territory and our own South Australia. It is also an ancient river system. Its 100-million-year development is evidenced today by the multilayers of sediments from limestone, brown coal and silts. We are privileged to see elements of this today in the rock and cliff formations that contribute to the spectacular beauty of our river. We, as humans, regardless of political association, have a heavy responsibility to ensure its sustainability is maintained now and long into the future.

We all know that over the decades the combination of natural droughts and increasing human use of the waterways for agriculture, manufacturing and communities has led to a decline in the health of the basin, as in April 2009, when drought and overuse of resources saw freshwater levels drop to more than one metre below sea level. This increased salinity levels, which damaged the ecosystem and threatened water supplies for people and livestock. As the lakes dried out, erosion caused the loss of soil with some sections of the riverbank below Lock 1 drying out, cracking and collapsing. It also put ecosystems under heavy strain, with plants and animals competing for food and space from a depleted environment.

When water finally flowed again, acid drainage water, which includes sulphuric acid created by certain soils being exposed to the air, washed into the river. This made parts of the river toxic to marine and freshwater plants and animals, contaminating water supplies and corroding concrete and steel. It was clear back then, as it is now, that combined action must be taken.

By 2012, there was widespread agreement across government that a plan was needed to manage our water carefully and protect the basin for future generations. The Murray-Darling Basin Plan was developed to manage the basin as a whole connected system. At its heart, the basin plan set the amount of water that can be taken from the basin each year, while leaving enough for our rivers, lakes and wetlands and the plants and animals that depend on them.

We know that the basin encompasses a complex network of people, industries and organisations with competing interests. On this note, so that we can all appreciate the true complexity of managing water and all the competing interests, I want to highlight whom and what the basin serves and whom it impacts, namely:

- more than 2.6 million Australians, spread across four different states and one territory;
- more than 40 Aboriginal nations;
- a fishing industry that employs approximately 10,000 people;
- 120 waterbird species and 46 native fish species;
- an \$8 billion tourism industry;
- more than 9,000 irrigated agricultural businesses;
- more than three million people who have access to precious clean drinking water from the basin;
- 16 internationally recognised and protected wetlands; and
- countless Australians who visit the rivers and lakes for recreational and social activities.

It is absolutely crucial that the water is managed carefully for Australians today and for future generations. Such management requires true leadership and, without a doubt, bipartisan support.

There are many threats to our precious river, but, as we know from the past 130 years, there is no greater threat to the entire Murray-Darling Basin system than that of cheap political game playing and scaremongering, as we have seen from the opposition. We know that we must all put the interests of our state and environment ahead of political games. The Marshall Liberal government recognises this. We know that as the downstream state we have been most effective when we are

united to pursue genuine partnerships across the basin, as the Minister for Environment and Water has stated many times today in this house and before today.

Even in opposition, we supported the establishment of a royal commission because, like the government of the day, we were concerned about water theft and the basin plan implementation. What we need as South Australians and Australians is strong bipartisan support and leadership to deliver the agreed basin plan and achieve the environmental and social outcomes that are in the best interests of South Australia and the broader community. A healthy river is in everyone's long-term best interests and we must work together to make that happen. I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (17:45): I move:

That the debate be adjourned.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 22
Noes 15
Majority 7

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	McBride, N.	Murray, S.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Power, C.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.
Teague, J.B.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Wingard, C.L.		

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E. (teller)	Cook, N.F.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried; debate adjourned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today Georgie Daish, who is the dux of Finniss, I am informed. Welcome to parliament.

ADJOURNMENT

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (17:50): I move:

That the house do now adjourn.

The house divided on the motion:

While the division bells were ringing:

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader of the Opposition, please!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: You can all continue this after the vote.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, please.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I will not hesitate in removing members if I need to. The member for Playford has paid for his sins today. He is very well behaved. Members on my left should take his example. Look at him.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier seeks to be heard. Time has expired. Order, members on my left! The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order: I simply ask you to bring the Leader of the Opposition to heel in relation to his continued shouting across the chamber.

The SPEAKER: He is on his final warning.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left and right, be quiet. Let's not end this way. I will name members if I have to. Certain members have already been named once. If they are named again, they will be missing three days.

Ayes 22
Noes 15
Majority 7

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.
Gardner, J.A.W.	Harvey, R.M. (teller)	Knoll, S.K.
Luethen, P.	McBride, N.	Murray, S.
Patterson, S.J.R.	Pederick, A.S.	Pisoni, D.G.
Power, C.	Sanderson, R.	Speirs, D.J.
Teague, J.B.	van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.	Whetstone, T.J.
Wingard, C.L.		

NOES

Bettison, Z.L.	Bignell, L.W.K.	Boyer, B.I.
Brown, M.E. (teller)	Cook, N.F.	Hildyard, K.A.
Hughes, E.J.	Koutsantonis, A.	Malinauskas, P.
Mullighan, S.C.	Odenwalder, L.K.	Piccolo, A.
Picton, C.J.	Stinson, J.M.	Wortley, D.

Motion thus carried.

At 17:55 the house adjourned until Wednesday 13 February 2019 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT**

466 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Referring to Budget Paper 4.3, page 91, Workforce Summary, the estimated FTE Human Services workforce for 2017-18 is estimated to be 3668.9FTE but is forecast to drop by 606.4 FTE positions to a total of 3062.5 FTE over the coming 12 months.

- (a) Can the minister explain this sudden drop in FTE equivalency when compared to the estimated 2017-18 levels?
- (b) From which line areas in the Department for Human Services are these staff cuts expected to come from?
- (c) Have staff already been identified for severance purposes?
- (d) What consultation did the minister undertake with her chief executive before cutting over 600 positions from the Department for Human Services?
- (e) How many positions are currently unfilled within the Department for Human Services?
- (f) Is this staff reduction expected to effect executive level officers?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

- (a) This decrease is primarily due to the transition of Domiciliary Care Services to RDNS, the net impact of the NDIS Transition and Service Reform initiatives, a reduction of the additional FTEs provided in 2017-18 for Concessions and the Electricity Discount Offer and the net impact of savings measures imposed on the department.
- (b) Refer to the program summary, Budget Paper 4.3.
- (c) The transfer of Domiciliary Care Services to RDNS and Child and Youth Services to an Employee Mutual have been completed, and where applicable the Concessions, Electricity Discount Offer and other short-term funded positions were end dated contract positions.
- (d) Refer to the response for part a.
- (e) The September monitoring to DTF reported a net favourable variance of 106 FTEs, against the September 2018 FTE cap.
- (f) Yes, as applicable, savings measures and NDIS Transition and Service Reform outcomes will impact on executive level officers.

GAMBLING PREVALENCE SURVEY

467 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). With regard to the South Australian Gambling Prevalence Survey -

- (a) What is the cost to government?
- (b) Who has been asked to participate?
- (c) What are the questions of the survey, and how is this data being captured and recorded?
- (d) How many FTE positions have been appointed to oversee the survey?
- (e) Has SkyCity Casino been asked to participate?
- (f) Have licensed poker machine venue owners and operators been asked to participate?
- (g) Have representatives from the racing industry been asked to participate?
- (h) Have representatives of online and mobile betting apps and services been asked to participate?
- (i) Will the survey report on the prevalence and role of gambling and odds in the broadcast of professional sporting events?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

- The cost to government for the South Australian Prevalence Survey is \$769,880 (GST exclusive).
- The in-scope population for the survey 'sample population' is South Australian residents aged 18 years and over, contactable by landline or mobile phone. The sample population was stratified by location to ensure equitable representation of participants across the state.
- A comprehensive suite of questions has been asked as part of the survey to assess continuing trends in gambling, and determine the prevalence of problem gambling in South Australia.

- To protect participant anonymity and confidentiality, all data collected was assigned a unique participant ID and any identifying information removed from all data outputs. The de-identified data and documentation has been stored in compliance with accepted research protocols.
- Existing staff within the Office for Problem Gambling have overseen the South Australian Gambling Prevalence Survey, with no additional resourcing.
- While the gaming industry has been advised about the survey, there has been no active participation from the SkyCity Casino, licensed poker machine venue owners and operators, the racing industry or representatives of online and mobile betting apps and services as the survey is aimed towards gambling behaviour in the general population.
- The survey will report on the prevalence of gambling in a number of professional sporting events. The odds in the broadcast of professional sporting events was not within the scope of the Survey.

GAMBLING REGULATION REVIEW

468 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What are the priorities of the government in developing and implementing phase 2 of the Gambling Harm Minimisation Strategy?

1. What is the time frame for this implementation?
2. What does success look like for the implementation of phase 2 of the Gambling Harm Minimisation Strategy and what are the key performance indicators of the strategy?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The priority for the government in implementing phase 2 of the Gambling Harm Minimisation Strategy is to ensure that patrons from diverse backgrounds are aware of the role that gaming venue staff have to support them to prevent gambling harm.

Engagement between venue staff and patrons can encourage individuals to seek help from services to reduce the further incidence of gambling harm occurring. Phase 2 will target the development of information materials aimed towards identified priority groups, through consultation with the gaming sector and Survey prevalence data.

The timeframe for Phase 2 of the Gambling Harm Minimisation Strategy is late June 2019.

Success for Phase 2 of the Harm Minimisation Strategy will be the distribution of the Phase 2 gambling harm minimisation materials in all gaming venues across South Australia. The Office for Problem Gambling is considering research initiatives in 2019 that will explore gambling trends and patron awareness of the initiative.

LGBTIQ COMMUNITY

469 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). When will the government conduct a round table to consult with the community and stakeholders on mechanisms to ensure that voices are heard at the highest levels of government concerning LGBTIQ issues?

1. Where will this round table be conducted?
2. Who will be invited to this round table?
3. Who from the government and the Department for Human Services will be participating in this roundtable?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The LGBTIQ Round table will be held in the first half of 2019.

LGBTIQ community organisations and significant non-government organisations that have a track record of working with LGBTIQ community members will be the primary participants.

Those State Government departments and authorities deemed to be of interest to the LGBTIQ communities, such as the Department of Health and Wellbeing, will be invited.

Due to concerns raised by LGBTIQ communities regarding domestic and family violence, Assistant Minister Carolyn Power will also be invited. Staff from the Department for Human Services will provide support to the round table and at least two active participants from the Policy and Innovation team of the Community Services Directorate.

While the LGBTIQ round table will be conducted in the Adelaide metropolitan area, consideration is being given regarding how those living in regional areas might be involved in the discussions as participants or observers.

MARIONLIFE COMMUNITY SERVICES

470 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the purpose of the \$30,000 annual allocation to the MarionLIFE community centre?

1. What value for money does this investment represent to the South Australian government and tax payers?
2. What representations were made to the government from MarionLIFE community centre?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The grant has allowed MarionLIFE to employ a part-time Community Development Officer (CDO), and contributes towards associated program and activity costs.

MarionLIFE provides a range of services for vulnerable people in the area of Mitchell Park, within the southern Adelaide region, including: emergency relief; budget and financial counselling; adult community education courses; youth programs; community meals; and a community garden.

During the recent state election campaign, the Liberal candidate for Elder, Ms Carolyn Power MP committed long-term funding for MarionLIFE to 'ensure the community centre can continue to provide vital services'.

COMMUNITY CONNECTIONS

471 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). With reference to sub-program 1.1: Community Connections and Support from the 2017-18 budget:

- (a) Where does this sub-program and its objectives now sit within the Department for Human Services?
- (b) What changes, additions, substitutions or discontinuations of Community Connections and Support have resulted from the machinery of government change, and what impact has this had on expenditure and FTE?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

All programs and objectives under in Sub-program 1.1: Community Connections and Support in the 2017-18 Agency Statements are now reflected in Program 1: Communities of the 2018-19 Agency Statements for the Department for Human Services.

There have been no changes, additions, substitutions or discontinuations of the programs in Community Connections and Support resulting from the machinery of government change, and therefore no impact has resulted on expenditure and full time equivalent staff.'

COMMUNITY SERVICES

472 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). With reference to Sub-program 1.2: Community Services from the 2017-18 budget:

- (a) Where does this sub-program and its objectives now sit within the Department for Human Services?
- (b) What changes, additions, substitutions or discontinuations of community services have resulted from the machinery of government change, and what impact has this had on expenditure and FTE?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) Sub-program 1.2 Community Services from the 2017-18 budget now sits within the Department for Human Services Program 1: Communities in the 2018-19 budget papers.

(b) The machinery of government (MOG) changes transferred Multicultural Affairs to the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC). As per the 2017-18 budget papers, the employee expenditure and FTEs associated with the Multicultural Services Sub-program were reported in Sub-program 1.2 Community Services. The following items allocated in Sub-program 1.2 Community Services of the 2017-18 budget were transferred to Multicultural Affairs in DPC as part of the MOG change: salaries \$1,325,000 comprising 11.0 FTEs, and goods and services of \$163,000.

ABORIGINAL FAMILY SUPPORT SERVICES

473 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the status of the across-government place-based response to improve justice, safety and wellbeing outcomes for Aboriginal people as listed in the 2017-18 budget?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

As outlined in the 2017-18 Budget, the Department for Human Services is leading the Making an Impact initiative. This whole-of-government effort, in partnership with the non-government sector and the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community, is aimed at improving outcomes for Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander young people living in Northern Adelaide with a focus on reducing contact with the criminal justice system.

The status of work under Making an Impact includes:

- (1) Yunga Nungas: Future Leaders pilot

- targeting high-risk young people for an intensive case support response to increase meaningful engagement in education and employment
 - 12-month pilot (2017-18) showed promising results, including participants' decreased involvement with the justice system and re-engagement in educational and employment readiness programs
 - a further two years funding to establish a proof of concept of Yunga Nungas has been secured. To ensure sustainability of the response to this cohort, the service delivery model will be embedded into Metropolitan Aboriginal Youth and Family Services (MAYFS). MAYFS is an Aboriginal service and sits within the Department for Human Services.
- (2) Early intervention diversion project
- targeting the point of arrest or first contact with the justice system, aimed at reducing remand rates and increasing diversion outcomes
 - a multi-agency diagnostic workshop in partnership with the Department of the Premier and Cabinet's Public Sector Innovation, ICT and Digital Government division to scope the project (occurred in October 2018)
 - Phase 1: will involve interviews focused on the pathway from an Aboriginal young person's first contact with police, through interactions with legal representatives and then to the court system.
 - Phase 2: Following the completion of interviews and data analysis, the Public Sector Innovation Lab will work with stakeholders to develop the scope for a 90-Day Project.
- (3) Aboriginal Community Sector development project
- aimed at improving service delivery outcomes for Aboriginal families living in northern Adelaide
 - multi-agency group is being established to scope the project and establish priority outcomes
 - MAYFS will lead this project with backbone support from the Making an Impact project team
 - focus will be on a collaborative service response to father and sons who have been disengaged as a result of contact with the justice system and attributing complex family issues.
- (4) A fathers and sons project
- focused on re-connecting adult Aboriginal offenders to their communities and engagement with their children and families
 - multi-agency discussions have been undertaken to scope interest and capacity to support this project
 - potential to join with project (3) above to prototype collaborative response.

The new Connected Youth Justice Strategy, currently in development, will have a strong focus on addressing the over-representation of Aboriginal young people in the justice system. Aboriginal communities and partners are being engaged in the development of the Strategy and its associated delivery plan. Implementation will commence in early 2019. Making an Impact initiatives will contribute to delivery of the Connected Youth Justice Strategy.

COMMUNITY CARE SERVICES

474 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). With reference to Program 2: Community Care Services from the 2017-18 budget:

- (a) Where does this program and its objectives now sit within the Department for Human Services?
- (b) What changes, additions, substitutions or discontinuations of Community Care Services have resulted from the machinery of government change, and what impact has this had on expenditure and FTE?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The activities and objectives of Program 2: Community Care Services from the 2017-18 Budget papers are reported as part of Program 1: Communities in the 2018-19 state budget.

Community Care Services was not affected by the machinery of government changes.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

475 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services, what is the breakdown of attraction, retention, and performance allowances, as well as non-salary benefits, paid to public servants and contractors in the year 2017-18?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

For the 2017-18 financial year, the Department for Human Services paid \$235,860.36 for attraction, retention, performance allowances and non-salary benefits to public servants. This figure does not include payments made to employees of Housing SA.

The breakdown of allowances paid in 2017-18 is as follows:

Allowance Type	Amount Paid
Attraction Allowances	\$123,249.95
Retention Allowances	\$112,610.41
Total	\$235,860.36

The department pays invoices for hours worked by contractors and does not hold a breakdown of allowances for the same.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

476 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister:

- What was the cost of electricity in 2017-18?
- What is the budgeted cost of electricity in 2018-19?
- What is the provisional cost of electricity in 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) The actual cost of electricity for the Department for Human Services (DHS) in 2017-18 was approximately \$2.979m.

(b) The budgeted cost for electricity for the DHS in 2018-19 is approximately \$2.114 million.
The budgeted cost for electricity for the SA Housing Authority in 2018-19 is \$703,000

(c) The provisional cost for electricity for DHS in 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 is:

2019-20 Provision \$'000	2020-21 Provision \$'000	2021-22 Provision \$'000
2,167	2,221	2,276

The provisional cost for electricity for the SA Housing Authority in 2019-20, 2020-21 and 2021-22 is:

2019-20 Provision \$'000	2020-21 Provision \$'000	2021-22 Provision \$'000
721	739	758

MACHINERY OF GOVERNMENT CHANGES

477 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the total cost of machinery of government changes since 18 March 2018 and what is the breakdown of these costs?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

On 17 May 2018, the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion was renamed the Department for Human Services. The cost to rename and rebrand the department was \$48,868 (excluding GST) There were no advertising costs associated with the renaming or rebranding of the department.

The costs are broken down as follows:

Expenditure Items	Cost (excluding GST)
Infrastructure: lanyards, signage and security cards	\$5,300
Communications and Engagement: printing—stationery, print collateral, distribution (e.g. forms, brochures, posters, pull up banners)	\$37,468
Business Technology: updating mainframe operating systems, internet and intranet sites, and other general systems	\$6,100
Total	\$48,868

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

478 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister, what ReturnToWork claims have been made since 18 March 2018?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

From 18 March 2018 to 30 June 2018, 66 ReturnToWork claims were submitted in the department, comprising 56 for musculoskeletal injuries and ten for mental stress

From 1 July 2018 to 16 November 2018, eight Return to Work claims have been submitted to the SA Housing Authority, comprising of five musculoskeletal injuries and three mental stress.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

480 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister, what new sections of your department or agencies have been established or abolished since 18 March 2018 and what is their purpose?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

On 1 July 2018, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) assumed responsibility for Multicultural Affairs from the department, and the South Australian Housing Authority (SAHA) commenced operations as a statutory corporation, separate to DHS. All Housing SA FTEs transferred from DHS to the South Australian Housing Trust, trading as SAHA. Multicultural Affairs is responsible for providing policy advice and support to the Premier and other stakeholders, administering multicultural grants programs and supporting the work of the South Australian Multicultural and Ethnic Affairs Commission. SAHA is primarily responsible for the delivery of housing-related services for lower income South Australians and management of the housing stock.

On 1 October 2018, the Early Intervention Research Directorate (EIRD) joined the department from DPC, as part of the MOG changes. EIRD plays a leading role in collaboration between the government and academic sectors; ensuring child abuse and neglect early intervention and prevention is informed by evidence.

All funded services within Domiciliary Care transitioned to the Royal District Nursing Services on 29 June 2018. Transitioned services include the Commonwealth Home Support Programme and the State Adults with Chronic Conditions program, as well as in-house corporate functions.

In response to these changes, the department's organisational structure has been reorganised. This includes the establishment of the Community and Support Services Division, which consolidates functions that support and engage communities including Screening, Concessions and Support Services, Community Services and the State Recovery Office.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

481 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister, since 18 March 2018 how many briefings have returned unsigned from the minister's office (by title and document number)?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

None.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

482 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister:

(a) What is the FTE cap for each year of the forward estimates?

(b) Does the department or agency expect to exceed that cap in any year of the forward estimates?

(c) What is the actual FTE count currently, and the projected actual FTE count for each year of the forward estimates?

(d) What is the notional FTE job reduction target that has been agreed with Treasury for each year of the forward estimates?

(e) Does the department expect to meet that target in each year of the forward estimates?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) The FTE Cap for each year of the forward estimates is 2,240.6 FTEs for 2019-20; 1,758.6 FTEs for 2020-21; and 1,265.1 FTEs for 2021-22.

Agency	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
DHS	2240.6	1758.6	1265.1
SA Housing Authority	854.2	769.2	708.2

(b) The department and SA Housing Authority do not expect to exceed the cap in any year of the forward estimates.

(c) The actual FTE count as at 30 September 2018 is 2,975 FTEs. There are no actuals projections for the forward estimates, other than the Department is not expecting to exceed its FTE cap in any year of the forward estimates.

The SA Housing Authority's FTE count at the last pay in October 2018 was 846.8. The projected FTE count across the forward estimates is in line with the approved FTE cap.

(d) Please note the following in regards to FTE reductions:

- FTE reductions associated with the 2018-19 budget savings measures are outlined in the 2018-19 Budget Measures Statement (Budget Paper 5).
- As part of the NDIS reforms and transfer of disability services to the non-government sector, please refer to the 2018-19 Budget Statement, Budget Paper 3 for the notional FTE reductions across the forward estimates, which is based on current assumptions of the transfer timing.

(e) The Department and SA Housing Authority expect to meet the FTE targets in each year of the forward estimates.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

483 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister:

- What savings targets have been set for each year of the forward estimates in the 2018-19 budget?
- Are you projecting to meet these savings targets?
- What measures are you implementing to meet your savings targets?
- If savings measures haven't been decided, when will they?
- What is the decision-making process to decide on the elements of the savings measures?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) Savings measures in the 2018-19 Budget and across the forward estimates were outlined in the Budget Measures Statement, Budget Paper 5.

In addition to the 2018-19 budget savings announced, the department is also managing the impact of the efficiency measures and other savings imposed from prior years.

(b) The department and SA Housing Authority is currently anticipated to meet its 2018-19 savings targets.

(c) Measures were outlined in the Budget Measures Statement, Budget Paper 5 for the department and SA Housing Authority. These measures outlined for the SA Housing Authority do not include offset savings through asset sales (net).

(d) Please refer to (a).

(e) The department undertakes an annual executive review of its savings targets. Savings are generally allocated to divisions using the same methodology as imposed by the government. During the year, divisions develop savings measures and strategies to achieve their allocated savings targets. The DHS Executive Budget Committee and Executive Leadership Team provide the governance and responsibility for the achievement of their component of the Department's annual savings. The achievement of savings forms part of the Division's end of year projection and is captured as part of the monitoring process.

Savings measures were identified by the Chief Executive of the SA Housing Authority, with the support of the Department of Treasury and Finance.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

484 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister, since 18 March 2018 what projects and programs have an underspend that were not approved by cabinet for carryover expenditure in 2018-19?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) The FTE Cap for each year of the forward estimates is 2,240.6 FTEs for 2019-20; 1,758.6 FTEs for 2020-21; and 1,265.1 FTEs for 2021-22.

Agency	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
DHS	2240.6	1758.6	1265.1
SA Housing Authority	854.2	769.2	708.2

(b) The Department and SA Housing Authority do not expect to exceed the cap in any year of the forward estimates.

(c) The actual FTE count as at 30 September 2018 is 2,975 FTEs. There are no actuals projections for the forward estimates, other than the department is not expecting to exceed its FTE cap in any year of the forward estimates.

The SA Housing Authority's FTE count at the last pay in October 2018 was 846.8. The projected FTE count across the forward estimates is in line with the approved FTE cap.

(d) Please note the following in regards to FTE reductions:

- FTE reductions associated with the 2018-19 budget savings measures are outlined in the 2018-19 Budget Measures Statement (Budget Paper 5).
- As part of the NDIS reforms and transfer of disability services to the non-government sector, please refer to the 2018-19 Budget Statement, Budget Paper 3 for the notional FTE reductions across the forward estimates, which is based on current assumptions of the transfer timing.

(e) The department and SA Housing Authority expect to meet the FTE targets in each year of the forward estimates.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

485 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister:

- What grant funding lines does the department and all agencies have?
- What grants have been provided from each line since 18 March 2018?
- Are job targets and clawback provisions attached to each grant?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

(a) and (b) The information requested in relation to grant funding lines and expenditure is available in the Hansard for the House of Assembly, Parliament of South Australia, on 27 November 2018.

(c) It is dependent upon the purpose of the grant funding as to whether job targets are attached to a grant.

DHS business units are required to manage unexpended funds in accordance with the department's Unexpended Grant Money Policy which requires that unexpended grant money to non-South Australian Government entities are dealt with in a manner consistent with Treasurer's Instruction 15.'

Where appropriate, grant agreements with funded organisations provide for the return of unspent funds to the SA Housing Authority.

HUMAN SERVICES DEPARTMENT

486 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). Regarding the Department for Human Services and all agencies reporting to the minister, since 18 March 2018 how many briefings have not been returned from the minister's office (by title and document number)?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Since 18 March 2018 until 5 December 2018 there have been 9 briefings not returned.

Briefing Number	Title
18TDHS/538	18TDHS/538—Community Services Division—Community Services Support Program 2017 Annual Report
18TDHS/1754	18TDHS/1754—Response from DHS—DHS Strategic Plan 2018—2022

18TDHS/1764	18TDHS/1764—Response from DHS—NDIS Transition Quarterly Check In (Sector forum)—1 November 2018
18TDHS/1778	18TDHS/1778—Response from DHS—Seek Approval to Extend Mr Ed Carson As Chair, Grants SA (Major And Medium) Assessment Pane
18TDHS/1839	18TDHS/1839—Response from DHS—FINANCE REPORT—October 2018
18TDHS/1429	18TDHS/1429—Response from DHS—Noting for Extension of Contract for DCSI394 Salesforce Design and Development
18TDHS/1688	18TDHS/1688—Response from DHS—Powershop Australia Pty Ltd Concession Scheme Administrative Arrangements Deed—For Execution By The Minister
18MHAF/042	Affordable Housing and State Coordinator-General Housing Affordability Update
18MHAF/066	Independent Community-Wide Homelessness Administrators Group Forum (ICHAG) Update.

CHARITABLE AND SOCIAL WELFARE FUND

487 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund (Community Benefit SA program), on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Charitable and Social Welfare Fund and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

CLIENT TRUST ACCOUNT

488 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Client Trust Account?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Client Trust Account, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Client Trust Account and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

489 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of community service obligations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for Community Service Obligations, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of community service obligations and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

STATE GOVERNMENT CONCESSIONS

490 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of concessions?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for concessions, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of concessions and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

CONSUMER ADVOCACY AND RESEARCH FUND

491 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Consumer Advocacy and Research Fund and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

DISABILITY SERVICES

492 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of disability services donations and bequests?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Financial information for Disability Services Donations and Bequests, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of Disability Services Donations and Bequests and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

DUKE OF EDINBURGH'S AWARD TRUST

493 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Duke of Edinburgh's Award Trust?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

This account was established to support the delivery of the Duke of Edinburgh Award. The department no longer manages the delivery of the Award and transferred the remaining administration of funds to a non-government organisation to support disadvantaged South Australians to participate in the Duke of Edinburgh's Award program in 2017-18.

GAMBLERS REHABILITATION FUND

494 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Gamblers Rehabilitation Fund and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

AGED-CARE FUNDING

495 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of health and aged-care service donations and bequests?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Financial information for the Health and Aged Care Service Donations and Bequests, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Health and Aged Care Service Donations and Bequests and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

HOME FOR THE INCURABLES TRUST

496 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Home for the Incurables Trust?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Home for the Incurables Trust, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Home for the Incurables Trust and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

HOMELESSNESS SOCIAL IMPACT BOND

497 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Homelessness Social Impact Bond?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Homelessness Social Impact Bond, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Homelessness Social Impact Bond and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

PERSONAL ALERT SYSTEMS REBATE SCHEME

498 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Personal Alert Systems Rebate Scheme?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The 2017-18 and 2018-19 budget for the Personal Alert Systems Rebate Scheme, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Personal Alert Systems Rebate Scheme and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

STATE EMERGENCY RELIEF FUND

499 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the State Emergency Relief Fund?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Financial information for the State Emergency Relief Fund, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the State Emergency Relief Fund and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

SUPPORTED RESIDENTIAL FACILITIES FUND

500 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). What is the 2017-18 and 2018-19 operational or associated budget and the 2017-18 and 2018-19 FTE equivalency in the operation or delivery of the Supported Residential Facilities Fund?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Financial information for the Supported Residential Facilities Fund, on a cash flow basis, is published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3 – Additional information for administered items – statement of cash flows.

Actual expenses for 2017-18 are contained within the Department for Human Services' Administered Financial Statements for the year ended 30 June 2018.

As applicable, the operational budget for delivery of the Supported Residential Facilities Fund and associated FTEs form part of the Department for Human Services' total controlled budget and FTEs published in the 2018-19 Agency Statements – Budget Paper 4 Volume 3.

YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

501 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). For financial year 2017-18, what is the total number of males incarcerated through the Youth Justice system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

There were 260 males admitted to the Adelaide Youth Training Centre in 2017-18.

YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

502 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). For financial year 2017-18, what is the total number of females incarcerated through the Youth Justice system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

There were 69 females admitted to the Adelaide Youth Training Centre in 2017-18.

YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

503 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). For financial year 2017-18, what is the total number of people identifying as Indigenous or Torres Strait Islander incarcerated through the Youth Justice system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

There were 166 young people who identify as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander admitted to the Adelaide Youth Training Centre in 2017-18.

YOUTH JUSTICE SYSTEM

504 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (29 November 2018). For financial year 2017-18, what is the total number of people identifying as living with a disability incarcerated through the Youth Justice system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Department for Human Services is not able to report on this due to the current system configurations for Youth Justice reporting.

POLICE NUMBERS

516 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (5 December 2018). What was the total number of sworn police officers (FTE) as at 31 October 2018?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

The total number of sworn (active FTE) police officers (including Community Constables and excluding Cadets) in South Australia as at 31 October 2018 was 4,597.2 FTE.

POLICE NUMBERS

517 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (5 December 2018). What was the total number of sworn police officers (FTE), at 31 July 2018, of the rank of:

- Constable (including probationary constable)?
- Senior Constable?
- Sergeant?
- Senior Sergeant?
- Inspector?
- Chief Inspector?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

Total number of sworn police officers (FTE) as at 31 July 2018, of the rank of:

- Constable – 966.2 FTE. This includes 363 Probationary Constables and 603.2 Constables.
- Senior Constable – 1,608.6 FTE. This includes 1058.3 Senior Constables and 550.3 Senior Constables First Class.
- Sergeant – 629.0 FTE
- Senior Sergeant – 220.8 FTE. This includes 88.0 Senior Sergeants and 132.8 Senior Sergeants First Class
- Inspector – 58.8 FTE
- Chief Inspector – 42.0 FTE.

POLICE NUMBERS

518 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (5 December 2018). What was the total number of sworn police officers (FTE), at 31 October 2018, of the rank of:

- Constable (including probationary constable)?
- Senior Constable?

- Sergeant?
- Senior Sergeant?
- Chief Inspector?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):

Total number of sworn police officers (FTE) as at 31 October 2018, of the rank of:

- Constable – 923.4 FTE. This includes 329 Probationary Constables and 594.4 Constables.
- Senior Constable – 1,597.2 FTE. This includes 1062.9 Senior Constables and 534.3 Senior Constables First Class.
- Sergeant – 631.3 FTE
- Senior Sergeant – 207.4 FTE. This includes 82.0 Senior Sergeants and 125.4 Senior Sergeants First Class
- Inspector – 61.0 FTE
- Chief Inspector – 43.0 FTE.

KORDAMENTHA

519 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). What are the names and positions of members of the KordaMentha Turnaround Team engaged by CALHN?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Mark Mentha and Chris Martin will lead the CALHN Organisational and Financial Recovery Plan turnaround team.

KORDAMENTHA

520 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). What is the schedule and amounts of payments to KordaMentha for the CALHN Turnaround contract?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The maximum amount payable to KordaMentha for the provision of the services under the CAHLN Turnaround Contract is an amount of up to \$18,900,000 (GST exclusive) in total.

KordaMentha will invoice on a monthly basis for services provided.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

521 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). Who were the probity advisers for the CALHN Turnaround Implementation Services tender?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

O'Connor Marsden and Associates Pty Ltd were appointed as the probity advisers.

KORDAMENTHA

522 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). On what date was the KordaMentha diagnostic report first presented to SA Health?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The draft KordaMentha diagnostic report was presented to SA Health on 10 September 2018.

KORDAMENTHA

523 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). On what date was the KordaMentha diagnostic report first presented to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

A draft of the KordaMentha diagnostic report was received in my office on 10 September 2018.

KORDAMENTHA

524 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). On what date was the KordaMentha Organisational and Financial Recovery Plan first presented to the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The Chief Executive, SA Health received a draft of the Organisational and Financial Recovery Plan on 24 October 2018.

KORDAMENTHA

525 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). On what date was the KordaMentha Organisational and Financial Recovery Plan first presented to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

A draft of the KordaMentha Organisational and Financial Recovery Plan was received in my office on 29 October 2018.

KORDAMENTHA

526 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). On what dates between 18 March 2018 and 26 November 2018 did the Minister for Health and Wellbeing meet with representatives from KordaMentha?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

28 August, 29 August, 15 October, 30 October, 1 November and 21 November.

KORDAMENTHA

527 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (6 December 2018). On what dates between 18 March 2018 and 26 November 2018 did the Chief Executive of the Department for Health and Wellbeing meet with representatives from KordaMentha?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The Chief Executive, SA Health met with representatives from KordaMentha on the following dates:

9 August 2018

28 August 2018

29 August 2018

11 September 2018

13 September 2018

4 October 2018

11 October 2018

12 October 2018

15 October 2018

6 November 2018

8 November 2018

21 November 2018.

MAIN SOUTH ROAD DUPLICATION

528 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (6 December 2018). The original proposal for the Main South Road Duplication—Seaford to Sellicks had a bike path run along Main South Road, can you confirm there will be a bike path or veloway which will run parallel with the duplicate road?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised—

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is progressing with the detailed planning required for this project. The planning will provide a better understanding of the timeline and extent of each stage, as well as provide clarity on the treatments with intersecting roads and provisions for pedestrians and cyclists.

Planning will consider the needs of commuter, tourist and recreational cyclists both along and across the corridor. It will also consider the best way to integrate with the existing and aspirational networks developed by the City of Onkaparinga.

Direct liaison with the community will be a strong focus throughout the planning and delivery for this project including the local bicycle users and groups.

At this point in time, the contact for the Main South Road Action Group will be the Manager Infrastructure Planning and Investment, Mr Scott Cooper.

MAIN SOUTH ROAD DUPLICATION

529 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (12 February 2018). What are the contact details for a person currently working on the Main South Road Duplication project to be a liaison with the Main South Road Action Group who represent the community?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised—

Direct liaison with the community will be a strong focus throughout the planning and delivery for this project including with the Main South Road Action Group. The project team will engage with the Main South Road Action Group over the next couple of months to allow the team to get the best understanding of the group's issues and expectations.

At this point in time, the contact for the Main South Road Action Group will be the Manager Infrastructure Planning and Investment, Mr Scott Cooper.

MAIN SOUTH ROAD DUPLICATION

530 The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (12 February 2018). The community have made it clear they want under/overpasses included in the Main South Road Duplication from Seaford to Sellicks. This has been discussed at meetings with the minister and submitted in writing by the Main South Road Action Group. Can the Minister provide an update on what is proposed for the major intersections?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised of the following-

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure is progressing with the detailed planning required for this project. The planning will provide a better understanding of the timeline and extent of each stage, as well as provide clarity on the treatments with intersecting roads and provisions for pedestrians and cyclists.

Planning will provide recommended treatments for the major intersections with consideration of the road function, safety and accessibility to adjacent properties.

Direct liaison with the community will be a strong focus throughout the planning and delivery for this project including the Main South Road Action Group.

At this point in time, the contact for the Main South Road Action Group will be the Manager Infrastructure Planning and Investment, Mr Scott Cooper.

TRAINING AND SKILLS COMMISSION

533 The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (13 February 2018). What was the cost of the Department of Industry and Skills' advertorial titled 'Industry bodies to help shape SA's job growth' to promote the Training and Skills Commission?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Industry and Skills): I have been advised that the cost is: \$14,279.00.

FINAL ACCREDITATION REPORTS

534 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What draft or final accreditation reports are set to occur over the next 12 months, and what are the deadlines of each draft and final report?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Accreditation is provided by a range of bodies for a range of activities. Clarification is necessary.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

535 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the average emergency department visit times for each metro hospital, country in total, and statewide total, for 2016-17 and 2017-18?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

I refer the Member to the publications of the Australian Institute of Health and Welfare.

HOSPITAL BEDS

536 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the number of hospital beds—broken down by category, and including a statewide total and broken down across each major metro hospital and country total for the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 budget and over the forward estimates?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The number of hospital beds flexes up and down on a regular basis. The historical numbers would have varied up and down over the year and the same would be expected in coming years.

EMERGENCY CODES

537 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the number of days there was a Code Black incident—in the form of total days—of Code White incidents—statewide and for each metro hospital and country total, for 2016-17 and 2017-18?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the member to previous answers.

EMERGENCY CODES

538 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the number of days there was a Code White incident—in the form of total days—of Code White incidents—statewide and for each metro hospital and country total, for 2016-17 and 2017-18?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the member to previous answers.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

539 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What were the total presentations to emergency departments for each metro hospital and country in total, for 2016-17 and 2017-18?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the member to information published on the DataSA website.

HEALTH SERVICES

540 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the FTEs across our health services, for 2016-17, for 2017-18, budgeted costs for this financial year and over the forward estimates, broken down into the following categories—DHW employees, LHNs, SAAS, medical professionals, nursing/midwifery, allied health professionals, public sector salaried officers, public sector executives, grant-funded scientists, medical scientists, technical officers, weekly paid/metal trades, dental officers, SA Ambulance Award, ministerial appointments and principal research fellows?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the member to the evidence given to the South Australian Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation's inquiry into Workplace Fatigue and Bullying in south Australian Hospitals and Health Services on Friday 7 December 2018.

HOSPITAL STAY

541 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What was the average length of stay, including the percentage changes from the previous financial years, statewide and for each metro hospital and country in total, for 2016-17 and 2017-18?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the Member to the SA Health website for Length of Stay data.

HOSPITAL STAFF

543 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the nurse/patient ratios, both statewide and across each LHN and site, for the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 budget and over the forward estimates?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Ratios can vary between medical disciplines and between sites.

LOCAL HEALTH NETWORKS

544 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What are the actual numbers of nurses versus average number of patients, both statewide and across each LHN and site, for the 2016-17, 2017-18, 2018-19 budget and over the forward estimates?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Nurses work in a range of domains where it is not possible to apportion nurses to patients.

GRANTS

546 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What is the breakdown of funding allocations for grants, for this year's budget and over the forward estimates?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the Member to answers provided to Estimates Committee B.

SA AMBULANCE SERVICE

548 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How much will the privatisation of ambulance services between the Modbury and Lyell McEwin Hospitals save the budget, and when will the private service commence?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The member's question is based on a false assumption.

NORTHERN ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

549 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How will the Minister ensure the safety of patient outcomes with a privatised patient transfer system in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The member's question is based on a false assumption.

CHELTENHAM PLACE

552 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Has the minister visited the Cheltenham Place HIV service, and if so on what dates?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

No.

AUSTRALIAN CRANIOFACIAL UNIT

556 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Has the minister received a report from the Chief Medical Officer on the Australian Craniofacial Unit and if so on what date?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

No.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

559 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What type of elective surgery operations are to be conducted at the Repatriation General Hospital?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The planning process is ongoing.

COUNTRY HEALTH SERVICES

560 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What country health services will remain centralised under the planned governance reforms, and what services will be split between the planned six new country health boards?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The planning process is ongoing.

COUNTRY HEALTH SA

561 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Under the health system restructure, will Country Health SA remain in place and retain its current structure and Chief Executive? Will it continue to oversee all country health functions which are not decentralised to new country health boards?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The planning process is ongoing.

AMBULANCE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION

563 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Has the government met all of the commitments it made to the Ambulance Employees Association prior to the election?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Election commitments are made to be delivered in the term of a government and will be delivered.

NOARLUNGA HOSPITAL

565 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Is the government still committed to the establishment of a 24/7, 12-bed Acute Medical Ward at Noarlunga Hospital, and if so:

- (a) When will construction commence on this ward?
- (b) Where will this ward be located?
- (c) Will this ward be 24/7 or will it have limited hours? If so what hours?
- (d) What is the anticipated opening date for this ward?
- (e) What will be moved off the Noarlunga Hospital site to make room for the acute medical ward?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The planning process is ongoing and the government will meet its commitments.

NATIONAL DISABILITY INSURANCE SCHEME

567 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How long is it taking on average for patients to successfully transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

As most South Australians transitioning onto the National Disability Insurance Scheme have been patients of SA Health at some point in their life, it is impossible to provide a meaningful answer to this question.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

569 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Has the minister ever made a request for a senior clinician to be seconded to work in his office?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

A wide range of candidates have been considered for appointment to my office. Secondments were considered but not pursued.

WELLBEING SA

573 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). On what date will Wellbeing SA be established?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The planning process is ongoing.

LYMPHOEDEMA COMPRESSION GARMENT SUBSIDY

574 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Has the business case commissioned by the previous government into establishing a lymphoedema garment subsidy been completed, and if so:

- (a) When was this completed?
- (b) When did the minister first receive a copy of the business case?
- (c) When will the minister publicly release the business case?
- (d) Will the minister commit to implementing the business case's recommendations?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

No.

HOSPITALS, PRIVATE PRACTICE

575 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Given the requirements of the SA Health Salaried Medical Officers Enterprise Agreement 2017 how will the minister meet the savings targets for the rights of private practice arrangements to start from next year?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

HOSPITALS, HOTEL SERVICES

576 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). With respect to the government's announcement of reform of hotel services at SA Hospital sites:

- (a) How will hotel services across SA hospital sites be reformed?
- (b) Will this reform of hotel services result in any reduced services?
- (c) What sites are the savings of \$4.5 million per annum to be made from?
- (d) Will any existing contracts need to be rescinded to deliver these reforms?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

CENTRAL ADELAIDE LOCAL HEALTH NETWORK

579 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Do the CALHN expenses contained in the 2018-19 state budget account for the relocation of the Royal Adelaide Hospital Sleep Clinic?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The Royal Adelaide Hospital designed and built by the previous government was not designed to accommodate an overnight elective sleep service. The government has released a consultation paper to staff and publicly prior to any final decision being made.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

581 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Will The Queen Elizabeth Hospital stage 3 redevelopment deliver in full on every planned upgrade that was outlined in the initial \$270m stage 3 redevelopment plan? When will the stage 3 redevelopment plan for QEH be finalised?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

In the 2018 budget the Marshall Liberal government committed \$273 million to the stage 3 redevelopment of TQEH.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

582 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). When will the stage 3 redevelopment for QEH go out to tender?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

I refer the member to the government's public statements about this matter.

QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL

583 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). When will the stage 3 redevelopment for QEH be completed?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

I refer the member to the Government's public statements about this matter.

CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

586 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Do the costings for The QEH cardiac upgrades contained within the 2018-19 state budget reflect the same costings put to the minister in the initial briefings he received on this election promise?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

CARDIOLOGY SERVICES

587 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Why did SA Health not provide CALHN with funding for the Cardiac Service at TQEH as outlined in the KordaMentha Diagnostic Review?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Incoming briefs are cabinet documents and subject to that confidentiality. I am unable to provide further information.

SAHMRI 2

590 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). On what date will SAHMRI II begin construction?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S HOSPITAL

591 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). On what date will the new WCH Taskforce release its report?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The report is not finalised and will be released following that.

MENTAL HEALTH PATIENTS

592 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Will the Minister advise what action has been taken to address the crisis of mental health patients causing ambulance ramping at The QEH and other metro hospitals?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Action to facilitate timely care in our hospitals, including for mental health patients, includes measures to both increase capacity and improve patient flow.

In terms of capacity, mental health beds have been opened at the Lyell McEwin and Royal Adelaide Hospitals.

MENTAL HEALTH PATIENTS

593 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How many mental health patients waited more than 24 hours for a bed in a public hospital between March 2018 and November 2018?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I refer the Member to the SA Health Emergency Department Dashboard.

ICE TASKFORCE

594 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Does the minister commit to delivering in full all the Ice Taskforce recommendations?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The response to the ice taskforce recommendations is coordinated by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

ICE TASKFORCE

595 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How has the government progressed with the Ice Taskforce recommendations, specifically referencing what recommendations have further progressed since the March 17 election?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The response to the ice taskforce recommendations is coordinated by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY REPORT

596 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How does the promise for three older person's mental health facilities tie in with plans for a tier 7 facility at the Repat, and the two mental health facilities being considered under the response to the Final Report of the Oakden Report Response Plan Oversight Committee?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The Marshall Liberal government is committed to an effective response to the gross deficiencies in older persons' care under the previous government.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

597 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). When will construction commence on the tier 7 facility to be located at the Repat?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

REPATRIATION GENERAL HOSPITAL

598 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). How many beds will be in the tier 7 facility at the Repat?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

MENTAL HEALTH PATIENTS

599 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). What is the current waiting list for forensic mental health patients waiting for an appropriate bed?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

The waiting list fluctuates constantly.

MENTAL HEALTH BEDS

600 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Are there any plans to increase the number of forensic mental health beds across the state—and if so by how many, at what sites and by what date?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised:

Planning is ongoing.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO AGED CARE QUALITY AND SAFETY

601 Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (13 February 2018). Will the minister allow the commonwealth aged-care royal commission full and uninhibited access to all South Australian aged-care sites?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The state will fully cooperate with the commonwealth commission.

ROYAL COMMISSION INTO AGED CARE QUALITY AND SAFETY

602 Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (13 February 2018). Will the government issue letters patent to enable the commonwealth aged care royal commission to exercise its power in South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

The royal commission can exercise its powers in South Australia.

TRAMLINE EXTENSION

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (8 November 2018).

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): The Minister for Transport and Infrastructure has advised:

The feasibility report on the tram right turn at the intersection of King William Street and North Terrace, prepared by independent engineering expert Aurecon, has been available on the department's website since 23 November 2018, and is available at:

https://www.infrastructure.sa.gov.au/public_transport_projects/city_tram_extension/news_And_publications

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **the Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens)** (14 November 2018).

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): I indicated that my understanding was that 'some kind of memorandum' went from the Attorney-General's Office to the Treasurer and/or to SAicorp with respect to arranging payment of \$2.57 million.

Having reviewed materials, I confirm that the Crown Solicitor's Office wrote to SAicorp on 1 May 2018.

I am advised that the Auditor-General did not request any cabinet documents, cabinet submissions or cabinet notes regarding the payment.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (28 November 2018).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): Approximately 483 employees in the department's residential care service have undergone a psychological assessment, with the majority of these staff employed in child and youth worker or similar roles.

Due to concerns for staff wellbeing and the fact that these assessment processes are still ongoing, it is not appropriate to comment on the number of employees deemed psychologically unsuitable.

All employees currently working within residential care facilities in the Department for Child Protection have been assessed and deemed psychologically suitable.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (28 November 2018).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

Pursuant to section 110A(2) of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* (CYPS Act) and regulation 34 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Regulations 2017* (CYPS Regulations), persons working in residential facilities established under the *Family and Community Services Act 1972* who are not employees of the Department for Child Protection (i.e. NGO and commercial care staff and volunteers) will be required to undergo psychological assessment by 6 September 2019.

Pursuant to section 107 of the CYPS Act and regulation 31 of the CYPS Regulations persons employed in a licensed children's residential facility are required to undergo a psychological assessment by 22 April 2020.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (28 November 2018).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

No known confidential information has been compromised as a result of weaknesses in C3MS.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (28 November 2018).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

Pursuant to section 110A(2) of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* (CYPS Act) and regulation 34 of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Regulations 2017* (CYPS Regulations), persons working in residential facilities established under the *Family and Community Services Act 1972* who are not employees of the Department for Child Protection (i.e. NGO and commercial care staff and volunteers) will be required to undergo psychological assessment by 6 September 2019.

Pursuant to section 107 of the CYPS Act and regulation 31 of the CYPS Regulations persons employed in a licensed children's residential facility are required to undergo a psychological assessment by 22 April 2020.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (28 November 2018).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

The net cost of care for 2017-18 was \$522.116 million.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (28 November 2018).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

As at the 30 June 2018, the total number of children in out-of-home-care is 3,695:

- Commercial care – 93
- Foster Care – 1,434
- Kinship Care (inclusive of Specified Child only carer) – 1,684
- Residential Care – 408
- Independent Living – 47
- Family day care—29

Please note:

- Data is correct as at 30 June 2018.
- Previous data adjustments occur due to information updates within the client management system. Data has now been frozen as at 31 August 2018.
- Data is counted for children aged 0-17, consistent with National Australian institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW) and Report on Government Services (ROGS) reporting.

GAMBLING REGULATION

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (29 November 2018).

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General): The Lotteries Commission of South Australia (the commission) is a statutory authority empowered by the State Lotteries Act 1966 to promote and conduct lotteries for and on behalf of the State of South Australia.

The commission has appointed Tatts Lotteries SA Pty Ltd (SA Lotteries) as the master agent to operate the Commission's brands and products for a 40 year term, which is due to expire on 10 December 2052.

The commission monitors Tatts and ensures the operation of lotteries in South Australia complies with all regulatory and legal arrangements.

All gambling providers operating in South Australia are governed by the Gambling Codes of Practice Notice 2013 (the codes).

Whilst the extension of credit by a gambling provider and the use of credit to gamble is prohibited under the *Casino Act 1997*, the *Gaming Machines Act 1992* and the Major Betting Operator and licensed racing clubs under the *Authorised Betting Operations Act 2000*, the *Codes and the State Lotteries Act 1966* do not prohibit the use of credit to purchase Lotto or Keno tickets.

As part of the transition to a new regulatory regime for gambling in South Australia, the Liquor and Gambling commissioner will be undertaking a broader review of all gambling regulation in South Australia.

The most appropriate way to progress the review will be determined by the commissioner early in the new year.

This matter will be considered in conjunction with consultation with the Lotteries Commission of South Australia and the South Australian public.

STRATHMONT POOL

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised:

The Department for Education's regular, personalised water safety program is not a swimming therapy program. The program is water safety focussed, in support of learning outcomes in the Health and Physical Education learning area.

In 2018, 452 students with disabilities accessed the regular, personalised program at the Strathmont Centre pool. The number of students accessing the program varies from year to year as students leave the school, new learning priorities are determined for existing students and new students are approved.

All students from the 15 schools previously accessing the program at the Strathmont Centre pool will continue to have access to a program in 2019.

STRATHMONT POOL

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised:

The Department for Education funds the cost of instruction for the water safety program. This is the major cost of the program. Schools and/or parents are responsible for any transport arrangements, transport costs and pool entry costs that may be necessary.

A pool entry cost applies to all students, including students with disabilities, at all program venues except for school pools, Strathmont Centre, Minda pool and Novita Regency Park pool. Pool entry fees are set by pool management and generally range from \$3 to \$4.80 per session.

A pool entry fee subsidy has been approved to limit the cost of pool entry for the relocated Strathmont Centre students to \$2 per session in the first instance. This fee will increase gradually to the normal entry fee over a five year period.

This is consistent with the costs for most other students accessing the Department for Education's water safety program.

SCHOOL FUNDING

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (5 December 2018).

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I am advised:

The state funding contributions under the previous national agreement were measured using the Australian Curriculum, Assessment and Reporting Authority financial data reporting methodology for state Net Recurrent Income Per Student. This methodology has not changed; however as outlined in 'Appendix 1: bilateral agreement between South Australia and the commonwealth on quality schools reform', the commonwealth is allowing South Australia to include in its funding contributions transport costs and depreciation of assets to a value of up to 4 per cent of the Schooling Resource Standard, plus regulatory expenditure relating to the SACE Board of South Australia and the Education Standards Board.

WALLAROO MINING PROPOSAL

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (6 December 2018).

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining): I have been advised the following:

- The application proposed is over a cleared paddock, currently and historically used for agricultural purposes, which has been subject to impacts from agricultural land use for some time.
- While independent surveys of the geology, flora, fauna, soil, air quality, noise, to name a few, are regularly required for mining lease applications, for this particular application the existing environment of a cleared paddock and low impact mining techniques proposed did not warrant an independent survey.
- If the extractive operation is approved, the zoning will remain unchanged however, consistent with government's assessment of the proposal, if the proposed operation is approved any future development in the area will be assessed in light of the surrounding environment, residences and businesses including the quarry.

- The application was circulated by the Department for Energy and Mining with an invitation for public comment for a total period of five weeks.
- During this period five public submissions were received, which will directly contribute to the assessment of this application.
- Additionally, Triad Transport provided evidence that they have agreements in place with the underlying landowner and overlapping exploration licence holder.
- The proposed activities described in the application is over an agricultural paddock, which is devoid of native vegetation and is currently used for agricultural purposes.
- Any flora or fauna growing or inhabiting the area would already be impacted by current agricultural operations, including the cycle of planting and harvesting crops.
- As a result of the public consultation and assessment of the application and responses received the Department for Energy and Mining have requested additional information from Triad Transport to assess potential impacts from proposed mining on adjacent businesses and residential properties.

Estimates Replies

KORDAMENTHA

In reply to **Mr PICTON (Kaurna)** (25 September 2018). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

1. As part of the 2018-19 Budget, \$6.1 million over three years from 2018-19 has been provided for dedicated resources to contribute to a process to improve the effectiveness and efficiency of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, and the operation of Central Adelaide Local Health Network more broadly.
2. A draft diagnostic report was received in my office on 10 September 2018.
3. No.
4. KordaMentha has previously been engaged in numerous high profile consultancies, providing commercial, workforce and financial analytics. Examples of public health entities they have worked with include Ambulance Victoria and Queensland Health.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (25 September 2018). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

(a) 2017-18 Actual

Department/Agency	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
Department for Health and Wellbeing	13.9	\$1,496,739
Country Health SA	5.0	\$510,873
Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	3.6	\$384,000
SA Ambulance Service	5.0	\$363,699
Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	3.08	\$353,517
Central Adelaide Local Health Network	3.56	\$498,238
Women's and Children's Health Network	4.0	\$440,225
DASSA	3.0	\$296,465

(b) 2018-19 Budgeted

Department/Agency	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
Department for Health and Wellbeing	14.1	\$1,448,695
Country Health SA	5.0	\$510,559
Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	4.5	\$424,433
SA Ambulance Service	5.0	\$599,104

Department/Agency	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	4.9	\$482,201
Central Adelaide Local Health Network	5.0	\$515,993
Women's and Children's Health Network	5.0	\$515,245
DASSA	3.0	\$307,060

The number of FTE budgeted and estimated employment expense is subject to change depending on the outcome of the Governance review which will affect DHW and LHNs in the outyears.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2018-19

Department/Agency	Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2018-19
Department for Health and Wellbeing	\$261,740
Country Health SA	\$2,000
Northern Adelaide Local Health Network	Nil
SA Ambulance Service	\$56,398
Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	Nil
Central Adelaide Local Health Network	Nil
Women's and Children's Health Network	Nil
DASSA	\$1,146,976

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (25 September 2018). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Recurrent grants budget as at the 2018-19 State budget is summarised herewith:

Grant program/fund name (Excludes contracted services)	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Budget \$000	2019-20 Estimate \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Budget unallocated until agreements approved	Various	29,797	30,518	33,979	33,522
The following table details grant expenditure incurred in 2017-18:					
Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2017-18 Actual \$000			
South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI) Operational Grant	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI)—operational grant 2016-2020	5,600			
Drug and alcohol services	Various Drug & Alcohol programs	3,943			
Exceptional Needs Funding	Bilateral funding for the Exceptional Needs Unit (ENU) program	3,208			
Nationally Funded Centres (NFC) program	South Australia's contribution to the Nationally Funded Centres (NFC) program	2,475			
Australian Digital Health Agency and delivery of the National Digital Health Work Programme	South Australian contribution to support the Australian Digital Health Agency and delivery of the National Digital Health Work Programme	2,328			
Cancer Research	Beat Cancer Project—foster cancer research in those areas where South Australia can make a significant contribution to the evidence base for cancer control locally and internationally	2,000			

Grant program/fund name (Excludes contracted services)	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Budget \$000	2019-20 Estimate \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Budget unallocated until agreements approved	Various	29,797	30,518	33,979	33,522
The following table details grant expenditure incurred in 2017-18:					
Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2017-18 Actual \$000			
Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia Funding	Provide services and support to the Aboriginal people of South Australia	1,833			
Closing the Gap in Aboriginal Health Outcomes	Provision of the environmental health worker program and aboriginal chronic disease consortium	1,624			
Suicide prevention strategies	Multiple small projects to improve suicide prevention	1,049			
Long term ventilator support for medically and surgically stabilised patients	Long term ventilator support for medically and surgically stabilised patients	700			
Other mental health programs—recurrent grants	Other mental health programs—recurrent grants	590			
Mental health—high needs consumer grants	Contribution to ongoing support for client of Exceptional Needs Unit	550			
Australian Commission on Safety and Quality Health Care program	South Australia's contribution to the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality Health Care program	546			
Men's Health—Expanding healthy workers	Healthy Workers—Healthy Futures initiative	541			
Mental Health Coalition of SA	Mental health promotion, coordination and lived experience program	507			
Homeless Support	Services and programs to support homeless isolated and disadvantaged people.	497			
Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia core services	Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia core services	449			
Community Visitor Scheme—Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	Mental health stream of the Community Visitor Scheme	470			
Age Friendly South Australia	Multiple small grants to support and engagement with older South Australian's	400			
South Australian Audit of Peri-Operative Mortality (SAAPM)	South Australian Audit of Peri-Operative Mortality (SAAPM)	398			
Palliative Support Services	Palliative Support Services	387			
Disease prevention for South Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities	Enhanced sexually transmissible infection (STI) and blood borne virus (BBV) prevention response for South Australian Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander Communities	355			
Statewide General Practitioner Obstetric Shared Care Program	Statewide General Practitioner Obstetric Shared Care Program	348			
Blood Organ & Tissue grants	South Australia's contribution to the National Cord Blood Collection Network (NCBCN)	338			
Spiritual care	Spiritual care program for people who are hospitalised and those who care for them	312			
Ethnic Ageing Grants	Activities that grow community capacity for active ageing for culturally and linguistically diverse communities	286			
Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council (AHMAC)	South Australia's contribution to the Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council (AHMAC)	254			

Grant program/fund name (Excludes contracted services)	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Budget \$000	2019-20 Estimate \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Budget unallocated until agreements approved	Various	29,797	30,518	33,979	33,522
The following table details grant expenditure incurred in 2017-18:					
Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2017-18 Actual \$000			
The University of South Australia—Chair in Mental Health (Practice and Research)	Funding for the position of Chair in Mental Health to generate research and community engagement	189			
Council on the Ageing SA Inc.	South Australia's Ageing Plan	180			
Positive Ageing Grant	Multiple small grants to positively engage with ageing South Australian's	155			
Community Foodies	SA community food program to improve knowledge and increase behaviours in relation to healthy eating	150			
Sexual Health Information Networking & Education SA Inc.	Yarning On Program—support schools to deliver culturally appropriate relationships and sexual health education programs to students	150			
Public Health Influential Partnerships	Support for the public health function of local councils	147			
Aboriginal Scholarships	Scholarships to support Aboriginal Studies undertaking tertiary courses	144			
Streetlink Youth Health Service	Streetlink Youth Health Service	142			
Retirement Village Residents Advocacy Service	Retirement Village Residents Advocacy Service	136			
University Program Grants	International Centre for Allied Health Evidence (iCAHE) translation and training funding	136			
Grants for Seniors	Multiple small grants to support senior's programs	101			
Sexual Health Information Networking & Education SA Inc.	Provision of telephone and face to face professional counselling and other services to members of the LGBTIQ community	100			
Fertility Fundamentals Inc.	Provision of fertility advice and guidance utilising modern natural family planning methodologies	100			
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	82			
Elder Abuse Prevention Phone Line Support and Referral Service	South Australian Elder Abuse Prevention Phone Line Support and Referral Service	80			
Strength for life	Strength for life	80			
Mature Women's Ambassador project	Mature Women's Ambassador project to enable enhanced participation of older women in the workforce	75			
Australia and New Zealand Intensive Care Society (ANZICS) CORE Intensive Care Registries	Review of processes and delivery of quality assurance programs detailing benchmarking of intensive care outcomes	73			
Council on the Ageing SA Inc.	Plan and deliver ZestFest 2018 (Every Generational Festival) program of events	70			
Aged Rights Advocacy Service Incorporated Program	Deliver a state-wide program to raise awareness and understanding of living a positive life, safeguarding rights, and prevention strategies for concerns related to elder abuse	54			
Radio for the Third Age Incorporated	Activities to enable older South Australians to feel connected and better informed about ageing issues, projects, programs and events	44			
Veterans Health Advisory Council Executive Officer	Funding to employ an Executive Officer to co-ordinate comprehensive support functions and project work for the Veterans' Health Advisory Council (VHAC)	40			

Grant program/fund name (Excludes contracted services)	Purpose of grant program/fund	2018-19 Budget \$000	2019-20 Estimate \$000	2020-21 Estimate \$000	2021-22 Estimate \$000
Budget unallocated until agreements approved	Various	29,797	30,518	33,979	33,522
The following table details grant expenditure incurred in 2017-18:					
Grant program/fund name	Purpose of grant program/fund	2017-18 Actual \$000			
Digital Inclusion Project	Supporting older people to develop the skills and confidence they need to connect, participate and interact safely in the digital world	30			
Knowing your Rights for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Communities Project	Raise awareness of services for older people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities	30			
Australian Rehabilitation Outcome Centre (AROC)—National Benchmarking System	Support a national benchmarking system to improve clinical rehabilitation outcomes	22			
National Mental Health Consumer and Carer Forum (NMHCCF)	Facilitate the National Mental Health Consumer and Carer Forum (NMHCCF)	21			
Other subsidies / grants	All other subsidies / contributions	8,379			
	Total	42,898			

The following table details grant commitments as at 30 June 2018:

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$000	Subject to grant agreement under TI 15
South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI) Operational Grant	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute Limited	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute (SAHMRI)—operational grant 2016-2020	11,624	Yes
Cancer Research	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute Limited	Beat Cancer Project—foster cancer research in those areas where South Australia can make a significant contribution to the evidence base for cancer control locally and internationally	3,000	Yes
Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia Funding	Aboriginal Health Council of South Australia Limited	Provide services that promote and advance social, physical and mental health for Aboriginal people of South Australia	1,429	Yes
Suicide prevention strategies	Beyond Blue Limited	National depression initiative	557	Yes
Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia core services	Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia Incorporated	Health Consumers Alliance of South Australia core services	488	Yes
Closing the Gap in Aboriginal Health Outcomes	South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute Limited	Establish and operate the South Australian Aboriginal Chronic Disease Consortium	460	Yes
South Australia's Ageing Plan	Council on the Ageing SA Inc.	South Australia's Ageing Plan	368	Yes

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$000	Subject to grant agreement under TI 15
Drug and alcohol services	South Australian Network of Drug and Alcohol Services Incorporated	Provision of leadership and co-ordination to the non-government sector and partnership between government and non-government drug and alcohol services	310	Yes
South Australian Audit of Peri-Operative Mortality (SAAPM)	Royal Australasian College of Surgeons	South Australian Audit of Peri-Operative Mortality (SAAPM)	272	Yes
Aboriginal Scholarships	Various	Various Scholarships	262	Yes
University Program Grants	University of South Australia	International Centre for Allied Health Evidence (iCAHE) translation and training funding	210	Yes
Veterans Health Advisory Council Executive Officer	RSL Care South Australia Incorporated	Funding to employ an Executive Officer to co-ordinate comprehensive support functions and project work for the Veterans' Health Advisory Council (VHAC)	187	Yes
Australia and New Zealand Intensive Care Society (ANZICS) CORE Intensive Care Registries	Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society	Review of processes and delivery of quality assurance programs detailing benchmarking of intensive care outcomes	150	Yes
Public Health Influential Partnerships	Local Government Association of South Australia	Support for the public health function of local councils	74	Yes
Tableong project	The Australian Centre for Social Innovation Inc.	Tableong project: encourage building of relationships through the sharing of mealtime experiences in local neighbourhoods	38	Yes
Engaging older people in the Festivals	Festivals Adelaide Ltd	Support major arts festivals to consider opportunities for the continued active involvement of older South Australians	18	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	University of South Australia	Activating citizen scientists among older members of the South Australian community	15	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	City of Marion	Building wellbeing across the southern region	14	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	City of Port Lincoln	Development of an Ageing Well in Southern Eyre Peninsula Strategy	14	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	Eastern Health Authority	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	12	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Agriculture Kangaroo Island Incorporated	Positive ageing grants—positively engaging ageing farmers	9	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	City of Tea Tree Gully	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	9	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Lakes Community Welfare Association	Positive ageing grants—re-engaging seniors from the wider African communities	9	Yes

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$000	Subject to grant agreement under TI 15
Age Friendly South Australia	City of Tea Tree Gully	Development of a framework for design and recommendations for precincts seeking to become Age Friendly	8	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	City of Victor Harbor	Meaningful community participation for people living with memory loss	8	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	Corporation of the City of Norwood, Payneham & St Peters	Connecting older people to places—age friendly wayfinding strategy for signage to enable older people to walk to key locations	8	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	District Council of Lower Eyre Peninsula	Social connectedness program to support older people connect to community, information and activities for health and wellbeing and digital literacy	8	Yes
Knowing your Rights for Culturally and Linguistically Diverse Communities Project	Multicultural Communities Council of SA Inc.	Raise awareness of services for older people from culturally and linguistically diverse communities	8	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Seniors Information Service Inc.	Positive ageing grants—healing with traditional remedies program for the Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander community	8	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	City of Onkaparinga	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	6	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	City of Playford	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	6	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Marra Dreaming	Positive ageing grants—basket weaving classes	6	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Eastwood Community Centre Inc.	Positive ageing grants—workshops to empower better health, wellbeing and resilience in older people	5	Yes
Seniors on Screen 2017 – Media Resource Centre Inc.	Media Resource Centre Inc.	Seniors on Screen 2018—affordable and accessible weekly arts program for older South Australians	5	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Carers and Disability Link Incorporated	Positive ageing grants—dementia friendly community garden project	4	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	City of Playford	Engage older men in teaching woodworking and metalworking skills to youth and working with school children to design and make items of outdoor furniture for the school community	4	Yes
Suicide prevention strategies	Every Life Matters	Suicide prevention—Every Life Matters Inc. Action Plan	4	Yes
Positive Ageing Grant	Uniting Communities Incorporated	Positive ageing grants—empowering ageing in Country SA	4	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	City of Port Adelaide Enfield	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	3	Yes

Grant program/fund name	Beneficiary/Recipient	Purpose	Value \$000	Subject to grant agreement under TI 15
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	City of Salisbury	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	3	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	City of West Torrens	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	3	Yes
Australian Childhood Immunisation Register Co-payment	District Council of Mount Barker	Australian Immunisation Register (AIR)—Childhood Immunisation	3	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	District Council of Barunga West	Digital literacy skills to connect older people to family and friends, information about community and government services, and activities for health and wellbeing	2	Yes
Age Friendly South Australia	Flinders University	Promoting activity engagement in older adults	1	Yes
Suicide prevention strategies	Pangula Mannamurna Aboriginal Corporation	Suicide prevention—delivery of the Live Long, Live Strong Treasuring Life program	1	Yes
		Total	19,637	

GRANT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (25 September 2018). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I can advise:

The government has provided a complete list of grants paid during 2017-18 in question 4.

PUBLIC SECTOR EXECUTIVES

In reply to **Mr BOYER (Wright)** (25 September 2018). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. S.G. WADE (Minister for Health and Wellbeing): I have been advised:

Between 30 June 2017 and 17 March 2018, there were 18 SA executive positions abolished across SA Health. The total employment cost of these positions was \$3,859,722.

PROGRAM DIRECTOR
DIRECTOR, RETRIEVAL AND AVIATION SERVICES
DEPUTY CHIEF OPERATING OFFICER
DIRECTOR, DOCUMENT COORDINATION PROJECT
DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE, SYSTEM PERFORMANCE AND SERVICE DELIVERY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PEOPLE AND CULTURE
DIRECTOR, WORKFORCE RELATIONS
PROJECT MANAGER, TRANSFORMING HEALTH
DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE, TRANSFORMING HEALTH
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, STRATEGY AND REFORM
DIRECTOR, COMMUNICATIONS
DIRECTOR, COMMERCIAL AND ASSURANCE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, PROCUREMENT AND GOVERNANCE

PROGRAM DIRECTOR
DIRECTOR, READINESS AND EXERCISING
NURSING PROJECTS DIRECTOR
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, SERVICE TRANSFORMATION
DIRECTOR, SERVICE PERFORMANCE AND IMPROVEMENT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, OPERATIONS AND REFORM

Between 30 June 2017 and 17 March 2018, there were 14 SA executive positions created across SA Health. The total employment cost of these positions was \$3,503,355.

DIRECTOR, EHEALTH STRATEGY AND ARCHITECTURE
CHIEF MEDICAL OFFICER AND CHIEF PUBLIC HEALTH OFFICER
CO-DIRECTOR OPERATIONS, REHABILITATION, AGED AND PALLIATIVE CARE
DIRECTOR, CHILD SAFETY STRATEGY
GROUP EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, STATEWIDE CLINICAL SUPPORT SERVICES
GENERAL MANAGER, THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL
NURSING CO-DIRECTOR, SURGERY
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR, ALLIED HEALTH
DIRECTOR, CORPORATE SERVICES
DEPUTY CHIEF EXECUTIVE
SENIOR CONSULTANT, RAH TASKFORCE
DIRECTOR ENGAGEMENT AND COMMISSIONING, THE QUEEN ELIZABETH HOSPITAL STAGE 3 REDEVELOPMENT
DIRECTOR ENGAGEMENT AND COMMISSIONING, WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S CAPITAL PROGRAM
DIRECTOR, WOMEN'S AND CHILDREN'S CAPITAL PROGRAM

Between 17 March 2018 and 30 June 2018, there were three SA executive positions abolished across SA Health. The total employment cost of these positions was \$961,313.

DIRECTOR, FINANCIAL PLANNING AND ANALYTICS
PROGRAM DIRECTOR, EPLIS
CHIEF EXECUTIVE ADVISOR

Between 17 March 2018 and 30 June 2018 there were five SA executive positions created across SA Health. The total employment cost of these positions was \$1,504,210.

DIRECTOR, OPERATIONS STATEWIDE SERVICES
DIRECTOR, SA BIOMEDICAL ENGINEERING
DEPUTY CHIEF FINANCE OFFICER
CHIEF PSYCHIATRIST / DIRECTOR MENTAL HEALTH STRATEGY
CHIEF EXECUTIVE ADVISOR