

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4 April 2019

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

**The SPEAKER:** We respectfully acknowledge the traditional owners of this land upon which the parliament is assembled and the custodians of the sacred lands of our state.

### *Motions*

#### **TIMBER INDUSTRY**

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:02):** I move:

That this house establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the exporting of wood fibre and other matters regarding the timber industry in the Limestone Coast of South Australia, and in particular—

- (a) whether the exporting of wood fibre is in compliance with the conditions of sale of the radiata pine forests in the Limestone Coast, sold by the previous state Labor government;
- (b) the volume of radiata pine log being exported from the Limestone Coast area;
- (c) the economic benefit and employment opportunities through additional wood fibre based industries should the current exported logs be made available for processing in South Australia;
- (d) the supply agreements between forest growers and processors; and
- (e) any other matter the committee deems relevant to the wood fibre industry in the Limestone Coast.

A broader inquiry is needed into the Limestone Coast region's forestry sector taking into account what has happened in the past, the present and the future. It has been nearly nine years since the harvesting rights to the South-East forests were sold off by the previous Labor government, but this is still an incredibly contentious issue for my electorate.

Many questions remain about the finer details of this sale, including the value of the asset. Many questions remain about compliance with the conditions of this sale. Many questions remain about the harvest rates of the forests and many questions remain about the supply agreements with processors and the amount of wood fibre exported from the Port of Portland. This week, the state government announced an independent audit on the lease agreement with OneFortyOne Plantations, something I have been asking for for quite some time, and it is perhaps in response to part A of the inquiry, but it is interesting to note that the independent audit is only for the 2018 calendar year.

Many questions remain about the number of trees harvested from 2012, when the forward rotations were sold, up to the current year of 2019. In my opinion, a limited audit of just 12 months does not capture past practices that may have been in breach of the forward sales agreement. I would ask the government to expand that audit from a 12-month audit to one that includes the period of time from 2012 so that any breaches and fears of overharvesting can be allayed once and for all in my community.

It is interesting that the Marshall Liberal government came to the 2018 election with a stated policy of an independent audit. We are now 12 months past that time, and there is a concern in my community that, if there have been breaches in the past, the company has known about this for 12 months and has had at least 12 months to rectify any previous breaches. I am not saying that there have been breaches. All I am saying is that that is a concern in the community if the independent auditor is limited to just the previous 12 months. It is well past 12 months since the state election.

A genuine concern for many in my community, including processors, is that the company may have improved its practices and that it will not address the overharvesting. My community has called for this inquiry. They would like to get to the bottom of what is going on in terms of the amount of wood fibre being exported. I want to assure companies that this is not a witch-hunt and I am not

targeting one particular grower. This inquiry would look at all companies exporting wood fibre, not limit it to just one company.

My community is requesting that the inquiry look into issues directly affecting the future of the Limestone Coast timber industry—that local processors are missing out when it comes to competing for log supply with the export market. In short, a large volume of our wood fibre is going offshore when processors are telling me that it can be utilised locally. There are hundreds of jobs that can be created in the Limestone Coast if exports of raw log was reduced or quotas introduced.

Over the last 24 months, I have been approached by three separate companies—established companies—wanting to invest or expand in Mount Gambier. These three companies have a potential investment of more than \$300 million in the South-East, and around 600 jobs on offer. If you sit back and look at that from a government's point of view, we are exporting raw product out of the Port of Portland that could be invested or lead to investments in the South-East of \$300 million and 600 new jobs. That is the basis for me and my community calling for this inquiry.

These companies that would love to invest and employ are hamstrung by the fact that they cannot access the additional wood fibre. It is a tragedy when you see truck after truck transporting that raw product over the Victorian border to be exported out through the Port of Portland. It does not even come up to a South Australian port where the benefit would be realised by the South Australian government and the people of South Australia. In my opinion, wood grown on the Limestone Coast should be available to the Limestone Coast businesses first. We need to have policy measures that incentivise these companies to look locally first.

Growing our economy should be our priority, not shipping off raw product and jobs overseas. In short, South Australia and our communities are missing out. Believe it or not, Australia has a \$2 billion trade deficit when it comes to importing sawn wood products. That means that we are sending our raw product overseas and importing \$2 billion more in value of processed wood product. Much of that product can be processed locally. It makes sense to me to look more closely at this for the benefit of not only those living in the South-East but those living in South Australia.

Countries across the world are beginning to put in place export tariffs to protect local jobs. I am not suggesting that we go that far, but it is interesting that other countries are looking at this to protect local jobs. In fact, Australia and New Zealand are the only countries that provide no protection for local manufacturers. Meanwhile, the shortage of timber is now affecting other industries. Vignerons, like Coonawarra's Doug Balnaves, are waiting up to 12 months for timber posts to grow and maintain their vineyards.

In a news story last year, Doug spoke about how ridiculous it is that the Coonawarra wine region is smack bang in the middle of a large and successful timber region but they cannot get access to these vital products. Primary producers, like Mingbool potato grower Terry Buckley, have also spoken out about having to use imported timber products for storage and transportation pallets because their local suppliers cannot access the raw product.

David Quill is the CEO of the SA Timber Processors Association (SATPA), and he has been outspoken on this issue for many years. SATPA member companies are all family-owned businesses and directly employ South Australians. I agree with David when he says it:

...makes no sense to sell our natural resources from under local jobs.

Australian domestic manufacturers need reasonable terms of contract in any supply agreement and a level playing field.

OneFortyOne Plantations recently announced that they will not export sawlog from their estates, with their executive general manager saying that it is the 'strongest domestic market they have seen for more than 15 years'. I applaud OneFortyOne for their decision. It is important to note that OneFortyOne is only one supplier, and this commitment is only until June 2020. So you have the problem that local processors, who are investing millions of dollars into their plant and equipment, only have that guarantee for another 12 months.

The forestry industry is one of the Limestone Coast's key economic drivers and supports thousands of jobs, both directly and indirectly, through services and employment. When I say I have

the full support of my community, that includes the council, and I will read out one letter of support from the City of Mount Gambier:

At a meeting of the City of Mount Gambier convened on 19 March 2019 Council resolved to express its full support for your proposed Notice of Motion to Parliament recommending 'That a Select Committee of the house be appointed to inquire into the Economic Impact Exports of wood fibre is having on processors of the South East of South Australia'.

The letter goes on to talk about the importance of that industry for our community. The future of our forests and our timber industry depends on better management, support and regulation, where it is needed, from this state government. There needs to be some greater scrutiny on what is going on from an independent regulator.

In closing, this inquiry is not trying to target one company. This inquiry will look at the lost economic opportunities for the South-East and for South Australia. If you saw the photos and the evidence of how much wood product is being exported out of the Port of Portland, they are missed opportunities for our state and lost jobs for our region.

What I am seeking, with this inquiry, is the facts. How much product is being exported? What is the economic loss to our state and to the community? It does not go as far as to seek tariffs or other mechanisms; all I am trying to establish is the facts, so that when policy is developed it can be done with the facts in mind to grow jobs in South Australia, jobs in the South-East and revenue for this state. With that, I commend this motion to the house.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (11:17):** I rise to speak in response to the motion for a select committee put forward by the member for Mount Gambier and note that the government will be opposing the establishment of this committee. That is because we are already undertaking a number of positive measures for the forestry industry so that it can work more closely with the sector.

Traditionally, across Australia plantation forest assets have been held in government hands. Over the last two decades, many state governments have devolved forest ownership to the private sector, and the previous state Labor government sold up to three forward rotations of the South-East ForestrySA and the asset to OneFortyOne Plantations.

There are three large pine forest owners in the South-East of South Australia: OneFortyOne Plantations, New Forests, and Green Triangle Forest Products. In addition, there are a number of small foresters. The South Australian Timber Processors Association has four members that are all small sawmills that process plantation pine, and these members have concerns about the quantity of pine being exported and generally about the ongoing timber supply. They claim that locally grown pine should be retained for local processing and not exported.

The South Australian Timber Processors Association has agitated for several years for government intervention in the commercial agreements with their suppliers, the forest owners. The forest owners claim that they offer timber for sale to these local sawmills but the sawmills do not have the capacity to take the timber or do not pay the same amount as export markets. OneFortyOne Plantations made a commitment in March 2018 not to export sawlogs. The definition of a sawlog is a log over 20 centimetres in diameter.

OneFortyOne Plantations has recommitted to this pledge this year; in March 2019 they gave a commitment again not to export sawlogs. However, some processors want access to timber that is smaller than the sawlog classification and, by and large, that is normally classified as pulp log. The state government has no controls within its lease agreements about the process through which OneFortyOne sells its non-sawlog or its pulp log. Similarly, the state government does not have control over other forest owners' operations to force them to sell small sawmills as opposed to exporting the resource.

The Green Triangle, consisting of the South-East of South Australia and south-western Victoria, produces about 28 per cent of the nation's plantation hardwood logs, 26 per cent of the plantations softwood sawlog and 25 per cent of the nation's plantations softwood pulp log. Attempts to constrict exports of timber resources growing in South Australia may have a negative, unintended consequence and disadvantage the SA forest businesses relative to those in neighbouring Victoria.

At a national ministers meeting on 1 June 2018, examples of other countries intervening in log exports were examined. In every example, this intervention created distortion in the market, resulting in negative, unforeseen local outcomes. At this meeting, it was agreed by all ministers that Australian and state governments should generally not intervene in the log export trade to avoid distorting the market. This issue is complicated, and further complicated by the fact that some of the small sawmills themselves undertake minor processing, which they themselves export instead of providing to local processors. That is, they are building pallets, using that pulp log to make logistical products and themselves exporting those products, so there is a significant pallet shortage here in South Australia.

The government action is that the Marshall Liberal government is in the process of procuring an independent consultant to conduct a one-off audit for OneFortyOne's compliance with the contract it has with the state government, as requested by the sector. I know that the member for Mount Gambier said that the audit is only going to come for the next 12 months, but OneFortyOne have self-audited and, as an incoming minister, I did not feel that was good enough. It was not quelling the anguish, nor was there the transparency and the commitment I thought OneFortyOne should have for South Australian taxpayers, so that is why we have an independent audit coming up for the 2018 season.

Again, the government has also formed the Forest Industry Advisory Council (FIAC) of South Australia, with its first meeting to be held in Mount Gambier on 10 April, next week. The FIAC brings together 11 key industry figures from across the value chain to provide advice to the state government on further developing the forestry sector. Each member has a high level of industry knowledge and responsibility.

Members include forest owners, forest managers, contractors, haulage, small mills, large mills, farm foresters and the biomass sector, and I will read their names into *Hansard*: Wendy Fennell is the chair, and she is Managing Director of Fennell Forestry; Mark Rogers, Managing Director of New Forests; Laurie Hein, Managing Director of Green Triangle Forest Products; Jill Stone, Three Streams Farm and farm forestry expert; Ian McDonnell, Managing Director of NF McDonnell and Sons; Linda Sewell, Chief Executive Officer of OneFortyOne Plantations; Ian Tyson, CEO of Timberlink Australia Ltd; Tammy Auld, Woodflow Manager, Timberlands Pacific; Martin Crevatin, National Operations Manager, PF Olsen Australia; Peter Badenoch, Managing Director of Plantation Treated Timber; and Emma Daly, Executive Manager of Van Schaiks Bio Gro.

The majority of them are local people from here in South Australia. We are going to put much-needed transparency into the forestry industry. If I am going to support a select committee, it is about doubling-up, and it is about putting a large amount of effort and commitment into these people, not only having to respond to a select committee but also now having a large amount of the industry leadership meeting in the FIAC group.

At the 2018 state election, the Australian Forest Products Association sought support for an industry target to double the economic value of domestic manufacturing in South Australia by 2050, and that is what the FIAC will address. It will address what has been historically the uncertainty with export log, and it will address the certainty of how we will attract investment into the forestry sector. It is about dealing with what is potentially a \$1 billion injection into forestry, forest products and value-add into forestry. A member of the South Australian Timber Manufacturing Association sits on FIAC.

The terms of reference in the motion are so broad as to include the operations of all forest growers, to investigate their commercial-in-confidence contracts with sawmills and other customers. This is broad, invasive and it is not required at this time. I have a press release I would like to insert into *Hansard*, and it is the agreement that OneFortyOne has come to the table. My conversation with the CEO of OneFortyOne states:

[OneFortyOne] has agreed to fully cooperate with this audit which will be conducted under the ASAE 3100 standard, set by the Auditing and Assurance Standards Board. I believe it will provide a high level of assurance to the assessment findings.

I think that is critically important. It is about putting in transparency. It is about alleviating the fears and the uncertainty of what the forestry sector has been about. It is also understanding that we cannot tell private business how to do business.

We cannot go in there and audit their books for the sake of auditing their books without having an intrinsic understanding that we are allowing private business to operate as a private business. It is also really important that FIAC will be there for the best interests of forestry in South Australia, particularly in the Green Triangle. This independent audit of OneFortyOne Plantations is about appeasing the compliance concerns of the forestry industry, particularly in the Green Triangle. Let me be clear about this, the audit will look at:

- age class distribution across the plantation estate;
- area weighted average clearfall age;
- tender process for uncontracted sawlog in excess of planned viable domestic supply;
- sale contract lengths for sawlog export; and
- the amount of sawlog and pulp log exported and if those logs were appropriately classified.

It beggars belief that we can go to any sector, any private enterprise, and tell them what they can and cannot do with their product, whether it be timber products, whether it be red meat, whether it be horticulture or whether it be a bottle of wine. We have to understand that OneFortyOne are coming to the table, that they are going to be transparent and that they will be audited in the manner according to the independent audit.

The timber industry is a great industry. It is a vital industry to the South-East, and that is why the government is moving to act responsibly on behalf of the Green Triangle and forestry in South Australia.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (11:27):** I congratulate the member for Mount Gambier on bringing this motion before the house. The opposition will be supporting the member for Mount Gambier's motion to:

...establish a select committee to inquire into and report on the exporting of wood fibre and other matters regarding the timber industry in the Limestone Coast...

As someone from a regional community that is dependent upon adding value to mineral products, I fully understand the desire on the part of the local member and the Mount Gambier and Limestone Coast community to maximise their advantages.

I have listened to the minister. I think a number of the initiatives are fine initiatives and worthy initiatives, so I am not critical, and this particular motion does not run counter to some of those worthwhile initiatives. It does in some respects enhance them: it enhances transparency and openness. The select committee will provide a platform to engage with a spectrum of views. In my view, anything that encourages openness and open dialogue should be supported.

Forest industries make a huge contribution to the economy of South Australia, generating around \$2 billion per year. It is a major employer in the Limestone Coast region, and there are also significant plantation forestry assets on Kangaroo Island and in the Mid North of the state. More than 7,000 people work directly in the forest, wood and paper products industries in South Australia and a further 15,000 people are employed indirectly, so it is a very significant contributor to our state.

The industry went through a significant downturn during the global financial crisis and for several years afterwards, but international and domestic demand in recent years has seen the industry booming. Advanced technology, manufacturing and processing of timber, much of which was enabled through the funding from the South East Forestry Partnerships Program, is part of a thriving and competitive industry.

While this is great news for the industry and those who work in it, it also presents challenges. The smaller manufacturers, in particular, have not been able to negotiate supply agreements to meet their demand for fibre, some for current needs and some for expansion. There are new businesses that would like to establish themselves on the Limestone Coast but cannot do so unless they can access timber resources. There are a number of growers in the region, most of whom export timber. There has been some concern in the local community that the volume of export is too high. The committee would be empowered to examine that.

There is some residual concern that the purchaser of the forward rotations of those forest areas, previously owned by government, may not be complying with the conditions of sale. Clearly, there are some mechanisms that were put in place by the government to look at this, but this will enhance those mechanisms further. This committee would be able to test that suggestion. It would also be able to examine the economic opportunities that may be available if supply could be found for additional local processing.

We hope that this select committee will seek to find solutions by looking at the current situation and options for the future. The opposition considers that it is vital to invest time and resources into the industry that is so valuable for our state, particularly to the Limestone Coast. Therefore, we support the establishment of the committee and commend the motion to the house.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:32):** I rise today to speak to the motion brought by the member for Mount Gambier and thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing it to the house. I also thank the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development for presenting our government's position on this motion. I would like to express my appreciation to the Liberal government for allowing me to express my position on this matter in support of the member for Mount Gambier's motion to support key forestry processing stakeholders and the Wattle Range Council.

The MacKillop electorate forms part of the Green Triangle, which includes the South-East of South Australia and south-western Victoria. It is a significant beneficiary of the forestry and forest processing industry. The Green Triangle produces 28 per cent of the nation's plantation hardwood logs, 26 per cent of the plantation softwood sawlog and 25 per cent of the nation's plantation softwood pulp log.

The MacKillop electorate includes a significant share of the total standing forest and supplies wood processing industries located both within my electorate and into the adjacent electorate of Mount Gambier. There are three large forest companies in the region, including OneFortyOne Plantations, New Forests and Green Triangle Forest Products. Farm forestry also has a role in the region, with several businesses operating in that space.

The industry is a valuable one. Analysis in 2017 by consultants EconSearch highlights that the economic contribution of the timber processing industry in Mount Gambier and Grant district council area in 2016-17 was around \$198 million in gross regional product. Of this GRP, flow-on effects account for another \$85 million. The same report identifies that the total employment contribution by the timber processing industry was around 1,521 jobs, which includes flow-on employment effects of around 684 jobs.

The report identified that the timber processing industry directly contributes around 7 per cent of the total GRP or around 12 per cent including flow-on effects. This is in the context of the 2016-17 data where the total GRP generated across all industries in the two council areas was around \$1.643 billion and total employment was around 14,529 jobs.

The South Australian Timber Processors Association, which comprises four small sawmill enterprises that process plantation pine, and Wattle Range Council have communicated their concerns to me in relation to log supply. What I have heard from stakeholders is, firstly, that the volume of log available is only available in large consignments. Small mills have indicated to me that they cannot handle the large volume consignments. Secondly, long-term contracts are challenging to smaller mill facilities. The industry and marketplace are still developing post the forward sale of rotations of the state government forest estate. Smaller mills are seeking to manage their risk.

Thirdly, the previous market arrangements lent to smaller consignments of timber that were received regularly now do not serve the harvesting speed or volume taking place today. Impacts include difficulties in accessing timber or appropriate volumes of timber; flow-on impacts to agriculture, viticulture and horticulture enterprises, which seek posts for a range of purposes and are unable to access the product they require in a suitable time frame; and a stifling of growth. I understand that there is potential for a range of new players to enter the market and for expansion of some existing processes; however, this potential may not be realised until there is a better understanding of the sales and contract arrangements and a pathway established for a clearer operating approach to the market for timber.

I appreciate that there are value-adding opportunities that need to be realised in the Limestone Coast and Green Triangle area. I appreciate the impact the log shortage is having on processing businesses and end users alike and the view that the current purchasing arrangements and market behaviours are stifling regional economic growth. It is the strong desire of my constituents and myself to realise an effective select committee process that brings together the information and hears from witnesses to identify driving forces in the sector.

I believe that a select committee would provide a transparent and bipartisan approach to support a regional industry that is struggling to achieve adequate log supply to value-add and grow the sector. I believe that the outcome will assist to identify how market transparency could be improved and how our region can better capitalise through value-adding to the timber and log products within our region. I am supportive of the select committee and, at the same time, would like to acknowledge that the Liberal government that I am part of, and the minister specifically, is taking steps to support the need for more information in relation to the extent of compliance to forward sale conditions by OneFortyOne Plantations.

The previous state government famously sold up to three forward rotations of the South-East ForestrySA asset to OneFortyOne, which is now one of the largest forest owners in the South-East of South Australia. As part of this arrangement, a number of conditions were set to ensure that the interests of the community and the forestry industry were conserved. I am sure that many of my constituents will be pleased when they hear that the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development has announced the initiation of an independent review to conduct a one-off audit of OneFortyOne's compliance with the contract it has with the state government. I commend our government and our minister for undertaking this audit. This is an important step to ensure that a great many people in my electorate and across the state can feel confident that the conditions of the forward sale are being met.

I acknowledge and support the establishment in December 2018 of the minister's Forest Industry Advisory Council of South Australia, which will meet for the first time next week. I had the pleasure of meeting several members of the Forest Industry Advisory Council during our last sitting week, when we held the inaugural meeting of the Parliamentary Friends of Forestry. The membership of this advisory council includes 11 key industry figures from across the value chain to provide advice to the state government on further developing the forestry sector. Each member has a high level of industry knowledge and responsibility.

I see the opportunity for this group to bring great value to the discussion of log market supply issues. In particular, key objectives of this group include playing an important role in identifying how industry and government can create the right environment for business to thrive, maintaining a strong working relationship with the Australian Forest Products Association and other industry stakeholders and advising on other industry initiatives, including the opportunities and impediments for expansion of the state's plantation estate and a sustainable and safe forestry and forest products industry sector.

I am fully supportive of the steps our government is taking; however, I believe, as do my constituents, that we need to take one further step and support the motion to establish a select committee for the purposes described by the member for Mount Gambier. I again thank the member for Mount Gambier for bringing this motion to the house and the Liberal government for the freedom to express my views in this house.

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (11:39):** I rise for the second day in a row to support a motion brought to this place by the member for Mount Gambier. I congratulate him on this motion because I think a select committee would be a good idea, if for nothing else but to give confidence to people in the South-East. As many people have mentioned, and as I know as someone who grew up in the South-East, the forestry industry is vitally important down there.

It is going gangbusters. It has been going well for a decade and that is terrific to see. In fact, there are probably still people out there who are trying to get people with the right skills to come and work in the forestry industry. It is one of those growth areas that quite often has a supply problem when it comes to getting the appropriately skilled employees into it.

I do not reckon that governments should ever be scared of having select committees. The current minister for agriculture was on the select committee that I was on a few years ago. After the 2011 grain harvest, there was a lot of disquiet around regional South Australia, and the member for Hammond brought a motion to have a select committee on the grain handling capabilities of Viterra to get to the bottom of it.

The agriculture minister at the time was a guy called Michael O'Brien and he did not want that to happen. I had some links to regional South Australia, and the member for Hammond and I had a few chats about it. I was able to go to our party room and convince them that there was actually nothing for the government to be scared of here. This was a private company that some people thought had done the wrong thing, so let's have a select committee into it.

The member for Frome ended up being the Chair. The member for Light and I were on it, as well as the member for Chaffey, who is now the agriculture minister, and the member for Hammond. I think we got on very well and we learned a lot. We sat down in the bowls clubs in Loxton, Wallaroo and Ceduna and also at the footy club at Pinnaroo during a mouse plague—I remember that night—and we heard from local people. I would urge the government to get onside with the member for MacKillop, the member for Mount Gambier and the opposition and support this in a bipartisan way.

As a former forest minister, I know there were always conspiracy theories that OneFortyOne was getting away with things that they should not have been able to get away with. As a government, we looked at the tight and stringent rules around that contract to ensure that OneFortyOne was behaving as it should, as set out in the contract. If we did have this select committee, and OneFortyOne and everyone else could come along and have their say, it would give a better understanding and maybe allay some fears that people have. One thing I know—and this was the same when I was the minister for forests as well—is that the best use of those forests in the South-East is to have them go to the wharves as a finished product, or at least something that has been partly processed, rather than go out as logs.

In the last few months as a forest minister, I had plenty of chats with Anne Ruston, who I think did a great job as the assistant minister for agriculture at the federal level. She had responsibility for forests and also fisheries. We had a sit-down roundtable meeting in my office with Anne Ruston and people from the federal government, we had people there from PIRSA and the forestry department and we had processors and forest owners there.

We were trying to get some solutions around that table. I am not sure whether that group is still having meetings, but there was a lot of goodwill from everyone around the table. Out of that first meeting, I think perhaps we got a better understanding about what difficulties and challenges the growers faced, as well as the challenges faced by processors.

I think there is actually a lot of goodwill out there in the industry. It is, as I said at the outset, such a vital industry for the South-East of South Australia. It is something that has bipartisan support—at least there is support on this side. There is support from one of the government members and from the Independent member for Mount Gambier. When you have the two members who have all these forests and all these processors coming into this place and saying it is a good idea, and you have the former forest minister saying it is a good idea, maybe it would be good if you reconsidered and just had another look at it.

There could be things that come out in that select committee that point to my time as the minister that say that perhaps I could have done things better and that the government of the day could have done things better in that four-year period. I am happy for that to come under the spotlight and for people to have a look at it because I think that is the mature approach we should take.

If there are ways of improving the forest industry in the South-East of South Australia, if there is a way to prevent logs going out of the Port of Portland and have those logs processed here in the South-East, which would in turn create more jobs and more economic benefit to the people of Glencoe (my home town), Nangwarry, Mount Burr and Tarpeena—all those towns that rely so heavily on the forest industry—then that is a good thing.

I urge the government to maybe have one more think about this, to get on board with the two local members from the South-East, get on board with the opposition, who want to provide a bipartisan approach to it, and let's give everyone who is involved in the forest industry, everyone who

cares about the South-East and everyone who wants to see that part of South Australia prosper the opportunity to have their say and have a little bit of a discussion.

Again, for the second day in a row, I commend the member for Mount Gambier for bringing a really decent and well thought-out proposal to the Parliament of South Australia. I commend his motion and wish him all the best in getting this select committee up.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:46):** I would like to thank all those who have made a contribution to this motion, and I would just like to reaffirm a couple of points. This inquiry is not a witch-hunt: it is about transparency and it is about allaying fears within the community. It does not go as far as putting any suggestions in there on what could be done, but it talks about the volume of wood fibre going over to the Port of Portland, which is a loss to South Australia and a loss to my community.

If that wood product was processed locally, what are the lost opportunities in terms of jobs? If it is 400, 500, 600 jobs, as I am led to believe, then that needs to be put forward. What is the lost economic impact of that wood fibre going over to the Port of Portland? That is all this inquiry is seeking to achieve, because once you have transparency you can then look at what steps a state government could take to encourage local processing and local jobs.

This is really just the first step. I agree with the member for Mawson that this type of transparency and this use of a parliamentary committee can actually provide great benefits to the forest growers of the South-East because it allays people's fears. Once things are put on the table—and, of course, there will be commercial-in-confidence matters that will not be able to be discussed—as a government we can look at how we attract 10 to 15 per cent of that export staying locally.

Are there issues around water that need to be addressed? Are there issues around plantation sizes and hectares needed to grow more product? Is it investment in smart technologies, like, Göran Roos, I think it was, identified with the inquiry that he did around 2013 looking at more advanced manufacturing for that supply?

The facts still remain that, over the last 24 months, three businesses have come to see me saying that they want to invest in our region to the tune of \$300 million, providing up to 600 jobs, and that they cannot get the raw product because it is on trucks heading over to the Port of Portland. I have put in people's pigeonholes a few photos of the ships and the stacks of woodchip over at the Port of Portland, and I look at that as a lost opportunity.

I fully respect and agree that these are privately owned estates. They have the right to export. Nothing in this inquiry directs against their right to do that. All it is saying is let's get the figures on the table so that we can start having some discussions around that. With those words, I thank all those members who have contributed to the debate and I wish it a successful passing.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes ..... 21  
 Noes ..... 24  
 Majority ..... 3

AYES

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

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.	Chapman, V.A.	Cowdrey, M.J.
Cregan, D.	Duluk, S.	Ellis, F.J.

## NOES

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.

Motion thus negatived.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

## VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the former president of the other place, the Hon. Ron Roberts. Welcome to parliament.

*Parliamentary Committees***SOCIAL DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE: REVIEW OF THE OPERATION OF THE MOTOR VEHICLES (LIFETIME SUPPORT SCHEME) ACT 2013**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (11:56):** I move:

That the final report of the committee, entitled 'Review of the operation of the Motor Vehicles (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013', be noted.

Before beginning my remarks, on behalf of the Social Development Committee I first of all acknowledge and thank those who have contributed to this review, including the Lifetime Support Authority (LSA) and board, for their assistance in providing the committee with very comprehensive evidence throughout the review; the Compulsory Third Party Insurance Regulator, for providing detailed information on the CTP insurance scheme; the specialists from the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre, for their contribution to the review—their expert evidence greatly aided the committee's understanding of the trauma and rehabilitation involved when a person experiences catastrophic injury; and the insurance industry and the legal profession, who provided their technical and insightful evidence on CTP insurance claims.

The committee also thanks Mr John Walsh, the disability advocacy organisations that were central in the development of the Lifetime Support Scheme and its operation and, importantly, the Lifetime Support Scheme participants, their families and loved ones, whose evidence of the individual experience of living with catastrophic injury and the manner in which the Lifetime Support Scheme has assisted each of them has been invaluable. Thanks are also extended to my fellow committee members.

The committee of the Fifty-Third Parliament, of which I was also a member, commenced the review of the Motor Vehicle Accidents (Lifetime Support Scheme) Act 2013 and had already heard the oral evidence. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Bills***VICTIMS OF CRIME (OFFENDER SERVICE AND JOINDER) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:00):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Victims of Crime Act 2001. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:00):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Victims of crime compensation is governed by the Victims of Crime Act 2001. The compensation provided to victims compensates the victim for the pain and suffering they have endured as well as compensating their economic loss incurred as a result of the crime. It is a compensation scheme of last resort, meaning that compensation from other sources is intended to be fought first. The victims of crime compensation is not intended to act like civil damages to restore a victim to the position they were prior to the crime, but to provide an acknowledgement from the state of their loss. In this regard, it is more of a redress scheme than a compensation scheme.

There is currently a requirement in section 18 of the Victims of Crime Act that claimants must serve a copy of their application for compensation on the offender. For many victims, such an application can be stressful and traumatic, particularly for domestic violence victims and victims of sexual offending. Quite simply, no victim deserves to have any part of offending against them retriggered.

Currently, the initial application for victims of crime compensation must be made in the prescribed form and is made to the Crown Solicitor's Office. The application is required to contain extensive detailed information, including medical reports on the injuries suffered by the victim. The vast majority of claims are settled by agreement with the Crown. It is exceedingly rare to have court proceedings instituted in victims of crime matters; however, it is possible for a victim to initiate court proceedings if their claim cannot be settled by agreement.

The requirement for victims to serve a copy of the compensation application on the offender is unique to South Australia. We are the only jurisdiction with that type of service requirement in our legislation. All other jurisdictions advise the offender of the outcome of the compensation application at the point when the state initiates recovery proceedings against the offender. There is no ability for the Crown Solicitor to waive the requirement for service in section 18 unless the whereabouts of the offender are unknown and cannot be readily ascertained. Service is also not required if the identity of the offender is unknown.

There have been concerns raised by both victims' legal representatives and by the Crown Solicitor's Office, and indeed by me, that the service requirement in section 18 presents a risk of renewed violence against the victim, particularly in domestic and family violence matters. This is a particular concern because the service requirement is imposed on the claimant directly. Any kind of direct contact, even via post, represents a risk of retriggering violence towards the victim. The communication can be perceived by offenders as the victim personally 'doing this to me'.

There are many victims for whom the requirement to contact their offender is so traumatising that they are too scared to comply with the requirement and may forgo a compensation application altogether. Additionally, victims and their legal representatives often have trouble obtaining the current contact details for the offender to serve the application. This is particularly true when the offender is a minor, as their contact details are not in the record of court outcome usually supplied to the Commissioner for Victims' Rights and cannot be provided to the victim for privacy reasons, but the service requirement contains no exemptions in the case of young offenders.

The bill removes the requirement in section 18 for the victim to serve a copy of their application for compensation on the offender. This ensures that all communications with the offender occur after compensation has been paid and the matter finalised with the victim and will come directly from the Crown Solicitor's Office. The victim will have no need to make any kind of contact with the offender, reducing the risk of triggering renewed violence.

There is currently also a requirement in section 19 for a victim to serve a copy of any application to the court, if court proceedings are initiated after the matter has not been settled by agreement. This situation is rare, as the vast majority of matters are settled by agreement with the Crown; however, the obligation on the victim is still present in the act. These provisions are amended by the bill to provide the court with the power to dispense with the service requirement upon application by the claimant.

The bill will also ease the administrative burden on the Crown Solicitor's Office, which is often forced to spend time redacting sensitive information in section 18 applications when a copy is requested by the offender who has complained they did not receive a copy from the victim. As a

result of the amendments, the Crown Solicitor's Office will be free to develop a simpler notification for the offender that does not disclose sensitive information.

Offenders will still be able to make representations to the Crown Solicitor's Office to the effect that the amount of compensation to be recovered from the offender should be reduced. This opportunity has not been removed but will now occur later in the process. Again, this change is bringing South Australia more closely in line with other jurisdictions, where offenders are contacted by the state and only at the point where recovery of the money is sought from the offender. This bill makes only a small change to the legislation, but it will have an outsized positive impact for victims negotiating the victims of crime compensation system in this state.

Accordingly, I commend the bill to members and I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

##### Part 2—Amendment of Victims of Crime Act 2001

4—Amendment of section 18—Application for compensation

This clause deletes the requirement for an application to the Crown for statutory compensation to be served on the offender.

5—Amendment of section 19—Joinder of offender as party to court proceedings

This clause amends section 19 of the Act to permit the Court, on application by a claimant in respect of an application to the Court for statutory compensation, to exempt the claimant from the obligation to serve a copy of the application on the offender. If such an exemption is granted, the offender is not a party to the proceedings before the Court. Currently the Court has this discretion only where the whereabouts of the offender are not known and cannot be readily ascertained.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Close.

#### *Parliamentary Committees*

### **SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:07):** I bring up the report of the select committee on the bill, together with minutes of proceedings and evidence.

Report received.

**Mr TRELOAR:** I move:

That the report of the committee be noted.

On 5 December 2018, I moved that the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill be referred to a select committee for inquiry and report. The terms of reference for the inquiry asked the committee to examine clause 23 of the bill, which proposes to introduce new powers for the Country Fire Service (CFS). The committee received 39 written submissions to the inquiry and held four public hearings across South Australia.

The committee travelled to Port Lincoln, Balaklava and Keith to hear concerns from a range of primary producers, CFS volunteers, local governments and community groups on the proposed powers outlined in the bill. A public hearing was also held in Adelaide. I thank all those who made submissions and participated in the committee's hearings for their important and considered advice, particularly as the inquiry was conducted over the busy holiday and harvest period.

The Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill seeks to implement recommendations from the 2013 review of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005, which was undertaken by the Hon. Paul Holloway. The Holloway review recommended that the South Australian government should consider amending section 82(2) to include the power to order the cessation of harvesting or any other actions that, because of weather conditions, may cause a fire, if ignited, to get out of control. The proposed power is a broad one. It could apply to harvesting or any other activity that has the potential to ignite a fire in high-risk weather conditions. Activities need not be prescribed before the proposed power is exercised.

The committee recognised that the proposed powers are aimed at a wide range of activities but that the main concerns raised through this inquiry were by grain producers about the impact on harvesting operations. The committee heard from grain producers around the state who shared their concerns about how the proposed powers would interact with the voluntary, industry-led Grain Harvesting Code of Practice (the code).

The code guides producers on safely undertaking grain harvesting and minimising fire risk. The code requires that grain harvesting operations be suspended when the local, actual grassland fire danger index (GFDI) exceeds 35. The GFDI is a figure derived by calculating parameters of air temperature, relative humidity, wind speed and the curing condition of the vegetative matter being harvested. The committee heard that the code is widely accepted across the state.

At public hearings in Port Lincoln, Balaklava and Keith, grain producers told the committee that, over the past 10 years of the code operating, multiple networks of producers have formed whereby decisions to cease harvests are made by local experts and communicated through established communities. To support decisions to cease harvests, producers have also readily taken advantage of available technologies that provide an evidence base for decision-making. A network of weather stations has developed across the state, accompanied by data that is uploaded to the internet and made available to local farmers. Some farmers have purchased portable weather stations or handheld meters that enable them to calculate localised conditions.

The committee recognises and acknowledges that the majority of grain producers are abiding by the voluntary Grain Harvesting Code of Practice. The committee applauds the efforts of the South Australian grain producers in developing and implementing an effective mechanism to mitigate fire risk during the fire season. Overwhelmingly, evidence presented to the inquiry indicates that the rate of noncompliance with the code is extremely low.

Multiple witnesses to the inquiry explained that one of the important roles of the code is in facilitating behaviours that support community wellbeing and set community values. Where one landholder is perceived as recalcitrant, community members can apply the pressure of community sentiment. However, the committee heard that a small minority of recalcitrant producers continue to harvest in dangerous conditions. In cases where a producer continues to harvest, the CFS, police and other authorities currently have limited power to direct them to cease.

The committee's report makes 10 recommendations. Recommendations 1 to 4 propose amendments to the bill to clarify how the proposed powers should be exercised. The committee supports the introduction of the proposed powers. The committee recognises that the proposed powers would assist in preventing fires, which furthers the aims of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 to provide for the prevention, control and suppression of fires.

However, the committee shares the concerns of primary producers and CFS volunteers that the bill as drafted does not adequately explain how the proposed powers would be exercised and by whom. The committee heard concerns about the role of the CFS in exercising the proposed powers. Grain producers were particularly concerned that CFS officers and volunteers would be given the power to direct producers to cease harvesting operations.

The committee heard that there are several specific reasons why CFS volunteers are concerned about the potential exercise of powers under section 82. Firstly, any person exercising the power will carry the burden of directing the actions of a fellow community member. In a small regional community, this burden is difficult and may impinge on future personal and/or business relationships.

Further, many farmers are also CFS volunteers. The committee heard that empowering CFS volunteers to direct their neighbours risks causing tension between neighbours and local communities. Some witnesses also suggested that divisions may arise between the CFS and local communities if the CFS is permitted to direct landholders to cease activities. Other submitters suggested that requiring volunteers to exercise the powers could result in farmers leaving the CFS.

The committee heard support for the South Australia Police (SAPOL) having a lead role in exercising the proposed powers. Submitters and witnesses suggested that police involvement creates a more urgent type of peer pressure and that most community members are likely to respect police authority. One important rationale for providing SAPOL with the power to direct is related to their skills and experience in enforcing legislation. The committee heard that stakeholders do not intend SA Police to take technical measurements of GFDI or to make technical decisions related to the fire risks of prevailing local conditions but should act on the advice of local community networks.

The committee recommends that the proposed powers outlined in clause 23 of the bill be introduced. However, the bill should be amended to clarify that SAPOL, as the chief authority for law enforcement in South Australia, should have the power to issue directions under the proposed powers in consultation with local communities, the CFS and local government fire prevention officers. Given the success of and stakeholder support for the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice, the committee recommends that the exercise of powers in section 82 must take into account any relevant industry-led codes of practice, including the grain harvesting code.

The committee further recommends that the South Australian government develop enforcement criteria and guidelines for the exercise of the proposed powers. The South Australian government should consult with industry bodies and relevant stakeholders in developing these criteria and guidelines.

In relation to recommendations 5 to 10, in support of the introduction of the new powers, the committee makes six further recommendations for the government to consider. The success of the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice highlights the important role that industry-led codes of practice can play in minimising fire risk across the state. The committee strongly supports the development of more codes of practice, based on the grain industry model, for other activities that may cause fires.

The committee recommends that the South Australian government support and encourage all relevant stakeholders, including industry peak bodies, to implement and review relevant codes of practice, including developing codes of practice for prescribed activities that may cause fires. This should include developing a mechanism to recognise codes of practice for the purposes of exercising the proposed powers outlined in clause 23. The committee further recommends that the government provide ongoing education to stakeholders and the broader community about fire prevention and existing codes of practice.

The committee also recognises the range of measures that producers have implemented, often at significant personal cost, to monitor and mitigate fire risk in support of the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice. The committee considers that these measures may make a significant contribution to community safety and warrant further support.

The committee considers there is scope for the South Australian government to review the supports available to producers to develop and improve fire mitigation initiatives. Therefore, the committee recommends that the South Australian government review existing community initiatives aimed at fire prevention, reducing fire risk, and information gathering and sharing, and provide additional funding and support where appropriate, such as developing local weather monitoring networks and SMS alert systems.

The committee recognises the vital role that the CFS plays in protecting South Australian communities and greatly appreciates the significant contribution of officers and volunteers across all levels of the Country Fire Service. However, the committee is concerned by suggestions that the CFS may not have the full support and confidence of communities across South Australia. The committee suggests that any measures to improve relationships between the CFS administration and regional communities, including primary producers and local CFS brigades, should be considered, particularly in relation to the exercise of the proposed powers to direct outlined in the bill.

The committee recommends that the CFS considers measures to improve communication, engagement and consultation with regional communities in decision-making processes, particularly in relation to the exercise of the proposed powers set out in clause 23 of the bill. This inquiry has also highlighted the psychological, emotional and financial impacts of fires on the ongoing wellbeing of regional communities and individuals. The committee appreciates the valuable contribution from communities across the state who shared their experiences of recent bushfire events. The committee recommends that the South Australian government review ongoing and periodic mental health and other wellbeing support services available to communities affected by fires and provide further support where appropriate.

The committee welcomed stakeholders' active engagement in the inquiry and recognises the wide range of suggestions on further amendments to the bill, which may warrant further consideration. As the committee's terms of reference were focused on the proposed powers in clause 23, it has not had an opportunity to examine these other issues in detail. The committee therefore recommends that the South Australian government review whether further changes to the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 may be appropriate based on further consultation and drawing on evidence provided to this committee.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank all those who have contributed to the inquiry and given their time and experience to provide important feedback on the bill. I commend committee members for their work on this inquiry: the member for Finniss, the member for Heysen, the member for Mawson and the member for Giles. I also express my thanks to Dr Josh Forkert and Dr Monika Stasiak for assisting the committee throughout. I commend the select committee's report to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

#### *Bills*

### **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 20 March 2019.)

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:22):** I indicate that I will be the lead speaker for the opposition on this bill. I look forward to what will probably be a reasonably lengthy committee stage in which I can ask questions as well as move amendments. I would like to give an initial view of the bill. While we will support its passage through this house, we expect to have a number of amendments considered and may add to those amendments between the houses ready for the Legislative Council.

It is 15 years since the Natural Resources Management Act was created in this house. A once in 15 years opportunity to have a look at the way natural resources are managed in South Australia is a very important moment. The bill is of considerable length; I think it is nearly 250 pages long, only very slightly shorter than the act it seeks to replace. It is therefore an extremely important bill that requires and deserves serious consideration and attention.

I think it is fair to say that there have been mixed messages about the extent of the form contained within the bill in its attempt to replace the current Natural Resources Management Act. The language in the discussion paper that was released in June last year is reasonably mild. It states:

While the NRM Act brought positive change and benefits, the passage of time and gradual centralisation mean the current system of natural resources management is not delivering what it should.

On the other hand, the announcement of the introduction of the bill states:

The bill will repeal the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 (the Act) and replace the broken and dysfunctional Natural Resources Management system that has transpired under 16 years of Labor.

That quote is from a ministerial press release on 20 March. I suggest that in substantial terms—and we will interrogate this further in committee—this, in fact, is not a significant change to the way in which natural resources are managed in this state. I suspect that the vast majority of the bill is

identical to the current act and that many of the matters, which over time landholders, who have at times complained to the department, politicians or directly to the media, have found difficult to manage, remain the same. I will be exhaustively asking questions to confirm that my understanding of the powers of authorised officers has not altered at all—for example, the way in which water is managed from start to finish.

In some sense, I think it could be said that the changes being proposed in the bill are largely cosmetic, and largely a nod to some of the concerns that have always existed in rural and regional areas about the management of the system in this state, but that the system itself remains in place. The great reform (by which I mean significant rather than necessarily terrific) that occurred in 2004 was to remove the individual boards that existed for pest plant and animals, soil and water and to create an integrated system. It is one that I supported then, it is one that I support now and it is one that remains in place, despite the talk of a broken system.

Essentially, there is a change to the capping of the increase in the levies to CPI and the election of three board members for most of the boards, which I think will take a lot of energy and time, and I will have questions to ask. I am not sure it will substantially change the nature of those boards, considering that people from the communities were always selected to be on those boards. More concerning to me is the reduction in the emphasis on biodiversity, ecosystems and the natural environment on which good farming depends.

Farmers who understand farming, which is the vast majority of our farmers, landholders and primary producers in this state, understand that a healthy natural environment and intact ecosystem services are absolutely essential to their lands' capacity for productivity. It concerns me that there have been a diminishing number of references to those and lower priority and emphasis given to them. The vast majority of the amendments that I have for consideration in this chamber and in the other relate to restoring the importance of nature in natural resources management.

I was concerned about this from the start, from the very first single piece of paper that was provided to talk about the intention of the government in the new bill through to the discussion paper I quoted earlier from June last year. A picture was drawn—I have been told that it came out of the minister's office, but I do not know whether that is true or not—that has soil, water and pest plants and animals as being the basics of natural resources management and that somehow, by managing and paying attention to those, vibrant biodiversity, healthy landscapes and ecosystems will emerge. I think that most people who are interested in and concerned with ecology understand that it is not quite that simple.

I have had this issue raised with me by a number of environmental organisations. I am sure they are raising them directly with the government as well, and they will be raising them with people in the upper house also. I think it is fair to say that the consistent feedback that I have had from stakeholders is that they are unhappy with the lower emphasis on biodiversity, on habitat and on ecosystems. I read a concerning section in that document from June last year, which states:

In addition to these priorities [being the three that I have mentioned], other local and landscape activities may be needed in particular areas. These activities, such as revegetation, rewilding and fencing, can also be important contributions to achieving the community's desired outcomes for their landscapes...As part of a landscape-scale approach, we can assist people to undertake broader efforts to restore their natural environments.

This is very much reducing that activity within natural resources management to a discretionary optional extra rather than understanding just how crucial and central they are to healthy, productive land in this state. There are many organisations associated with the environment movement, of course, but one sent to me a concern about the back-to-basics mantra, that NRM boards will be directed to specifically focus on soil, water, pest plants and animals and under a plan where a maximum of five priorities can be identified. The concern states:

Under the structure proposed by the Landscape Act, we are concerned that any focus on biodiversity conservation as a priority in the landscape could be very much reduced or even completely absent.

I am not certain whether this is entirely deliberate on the part of the minister. I have raised it a number of times, but I raised my concern in the briefing that I had last week on this bill and had the impression that the minister's office at least had not seen this downgrading of the priority of biodiversity conservation as being a deliberate act, in which case I have some hope that some of my amendments might be acceptable to the government. Most of my amendments are drawn from the current act. I

think it is simpler to use language that has already been in place for 15 years than to invent from the start, although there are some additional amendments in order to conform to the slightly different wording of the new act.

I mentioned that the government has determined to limit the levy increases to CPI, and I acknowledge that that is something they were very clear about going into the election. This was absolutely clearly part of their reform agenda. I guess that I am concerned about ensuring that the exemptions that sit within the bill are sufficient to enable a board to respond to the demands and requirements of the natural resources, which of course themselves have absolutely no bearing on CPI, although I do see that there are exemptions, and it may well be that they are sufficient.

I do not at this stage have amendments, but I will be asking questions about different circumstances in order to assure my side of the chamber that there is sufficient latitude to be able to respond to the kinds of challenges that we know are occurring broadly from the two horsemen of the apocalypse that our environment is facing: climate change and biodiversity collapse.

While I talk about funds, a specific concern has been raised with me by Landcare, which is a fantastic organisation, and I know that everyone in this parliament supports the work they do. They have a particular concern about the grassroots fund that has been established. The idea of having a fund that can be spent on grassroots activity, on-ground activity, a grants program that organisations can apply for, is a very good idea.

However, they have raised with me, and no doubt they will have also raised with the government, a concern that the wording in the bill is not entirely consistent with the election commitments that were made. In particular, there is a question mark over whether the impression had been given in the election commitment that the \$2 million annually would be in addition to that raised by levies rather than using levy funding. I will ask questions about that during the committee stage.

Secondly, it seems pretty unambiguous that it had been characterised as a statewide fund, whereas the bill appears to attach it to individual boards, therefore potentially misaligning the amount of money available in any particular region to the money that that particular board has available, rather than there being a pool of \$2 million that any group within South Australia could have access to. They are two legitimate concerns raised by Landcare, but there are a couple of other questions they have also raised that I will deal with. I also note their not unexpected concern about biodiversity management and conservation.

On another theme, the question of consultation has also been raised with me by stakeholders. There is not much guidance given or many requirements specified within the act for the minister, for boards, to undertake consultation at various important stages, such as the establishment of regions, the selection of non-elected board members, the creation of the 10-year state landscape strategy or the five-year regional plans.

There is, I believe, a reference simply to 'as the minister directs' or 'regulates', and I think that is insufficient comfort for many of the groups that would wish to be consulted and would wish to participate. They have raised no individual concerns about the current minister nor, presumably, about the current shadow—should things change—but it is the principle of ensuring that they will always have a voice, regardless of who happens to be in the ministerial chair, and an attitude for listening to those organisations.

There is a question mark that has been raised about the boundaries of the regions. This bill facilitates the creation of Green Adelaide, and we have no objection to the creation of that board on this side of the chamber. However, the government has signalled other changes in boundaries that would mean that the idea of water catchments, being the dominant reason why you would have particular boundaries, would be abandoned. The act does not, in fact, detail the boundaries—it creates the power for the minister to do that by proclamation by the Governor—but it does list the factors that the minister may take into account.

Paying particular attention to water catchment areas has been removed from the current act. I will be asking questions and moving an amendment to restore it, consistent with the feedback I have had from conservationists in the environment movement about the importance of carrying out

the management of natural resources in a way that reflects the structure of our natural resources rather than the location of our towns and cities.

Staffing is another area we ought to spend some time on. I worked in the department when it went through the process of winding up what we fondly called 'walabi' at the time—the department for water, land and biodiversity conservation—and turned into the Department for Water, which has subsequently been put into the environment department as well, but I was in the environment department when natural resources came in. At that time, there was a centralisation—or at least a unification at a regional level—between the people who were employed through the environment department, who were primarily responsible for native wildlife, national parks, protected land and protected species, and the natural resources people.

This bill seeks to return, in a way, to the structure that happened initially under the NRM legislation in 2004, where the staff of the boards are public sector rather than Public Service and have a separate line of accountability away from the department—other, I note, than obviously the chief executive. Anyone who has worked in particularly public sector organisations, be they universities or public departments, or who has been in any kind of large business will know that pendulum swings back and forth on centralisation and decentralisation.

The change is annoying and frustrating for people who are working within, but it is the prerogative of new management to swing that pendulum in the other direction. I will have a number of questions about the working conditions for those who will be moving over into the public sector away from the Public Service. However, the concerns I have are about duplication.

We have a situation where the environment department budget is being cut and we are seeing people being offered TVSPs and leaving the department. We are seeing the imposition of a levy cap and we are seeing a decentralisation and a disentangling of staffing which ordinarily puts on budget pressure. I am concerned that we do not see a reduction of the dollars available to spend on natural resources, or on the environment and water in the department, as a result of this desire to have the appearance of these two areas being separate. I will be asking questions about that. I will be raising it as a risk that I see and, assuming that this bill emerges through parliament in roughly this form and becomes the act, that we are able to monitor what happens with the expenditure and how far the environment and natural resources dollar goes.

I am very pleased to see climate science or climate change being placed into this bill. I think it was not sufficiently recognised in the 2004 act and this bill remedies that, and I am pleased to see that. However, in the current status of the bill, it is largely a headline but does not come to life in the content or the requirement for the consideration in the state landscape strategy nor in the regional plans. I have filed amendments that seek to remedy that so that we not only have a nod to climate change but understand that keeping abreast of climate science is essential when we are dealing with the natural environment. It is essential for being legislative custodians for our farmers and primary producers.

That covers the vast majority of my issues. I am disappointed by the bill's inattention to nature and the importance of biodiversity conservation and habitat restoration. Anyone who understands what is happening in the natural world knows that that must be a high priority in order for us to continue to have productivity from our natural resources. I am pleased to see climate change in there and I am also pleased that there is an increasing emphasis on understanding and working with Aboriginal communities.

However, I have one more element of disappointment and that was the process used in bringing the bill to this chamber. I am on the Natural Resources Committee of parliament. It is a standing committee. It is a government member dominated committee, and I believe it is extremely discourteous for that committee not to have had the bill provided in draft form, for there to have been no face-to-face briefing despite repeated requests from the committee and, indeed, for it not to have been referred to our committee.

It is a substantial piece of legislation. It is a lengthy piece of legislation and it at least purports to be a major reform. It will guide the work of the Natural Resources Committee inevitably, and the Natural Resources Committee ought to be well placed to understand clearly what the changes are,

what the community thinks and thought in the initial consultation phase of the changes and to advise this house and the other place on its views about the bill.

As I said, there have been repeated requests to the minister and the minister's office for that to occur—and not just from the Labor side. I am disappointed that has not happened. I think it is at the very least discourteous but, more importantly, it has probably robbed the chamber and the other place of useful input into what ought to be a very significant bill. With that, I will be interested to read the contributions by other members in the second reading stage and look forward to the committee stage as well.

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (12:45):** I rise to support the bill, which is a major, ambitious and meaningful reform to what has been a real problem area in regional South Australia. As a regional MP, I am particularly pleased to rise today to support the Landscape SA Bill, because it is particularly relevant to regional communities and is, I believe, a bill about which there is plenty to like. The bill establishes a new framework that better manages this state's natural resources. Of particular note are the features of:

- decentralised decision-making finally being instituted and returning that decision-making to local communities;
- a simpler and more accessible system;
- a very welcome back-to-basics approach;
- caps on levies to further address cost-of-living pressures;
- the inclusion of a new, statewide landscape priorities fund;
- a grassroots grants program which is enshrined in legislation by the bill and which recognises the value of local knowledge and expertise;
- giving regional and rural communities a greater say in the management of the natural resources around them; and, importantly,
- refocusing on actually delivering practical, on-ground outcomes and tangible, meaningful improvement in the lives of those people who live around the natural resources that need more protection than we can offer.

During the consultation and planning processes for this important natural resources management reform, we heard that people want to see more doing and less talking about doing. That is what this bill does: it delivers practical environmental outcomes that protect our environment and benefit local communities. It is a mantra I particularly believe in, and I am really excited to see it as the basis for this bill.

There is plenty to like about the Landscape SA Bill and, importantly, the reform within it is also the delivery of another pre-election commitment by the Marshall Liberal government, another pre-election commitment met. The repetitive, overlapping planning arrangements have been removed. Each of the new regional boards outlined under the new act will have a high-level, five-year regional landscape plan that sets out five priorities for managing the region's landscapes and identify how success will be evaluated.

Plans will be simple and approval processes have been streamlined. Each board will set its own budget, which will be set out in an annual business plan and which will clearly show the expenditure proposed for each of its priorities. This will improve the ability of the board to manage its own business. Boards will be required to keep proper accounts and publicly report on their activities annually, including a specific report on the actual expenditure of levy funds for the relevant financial year tracked against the board's budget for that year.

Importantly, boards will be responsible for setting strategy and approving programs, cutting out unnecessary high-level approval processes that are time consuming. In addition to being responsible for their own budget, boards will employ a general manager who will be responsible for employing and directing staff. All these measures will see less time planning what has to be done and more time actually doing what is required.

There will be time lines for completion of projects, further instilling confidence in the communities the new board will have to serve that they will see direct outcomes for their money. Boards will be required to outsource aspects of these priorities to the private and non-government sectors to create jobs and drive investment further. Local councils will be encouraged to apply to undertake this work. This is an all-important dimension, as the partnerships and localised teamwork that will follow will be invaluable for all involved.

Land and soil management will be a priority for the new landscape boards, particularly in regional areas, and this work will be achieved through greater and closer ties with landholders. In short, I view the introduction of the Landscape South Australia Bill into this parliament as another exciting development for regional South Australia, heralding a much-needed complete overhaul and reform of natural resources management.

The feedback I have received since becoming the member for Narungga is that, broadly, it is generally accepted that the natural resources management system is no longer serving its purpose, with non-localised decision-making, high fees and inefficiencies. As stated by minister Speirs when introducing the bill to this house, regional communities want a simpler system, a greater voice in decision-making and board members who actually reflect the community.

The new Landscape SA framework, as proposed, I believe will solve these problems and, importantly, also cap increases to land and water levies to CPI to further ease cost-of-living pressures that are being felt so hard by so many throughout our state. This important reform will see local, democratically elected representation on the new Landscape SA regional boards, lower fees and money raised in each region staying in that region—what a novel idea that is. With so much beautiful fauna and flora in the Narungga electorate, it is important that we have a practical system to look after it, and I believe that this reform will help that cause.

The introduction of the bill follows an extensive three-month public consultation process involving 26 community forums, 23 engagement sessions and 250 written submissions being received. Of the new regional landscape boundaries that are proposed, I believe that they have better aligned regions with communities of interest and local government boundaries, better enabling communities to work together in managing landscapes.

In my patch, it is proposed that the new Northern and Yorke landscape region will include the whole of the Narungga electorate with the additional areas of Burra, Springton and Mount Pleasant, currently located in the Murray-Darling Basin NRM region, as well as Gawler and Mallala, which are currently in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges region. I can attest that Burra, Springton and Mount Pleasant are a better fit in the Northern and Yorke region than in the Murray-Darling Basin region and that including Gawler and Mallala in the Northern and Yorke region is a far more logical fit than where they currently find themselves, that is, in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges region.

I also personally like that, as part of the reforms, the government has sought to expand the scope of natural resources management to include coastlines that are adjacent to land and have not had the care or attention they require. The Narungga electorate, which features the Yorke Peninsula leg of coastline, is unfortunately currently facing myriad erosion and sand drift issues. It is my hope that the new recognition of coasts and seas within this new legislative framework will result in new partnerships, collaboration of vital resources and a better coordinated approach that better recognises the value of our pristine coastline.

It is also noted that the reform under the proposed act offers a dedicated, clearly defined role in assisting with the management of the impact of native animals and also recognises that weed control is a critical component of preserving biodiversity in the regions. Each board will be able to work in partnership with their local community and relevant authorities to work out the best approach for their region and local circumstances. When we consider pest plant and animal control, this bill does away with the action plans and replaces them with action orders. This is further welcome streamlining.

In response to the feedback that there needs to be a simpler and faster process rather than the landholder identifying what action is needed, going forward the authorised officers will be able to issue an action order setting out what action needs to be taken, and we can be confident that it will be. Another example is removing the distinction between state and regional authorised officers to

increase compliance capacity, meaning that tasks can be done quicker. Currently, regional authorised officers can operate only within their region and need to be cross-authorised by multiple NRM boards in order to be able to deal with cross-boundary issues, such as managing pest plants and animals. This is a classic example of unnecessary red tape.

Regional landscape boards are also to have a defined role in helping manage native species that are causing adverse impacts. Importantly, this reform simplifies the planning load for boards, removes prescriptive consultation requirements and replaces unnecessary administrative processes, such as a requirement to gazette a notice as to the basis of assessment of water taken each year, and referring matters to the Natural Resources Committee unnecessarily.

Vitally, the new landscape SA act will put people at the heart of the management of our natural resources—the people who live in the regions and know them best will be put at the front of this reform—and that recognises that those who work on the land on a daily basis are best placed to sustain its environment. The bill recognises the value of strong on-the-ground partnerships and the value of the knowledge that land users have.

We are repealing the Natural Resources Management Act and replacing it with the landscape SA act to reduce the level of red tape and give real focus to practical programs and on-ground outcomes delivered by local skilled people who care about the land and soil around them and who, this government recognises, have the capacity, valued expertise and experience to directly contribute.

That is why the newly created landscape boards that are to replace the existing NRM boards will be responsible for setting strategy and approving programs. They will sit at arm's length from the government and be responsible for their own budget. They will be duly respected to decide on their projects and priorities, being trusted to identify up to five priorities to be achieved by their plan over a quantified five-year term.

Each board will have seven members, with three members elected by the community, ensuring that local knowledge plays a major role in decision-making on how to spend the hard-earned dollars raised to undertake the most needed projects. Each landscape board will establish a five-year landscape plan for their region and the plan will be simple and publicly accessible. Each landscape board will be responsible for employing a general manager who will employ and direct staff to deliver the environmental management programs of the board.

As noted, annual land and water levy rises will be capped at a rate set by an independent body or according to the Consumer Price Index. Importantly, the levies collected in a region will be spent in that region. There will be increased transparency, with every budget being publicly available and outlining how levies will be spent.

I believe that for the reasons outlined—increased transparency, decentralised decision-making, the focus on using and respecting local knowledge and expertise, the emphasis on better management of natural resources in regional areas, the reduction of red tape, better use of funds which translates to actual completed projects and the overall recognition that people want to see more doing and less talking about doing—this reform will be well received by the electorate of Narungga and the state overall.

It is really important to understand why those on this side felt so strongly that there was a need to repeal the Natural Resources Management Act and replace it with the proposed act we are currently debating and why our extensive consultation with the people of this state has culminated in the introduction of the bill before us and the radical, meaningful and ambitious reform of current management practice.

In my patch and in surveys across the state, similar sentiments were shown. The people paying the NRM levy had long lost confidence in where and why the money was being collected. Surveys revealed that 65 per cent of people did not know how their NRM levy money was being spent—65 per cent—nor did they know why the levies were continually going up, at exorbitant rates at times. We found that there was significant dissatisfaction across the state, and our consultation confirmed that the key to reform was a requirement for NRM boards to be independent from government and that:

- a local community should be able to nominate board members in their own region;
- the levies were too high;
- decisions were seen to be being made by people in the city who had not visited the natural environment they were charged with managing, there being seemingly little understanding of local ecosystems or specific problems that needed to be addressed in specific regions;
- the communities and landholders had no voice; and
- the priorities appeared to be more about compliance and were too light on building relationships.

It is clear that the people in my region want more of the decisions affecting them to be made by the people who live in and understand their community and who know what the problems and priorities are. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

#### *Petitions*

#### **SERVICE SA MODBURY**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 100 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.

#### **SCHOOL ZONING**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens):** Presented a petition signed by 200 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to immediately reverse its decision to exclude from the Adelaide High School and Adelaide Botanic High School zone the children of the families residing in Torrensville, Mile End, Hilton, Richmond, Marleston, Kurralta Park, Black Forest, Glandore and Clarence Park, and to recognise the immediate and adverse impact of its decision on families, students, educational outcomes and property values in the impacted suburbs.

#### *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 Deputy Premier (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Adelaide Youth Training Centre, Pilot Visiting Program and Review of Records for the—  
Final Report February 2019

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

Review of the performance of South Australian health systems, the health of South  
Australians and changes in Health outcomes—Report 2015-18

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

Grain Growers Rail Fund—Eyre Peninsula Annual Report 2017-18  
Grain Industry Research and Development Fund—Annual Report 2017-18  
Industry Fund—  
Apiary Annual Report 2017-18

Cattle Annual Report 2017-18  
Citrus Growers Annual Report 2017-18  
Grain Annual Report 2017-18  
Pig Annual Report 2017-18  
Sheep Annual Report 2017-18  
Wine Industry Fund—  
Adelaide Hills Annual Report 2017-18  
Barossa Annual Report 2017-18  
Clare Valley Annual Report 2017-18  
Langhorne Creek Annual Report 2017-18  
McLaren Vale Annual Report 2017-18  
Riverland Annual Report 2017-18

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome to parliament today the Hon. Neil Andrew AO, former Speaker of the House of Representatives and former member for Wakefield. Welcome to parliament, sir.

*Question Time*

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:03):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Why has the minister decided to sack CFS Chief Officer, Greg Nettleton?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:03):** I thank the member for the question. The contract for the Chief Officer of the CFS expires and I am not renewing that contract.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, we had the question.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** That may be so. The Leader of the Opposition.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** A supplementary question: why did the minister choose not to extend the contract of Chief Officer Nettleton?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:04):** I thank the member for the question. As the minister in charge, it was a decision that I took.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe is called to order, as is the member for Kaurana. Leader of the Opposition.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:04):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Why did the minister—

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier is called to order. Can I have the question again, please.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Can the minister please inform the house why he elected to take the decision that he did?

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** That was the last question.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** No, it's not.

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is called to order. The minister has the call. I would like to hear the answer.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:04):** I refer the member to my previous answer.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is called to order.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, there have been three questions asked in the first minute.

#### **DROUGHT ASSISTANCE**

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:05):** My question is to the Minister for Primary—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is called to order.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

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

**Mr PEDERICK:** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on measures in the federal budget to futureproof our farmers against drought?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:05):** I certainly can. I thank the member for Hammond for his question, and an important question it was and is today. I thank the member for that question, and he knows only too well the hardships that drought is bringing not only to the farmers around South Australia but to his electorate of Hammond, which is probably one of the electorates suffering most in the state. I have been working closely with the Liberal Coalition in Canberra, looking at ways we can support our primary producers.

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light is interjecting.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** We just recently had the third visit from Major General Stephen Day, the Prime Minister's drought coordinator. He has been over here looking at ways he can help fill the policy gaps right across the nation, particularly here in South Australia. We have seen his good work. He has been the conduit from this government to the federal government for ways we can support our farmers to help them be more resilient and also to help them futureproof their businesses and their families.

It is also important to note that the federal budget handed down a number of measures that will help futureproof those communities, particularly our primary producers, so that they can remain. The establishment of a \$3.9 billion emergency response fund providing up to \$150 million per annum, starting from the 2019-20 year, is part of a recovery package for all natural disasters. There is a more than \$3 million increase in access to the Farm Household Allowance, and there is a \$5 million grant to the Country Women's Association to help farmers' families experiencing hardship. The money to the CWA, by and large, is a bit of a gap fill. It provides money and puts food on the table to make sure that the kids go to school while those families and communities can access the Farm Household Allowance.

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** There is \$34 million nationally over four years to encourage stewardship and biodiversity practices in the ag sector, including the new grants program, and \$4.2 million over four years to improve the National Drought Map. We need to understand that the National Drought Map, sadly, has expanded this year but, as we know, farmers are eternal optimists and they will look to the skies for rain.

Additionally, the budget also reconfirmed delivery of \$5 million for five additional South Australian local government areas to be eligible for up to \$1 million in the Drought Communities Programme. We see now that Berri, Murray Bridge, Light, Flinders Ranges and Peterborough bring us to a total of 22 local government areas. That's \$22 million being put into the regions to help them adjust for job losses that have been caused by drought. Senator Bridget McKenzie was also working with the member for Grey, the member for Barker and Senator Anne Ruston. They all came together with myself and the Premier to bring that money to South Australia.

The extension of the Drought Communities Programme also enables farmers, workers and now suppliers to be eligible for a further \$3,000 per affected household. It is vital that we continue to work with the federal government so that we can address the hardship and the uncertainty. The Premier, myself and the regional local members have been out in the drought-affected communities. We have not just flown into an area, visited one area, made a bit of a headline, got a radio grab, got a TV grab and shot through.

The Premier, the local members and I have been out extensively. We have been out from the West Coast, through the pastoral lands, and we have been to our eastern borders. We have been out there and looked at the majority of South Australia that is doing it tough. Those drought-affected communities can rely on this government to represent them and to give them support because we know that #RegionsMatter.

**Mr Hughes:** There wasn't a dollar in the budget.

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

#### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Is the minister seeking to take the CFS in a new direction under new leadership?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:09):** I thank the member for the question. One would surmise that, if the contract of the previous chief officer hasn't been renewed and we are going to get a new chief officer, there will be a new direction, yes.

#### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** What is the new direction the minister wants to take the CFS in?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:10):** You will have to wait and see.

#### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Has the minister consulted with the over 10,000 CFS volunteers on the new direction he wants to take the CFS?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:10):** I thank the member for the question and point out that there are more than 13,000 volunteers. I have been spending a lot of time—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —out in the regions speaking with our CFS volunteers and talking to them about what they want. In fact, when we came to this election, we put forward \$5 million to help fix up the mess that you left behind. We have been out to a number of their facilities and stations—

**The SPEAKER:** I did not leave a mess behind.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** My apologies, Mr Speaker: you didn't leave it behind; the Labor Party left it behind. We have been out talking with the volunteers, listening to the volunteers and engaging with the volunteers. Can I just take this opportunity to say what a wonderful job our volunteers do in our community and we are here for our volunteers. We want to make sure that we have a volunteer-strong emergency services sector. The CFS and SES do an absolutely outstanding job, as do the MFS. We know that within these sectors these people do an outstanding job.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The Leader of the Opposition is chirping away on the other side, and the fact—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I will be abundantly clear. You asked the question and I gave you the answer: the chief officer's contract is up and it's not being renewed.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** That is the answer, and what we will be doing is making sure that we have a volunteer-focused—

**Ms Hildyard:** Why? Now tell us why?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —emergency services. We will make sure that we are delivering for our communities and make sure that our volunteers are well served in their roles. We thank them for what they do. We will continue to work with them, as we move forward, to make sure that we have the best emergency services sector this state can possibly have.

### MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:12):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house about how measures in the federal budget are giving greater mobile phone access to regional South Australia?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:12):** Yes, I can. I know that the member for Heysen is excited because he now has the opportunity for more connectivity on the Long Valley Road between Wistow and Strathalbyn—a great outcome. Previously, there were no blackspots in South Australia, but since coming to government we have actually found the blackspots and we are out there working with the federal government.

It has recently been announced that round 4 has been contested and South Australia has seen some significant movement. What we have seen in the previous rounds 1, 2 and 3 is that South Australian regions were ignored. There were no blackspots in the regions of South Australia. What

we are seeing now is round 4 a new government and we are now putting money towards it, and an election commitment, \$10 million on the table so that we could address some of those blackspots. We are working with the commonwealth government and we are working with the telcos and it's a shared responsibility.

We can announce that 29 mobile towers were announced on Friday 22 March. I was joined by Senator Bridget McKenzie, federal Minister for Regional Communications, as well as the local member for Grey, Rowan Ramsey, and the local member for Barker, Tony Pasin, to make that announcement. It's exciting that the regions of South Australia now have the opportunity to be connected to the world. It's amazing how we found the blackspots that the previous government couldn't find. They ignored them for such a long time.

This is a \$19.4 million investment, with \$5.3 million from the state government and \$5.5 million from the federal government. This is a commitment that the Marshall Liberal government took to the election and we are now delivering. It was also announced that there are a further two rounds, round 5 and round 6. We will use the remainder of that money to leverage both commonwealth money and that telco's money because we are out there addressing the needs, wishes and wants of regional South Australia.

It is also important to note that regional South Australia under the first three rounds received 37 mobile towers out of 867 towers nationally. It is a disgrace that South Australian regions were ignored for such a long time—for almost three years they were ignored. What I can say is that this government is going to govern for all of South Australia.

I will say that Riverton and Rhynie in Frome have received towers. Kangaroo Island has received a tower, as has Compton down at Mount Gambier. There have been a number of towers delivered in Giles. Baird Bay in Flinders and Ettrick in Hammond also received a tower, as well as a number of towers in Stuart, particularly in the Flinders Ranges region. There have also been towers in Chaffey, so that's great news for the people of regional South Australia.

What I can say also to the member for King is that, Little Para Pass also received a tower, so that's great news up there. What we are doing as a government is connecting regional South Australia with the world. We are making sure that we actually stand up for South Australia and the regions included. It is important to note that we will continue to put money on the table to connect regional South Australia with the world.

It is not just about safety, it is not just about our tourists and it is not just about productivity: it is about making sure that our country communities, our regional communities, are connected with the business world, that they are competitive and can go out there on a daily basis and have connection through their mobile service, because we know #RegionsMatter.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is called to order. The Leader of the Opposition.

#### **COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Has the minister consulted with the CFS Volunteers Association on his decision to terminate the appointment of Chief Officer Nettleton?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:16):** I thank the member for the question—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Lee!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and I apologise for repeating the answer, but I just need to make it abundantly clear that it is a decision that I made, and we are moving forward. The contract was up. We are not renewing the contract, and we are working with the volunteers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We work closely with the volunteers every day. In fact, as I look around the room, I see the member for Hammond. I had a great tour with him and some of his wonderful CFS, as well as the member for Newland and the member for Morialta.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I go down the line and I have visited numerous CFS stations and spoken to countless volunteers. We have a very volunteer-focused party/group—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and we are going to deliver for our volunteers—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —unlike those on the other side who didn't care much for their volunteers. They let their facilities run down—trashed the facilities that they lived in. But what we—

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Doughnuts!

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is called to order for shouting 'doughnuts'.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We did deliver doughnuts for our volunteers. They delivered nothing for our volunteers. That was what they delivered—absolutely nothing. On the other hand, we very much care for our volunteers. We make it abundantly clear we are going to have a very strong volunteer capability within our emergency services. Our CFS crews in particular do a tireless job. We can't thank them enough. I have been out there thanking them week in, week out, ever since I came into this job, and we are going to be even stronger going forward.

### COUNTRY FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Has the minister complied with his obligations under the volunteers charter with the CFS regarding the decision to not continue the contract of Chief Officer, Greg Nettleton?

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:17):** I thank the member for the question. I have made it abundantly clear the path I have taken. He knows exactly what I have done.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** What I will say is that we are not going—

*Mr Boyer interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —down the Piccolo path. We are making sure that our volunteers are strong and that they will be supported all the way through, and we will continue to do that.

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford is called to order.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens, please be quiet. The Leader of the Opposition.

#### EMERGENCY SERVICES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the minister—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** One moment, leader; please be seated. The Minister for Transport and the member for Hammond are called to order. Leader.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Is the minister seeking to make any changes or reorganisation of emergency services under his leadership?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:18):** I thank the member for the question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and more specifically I thank the Leader of the Opposition for the opportunity to point out very strongly that we are not going down the Piccolo path. I can't make that any clearer. We are here to support our volunteers.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Ramsay is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** What we are doing, and again I stress the point that I have made abundantly clear, is the contract for the chief of the CFS is not being renewed. The head of SAFECOM, it was also announced, will not be continuing on. We will be replacing the head of SAFECOM and then finding a new chief of the CFS as well.

**The SPEAKER:** I will give the leader one more, and then we will move to the member for Davenport.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** Make it a good one.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. Considering the chief of the MFS resigned in the middle of last year, when will the minister get around to making an appointment for chief of the MFS?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: it might be admissible in the Legislative Council; it is not acceptable in the House of Assembly to introduce information before the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Because the Leader of the Opposition was allegedly introducing a fact given that something happened—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, it's a gentle breach. I will give the leader one more opportunity and then I will move to the member for Davenport.

**Mr MALINAUSKAS:** Thanks, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. When will the minister finally make an appointment to the role of Chief Officer of the MFS?

**The SPEAKER:** That question is in order. Minister.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:20):** I thank the member for the question. I do want to be really careful here because we were both at the retirement event for the outgoing MFS chief, who is a wonderful person. I didn't work with him for very long. He did leave for health reasons, as the member on the other side knows, so I won't go into the personal details of that, but it was—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth is called to order. The member for Lee is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —a sudden announcement. We did put the deputy chief in place for an interim period—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —for an interim period, yes—to give him an opportunity to get his feet under the desk and have a go, very happy and proud, and he has done a wonderful job. We have that job out to tender. It is going through the appropriate application process—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and we will let you know as soon as the appointment is made.

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Giles can leave for 25 minutes under 137A. He has been at it for the first 17 minutes.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Davenport has the call.

#### ROAD SAFETY

**Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:21):** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader, Minister for Energy, be quiet. Member for Davenport.

**Mr MURRAY:** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house how the government is working with SAPOL and other agencies to combat the increase in fatalities experienced so far this year on South Australian roads?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:22):** I thank the member for Davenport for his question—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —a very important question it is as well, and I know he has great care and consideration for people on our roads and making sure that they get where they need to go safely. We do know that this year the number of people who have died on our roads is higher than it has been previously. We also acknowledge that any death on our roads is one death too many.

We must also point out that it is fundamentally everybody's responsibility when they are on the road to drive carefully, to make sure they get where they want to go, they get there safely, they don't impact their family by having an accident and hurting themselves and they don't impact other families by hurting someone else on the road. That is a key point that needs to be made.

We do hear people often talk about the road toll, and I really don't like that term because 'toll' indicates a price you have to pay, and we don't have to pay this price. We look at the number of

deaths on our road this year at 31, and police say very clearly that all of them could have been avoided if people were more careful. To see and hear of people driving their car without seatbelts on, riding motorbikes without helmets, speeding when they shouldn't be—these are things that everyone can control, and we implore—and I'm sure that those on the other side of the house do as well—people to drive safely when they are on the roads. I was very happy to hear the deputy commissioner today—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Lee!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —talk about the fact that they have elevated road safety to the top of their agenda today at a meeting they had with 60 other senior police personnel—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —to make sure they are doing everything they can. The thing you will notice about road safety, and we are very aware of it on this side of the house, is that it transgresses through a number of portfolio areas.

I wish there was just a wand that you could wave to fix the problem. There isn't. It actually goes across a number of areas. I pointed out one, and that is personal responsibility, and police are driving that message very hard. The other one is—and I want to commend my colleague the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure—that we get the right infrastructure in place. He went to great lengths yesterday to outline the amount of money that the federal government have chipped in at the most recent budget, and last year in our state budget, with billions of dollars going into infrastructure spend here in South Australia to make sure our roads are as safe as possible.

We want to do everything we can at that end to make our roads as safe as possible. We want people taking responsibility. The police will be doing policing. That was the discussion the deputy commissioner was having today, to make sure that we can look at operations or practices that can be put in place to make sure that we are there trying to get to people before something goes wrong. Unfortunately, it can't always happen, but the police are doing everything in their power to make sure that it does.

Another one is, of course, education and advertising. Since the previous government sold off the Motor Accident Commission, it left just the shell of an organisation, and those arms are being absorbed into the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and also into SAPOL to make sure that we can keep delivering those messages as much as possible to make sure that people are aware and to make sure that they are responsible for their actions. We cannot drive that point hard enough.

I know those on the other side have mentioned that there have been a number of motorcycle accidents—and there have been this year—and there is talk about the graduated licensing scheme. We are working through that, but we want to make sure that there aren't any unintended consequences with that. That is a focus on the younger age group, but when we look at the deaths from motorcycles this year a lot of them are actually 30, 40, 50 and 60-year-old men. One of the things we are looking at is making sure that as they get their licence—they get their licence in a car where they have extra protection. We know that when people get onto the road they are learning about the road and the road rules and without that protection they are vulnerable. We are doing that work and we look forward to bringing it back to the parliament.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:26):** My question is to the Minister for Road Safety. Why has the Motor Accident Commission been directed to stop making media comments?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:26):** I thank the member for his question. The Motor Accident Commission, as I pointed out just a few moments ago, was sold off by those opposite—the big conglomeration that it was.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** If you let me finish—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Waite is called to order.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Pump your brakes. We know the treasurer raped and pillaged and took all the money out of the Motor Accident Commission and left it as a shell of what it was.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The Motor Accident Commission is winding down its duties, still delivering advertising and educational programs, as it has in the past, as it transfers across to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and across to SAPOL as well. That is happening because of the mess we were left with. We are tidying that up and fixing it up and those two agencies will take forward the responsibilities of the Motor Accident Commission. They—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Did you direct them to stop making media comments?

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We have the question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —have actually handed the duties over and they are handing the duties over. SAPOL—

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

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

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and a number of other organisations, the RAA and a number of not-for-profits, are getting involved in making media comment about road safety aspects. I know that the Leader of the Opposition thinks that a billboard will solve all the problems, but that is not to be the case. It is a collection, as I said in my last answer, of activities right across the board that will help with our road safety strategy.

#### **MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION MARKETING BUDGET**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Did the minister seek to divert some of the MAC marketing funds destined for SAPOL to other areas in his portfolio?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:27):** No.

#### **MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION MARKETING BUDGET**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Did the minister receive a minute from the Treasurer in February advising him that he would not approve the diversion of MAC marketing funds to other portfolio areas as he had requested?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:28):** I thank the member

for the question and refer him back to last year's budget papers because he clearly didn't read them. I think the Treasurer made this abundantly clear last year. In the winding up of MAC—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and the responsibilities of MAC—which were around advertising and education campaigns. I think you had them sponsoring clubs. I think you had them funding schoolies week. There was a whole myriad of activities that the Motor Accident Commission had an involvement with. Some of those were actually sponsoring sporting organisations: community football, basketball as well, Adelaide United. I think Port Adelaide Football Club got some money through all this.

It was actually quite messy to be honest with you, so the Treasurer made it abundantly clear that those operations working with sporting clubs, that money would go across and still be allocated to them. It's a matter of how we lined it up and where we put it and which organisation looked after that. The Treasurer made that abundantly clear, that the Office of Recreation and Sport would be included along with SAPOL and with the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** You're right. The Leader of the Opposition is right: it was a mess. He is also right: we are fixing it up.

#### SPORTS FACILITIES

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall government is supporting sporting infrastructure in our regions?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:29):** I thank the member for Flinders very much for his question—a very hardworking member doing some wonderful work. There is so much to talk about and I've only got four minutes. I've got so much ground to cover. We talk about more jobs—

**The SPEAKER:** You don't have to monopolise that four minutes if you don't want to.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —lower costs and better services. Are you going to give me extra time? I thank you, Mr Speaker. We've got a lot to get through. In the last 12 months, as well as visiting all our emergency services—as many as I can, right across the state—I have covered the length and breadth and I think I have been to just about every region there is. I have also visited a lot of the great sporting clubs and sporting communities. I have been from top to bottom, left to right, right across the state—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The suggestion has been that I should have run more kilometres than travelled by vehicle or plane or whatever it might have been, and they are probably right: I should have run a bit more. I have put on a little bit of weight, and I apologise for that. My kids give me a hard time about putting on weight all the time. I tell them that I am just getting a thicker skin.

I was very fortunate last week to be in the member for Flinders' electorate. We went to Cleve, a wonderful country community. They have spawned some of the greatest people in South Australia. I am from Cleve. It's a great community. You wouldn't believe it, but a number of years ago they had their clubrooms blown over. Three years they have been without clubrooms and to go there and see the frame go up—I know the member for Flinders had a big smile across his face. They are doing an outstanding job.

The community has put money into this, the state government has put \$630,000 into this, they are building an outstanding facility. What I liked about this in particular was that this facility doubles up as an emergency relief centre.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for West Torrens, be quiet.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** So it's a sporting club—netball, football, cricket, you name it, the sporting clubs are invited in there. The community is going to use it, they are talking about using it for weddings as well, and it is an emergency relief centre. It's absolutely outstanding. I commend Kelly Richardson, Al Schumann, Amy Allen, Frank Gillings and Robert Quinn. We met them all, and council has also had an injection in this one and we thank them very much.

We did duck across to the member for Giles' electorate as well. This used to be in the member for Flinders' electorate. We went to Cowell, and they got \$87,000 for some new lights for their facility. They chipped in some money as well. It's a wonderful field. It actually has two cricket ovals on it, and it could potentially have three footy ovals on it. With the number of people they can get playing by having lights, it just about doubles the amount of activity they can have on there.

They are looking at expanding potentially out to softball for the local region and, because it gets quite warm on Eyre Peninsula, by having night games they can play deeper, longer into the season. So this is really fantastic, and it will get more people playing and more people active. It was wonderful to see Wayne Piggot over there, Rowena Norris and Matthew Franklin, three of the key instigators who actually helped make that happen.

The other point of this—and this is how resourceful people in the regions are, and I think we all know and appreciate that, and it just does bring a smile to your face—is that the new light towers are going up, and they are going to be fantastic and increase the activity, as I said. But they are that resourceful that they take the old light towers and move them over to the netball and tennis courts, and they are going to be even better lit over there as well. Everyone is a winner out of this, and the community has had a wonderful uplift.

I was down in Naracoorte on the weekend with the member for MacKillop and, again, there was a big smile on the face of the people of Naracoorte as we opened their new hockey facility down there—a great facility this one: 230 members, 1,500 users. They are already talking about trying to attract some regional development, get some tournaments in and bring people in from over the border, bringing economic dollars into the local region of Naracoorte. I tell you what, they gave a stick to the member for MacKillop and he had a couple of penalty shots on goal. He might spend a lot of time being a football umpire, but he really should take up hockey. He was very impressive. It's great to be serving the regions and, as my good colleague says, #RegionsMatter.

#### **MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION MARKETING BUDGET**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:33):** Will the minister guarantee the marketing budget will be maintained when it moves from the Motor Accident Commission to SAPOL?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:34):** I thank the member for the question. Again, I should give him the budget papers from last year and the budget speech from last year. The Treasurer was very clear in that speech that all the money that is in the Motor Accident Commission will be rolled over to all those agreements in the next year.

#### **MOTOR ACCIDENT COMMISSION MARKETING BUDGET**

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:34):** Supplementary: has the police commissioner agreed to take on responsibility for road safety messaging and is he satisfied with the funding arrangements?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:34):** I thank the member for the question. Again, I just don't know how I can be any clearer. I am not sure if he needs to clean out his ears.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members of my left! I would like to hear the answer.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Listen, because I have been really clear.

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I have to stress the matter again, that the Motor Accident Commission was sold off by those opposite. We have made that abundantly clear. They sold that off. They stripped the assets—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Elizabeth is warned.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** —and paid down their debt. We know how they work on that side. That left the road safety component. That money is being transferred. As the Treasurer made abundantly clear, we are looking after all the accounts and all the operations within that, and they are being transferred to SAPOL and DPTI. They are being transferred between the two organisations and to the Office of Rec and Sport as well.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

#### NATIONAL PARK RANGERS

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:35):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Mr ELLIS:** Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall Liberal government's focus on park rangers will deliver better on-ground environmental protection and whether there are any alternative views that he is aware of?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:35):** I thank the member for Narungga for his question and know he has a great interest in national parks and wildlife, particularly in having a strong ranger service here in South Australia and particularly looking after Innes National Park in his beautiful electorate.

Many people here would know that we went to the election with a commitment to increase the number of park rangers by 20 and to rebuild that front-line workforce, which of course had been gutted, absolutely gutted, by the previous Labor administration over 16 years. In fact, rangers themselves had become a threatened species looking after threatened species as a consequence—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —of the maladministration of the Labor Party. But, never fear, we are now in control of the treasury bench and we are determined to rebuild our ranger workforce—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —and to do that we have begun recruiting—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —new rangers. We said we would recruit 20 and we are already well on the way to having the first five in place.

*The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** They will start undertaking that iconic role in our natural environment, supporting local communities, supporting friends groups, to build resilience in our landscape—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee, be quiet.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —and look after our natural environment, working with volunteers, working with NGOs, to invest in the environment. It was with interest—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left, be quiet.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —that I heard that the Labor Party doesn't appear to be overly supportive of our move to increase the number of park rangers. If I were the South Australian Labor Party, I would run far, far away from any conversation about rangers, given what they did during their term. But, no, there appears to be some background briefing of journalists around our commitment to rangers. There appears to be a comment that we are just rebadging existing workers—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Leader and deputy leader, be quiet.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, Mr Speaker. There appears to be rumour and innuendo that we are just rebadging existing officers as rangers, but I can tell you that we have created a pathway for existing officers to become rangers, absolutely. That will be over and above our 20 additional rangers. We have already, as part of workforce transition and workforce renewal, been able to identify a number of officers who are in other roles, who have said, 'We would like to be rangers.' We see this as part of the government workforce that the Marshall Liberal government is investing in and so we have created this pathway.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I hear the deputy leader, who apparently hates rangers and doesn't want us to do this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, please do not respond to interjections, and the deputy leader is warned. Please stop interjecting.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I hear her saying that this is an unfunded commitment. But is it unfunded? I look to page 64 of the 2018-19 budget papers and they are fully funded. Our 20 new rangers are fully funded. They are happening. Not only have we fully funded rangers but we are looking for pathways for existing workers in the department—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is warned for a second and final time.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —to transition to rangers. You know what? When I asked the chief executive about this, about whether it was something that was regularly done, transitioning people within the department to rangers, he said, 'That's been happening for years and the Labor Party did it 13 times over.' They transitioned and rebadged 13 people and now the deputy leader is criticising us for 20 new rangers and a whole host of new pathways for careers to rangers. This will result in new rangers in Glenthorne National Park, on Kangaroo Island and in the River Murray National Park. Interestingly, we might even get one at Bimbowrie Conservation Park—which, for the opposition leader's information, is right next to the town Cockburn.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The deputy leader is on two warnings. If she continues to interject, she will be leaving the chamber.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister explain why her department actively considered a plan to introduce 12-hour shifts for residential care workers without breaks and without penalty rates?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:40):** That is an operational matter and I won't be discussing it.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is warned for a second and final time.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister rule out her or her department ever again considering the introduction of 12-hour shifts for residential care workers?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:40):** I thank the member for her question and—

*Ms Stinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The member for Badcoe is warned.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Why don't we set the scene of the child protection department that I was left with after 16 years—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, be seated. The deputy leader can leave for the rest of question time, please.

*The honourable member for Port Adelaide having withdrawn from the chamber:*

*Mr Pederick interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hammond can join her for the rest of question time.

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

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call. I understand the interjections, on my left especially, but I will allow the minister some time to compare and contrast, and then I expect her to come to the substance of the question. I would like members on my left to be quiet.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** As we are well aware, you can look at the Robyn Layton report, the two Mullighan inquiries, the Debelle inquiry, the Nyland royal commission to see that child protection as a system was not working under the Labor government. In fact, in every measure it was failing dismally—

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

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Mawson is warned.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —so when I came in a year ago as the minister, pretty well every single thing I looked at in that department I would look at changing. It was a mess, an absolute mess. Calls weren't being answered—

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Cheltenham is warned. That didn't take long.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —investigations weren't being made. There were high numbers of 'closed, no action'. Under the Report on Government Services, we were the lowest, if not in the bottom two, on every possible measure. My department and my CE, Cathy Taylor, have been

working hard to look at every single area and how we can improve it. We are looking at every area, from computer systems to resourcing to how we do things—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —to the treatment of our foster carers.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** We have already announced several policies, as members know. Under Labor—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —there was strike action from the PSA because of the 270 FTE vacancies—

*The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —that had been held for almost four years that I was the shadow minister. We are working hard to address staffing issues. We have broadened the qualifications that are accepted and we have already placed over 30 people in front-line positions under that new policy. We are answering more calls, we have fewer hang-ups, we are making more investigations. More children are being kept safe under this government, and I will not apologise for that.

We are improving our efficiencies and, as members know, we will continue to improve our efficiencies. We will look at every, single area from staffing to recruiting to foster caring. We have already announced foster and kinship care repayments to 21, the first state in the nation to initiate that. I am very proud of the changes we are making and we will continue to make—

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

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. One moment, minister.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** You gave the minister two minutes to expand on the question. Now if she could get to the substance of the question—debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is debate. I believe the minister is finishing up her answer.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I am, to say that—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —everything is on the table, any efficiency, anything that we can do to improve the outcomes for our children.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Allow the minister to finish.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** My job is to look after the children who are in my care, and I will do that and I will do it in any way that is necessary to get better outcomes for the children under my guardianship.

#### EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:44):** My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. What is being done to relieve pressure on emergency departments, especially

with winter and a new more virulent strain of flu fast approaching? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

**Ms BEDFORD:** As I understand it, on Monday night Modbury Hospital's emergency department was overrun at around 5 o'clock, seeing patients diverted to the Lyell McEwin. The Lyell McEwin was subsequently totally overrun by 8pm and no-one could divert to the new RAH as they were already experiencing ramping by that time.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:45):** Thank you to the member for Florey for that very important question. As we approach summer—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Winter—sorry, yes. As we leave summer and approach winter, the flu season is something we are all aware of. In fact, I suspect most people in this chamber today got their flu shot this morning, which is a terrific service. With regard to the question from the member for Florey, I am reminded of the former government's performance with regard to the transition from the old to the new RAH and the bungles that were made there in connection with the flu season, so the Minister for Health and Wellbeing is very focused on this issue.

You had many components to your question with regard to different services at different hospitals that were impacted, so I would be very pleased to go back to the Minister for Health and Wellbeing to get a very clear briefing for the member for Florey with regard to exactly how this flu season is being approached.

#### VICTOR HARBOR ROAD

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:46):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister inform the house on the government's plans to duplicate the Victor Harbor Road?

**An honourable member:** What about the causeway?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:46):** I can.

**An honourable member:** Good. Very important.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** It is very important, so I am a little bit bemused because the issue in relation to the causeway is actually in the public sphere and I would answer the question, but I would be in breach of the standing orders.

What we announced in conjunction with the federal government on Tuesday in relation to the Victor Harbor Road is a fantastic part of our plan to deliver road upgrades for regional South Australia. The member for Finniss was actually regaling me on the drive with how old he was when the road first got upgraded, and I don't want to talk about the time gap because it's quite a few decades.

Essentially, he has relayed—as somebody whose family has lived in the area for quite a long time—the history of this road and the notorious nature of this road and the fact that it took until 2019 for us to stand there, as we did, on the turn-off to Seaview Road at the top of McLaren Vale to announce the duplication of Victor Harbor Road to McLaren Vale. It is something that his community on the South Coast has been calling for for decades, something that the people of McLaren Vale have been calling for for decades, and it's finally going to become a reality.

This four-kilometre stretch of road, essentially from the turn-off at South Road all the way through to McLaren Vale, is going to deal with a stretch of road that takes about 25,000 vehicles a day. That is huge. In terms of the roads we have around South Australia that are still single lane with 25,000 cars a day, this one is one of the ones that takes the cake. It's why we were so keen to deliver this project in conjunction with the federal government—92 million bucks on the table—to get this job done.

We know that this is actually quite a dangerous stretch of road; in fact, we have seen only in recent weeks a fatality on that stretch of Victor Harbor Road. It brings very much into stark relief the fact that this money that we spend is going to make a material difference to people's lives. We can only really ask ourselves the question: had this duplication happened earlier, would circumstances be different?

This, again, was also going to help drive tourism. In fact, the front page of *The Advertiser* today puts paid to that fact. That is, Victor Harbor, Goolwa and the surrounding areas are a major part of our tourism economy, and connectivity between Adelaide and regions such as the South Coast are so very important. Whether it be the Adelaide Hills, the Barossa, a little further up to the Riverland or down the South Coast to McLaren Vale, getting people out into our regions is a key way that we can help to drive growth in the South Australian economy.

It is as much about perception as it is about reality in terms of the distance that it takes to get people out into our regions. To put this money on the table, to be able to demonstrate that it is going to be a lot quicker to use Victor Harbor Road to get down to the South Coast, is going to make it seem and actually be more accessible for people to get down there. I look forward to the benefits of that being fully realised and for the local tourism economy to be able to thrive in that regard.

I thank very much the member for Finniss for his advocacy in this regard. He took the opportunity to take me the length and breadth of his electorate. We did discuss whether Adelaide should be down at Currency Creek or whether it is in the best spot for it, but we stood on top of the hill and the member for Finniss implored me about the importance of what this duplication project will deliver for his people. I am just so very proud that we have a constructive federal government that has put money on the table and a state government that is willing to get on and help deliver this project.

#### KINSHIP CARERS

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister stand by her public statements that her agency never considered cancelling last year's kinship carer Christmas lunches?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:51):** I thank the member for her question. Obviously, I don't have a photographic memory—

**Ms Cook:** Well, you need one.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —to remember what was said last year.

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

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** However, during the month of December, kinship carers had organised Christmas events, some of which I attended. I attended quite a few, actually. There were lots of Christmas events. A total of 371 carers attended 12 events ranging from providing thankyou gifts to holding breakfasts, brunches and lunches as well as garden demonstrations and visits to an animal farm. There were lots of Christmas parties organised for carers, both kinship carers and foster carers, and I went to quite a few of those. A lot of them were at swimming centres; around three were at the Semaphore swimming and slides centre.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** So there were lots of carer events.

**Ms Stinson:** Answer the question.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe is warned.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I would like to put on the record the great work that our kinship carers and foster carers do. It is such a difficult job and a much appreciated job, and that's why we expanded their payments to age 21.

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

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order. Is the minister finished?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Yes.

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has finished her answer. The member for Wright and then the member for King.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, I saw it.

### PARK-AND-RIDE FACILITIES

**Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:52):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Have Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure staff held discussions with Tea Tree Gully council about building the additional parking spaces promised for the Golden Grove park-and-ride at any other location?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:52):** I thank the member for Wright for his question. I was asked a bit of a bizarre question in relation to this, which was again like the Minister for Environment, backgrounded via the media to ask some questions. It had a nefarious purpose, but I did get to the bottom of it.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** There is still three minutes and 45 seconds to go.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! I am trying to listen to the answer.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The answer is that there is a north-east planning study being undertaken at the moment. It should arrive on my desk, I am told, within the next few weeks. It will outline options for the best way forward because, again, a bit like yesterday's discussion, when we undertake this infrastructure work, there needs to be a degree of strategy around it. Can I say for the record that the Marshall Liberal government is committed to delivering the Golden Grove park-and-ride. The money was in last year's budget—

**The SPEAKER:** And Paradise.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —\$18½ million. I note, Mr Speaker, without incurring your wrath, that Paradise will be delivered first—

**The SPEAKER:** Absolutely.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —and then we are on to Golden Grove. We are also considering the augmentation of the O-Bahn out to Golden Grove. If you were to look at options for delivering that, it would make sense to couple it together with a park-and-ride. To make it very clear, if you are going to extend the O-Bahn, which is something that the north-east planning study is considering, you want to make sure that wherever you stick a park-and-ride complements that. I think that is strategic; I think that is quite intelligent. I think what the member for Wright is trying to suggest is that somehow this study is going to see not a park-and-ride but just a number of car parks all over the place. That is not true. It was information that was backgrounded to a journalist.

When we were asked the question, we were able to refute that claim, which is why, I assume, the story never appeared in the paper, but potentially why the member for Wright is trying to bring the issue back up here in parliament under the guise of parliamentary privilege. I'm glad I am able to provide this information to the house to restate our commitment to delivering a Golden Grove park-and-ride.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The minister has the call.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Mr Speaker, I would never dare to go against any of your rulings in this way. I merely seek to serve the house with information, and to clear up any misconceptions that people might be trying to spread around the north-east, and to say that this is a Marshall Liberal government that will deliver on its promises but will do so in a strategic and planned way that gets the biggest and best bang for buck for our infrastructure dollar.

#### TRANSPORT INFRASTRUCTURE

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:55):** My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on the broader transport and infrastructure initiatives we had planned for the north-east?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:55):** I certainly can. Again—

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Have you got the report already? I thought you were waiting for the report in two weeks' time.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Light, be quiet. The minister has the call.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** He said in his previous answer, Mr Speaker, that he was waiting for a report in two weeks' time, so where is the report?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light can leave for the rest of question time.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The report is coming down in a few weeks' time, as I said about 30 seconds ago.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Light can leave for the rest of question time, please.

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I thank the member for King. It seems that many MPs on this side of the house want to take me and show me really bad roads around South Australia and then we have to go and fix them.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I did have the good fortune to be out with the member for King looking at a little left-hand slip lane that is actually going to deliver massive road safety benefits in her electorate. It's a little part of the world called Skyline Drive. In last year's budget, \$343,000 was committed to deliver the project. I don't need to tell the member for King because she has been there almost every day having a look at it. The project is basically done. We have been able to deliver on the promises that we made to the South Australian people.

But there is more to be done in the north-east. I have spoken to this house previously about Golden Grove Road and our ability to fix that difficult stretch of corridor. About 10,000 vehicles or so traverse that corridor on a daily basis. What we have seen over the preceding decades is that there have been a lot of housing developments in those surrounding suburbs of Golden Grove, Greenwith and the like. What we haven't seen, though, is the infrastructure investment to support it, and that's why it was such a big issue in the lead-up to 2018 for the King community. They did not have the dollars spent on them that they should have and it's why \$20 million on the table to deliver an upgrade to Golden Grove is extremely important and so very much needed.

What we have been able to deliver is from north of the intersection, all the way up to what I could call the old Arlington's corner. We are going to deliver this upgrade with proper cycling infrastructure, proper sheltered right-hand turn lanes, as well as a complete upgrade to the road and kerbing infrastructure—everything that people who live in suburban Adelaide would come to expect and should come to expect, that is, a proper functioning road.

This is part of a broader strategy to deliver infrastructure to support population growth. This is what needs to happen. If we build communities, we need to build the infrastructure that goes along

with those communities. This is exactly the feedback that I got when the member for King hosted me at a transport forum in her electorate. I don't need to tell the members for Florey or Wright, as they were in attendance on the evening, as well as Councillor Rankine from the Tea Tree Gully council. It was to hear the concerns of locals. The broad feedback that we got from that forum was, 'Thank you so much for getting on with fixing Golden Grove Road. This has been an issue forever and we are glad that we are finally getting on with it.'

We have plans in place. They have been through the Public Works Committee. Construction will begin in the coming months. It will be a difficult 12-month time frame delivering this project and there is going to be disruption for that local community, but my message on the night was to please be patient. The outcome is worth the wait and the ability for people to get to where they want to go from where they are more quickly and safely is going to be the outcome. Can I say that my overall out-take from the night is that people do want to see better public transport in the north-east. People do want to see better road infrastructure, and these are concerns that are very well relayed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —by the member for King, and as we were standing on the side of the road we got honked at, I reckon, every 15 to 20 seconds by people who quite clearly see their local MP as somebody that they know, a face that they love and somebody who is going to deliver for their electorate.

#### TOURISM

**The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay) (15:00):** My question is to the Premier. Why is South Australia the only state in Australia to report a slump in international visitor numbers in the year to December 2018?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00):** The government is working very hard to do everything we can to increase the number of visitors that we have into South Australia. We are doing that with the money that we put into the budget for last year—

*The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the budget which was handed down in September. There are always fluctuations that move around. I don't have a detailed answer for the member specifically why the most recent numbers have shown a less than favourable improvement compared to the rest of Australia, but I will find out. It's an area of high priority for the government. It's one where I believe there is huge potential—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Members on my left, you have asked the question. I would like to hear the answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Sorry, sir, it was very distracting hearing those opposite warble away. The reality is—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has the call.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader, be quiet.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —this is a very important sector for us. It is one that we believe in very strongly. We think that we have excellent product here in South Australia. We are working very hard to do everything we can to promote South Australia to interstate and overseas visitors to

South Australia. It's one of the reasons why we are absolutely intent on delivering a gallery of global significance for Aboriginal art and cultures. We know that this will be a drawcard for South Australia. It's one of the reasons why we get very excited about the World Routes conference, which will be held in Adelaide in September this year.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** No worries, we got that for you.

**The SPEAKER:** Order, member for Mawson!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** That gives us an opportunity to showcase the excellent product that we have in South Australia. It's an area of priority for this government and we will continue to work on it.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Frome was patiently waiting. He has the call.

### PORT PIRIE COURTHOUSE

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:02):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the minister please advise the house whether there have been any discussions or proposals to privatise, reduce operations and/or close the Port Pirie courthouse?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:02):** Well, certainly not by me and, as the member may be aware, the Courts Administration Authority is entirely, quite uniquely amongst our agencies and departments, independent of government. So, whilst the council is in charge of the Courts Administration Authority, headed by the Chief Justice, as Attorney-General it is not within my purview—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —by the statute to make decisions in relation to that. At this stage, the Chief Justice, who I meet with regularly, had indicated earlier in the year that he would be going out to consult with a number of people in the units for which he is responsible, including the country courts, as to their requirements, their views, etc., and as to the services they were providing.

I welcome that, and I think it's an important thing for anyone who is in charge of a department, the Courts Administration Authority included, that they do so. I can't remember a chief justice indicating that they were going to do such a comprehensive tour since the former chief justice the Hon. John Doyle, who is now retired, of course. I think it is important that they do exactly that, that is, to go out—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —and make sure that they are fully briefed before they ultimately make the decision in respect of the funds that are provided. But certainly, on behalf of the Chief Justice, he sought assistance to promote certain other projects that he has in mind that he would like to pursue, and I continue to discuss those with him.

### *Grievance Debate*

### SCHOOL ZONING

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:04):** On the steps of parliament today, we saw 130 schoolbags—that is, 130 schoolbags representing 130 young lives, 130 students who expected to start their high school journey next year at Adelaide High or Adelaide Botanic High, 130 students who were stunned to discover not even six weeks ago that they were suddenly excluded from those schools.

The campaign by these students, their families and many others has been ramping up. Today, their message to this government was that they want to see the school zone cut reversed. They also asked for at least a two-year stay on the axe falling on their children so that at least their kids will not be disadvantaged from finding an appropriate new school, as they currently are, considering the lateness and suddenness of the decision. This decision has not just sparked a

discussion among children and families recently axed from the city school zone; it has also stirred discussion at other schools throughout the western and southern suburbs.

Another message that is shining through is this: for those schools that now have a larger school zone, what support is this government providing to them? Did those schools get a share of the \$185 million this government announced for school upgrades after the zoning cut? No. Those school communities find it difficult to understand why the government would give schools with shrinking school zones more money while they, expecting hundreds more students, get none. There are plenty of things that require this government's attention and investment.

In February, two students from Plympton International College wrote to the education minister. Year 11 leaders, Oshianna Eyles and Daniel Cave, should be commended for speaking up to those in power. They wrote that they had seen big changes at the school while they have been there but that more work is needed. They wrote that they are very proud of their 'wonderful STEM building' and work harder when they are there but that one excellent building is not enough to make theirs a competitive school.

Oshianna wrote that she is embarrassed to show people through a particular part of the middle school, saying:

If you could imagine walking through an old tattered house where everything is old and falling apart, that's what our middle school looks like.

She even provided the minister with photos. Daniel wrote to the minister:

The bathrooms are repulsive...You can only imagine how uncomfortable our students are having to use a bathroom that looks like it has come from a prison cell.

The students offered to show the minister around the school and point out what needs to be repaired and replaced, and I hope he takes up that offer.

The previous government heard the calls of Oshianna and Daniel. That is why the school received a \$3.5 million STEM centre, which I was pleased to see opened a few weeks ago, and another \$3 million for classroom upgrades, but that good work needs to continue.

*The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:*

**Ms STINSON:** Exactly—the good work needs to continue, that's right. Right now, this government has dropped the ball. The school is expecting 100 more students due to this government's decision to rezone and expects to be full in two years because of the rezoning and the excellent partnerships with UniSA and their sister school in China.

Some improvements the school is requesting, and I have written to the minister about, include a new gym, estimated to cost about \$20 million; updating classrooms—as I said, \$3 million has already been provided by the previous government, and they would like another 10 to finalise those classroom upgrades; landscaping of the outdoor learning areas—the school has a lot of concrete and not a lot of trees; and an upgraded or new performing arts centre so that all students who want to do drama and music have the opportunity to get on stage.

The RAA also recently rated the school as having the most dangerous school crossing, which is on a bend. That also needs urgent attention from this government in cooperation with the local council. Better signage on the main road to help promote the school is an affordable step in boosting the image and attractiveness of this great school, and that could be done tomorrow. We are all asking this government to pick up that dropped ball. There is nothing stopping you. Continue that investment that was started under the previous Labor government and run with the ball. Children like Oshianna and Daniel, and all those who follow them, will thank you for it.

#### **MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM**

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:09):** I rise today to speak about—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —an issue in my electorate that has been a bone of contention for a number of years. It gives me great pleasure—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Badcoe can leave for half an hour under 137A, thank you.

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

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** —to rise and speak about the current Mobile Black Spot Program that this government has put funding into in association with the commonwealth's round 4 Black Spot Program. It really warms the cockles of my heart that I can announce that in Chaffey five towers will be put in place. Thanks to that partnership, and in conjunction with the telcos, we now see that Murtho, Murtho South, Wunkar (home to the Bulldogs), Bower and Mount Mary will all get mobile towers.

The blackspot at Murtho is an area I have advocated about for a number of years. Not only have I advocated for it but I have doorknocked that entire Murtho Road district. I undertook an economic study to justify why Murtho should have blackspot towers and why it should have mobile phone coverage—because it is a growing economic powerhouse and also a growing tourism destination.

More importantly, what we see at Murtho and Murtho South is economic activity, with large farms growing there and large numbers of itinerant workers arriving. Not only do we have people living and working out there but, when we have the itinerant workforce arriving, the population increases by somewhere between 1,300 and 2,000 people in the district. It is a prime irrigated horticultural area that lacks mobile coverage, and it is great to be able to talk about Murtho and also Wunkar.

Wunkar is a dryland farming district just out of Loxton, and it has long called out for digital connectivity. Under the previous government there were no problems with blackspots because they had three rounds to put in for, but not one out there. I will talk about Murtho a little bit because it had a number of issues around blackspots. Murtho is one of the 29 towers, and it is great to see that the South Australian government has put in \$5.3 million, a co-contribution of \$5½ million from the commonwealth, matched by those telcos.

Many of the people at Murtho have come to me pleading that their businesses are suffering. Both Tom and Sarah Freeman, owners of the Wilkadene Woolshed Brewery, have experienced significant loss of business because of the lack of connectivity. They are running a commercial business out there—not only a brewery but a destination, as they also are a large houseboat rental organisation, and that is a great experience.

They are also neighbours of the Chowilla Station, and that attracts over 25,000 visitors a year. If 25,000 visitors came to Adelaide and they had no mobile phone connectivity, it would just hit the fan and all hell would break loose. Out at Murtho, they have waited patiently and that patience is paying off. I visited many of those farms and businesses, particularly at Bunyip Reach, and I know the Stoeckel family will be opening up the champagne because they have lobbied me for an extensive period of time. Omega Orchards is another horticultural business.

Martin Howie at Nelwood has been leading the charge and done a great job gathering information, making sure that when I went to the federal government and the telcos that we had the information and the justification for why Murtho should be one of the areas looked after. We have Costa, through the Costa exchange, the Haslett family out at Woolenook Fruits and of course the Murray River Walk, one of the 10 great walks in Australia. Tony and Susie Sharley are now about to open up champagne as well, as they will not have to carry satellite phones and will be able to offer mobile coverage to their customers. I think it is a great outcome. There are other opportunities, particularly out at the Customs House, which will now be served by mobile phone coverage, so it is a great outcome.

Those in the electorate of Chaffey who have missed out, please continue to keep liaising with me because we still have round 5 and round 6 of the commonwealth government Mobile Black Spot Program. The state government still has money to put into blackspot towers. It is good news for

regional South Australia and it is great news for Chaffey that this government is looking after regional South Australia and looking after Chaffey.

### WHYALLA HOSPITAL

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:14):** I rise today to speak about the serious concerns that have been expressed by staff at Whyalla Hospital, by doctors, nurses and other employees, about staff safety. As employees and medical professionals who visit the hospital—because it draws upon local GPs and others—they deserve a safe working environment. I am deeply concerned about the safety of workers and patients at Whyalla Hospital due to what appears to be an increase in threatening and violent behaviour. Of course, that is not something exclusive to Whyalla Hospital; other major regional hospitals also have similar experiences, as do hospitals in the metropolitan area.

There have been several incidents that have threatened the safety of employees, often during dealings with patients with mental health or substance abuse related issues, and sometimes a combination of both. Overall, people with mental health issues are no more violent than the rest of the population; in fact, they are less so. However, some people with particular mental health issues, especially when enhanced by substance abuse, do pose a significant threat to hospital workers. Of course, there are those people who are basically arseholes. I do not know whether that is parliamentary language—

**The Hon. T.J. Whetstone:** No, it's not.

**Mr HUGHES:** Well, there clearly are some people who are not very pleasant people. I have been told that most of the incidents have been at the accident and emergency section of the hospital. I have been contacted by several hospital employees and their family members. Their family members have expressed some serious concerns about potential serious consequences for their loved ones who work at the hospital.

They fear that somebody is going to get seriously hurt, or even worse, given the nature of some of the incidents. I also strongly believe that it is just a matter of time before something incredibly serious does happen at the hospital. There are designated security officers, but these are employees who have been nominated for this extra role, and it is something that falls well short of what is needed to ensure a safe working environment.

One of the concerning things is that, for some of the nurses and some of the other people at the hospital, it almost becomes a normal situation that they put up with as part of their day-to-day work. But that is not acceptable, and a number of people are now speaking out and wanting action. It is time that properly resourced measures are put in place so that our nurses, doctors and other workers can get on with their job in a safe manner, and the department does have a duty of care to provide a safe working environment.

Employees have requested that security guards be employed at Whyalla Hospital so that they can be there promptly when these incidents occur, or when the situation is about to escalate, rather than waiting for the attendance of police, who are often stretched elsewhere out in the community and often not in a position to respond as rapidly as some people would like. Unfortunately, it is a sign of the times that employees are increasingly having to deal with patients with substance abuse issues and alcohol-fuelled violence. It is clear that ice has had an impact, but alcohol is still one of the main contributors to violence and potential violence in a hospital, so it is time that urgent action is taken.

I did write to the minister last week. I know that the minister is a decent man and that he will want to do something about this. I do not envy the Minister for Health. It is an incredibly challenging role, irrespective of the government that is in power. The competition for resources is huge and we know it is the largest budget item, but, at the end of the day, people deserve a safe working environment.

### NARUNGGGA ELECTORATE

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:19):** I rise today to highlight the importance of new skills, training opportunities and incentives for young people within the Narungga electorate. Last Friday, I was honoured to cut the ribbon on a new automotive centre at Harvest Christian College in Kadina. This

Friday, they are celebrating the opening of the new STEM works development at the Kadina Memorial School. These are two really great initiatives shown by local schools to help train young people for the jobs of the future.

Much has been made of the vital need to ensure South Australian school students are equipped and skilled, ready to capitalise on the projected king's ransom of jobs anticipated to hit our shores in the very near future. The decision by the federal government to award South Australia the national Space Agency and the extensive shipbuilding contract means that there is a wide range of jobs that the next generation of South Australians will have access to.

In order to capitalise on those opportunities, South Australian students need to have the requisite skills to make the most of their chances, and that is where facilities like the new automotive centre at Harvest Christian College and the STEM facility at Kadina Memorial School—which is now the largest school outside metropolitan Adelaide—will be so beneficial.

It was a delight to be a part of the opening of the automotive centre last Friday. Restored vintage Valiants were on display and even the school's percussion group entertained us using various car parts as instruments. It was quite a show indeed. A tour of the well-equipped workshop followed, complete with a hoist in action, and the enthusiasm and pride for the project from principal Peter Ayboub, staff, students, parents and friends were clear.

Learning facilities like this one enable students to get a taste for what specific trades entail, inspire them onto future career paths, provide an early chance to learn those skills and to get an opportunity to make a more informed decision about what they want to do in the future. There is no disadvantage in choosing to pursue an apprenticeship. In fact, the Minister for Industry and Skills told a business round table recently that it has been reported that those who start an apprenticeship are earning, on average, \$2,000 per year more than their uni counterparts after five years—all that without a HECS debt.

As I said, that statistic was highlighted by the Minister for Industry and Skills when he visited Kadina and Wallaroo last week, where we met with training providers and employers specifically to discuss future workforce needs. I thank him very much for that visit. It was wonderful to have him down there, and I would contend that there was quite an impressive turnout to that business round table by local businesses and training providers, which highlights the impact that the minister's policy for apprenticeships is having on local industry.

The minister also talked about the government's Skilling South Australia program, the 780 qualifications that are now subsidised and the \$203 million partnership with the federal government to rebuild our training system to create an additional 20,800 apprenticeships and traineeships across the state. We were pleased to meet with students and staff from Kadina Memorial School, tour Kadina TAFE, meet with training providers and talk with local employers and providers at the business round table I referred to earlier. Skills gaps, potential areas for improved services and support, available grant programs and direct experiences from the employer and apprentice point of view were shared openly and honestly.

Hurdles being faced by local business include attracting, training and retaining their workforce. There are no easy points; it all needs work, but hopefully the policy that the minister has put together so wonderfully will help that pipeline of future apprentices. Across the state, apprenticeship numbers are down 55 per cent in the last five years alone, which will inevitably mean that we will face a shortage of skilled tradespeople sometime in the relatively near future.

For instance, we know that we are facing a projected shortage of 1,100 specialist welders that we will need when the shipbuilding commences, so it is important the state government foresees the gaps and provides the required training opportunities to ensure students are equipped to be ready for future industry needs. This government places a high premium on ensuring that involvement in apprenticeships increases and that we arrest the decline trend and reverse it.

Under Skilling South Australia, the Marshall Liberal government has more than doubled the accommodation allowance and has increased the travel rate to ease the cost of accessing training for employers of regional apprentices and trainees. Late last year, we announced an additional 383 courses will receive subsidy funding from January 2019. It is very exciting for local employers to be

able to access that increased subsidy, as well; I know it makes their job easier because inevitably that cost is transferred over to them.

There are projected future workforce and skills gaps in the health and disability services area, too, and last week's announcement by minister Pisoni that a new aged-care traineeship, a certificate III course, is now being offered is further good news. It means there are now more than 30 Skilling South Australia projects creating apprenticeship and trainee opportunities in our state, and I congratulate the minister on the wonderful work he is doing in this space.

### **ROYAL LIFE SAVING SOCIETY SA**

**Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:25):** The Royal Life Saving Society was established in South Australia in 1909, operating statewide in schools, pools and, at that time, beaches. Since 1952, it has concentrated on inland situations with the goal of reducing the drowning rate to zero, while making a significant contribution to the South Australian community in the areas of swimming instruction, instructor training, water safety, lifesaving and drowning prevention.

Today, it operates as a not-for-profit community-based organisation, with some paid administration and a mixture of paid and volunteer staff. Water-related instruction is provided at a number of heated pools all year around and at others during the swimming season.

While some progress has been made, drowning remains a key issue in the South Australian community. In 2018, the Royal Life Saving Society reported that 15 people drowned, and more recently it has expressed concerns about drowning in migrant communities, drowning in regional areas and the need to improve the swimming and water safety skills of all South Australian children. Drowning is classed as a preventable death and, as such, the society is committed to reducing this number and turning everyday South Australians into everyday lifesavers.

This morning, I had the opportunity to visit the Payneham swimming pool, where 190 St Paul's College students—among them new migrants and refugees, many from my electorate of Torrens—participated in a five-day Swim and Survive program to learn foundation skills in swimming, survival and basic rescue. Sport and co-curricular development coordinator at the college, Nick Gillard, said that the students come from diverse backgrounds and have a low-level of swimming ability. He said:

I believe that if we can get our boys to understand water safety and how important it is to be responsible around water, then this can have an effect on the rest of their family and the community around them in years to come.

This program is just one of many programs delivered by the South Australian Royal Life Saving Society. Another is the VACSWIM program, run for all inland swimming programs including public pools, private pools, school pools and swimming lakes. This program has been responsible for the water safety education of over 200,000 children every year.

Royal Life Saving SA VET training for the aquatic sector first delivered pool lifeguard training to South Australia over 20 years ago and continues to offer high-quality VET training for the aquatic sector, including first aid and CPR. The iconic Bronze Medallion award is the culmination of years of training, resulting in a person who is able to effect a challenging rescue in any inland waterway. A team of highly trained volunteer examiners conducts examinations for this award.

Refugee and migrant learn-to-swim programs are available to community groups that have been identified as high risk through their limited exposure to water in landlocked countries or because of long periods of time spent in refugee camps. The Royal Life Saving Society provides programs to increase the understanding of dangers and skill levels in aquatic environments to reduce drowning events among these community groups.

The society also provides affordable water safety and educational school programs to private and Catholic education schools, both on site and in public pools, teaching young South Australians how to be safe in, on and around the water. The Swim and Survive program for primary school-aged children is used extensively throughout South Australia by our clubs and centres for water safety education and operates with regional liaison officers and volunteers to help coordinate the country programs, ensuring maximum attendance and program quality.

Respect the River is another vital program that addresses the many risks that are unique to river systems, especially the Murray, and educates at-risk groups, including middle-aged men. Royal Life Saving SA initiated the Pool Lifeguard Award in SA and delivers pool lifeguard accreditation and training.

In recent times, Royal Life Saving SA has faced some challenges but now has a new board and CEO and is revitalised with the aim of delivering high-quality services to the South Australian community to achieve its mission of promoting water safety, reducing drowning and near-drowning events. Throughout its long history, for generations, Royal Life Saving SA has developed deep connections with the South Australian community. With the hard work they are putting in and suitable support, they will be there for generations to come.

### **AFL NATIONAL WOMEN'S LEAGUE**

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:30):** What a day Sunday was for sport in our state! The Adelaide Crows romped to a 54-point victory against Carlton at our beloved Adelaide Oval and attendance records in women's sports were broken. It is a win for all South Australians, a win for women's sport and a win for women.

Firstly, I extend huge congratulations to the Adelaide Crows on their amazing 2019 AFLW grand final victory. I also stand here today to acknowledge the league's importance in growing grassroots participation in women's football and providing incredible role models for the next generation of players.

Not only have the Adelaide Crows won the grand final twice in the first three years of the women's league Erin Phillips, Adelaide Crows co-captain, also won her second AFLW grand final best on ground medal, even after she suffered an ACL injury in the third quarter. This year, Ms Phillips also becomes the first multiple winner of the AFLW Players' Most Valuable Player Award after receiving that honour in 2017. I congratulate Ms Phillips on her outstanding achievements and I know everyone in this place wishes her a full recovery.

I also congratulate the Adelaide Crows co-captain, Chelsea Randall, who was named the AFLW's most courageous player for the third consecutive season. It makes her the only recipient of the award since the competition began. What outstanding role models we have in not only the co-captains but all the AFLW players! These women, leading the sport, are paving the way for female football players at all levels. With the outstanding support seen by crowds on Sunday, I look forward to female football being elevated amongst sporting codes. Indeed, I hope the community support continues to grow for women's sport of all codes, helping to create more professional pathways for women in sport.

I am so pleased that young girls today can say, 'When I grow up, I want to play in the AFLW. I want to play in front of a stadium full of people.' As little as four years ago, this was not even a possibility for women. Only boys could dare to dream this dream. No doubt, it was a dream for many but it was still a reality for some boys. For girls, the reality was none.

More than 53,000 people streamed through the gates at Adelaide Oval to watch the best of the best in the women's AFL on Sunday. More than 53,000 people had the chance not only to enjoy a spectacular game of footy, cheer on their local team and soak up the grand final atmosphere but also to support women in sport.

This year, we are celebrating 125 years of women's suffrage in South Australia, marking 125 years since women in our state gained the right to vote in general elections and stand for parliament for the first time anywhere in Australia. Today in South Australia, we are celebrating the largest ever attendance at a women's sporting game in Australian history. The crowd of 53,034 was also the sixth largest crowd ever at Adelaide Oval for an AFL game. This is something to be proud of as a state and a leader in our country.

Congratulations again to the Adelaide Crows and we look forward to seeing all the talented players throughout the league taking to the field in the years to come. Importantly, I look forward to the ripple effect playing out in our state and our country as we embrace gender equality, not only at work and in the boardrooms but also in the sporting arena.

*Bills***SUPPLY BILL 2019***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:34):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act for the appropriation of money from the Consolidated Account for the financial year ending 30 June 2020. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:35):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

A supply bill is necessary until the budget has passed through the parliamentary stages and the Appropriation Bill 2019 receives assent. In the absence of special arrangements in the form of the supply acts, there would be no parliamentary authority for expenditure between the commencement of the new financial year and the date on which assent is given to the main Appropriation Bill. The amount being sought under this bill is \$5,515 million.

Clause 1 is formal.

Clause 2 provides relevant definitions.

Clause 3 provides for the appropriation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

*Resolutions***END-OF-LIFE CHOICES**

The Legislative Council passed the following resolution to which it desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

1. That, in the opinion of this council, a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on:
  - (a) the practices currently being utilised within the medical community to assist a person to exercise their preferences for the way they manage their end of life when experiencing chronic and/or terminal illnesses, including the role of palliative care;
  - (b) the current legal framework, relevant reports and materials in other Australian states and territories and overseas jurisdictions, including the Victorian and Western Australian parliamentary inquiries into end-of-life choices, Victoria's Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017 and implementation of the associated reforms;
  - (c) what legislative changes may be required, including consideration of:
    - i. the appropriateness of the Parliament of South Australia enacting a bill in similar terms to Victoria's Voluntary Assisted Dying Act 2017; and
    - ii. an examination of any federal laws that may impact such legislation;
  - (d) any other related matter.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the Legislative Council be represented thereon by three members, of whom two shall form a quorum of council members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.
3. That this council permits the joint committee to authorise the disclosure or publication, as it thinks fit, of any evidence or documents presented to the committee prior to such evidence being reported to the council.

The Legislative Council has also resolved to suspend standing order 396 to enable strangers to be admitted when the joint committee is examining witnesses unless the joint committee otherwise resolves, but they shall be excluded when the joint committee is deliberating.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:38):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) agrees with part 1 of the resolution of the Legislative Council contained in message No. 78 for the appointment of a joint committee on the end of life;
- (b) concurs with the proposal for the committee to be authorised to disclose or publish, as it thinks fit, any evidence or documents being reported to the parliament; and
- (c) concurs with the proposal to enable strangers to be admitted when the committee is examining witnesses unless the committee otherwise resolves, but that they be excluded when the committee is deliberating.

Motion carried.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** I move:

That this house be represented on the committee by three members of whom two shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee and that the members to represent the House of Assembly on the committee be Mr Basham, Mr Duluk and the Hon. Mr Piccolo.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **MOTOR VEHICLES (COMPULSORY THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:40):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce a bill to amend the Motor Vehicles (Compulsory Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill 2019. The bill is about maximising benefits for South Australian motorists by providing a fair and competitive compulsory third-party (CTP) insurance scheme.

In 2016, the former government approved four private insurers to underwrite the CTP scheme and establish an independent CTP regulator to oversee insurers and the scheme. The CTP scheme is in a period of transition to a market-based competition model. The competition model will begin 1 July 2019 and apply to CTP insurance policies that commence from 1 July 2019.

Since 1 July 2016, motorists' CTP insurance policies have been automatically allocated to approved insurers. This auto-allocation will no longer apply after the expiry of the transitional period on 30 June 2019. The bill will enable the continuation of all auto-allocation for new vehicle CTP policies after the commencement of the competition model. The auto-allocation will occur based on a scheme determined by the minister, rather than enshrined in the legislation.

The proposed scheme will allocate new vehicle policies according to improved insurer market share at the lowest premium price offered for the premium class by any of the approved insurers at the time of allocation. Auto-allocation will not apply to renewal of CTP insurance policies. The continuation of auto-allocation for new vehicle policies will remove the possibility of commissions and inducements being offered by insurers to motor vehicle dealers to acquire CTP business where there is no direct benefit to the motorist.

Experience from other jurisdictions is that commissions paid by insurers to intermediaries, such as motor vehicle dealers, hinder competition by providing a barrier to new entrants or insurers wanting to increase market share. The commissions are passed on in premium costs and offer no value to the motorist. Motorists will not be disadvantaged by the removal of choice at point of sale, as they will be able to nominate an alternate insurer within the first three months of the new policy, with that nomination taking effect at the fourth month of the policy.

One element of the CTP scheme established by the former government was to allow CTP insurers to compete for customers through offering value-added goods and services. The bill therefore enables approved insurers to offer direct policy holder benefits (inducements) as approved by the minister. However, these inducements cannot be a charge against the CTP business. In other

words, if an insurer offers some form of inducement, like a multipolicy discount, the associated costs will not be borne by all South Australian motorists through their CTP premiums.

The minister will approve the types of inducements to be offered by the insurer to ensure they benefit motorists. This will give the market flexibility and promote innovation, rather than prescribing all types of allowed inducements in law. Common inducements offered in other jurisdictions include at-fault driver protection policy, multipolicy discount, rewards program membership or a gift card. This change aligns SA to the other privately underwritten schemes in New South Wales, Queensland and the ACT. I seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading them. I do not seem to have them here actually.

Leave not granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Accordingly, an explanation will be provided shortly.

**The SPEAKER:** That can be tabled if you wish, Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of clarification: the minister just said she was seeking leave to insert the remaining explanation into *Hansard* without her reading it and then told the house that she did not have them here to table.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** That is right. Aren't you listening?

**The SPEAKER:** But leave was not granted prior to that.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** What was she going to hand up?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Exactly—leave was not granted.

**The SPEAKER:** That is a very good point. I imagine they were within her grasp nearby.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Then hand them up.

**Mr Pederick:** You refused leave, Tom.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! In the order that it occurred, leave was not granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Exactly; thank you.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave was not granted. I will take the other matter on board and I will have a chat to the Deputy Premier immediately after this.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Brown.

## **RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

## **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:46):** It is a pleasure to resume my remarks about the Landscape South Australia Bill and the practical environmental outcomes that this government hopes to achieve, practical outcomes—more doing and less talking about doing.

Just by way of a recap, perhaps to get myself back into the swing of things, this new act will constitute eight new regional landscape boards plus Green Adelaide, the metropolitan body. Each board will be elected with three members from the local community being democratically elected and four members appointed by the minister.

The board will be decentralised, putting the decision-making authority in the hands of the local community, the land and water levies will be capped by CPI, and boards will be responsible for setting and managing their own annual budgets and expenditure. The act importantly will take away

the requirements for extensive bureaucratic business plan development and focus on outcomes for our natural resources.

It is clear that the natural resources management system, established by the state Labor government in 2004, has lost the confidence of the South Australian public, particularly our regional communities. A gradual centralisation of staffing, resources and decision-making has eroded the public confidence in the way NRM works. Goodwill, which is essential when cooperation between multiple parties is required, has drained away. While that has happened, NRM levies have risen dramatically as well.

While it is noted that eight NRM regions that were created back in 2004 started with the best intentions, it appears they have become entangled with red tape and centralised bureaucracy, alienating the on-ground local Landcare groups, who can see what soil protections and pest controls are needed but were so far removed from the hierarchy management that their voice was mute and their skill sets ignored.

The Landscape South Australia Bill takes away the requirements for extensive bureaucratic business plan development and focus on outcomes for our natural environment. The bill also recognises the need for emphasis on partnerships with local service providers, local councils and Aboriginal organisations. It also addresses what the people and communities we serve are telling us: that improvements must be implemented regarding the NRM structure, how we fund programs, how land and water levies should be calculated and where the levy money should be spent.

I particularly welcome the \$2 million grassroots grants program attached to this bill that supports community groups to undertake local projects, which will do much to improve and build relationships with all the people and organisations who care for soils, flora and fauna as well as natural resources. Each region will have a grassroots grants program available to volunteers and not-for-profit organisations that play a significant role in managing natural resources by contributing time and energy carrying out on-ground works. It is an annual fund, which is in addition to existing NRM grants programs, and will be administered at a board level for volunteer, community and not-for-profit groups to access.

Regional administrations reflect the underlying reform principle of the need for decentralisation and will provide an important mechanism for boards to build relationships with local volunteer community groups. Regarding the new statewide landscape priorities fund that will enable investment in large-scale integrated landscape restoration projects, I stress that it will be a separate statutory fund, with a requirement for proper accounts that will be subject to an annual audit by the Auditor-General. Investment from the fund will be guided by high-level principles set out in the State Landscape Strategy. A percentage of Green Adelaide's land and water levies is also to be dedicated to the fund at a percentage to be determined by the minister. Finally, projects will be delivered through partnerships between the boards and others, including locally based organisations, groups and individuals.

Another key benefit of the new act that I wish to highlight as a regional MP is the potential for improvements in the primary production sector. The Landscape SA Bill reduces costs to businesses and householders with the CPI cap on land and water levies. It legislates the principle that boards will work collaboratively with primary producers and local communities to deliver real outcomes. An example is the clause which provides for the minister, boards and other decision-makers to be required to be informed by local knowledge and expertise, together with the best available science, in planning and making other decisions.

The bill also specifically requires regional landscape boards to consider the local situation, conditions and other factors before requiring landholders to prepare and implement an action plan to address land degradation issues on their property. It also provides greater ability to take swift action against neighbouring landholders who are failing to control pest plants and animals on their properties. These are all important components.

In closing, I believe that people are more accepting of paying for things if they know where the money is going, that it is being spent in their region and that outcomes will actually be delivered. I also believe that constituents appreciate the emphasis that the Marshall Liberal government is placing on relieving cost-of-living pressures for households, and the capping of the annual land and

water levy rises at a rate to be set by an independent body is another welcome example of this government's commitment to that promise.

This natural resources reform offers a good whole-of-landscape approach, combining the efforts of many individuals and organisations for more substantial, visible and long-lasting results. It offers a very welcome focus on a back-to-the-basics system to address natural resources management. I commend the bill to the house and congratulate the minister on a sterling effort.

### **MOTOR VEHICLES (COMPULSORY THIRD PARTY INSURANCE) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:52):** I formally table the explanation of clauses for the Motor Vehicles (Compulsory Third Party Insurance) Amendment Bill 2019 without reading the same.

### **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

*Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:53):** I was going to listen to a few more of the country members because I do believe sincerely that their input into the proceedings would be of value. As you know, I come from a country community, but it is an industrial community. I am probably one of the few people on this side of the house who has spent some time out there poisoning rabbits—do not let the animal liberationists know that—and working on pest plants and animals, so I have had a little bit of practical experience.

This is a significant piece of legislation, or at least on the surface it appears to be, even though a large element of the Natural Resources Management Act has virtually been put over into this bill. It will be interesting to see how fundamental the changes are going to be on the ground, and I suspect the changes are not going to be fundamental.

When the original bill was brought before parliament—and it has stood now for 15 years as the act—the initial intent behind it was to generate a far more integrated approach to a whole raft of issues in the broad sweep of our state, and it did some of that effectively. However, over time systems do evolve, and I have heard some of the criticism that has come from people in country South Australia about what they believed was the centralisation of decision-making and what was seen as an increase in red tape. I think it is always valuable to look at longstanding acts and see how they can be improved and how they can be changed.

Having looked at some of the literature surrounding this bill and having looked at the legislation, in some respects I see this as an evolutionary process, and there is always going to be that give and take. I spoke to some people from various sectors of primary industries and asked what they thought about the current bill. I have to say that the feedback that I received, especially in relation to consultation, was positive.

As a regional person, I have been exposed to all sorts of consultation processes over the years and some have been very good—some were very good by the previous government and some were very poor. I would have to say, though, that the people I have spoken to across a number of industries gave this a tick. They said that there was a lot of constructive engagement between primary producers and those people with a strong and primary emphasis on conservation and conservation practices—not that the two things are separated: there is often a very significant overlap.

It was put to me by someone with a lot of history in this area, and a lot of history in primary industries, that what they attempted to do with the bill was to get the structure right and that some of the really profound contentious issues, such as the big issues around water, were parked to one side. In the main, in this state, a lot of issues around native vegetation legislation are to a large degree settled, certainly far more settled than the other states. When people get the consultation right that is important and it should be acknowledged. In my part of the world, there was a whole series of meetings and there was strong involvement, and I think that is positive.

We have to see how this works in practice, so I do not want to necessarily pre-empt it, but one of the concerns that we on this side have is that there is a downgrading of emphasis when it comes to biodiversity and habitat protection. Even though we have had an act for 15 years and there is a whole range of other factors at work—and then there is that whole legacy of what has happened in this state before the Natural Resources Management Act and now this bill—when it comes to biodiversity in the state, the record has not been fantastic.

Over 60 species have become extinct, and it looks as though it is continuing apace, which is incredibly sad. Some scientists believe that we are entering into the sixth great extinction with the rate of species lost globally, but also in Australia, which does not have a fantastic record. You would not want to see a watering down at a local level when it comes to activity to do the right thing by our environment.

As the deputy leader said earlier today, good farming practice recognises the supreme importance of good conservation practice and the need for the preservation and expansion of natural habitat. Even though there seems to be a reduction in emphasis in terms of language, we might well find that practice by those people on the ground, the great variety of people who make a contribution in regional South Australia, is not going to fundamentally change.

The bill talks about the election of three people to the board, and I think that is a good thing. It can be challenging, but it does give it a degree of democratic and regional legitimacy. I know that to date people have been increasingly reluctant to put up their hands because they questioned the value of some of the things that were being done. If we are going to improve, that is a good thing.

Reflecting contemporary circumstances, there is mention of climate change in the objects and principles of the bill. That is going to be a fundamental challenge in regional South Australia. Sometimes I hear those opposite talking about practical conversation and practical measures, and they are not quite on board with the profound changes that are going to happen in regional South Australia—profound changes that are going to put at risk the livelihoods of a lot of people who over generations have depended upon primary industries.

Current trajectories show that we are heading toward an increase of 3° to 4° in average global temperatures. Translated into reality, the changes that are going to be driven by global warming are going to manifest themselves in this state—which is the driest state in Australia and part of the driest inhabited continent in the world—more severely initially than in all the developed countries in the other developed parts of the world. The bill needs to identify climate change in the objects and the principles.

The bill needs to look at how we effectively translate that adaptive response. It is my belief that there are things we can do to adapt, but the level of change we are talking about is going to outstrip our adaptive capacity in a whole range of ways. The member for Flinders might well be aware that one of the big pieces of adaptive strategy was actually done on Eyre Peninsula. It is very disappointing that that body of work was let slide to the side when the Marshall government was elected, as the work had national and global recognition.

The CPI increases, and the cap on increases, is one of those givens, where people say, 'Well, we're not going to be paying more and it is going to be limited to CPI increases.' That is always popular and we recognise that. It might be popular, but there needs to be an assurance that at the end of the day funding will be commensurate with real needs, and real needs often do not reflect the CPI increase. I know there is provision in the bill for the minister to intervene in a way to adjust, if need be, beyond the CPI cap. I hope that he exercises that responsibility in a way that is going to advantage the environment and the people in regional and urban South Australia.

I think it is incredibly important that when it comes to funding the activity that happens and the work undertaken throughout regional South Australia, and indeed in urban South Australia, it is done in an equitable manner. I know that historically I have had some issues with the current act. Those issues were about ensuring that in an equitable way we make a contribution to the upkeep of the environment and all the things that need to be done in South Australia.

At the moment, at least some components of what people pay with the NRM levy is not done on an equitable basis. Somebody with a property in Whyalla will be paying significantly more than someone with a property in some suburbs in Adelaide. This is a personal point of view, but when it

comes to a degree of cross-subsidisation, that should not be done on a regional level. That should be done at a state level, given that we all have an obligation, but take into account people's capacity to pay.

In general, it should be done in an equitable fashion across the state because the services delivered by regional South Australia are services we all benefit from. Even though there is an urban component to this, most of it is out there in regional South Australia. That said, there needs to be some concentration on ensuring that we do not degrade our efforts in biodiversity, habitat protection and enhancement. In fact, I believe that additional resources should be allocated to those areas.

Once upon a time, the activities that occurred out in regional South Australia, in our rural areas, were about soil, water, pest plants and pest animals. A lot of the focus was initially on those, but there is now a whole raft of other issues. It is making sure that we do that effectively. There is a whole range of things that happened over the years that are a cause for concern and happened not just in South Australia but also nationally.

I have spoken to some of our soil scientists. The number of soil scientists we now have in this state has greatly reduced over the years. I know that primary industries used to employ a significant number of soil scientists, but that number has gone down, and we should all reflect upon this. My side of the house should reflect upon this as well because I think it is just fundamental.

When it comes to entomologists nationally in this country, the number that we now have, despite a whole raft of challenges, is greatly reduced. Maybe people do not see these as sexy areas to get into, but they are fundamentally important. When we are allocating resources to ensure soil protection and enhancement, looking after water, addressing that ongoing challenge of pest plants and pest animals, we need that strong science background, but we are losing that; we are losing it as a nation and we have lost it as a state. There are some substitutes for it, but a lot of it has disappeared. Given the challenges that we are going to be facing in the coming decades, that is deeply concerning.

One of the areas of interest, given what I believe is the lack of an equitable way of funding the NRM, is that the landscape priorities they fund might give us an opportunity to address some of that, depending on how that fund ultimately operates. With the big population centre of Adelaide, more of that money might well be available to go out into the regions to meet some of the challenges we face and some of the resource needs that exist out there.

When I was on the Whyalla city council, one of the bugbears I spoke against on a frequent basis was this funding element of the communities of Eyre Peninsula. Obviously, there are other contributing sources from beyond the communities, but of all the communities on Eyre Peninsula the community of Whyalla provided the biggest amount of funding. What was interesting about that was that of the 80-odd projects I tallied up at the time, only two or three of those—which were very minor in nature—were funded in Whyalla. The rest were on Eyre Peninsula.

That might have reflected a real need—that is not my argument, that those needs should not be met—but I believe that consideration should be given to the element that comes from our households and how best to do that in an equitable fashion. Another thing that was often a bugbear—and I know it was about administrative simplicity, but at the end of the day this is a state-sanctioned charge—was that the charge was on rate notices. I think it should be very clearly identified as a state charge.

It will be interesting to see what ultimately happens on the ground with this bill, assuming it is passed. Given the people who have been involved in the past, I think many of them will continue to do what they do in regional South Australia and in the urban area. There might well be other people who are willing to make a contribution. As I said, some people did have the perception that decision-making was moving in a more centralised direction.

I think it is always important to have that combination of genuine grassroots expertise and local knowledge but, in addition, some of the rarer points of view that are based upon an incredibly strong grasp of the science. There needs to be that mix with sometimes centralised expertise, but it has to be done in conjunction with the grassroots expertise that exists within our community. At the

end of the day, we all want to see our primary industries succeed, but we also do not want to continue the losses we have encountered in the past.

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:13):** I rise to commend this bill to the house. I am glad to hear indications from the other side that it will have support for a speedy passage through this place, and I hope the other place as well. It is an important reform, and the minister ought to be rightly proud of the diligent and thoroughgoing work he has engaged in over the course of getting on for two years now to bring this bill to the house.

To set the scene and to put it into some context, this is a tremendous example of how a policy ought to be prosecuted. This bill is the result of policy commitments made by this government in the course of the campaign. It is a set of commitments that has been thoroughly put to the people ahead of the election. We are now in yet another example of steadily going about doing what we said we would do in delivering for the people of South Australia, bringing to this parliament thoroughgoing reform legislation designed to result in practical outcomes for the betterment of people throughout South Australia. That is particularly so in relation to people from the regions.

This has been a year in coming. It was presented to this house a little over a year following the election. Perhaps to illustrate the substantial amount of work that has been involved in bringing this bill to the house, I note that in schedule 5 to the bill, commencing at page 219, we see 28 separate pieces of legislation that are affected by this bill that require a consequential amendment as the result of the reform process that is set out here.

The member for Narungga, in his remarks earlier, has ably set out the core objectives of these reforms, and I will not repeat them. They are clearly understood by the people of South Australia, not only because the member for Narungga so ably explained them to us today but for the reason that we have been going out and talking about this with the community of South Australia over a long period of time. So even before this legislation comes into action, as I hope it will very soon, the people of South Australia who have been engaged in this space, particularly those in regional South Australia, have been very much part of the process of reform.

They told us why they had lost confidence in the regime that was in place over the entire period of the previous government, commencing in 2004. They told us that they were sick to death of the constantly increasing costs that they were having to bear, coupled with the increasing lack of direct control over what was going on in terms of delivery of the NRM throughout the regions. They made it clear that they wanted to have more direct involvement at a local level, more efficient and relevant delivery of programs, making real difference on the ground, together with a realignment of the boundaries—the structure in which this is delivered—so that the regions actually reflect the communities that they are there to deliver outcomes for.

I listened carefully and, with respect, I appreciate the contribution of the Deputy Leader of the Opposition in making her remarks as the lead speaker for the opposition. In understanding that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition indicated support for the passage of the bill, I noted three key areas of concern raised by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition, echoed by the contribution of the member for Giles just now. The first was in relation to our commitment to cap rises in levy rates according to CPI.

The second, which the deputy leader raised as a matter of concern, was the introduction of elections in terms of the selection process. The third was what was described as a reduction in emphasis on biodiversity, although I note that both the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Giles were quick to note that this legislation is, for the first time, making direct reference to the broader challenges of climate change.

First, in relation to our commitment to cap the rises in costs, this is a commitment of which we are very proud. Of course, it comes in the context of a provision for exemptions where the climate does what the climate does and throws at us extraordinary circumstances, but this is part of what we are committed to do to restore confidence in the community in the delivery of a program that compels people to make a contribution to it. We want to restore confidence by giving people the assurance that we will not, in an open-ended way, continually up the costs that they have to bear.

Secondly and in connection with that, by way of addressing the concern raised about the introduction of elections, we wholeheartedly look forward to the introduction of a democratic process

to participation on the NRM boards. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition observed that this might take some time and involve some energy being committed. That is true, but if we are genuinely to achieve a restoration of engagement of our local communities and a gradual building of confidence over time in these processes, then predictability around cost and the opportunity for election to participation are two key elements.

Of course, on this side of the house, as in all things that involve public money, we are quick to acknowledge that this is not our money: this is the money of the people of South Australia, in this case contributing to levies. It ought to be very carefully applied and, indeed, carefully spent when we require contributions to be made.

I point to one key statistic that was adverted to by the member for Narungga earlier. The consultation in the lead-up to these reforms indicates that a very high number of people—indeed, 65 per cent—reported not knowing where and how their levies were spent. It is not surprising that, as a corollary to not being aware how the rates are spent, they would take a view that the rates are going up too much, so the two go together.

We want to limit what we charge. We want people to be more confidently and actively engaged in the process. It is a very important reset that we now engage in. As the member for the seat of Heysen in the Adelaide Hills, I am very aware that this area has been increasingly contentious, particularly over recent years, in terms of management. I look forward to being actively engaged with all the members of my communities, from those who are active in the environment and volunteering space through to those who derive their living on the land and everyone in between, to ensure that this legislation does in fact lead to the greater level of engagement and confidence that we expect.

I would like to illustrate the breadth and depth of engagement in Heysen, an area that I am very conscious of is one of 15 biodiversity hotspots nationwide, a particularly valuable and precious part of our state as far as the natural environment is concerned. I was proud that the first of my major public fora, following being elected as the member for Heysen, was to convene a forum for Friends of Nature locally through the Hills. It was a forum that took place on 21 August last year.

Looking to get the various different community contributors engaged and talking to one another effectively, I was surprised and delighted by the level of goodwill and engagement that was out there and the willingness of people to engage. I hope that many of them will put up their hands to participate in the elections that are coming.

To illustrate the sort of cross-section of participants in this space in the Hills, I note that we heard from Professor Chris Daniels, who is the Director of Cleland Wildlife Park and also the Presiding Member of the Adelaide and Mount Lofty NRM Board, and Ms Natalie Stalenberg, who directs the Water for Nature program at Nature Foundation SA.

We also heard at the forum from Jasmin Packer, who is active at the University of Adelaide in the Adelaide Hills Science Hub, where she is a research fellow. We also had participants at the forum from the Adelaide and Mount Lofty NRM, including Ms Stephanie Cole, who is a volunteer support officer, and Mr James Thiessen from the Department for Environment and Water. Also at the forum were Mr Brent Lores and Ms Jennifer Pitman, who are rangers. We heard from the minister earlier today about how we are working in parallel to expand the number of rangers who are active throughout the state. Also presenting at the forum were Ms Amelia Hurren from Trees For Life and Mr Ross Oke from the Goolwa to Wellington Local Action Planning Association.

Mr Oke is a tremendous example of someone active through the Hills, leading a combination of voluntary and professional effort and achieving practical improvements for our local environment by working collaboratively with landowners, scientists and volunteers in a natural environment. I was very grateful for the opportunity to provide Ross with a chance to lead the minister through some of the many projects that he and the Goolwa to Wellington LAP have underway and completed over the journey when the minister joined me to travel through Heysen earlier this year.

We also heard at the forum from Mr Danny Rohrlach, who is well known throughout the Hills as President of the Sturt Upper Reaches Landcare Group, and from Mrs Merri Tothill, who is the Chair of the Angas River Catchment Group. We also had contributions from Mr David Ragless, a celebrated quiet achiever in the Hills and a longtime driver of the good work of the Friends of

Woorabinda, among many other things. We heard from Mr David Mussared of the Aldgate Valley Landcare Group and also from Mr Peter Watton from the Friends of Scott Creek.

The forum was attended by well over a hundred people from far and wide from throughout the Hills. It is the sort of cross-section of people who have knowledge and motivation and, given the incentive and empowerment by government in this space, can help us to achieve great things together as local communities.

Having mentioned the Friends of Scott Creek, it is an opportunity for me to note also that when we talk about practical outcomes it is very important to listen as a government to what we are told by those who volunteer in the space, and the Friends of Scott Creek have long sought to expand the area of the Scott Creek Park marginally to take in some land that adjoins the park that has been controlled by SA Water.

It is an area of land that has on it a pioneer cottage, Mackereth Cottage, and for a long time the Friends of Scott Creek, who are doing great work throughout the conservation park, were somewhat thwarted as they looked at this small patch of land under the control of SA Water and Mackereth Cottage. They have wanted nothing more than to get their hands on that area of land so that they could carry on their great work in weed eradication in appreciation of the biodiversity, as well as maintaining the cottage.

I was delighted to bring this to the attention of the minister recently. I am very pleased— notwithstanding this having been a matter of ongoing advocacy for the better part of the last two decades—that the minister was very quick to act and that that portion of land has now been transferred to the friends, and I look forward to improvements on that patch of land and to the gradual restoration of the cottage.

That is just a small illustration of what can be done when active contributors in this space are empowered and when a government listens to proposals that have merit. That is what this reform is about. It is a substantial body of work and it will have its workings out over the long term ahead. I commend the minister for his work and I commend this bill to the house.

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (16:33):** I likewise rise to support this important piece of legislation. As a long-term farming family in the Fleurieu Peninsula, I certainly understand the importance of managing landscapes and managing the land we work with and managing the other important parts that interact with our farming operations, that being the natural environment that is there as well.

I certainly have been very supportive of the minister bringing this to the house and the development of this important piece of legislation. There have been many hours of consultation, and certainly the members of the community of Finniss have been heavily involved in conversation around this bill and the importance of bringing it forward. There was a great need to bring back particularly the confidence of the farming community in this space.

Natural resources management is an important part of farming, and having the confidence in the way the government is operating in this space, and the engagement to and from the farmer back to government and others, is essential to make sure that we achieve the best outcomes. It is something that I have certainly watched over many years and been involved in, in particular with a dairy farming discussion group of about 10 dairy farmers who operate across the Fleurieu. It is something that is discussed nearly every time they are out together as they walk around their properties looking at different things, looking at the way they try to manage their properties within the environments within which they sit.

Sometimes it is the simple frustration of the neighbour's lack of weed control that sits at the height of their concern. This goes back to the early days of my farming career and the way weeds were managed back then. There used to be local weed officers who were paid by council who would assist farmers to make sure that the weeds on their property were controlled. They would also help them have conversations with their neighbours. That has certainly been lost over time, but it is very important for farmers to make sure that they are actually operating with the total environment, not just in their own space, on their own piece of property. It needs only one neighbour to be a problem and it is a costly problem for them going forward.

Over the years, on the two properties my family has had—one at the coast, at Port Elliot, and one at Mount Compass—we have had many weed problems we have had to deal with, and we have covered many of the notifiable noxious weeds that have operated on our properties. At one stage, there was silverleaf nightshade, commonly known as tomato weed, which is a big problem in the cropping industry, as it shifts so easily with cultivation. My grandfather reported it on our property at Port Elliot back in the 1950s. Interestingly, we had a spray contractor find it on a property back in the early 2000s and it was reported again. It is very important to know that it was understood that it was still there and still being managed and had been managed, trying to restrict its spread.

That is what farmers do. They are out there looking after their land, making sure that it is there for the future and managing within the frameworks of legislation, such as this landscape bill. It gives us guidelines as farmers on how to operate and how we need to operate without neighbouring farmers and neighbouring landholders, who are not always farmers now (as we see particularly in the peri-urban areas), as the community from the cities move out into regional areas. We need them to understand why we need to manage our environment, as much as the way we do it ourselves.

It is a combined community effort to make sure that we look after our landscape. Landscape is not just about weeds: it is also about managing the pests and managing the native species on our properties. This morning in a committee, the member for Heysen and I were discussing the overabundance of kangaroos in the Adelaide Hills region, and that is certainly something that has happened with the big changes that have occurred on our farm in my lifetime.

My parents bought the farm where we live now in 1976; at that stage, there were no kangaroos on the property, and that was the way it was pretty much right through into the late 1990s. You would see the occasional one come through, but you certainly would not see a permanent residence of kangaroos existing there. We now have well over 300 kangaroos living on our farm. Back in 1997, we fenced off a piece of scrub to stop cattle going through the scrub after a fire went through, to allow the scrub to regenerate, and it has given a great environment for the kangaroos to live and thrive in. They have their own refuge from cattle disturbing and chasing them away, and they have effectively been able to use it as their home and we have seen a huge explosion in numbers.

This morning, I was listening to Associate Professor David Paton, and his concerns are that the kangaroos are probably doing as much damage as the cattle were trampling through those pieces of scrub because of the sheer numbers that are actually there now, which are well beyond what would have been there naturally when there were predators such as dingoes, etc. keeping the numbers down. This is the sort of material that we need to look at as we go through this important piece of legislation to make sure that we are putting the levers in the hands of locals who understand their community and understand their problems and are able to address those problems locally. Under the old structures and the boundaries, that was certainly one of my frustrations.

Water has not been a big reform in this bill. My understanding is that is to be done at a future time. However, I spent about 11 years working as part of a consultative group on a water allocation plan in the Eastern Mount Lofty Ranges. It was an extremely frustrating process because, mirrored alongside that at the time, was a similar process happening in the Western Mount Lofty Ranges. The two plans were very close to one another and operated by two different groups doing roughly the same thing, roughly at the same time and trying to achieve roughly the same outcome. It seemed like a complete waste of resources, when the environments are very similar.

I think it is fabulous to see the proposed boundary changes in this bill to allow that community to realise that it does not have to operate down two separate avenues with a line that runs at the top of the catchment and to allow those communities, which are very similar, to operate as one and make decisions for their environments as one. It is also really important that this bill allows the locals themselves to have a say about who sits on their local boards, to elect members to that board and to allow people with an interest to get involved and understand what is needed in their region and to give the ability for farmers in particular and other community members somewhere to go to in order to have a conversation about the problems facing them and what needs addressing.

There are some things that I see just through my community that concern me that are not addressed because they are not front of mind and they are not issues that are actually out there that people believe need addressing in a strong way. One that comes to mind is that many years ago

outside the town hall in Mount Compass there was some sand drift. As a solution, someone decided to plant African lovegrass outside the town hall to try to hold the soil.

African lovegrass is a nice, flowing grass that blows in the wind, and I suspect that is how it gets its name: it is nice and flowing and hides other activities. It was planted there to stabilise the sand drift in front of the town hall but, interestingly, it has shifted down every single road that leads to Mount Compass, with the council graders operating and dragging that plant down the roads. It is now at the point where it is starting to invade other properties, not just the roadside reserves.

This is an issue that the community has been aware of 40 years, but it is only just starting to come to the point where someone says that we should do something about it. It would have been quite easy to have stopped it 35 years ago, but now we have hundreds of kilometres of roads that have African lovegrass along them and it is getting out into paddocks. It is going to be difficult to remove it from roadsides, etc., so we need the planning and we need the local community to bring those problems forward.

Another weed that I see as an issue around the Mount Compass area is radiata pine. The Kidman family had land in the Mount Compass area and they decided they would like to bound their properties with radiata pine. They planted many radiata pines around their property and they can be seen sitting there today. The original ones that were planted are getting to the age where they are starting to die, but, unfortunately, they also seed and many of those radiata pines are now appearing in native scrub.

As you stand in Mount Compass and look up toward Mount Moon, the hill just north of the town, you can see pine trees popping up all over it. The difficulty is that they are very hard to access because they are on the side of the hill, but it is also difficult to stop this happening because the seed is drifting in there. It does need attention because those trees grow into significant trees and they take out a lot of the native vegetation that is underneath that, causing problems.

This is where we need to see the planning. We need to make the decisions and we need the locals to decide that this is a problem and it needs addressing. Likewise, as I mentioned earlier with kangaroos, there is no point in one neighbour deciding to take kangaroos out from his property by seeking permits to remove a certain number of kangaroos because, without a controlled and managed way of dealing with this issue, they will just come back in from the neighbour's property. This is where it is so important that communities have some say and control, and we are able to give their farming communities as well as their non-farming communities in the region some ability to achieve the desired result.

There are also challenges in dealing with the different aspects of the community. One thing that seems to have become a very popular pastime in the last couple of years is blackberry picking. There are many people parked on the side of the road with their ice-cream buckets trying to get a bucketful of wild blackberries growing along the road. Blackberries are a complete and utter menace to our native environment and should not be there in the first place.

We are now seeing a conflict occurring because the people who love picking and eating blackberries are getting really irate with farmers who are out there spraying, or even with the local council if they decide to spray the roadsides. They do not understand the risk that those blackberries are placing on many other parts of our environment, smothering important bits of native vegetation. Road reserves are often the only bits of remnant native vegetation around and it is very important that we protect them.

For my whole farming career, we have gone around our property on a yearly basis to try to minimise the number of blackberries that are growing alongside the roads. We still need that to occur in order to get them removed from the environment and prevent them from pressuring out native plant species and providing a habitat for animals such as foxes, which can attack both native and domesticated species, causing problems there. This is a very difficult space in NRM.

There are so many challenges and so many things that have to be dealt with to try to achieve the right outcome for the community. I think this bill is doing a fantastic job of bringing the localness back, giving confidence back to farming communities, rural communities and city communities that this is going to achieve an outcome to improve the environment right across South Australia. I think this is a brilliant piece of legislation that has been brought before this house. I thank the minister for

the work he has done in this space and I thank all the other members, particularly the regional members, who have been involved in the consultation process through the regions.

There was an extensive consultation that went through different parts of the state. There are different needs everywhere. One of the places that the Natural Resources Committee went to look at were the arid lands. They have completely different needs and different expectations as to what the bill is going to deliver to them. But very importantly, the outcome is always the same: trying to get a better landscape and a better management system for that landscape to achieve what is needed.

I also commend the minister for the Green Adelaide region. Adelaide certainly needs to manage its environment as well. I think it is really important that it has been separated from the Western Mount Lofty Ranges because they had very different expectations, desires and outcomes that could be achieved. To actually separate and remove that link I think has been very important. It will be fabulous to see Green Adelaide operating and looking after the different aspects of the environment and the natural resources that exist through the city.

There are still many things that are important to manage within the city region. There are rivers that flow through Adelaide. We have the River Torrens just down from Parliament House. We have to make sure that is also looked after. However, it is looked after in a different way from streams such as the Tookayerta that flows from Mount Compass down to the Lakes through the Finnis River. They are totally different environments, but both still need to be managed to make sure that the needs of those systems are met.

The Tookayerta is a really interesting creek system. It is the only creek system that flows every day of the year. The water seeps out of the sands at Mount Compass and flows down the stream, flowing the whole length of the creek right throughout the year. It has some amazing fish species that are only found in that stream because of the reliability of that water. It is so important that we look after and protect streams like the Tookayerta. It is a challenge.

There are many things that need to be done for the natural resources of this state going forward, but I think the bill is a fantastic step forward. Hopefully, it will restore confidence, particularly of the farming community, to get back involved, not just looking after their patch but looking after their neighbouring patches to make sure that the environment we live in is protected going forward and that they are still able to operate their businesses sustainably throughout that period as well. That is also very important. It is not just about the environment; it is actually about operating in a sustainable way, making sure that the environment is protected and also that business is protected. With those words, I highly commend the bill and thank the minister for bringing this legislation forward.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (16:53):** I rise today to add my support to the Landscape South Australia Bill 2019 introduced by the Minister for Environment. I thank him wholeheartedly for the hard work that he has put in, along with those in the department and in Legislative Services, which enables us to have a bill of the density that we have in front of us. It would be remiss of us not to thank those who have worked extremely hard in preparing the bill we have in front of us today for consideration.

The Marshall Liberal government, as has been made very clear over the debate so far, has a strong focus on practical environmental outcomes. It protects our environment and benefits all our communities, and prior to the 2018 election it was made very clear to us that communities wanted to see reform in the area of natural resources management. That is exactly what we intended to do by bringing this bill to the house today.

That being said, it was made very clear that some parts of the NRM process were working well. There were good parts to the legislation, but one of the most common complaints around the NRM process that I received was about the propensity for time and resources to be spent, in large part, around business case development and that what led, in terms of on the ground delivery, was not necessarily reflected in the contribution and business planning that had been prepared. The existing system that was established by the previous government in 2004 had, in many respects, lost the confidence of the public, particularly within regional areas, as has been made evident by many of my colleagues.

It is not every day that we get the opportunity to make reform in this manner. It really is a generational legislative change brought forward here today that redefines how we look at natural resources management to now broaden the definition to landscapes rather than just to natural resources management, although I guess when we say 'generational' there are some in this place who have well and truly outlasted that 15-year process.

As a result, we have a bill before us today that is extensive and that has been well consulted on. The member for Heysen, in his contribution, made it very clear that the consultation for this bill that occurred during the campaign process, and since government as well, is, I would say, almost an exemplar for how good consultation is conducted and how good preparation is conducted when writing and putting forward a policy that then becomes a bill to be brought before the house.

That extensive engagement included a wide range of activities. There were 23 engagement sessions held with peak bodies and other relevant members. The NRM partners and presiding members and board members were all involved in that process, as well native title groups, First Nations and the South Australian Regional Organisation of Councils. There was an extensive period where the YourSAy online engagement tool was used, and a number of interested stakeholders participated in that discussion online.

There were also 26 community forums held across metropolitan Adelaide and regional and outback locations. Those forums were held in places right across South Australia: from Port Lincoln to Ceduna to Port Augusta, to Victor Harbor, McLaren Vale, Murray Bridge, Kingscote, Clare, Glenunga, Mawson Lakes, Gawler, Coober Pedy, Mount Barker and, on a number of occasions, Berri, Yunta, Leigh Creek, even Grange, as I am sure the member for Lee would be very excited to hear.

There was a wide range of views across both rural, regional and also metropolitan South Australia, and it really is a credit to the hard work of the minister, his department and the broader team in terms of the preparation put in place to bring this bill to the house. At the end of the day, this is a bill whose primary role is to put people back at the heart of natural resources or landscape management. It also seeks to address the constant gripe of many within our community that many of our cost-of-living levies have often not included a CPI cap or increase, and this is something this bill seeks to introduce.

Lastly, in terms of the overall aims of the bill I would like to draw attention to the fact that it is something we committed to introducing. It was an election commitment and, in bringing this bill to the house in the last parliamentary sitting week, the minister has ticked off that election promise, another election promise delivered by this Marshall Liberal government.

In terms of key policy changes compared to previous arrangements, they include the introduction of eight regional landscape boards plus Green Adelaide, the metropolitan board which will encompass all of metropolitan Adelaide, including the whole seat of Colton and the three council areas that make up that area—West Torrens, Charles Sturt and Holdfast Bay. I will talk a little bit further about Green Adelaide in just a second.

The boards obviously will be decentralised, putting decision-making and authority back in the hands of the community, particularly in terms of the regional areas. Previously, I touched on the change in CPI arrangements, which I believe will be welcomed strongly by many members within my community. I now move on to discuss Green Adelaide and some of its functions and proposed oversight arrangements.

I see it as a very exciting introduction and change as far as landscape management is concerned. There are seven priorities that Green Adelaide seeks to address: coastal management, urban rivers and wetlands, green streets and flourishing parklands, water-sensitive urban design, controlled pest plants and animals, nature education, and fauna in the urban environment. They are all very important priorities for us to address.

The key part of these priorities that Green Adelaide wishes to impart—particularly for those in the western suburbs of Adelaide, right the way down our metropolitan coastline and, more broadly, the coastline of South Australia—is a return to an approach that treats the Hills and the sea as one. It recognises the connection of the waterways and the sea, and the impact that inland activities can have on our coastal environments.

The first area I wish to briefly make a few comments about is the priority of urban rivers and wetlands. It is an extremely topical subject within the western suburbs. Obviously, we are at the end of the River Torrens where the Torrens meets the sea. The River Torrens catchment is over 500 kilometres in length, also named Karrawirra Parri, for those who can recognise the Indigenous name associated with that system. It originates in Mount Pleasant, makes its way through the Mount Lofty Ranges, flows for about 80 kilometres across the Plains and then exits at the Torrens mouth between West Beach and Henley Beach South.

There are a number of issues pertaining to urban rivers and wetlands and their importance to our broader coastal environment. The first, and probably most pressing, is that of sediment, wastewater run-off and pollutants that often enter Gulf St Vincent. Over the last few years, some great work has been done in recognition of the importance of wetlands, and a number of restoration activities have taken place, both across my electorate and more broadly through the River Torrens and other waterways within the western suburbs.

We talk about practical outcomes and the great activities that local groups have. We have seen a huge level of impact that local groups in small community-based organisations have had in positively impacting these areas across my electorate. For instance, there are a number of friends groups that dedicate themselves to ensuring that the waterways are clean and free of rubbish to prevent it entering Gulf St Vincent or, more regularly, to prevent it sitting there when we do not have clear flows through the system.

I make the observation that this is probably the driest I have seen the Torrens run from the weir down to West Beach at the moment. It is probably the driest I can remember it being in the time I have lived in the western suburbs. It is something we must all keep in mind as things start to change and move in our broader environment. Every year, Arbor Day is held within the western suburbs across Lockleys and the River Torrens catchment area. A huge group of volunteers regularly come out to plant and clean and ensure that the river system is in the best possible condition, ultimately ensuring that run-offs, the sediments and the pollutants, are absolutely at a minimum when they enter our coastal environments.

The second area I wish to touch on briefly in regard to the priorities of Green Adelaide is green streets and flourishing parklands. An issue that has been raised with me across the broader electorate in regard to green streets and parklands is the loss of green space within many of our council areas. I believe that the Local Government Association, in conjunction with the state government, has undertaken a range of urban heat mapping activities to understand the impacts of the urban heat island effect, which for all intents and purposes is a by-product of urban infill where we have reduced the number of trees, plants and open green space within some of our more densely populated metropolitan areas.

Understanding these heat maps provides an opportunity for where we should be directing further activities and infrastructure investments by way of parks, trees, etc., into the future. In a Vision 2020 report, it was noted that the canopy cover for urban South Australia was at 19.5 per cent, down nearly 2 per cent across the years 2013 to 2016. A large degree of that impact was certainly felt within my local area.

Another report on green space I would like briefly to reference is titled 'Where should all the trees go?' It was undertaken by a research group, Horticulture Innovation Australia. It listed both the West Torrens council area and the City of Charles Sturt as two of the worst performing councils across all of Australia, certainly across South Australia, by way of lost green space. A 7.2 per cent drop was recorded in the Charles Sturt area in 2013. It is significant to realise and understand the impacts that urban infill and densification are having.

I am incredibly lucky that I represent an area where many people wish to live and where many people have the great opportunity of accessing coastal areas and everything that comes with that, but there is something that we obviously need to keep in mind in terms of replenishment of any green trees or canopy that are taken out of the area. To put it into context, it is estimated that the loss of canopy in the period from 2008 to 2017 would almost cover 40 ovals the size of Football Park filled with trees. It is a significant change. Obviously, with that come increased energy costs in terms

of keeping housing cool. It is clearly placed as a priority for the Green Adelaide body that will be made as a result of this legislation.

Another area that I want to touch on briefly is nature education. We obviously have a great opportunity to tap into this with the creation of Glenithorne National Park in the southern suburbs of Adelaide. Increasingly, we have seen a willingness of schools and businesses to partner around nature education. The results of many surveys have indicated that children want to learn about their natural environment. It has been incorporated into many of our STEM activities across the state as well as within many of our schools. Those STEM activities also include outside nature-based areas.

Finally, in the time remaining to me I would like to address another priority of Green Adelaide, one that is also very close to my heart and my local constituents, that is, coastal management. My constituents will certainly welcome the new approach by the Landscape South Australia Bill and Green Adelaide to encompass the Hills to sea mindset and to recognise that the coastal area and our seas should not be treated differently and that the impact on inland areas certainly has a significant impact on our coastal environment.

As a government, we certainly recognise the value of our pristine coastline, and we are doing what we can to protect it through broad and strong environmental reforms, such as those we are putting forward today. The impact of these changes has certainly been seen across my seat of Colton, within both the broader Green Adelaide policy that will soon come into place and the 'New life for our coastal environment' policy, which includes increased sand replenishment, a R&D fund, seagrass restoration and a focus on stormwater run-off and sediment and pollutants entering Gulf St Vincent.

We certainly acknowledge that there is more work to come and more things we can do, but I want to draw attention to the increasing impact that both storm activity and the natural process of longshore drift have had on our western suburbs, from Glenelg North through to West Beach and Henley Beach South. The neglect of this section of precious coastline over the last 14 years has certainly culminated in the slow erosion of dunes across that system. There is a renewed focus by this government that is made very clear by the DHI report and the consideration by this government of long-term options that will present us moving forward.

When we talk about the bill and a shift of focus back to what can be done at the grassroots level, I must also recognise the incredible work of many of our local community groups right across my electorate that are undertaking great work in doing what they can to protect our dune system as well. Lisa, Bernadette and their wider team from the Henley Dunes Care Group have been constantly out with planting days and dune maintenance days to do what they can at a local level to ensure that our dunes are well looked after. Like many, they recognise the importance of planting and the importance that should be placed on ensuring that our dunes are there for the future.

There is much more that I can talk about in terms of coastal management, and I am sure that I will be making further commentary around that in this place during my time here but, in regard to this particular bill, I just want to make it very clear that I support legislation that positively impacts on the cost of living and this bill does that through the CPI cap on the NRM or subsequent levy. I support legislation that removes red tape and creates efficiency. I support legislation that puts people front and centre.

I am pleased for the people of the western suburbs that a Hills to sea approach that has been identified for Green Adelaide will be put in place as a result of the Landscape South Australia Bill passing. I commend the bill to the house and I thank the minister for his hard work and dedication in preparing it.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (17:13):** I, too, rise to speak on the Landscape South Australia Bill. I will start by saying, 'Picture yesteryear.' Once upon a time, we used to look around and see the animal and plant control board doing great work. We would see a few of those officers doing great work, working with the landowners and working with the farmers. We would see plant control vehicles getting around and the officers working with the landowners to make sure that boxthorns were dug out, cacti were removed, coordinated baiting programs were currently underway and introduced pest species, particularly weeds, were being eradicated. Everyone, by and large, was doing a great job.

Some of those landowners and farmers were not adhering to the rules, and they would always receive a letter in the mail saying that if they did not clean up their act, if they did not actually work in a constructive way, the animal and plant control officer would undertake the work and would then send a bill to the landowner, and that is the way it used to be.

I know that I used to take pride in making sure that, with respect to my property, once a year the program was that if there were any boxthorns or any introduced weeds or pest species I would eradicate them. By and large, a lot of those programs sadly have disappeared. What we are seeing now, today, are large offices full of people dedicated to the NRM, all wearing nice, clean, shiny uniforms, and there is a fleet of vehicles—a large fleet of vehicles—that you cannot see the end of, and they are all NRM vehicles.

We look around at the levies that were once paid specifically for looking after our soils, looking after our water and looking after our pests, animals and weeds. They have now been replaced by NRM officers who are now an adjunct to the Department for Environment and Water. Those fees are now paying wages. Those fees are now having large amounts of people sitting in offices looking for the next opportunity to fill out a grant form, a process, so they can look at the next round of funding so they can keep their job—actually making sure that they are still part of that NRM workforce.

I must say that the majority of them are doing a great job, but they have fallen into a system that now requires a previous government's bureaucracy that has turned into a monster, and that monster is known as the NRM board. I think it would be fair to say that it is a system that has been bastardised, and it has now been pushed into disrepute whereby landowners and farmers particularly—it is not just regional people, but all the people who care about the environment, the environmental groups, all those people who are the eyes and ears—are now disenchanted with the way that things have fallen, the way that the government has treated those groups as a cash cow, and I think the level of service has reduced.

I drive around my electorate and there are large amounts of boxthorns and there are large conglomerations of cactus. If I look out of my back window—and I am blessed that I look across the flood plain on the great River Murray—what I see over that flood plain, the Lyrup flood plain, are boxthorns. I see cactus and I see the river corridor with Bathurst burr and the Noogoora burr. Travelling along the highway, we see the Buffel grass. We do not see any eradication of Buffel grass; we see signs that say 'Buffel grass'. That is outrageous! We know that it is Buffel grass, but nothing is being done about it, other than the signs to say, 'Buffel grass'.

We are now seeing large numbers of corellas that are not being managed. The number of foxes I think is alarming. Those foxes are having a detrimental impact on our native species, those small native reptiles. We see a large number of cats. When I say 'a large number of cats', I mean a large number of cats. I am sure that you, too, Mr Deputy Speaker, would attest to the number of feral animals that grace our primary producer paddocks and our regional centres.

We know that rabbits are a problem. We know that our abundant native species, particularly kangaroos and emus, have been a significant problem, particularly in the north of the state. Earlier this week, I announced a rabbit coordinator, and that rabbit coordinator will do some great work. His role will be to coordinate landowners to come together and control rabbits in a much more collegial and collaborative way, so that one neighbour is not fighting the good fight while the other neighbours are not aware that there is actually a baiting program currently underway. With the eradication program, we will see a much more collaborative approach, much like the wild dog situation that we saw south of the dog fence.

Sadly, the dog fence is in disrepair. Sadly, we are seeing more and more wild dogs moving south, and sadly we are seeing more and more sheep, particularly in a year like this year, that are being taken. It has been reported that more than 20,000 lambs have been taken this year. If you do your sums, you do not need to be a rocket scientist to understand that lambs are at a record price and wool is at a record price, yet these dogs are roaming free. That is why, as an incoming government, I was part of the decision-making to have a much more coordinated aerial and land-based baiting program with dog trappers out there. These programs have been introduced through the NRM's lack of ability to act.

We know that the role of the NRM is not so much that they have to be up in the arid lands or up in the pasture country eradicating dogs, but the dogs are heading south. Those numbers are increasing significantly, and they are having much more impact on our livestock. Livestock is one of the largest commodities in this state. It is my wish and my wont, and I will increase the number of livestock so that we can increase the amount of exports in order to help our farmers to grow. We will increase the herd numbers and flock numbers but, to do that, we need to manage our landscapes.

We need to have a much better process in place. That is why the Minister for Environment has been so dedicated to the cause of changing from the NRM Act and moving it over to the landscape SA act. I commend his vision, and I commend all the contributions here today because we understand what we are up against. Again, what we have seen is a bureaucracy that has come at us but is not dealing with the problem. As I said, there is a real problem there.

Prior to the 2018 election, we made it very clear that this government wanted to reform the Natural Resources Management Act. It is great to see that a large amount of consultation was done prior to this bill coming to the parliament. I know that many groups, particularly groups that care and are out there volunteering—whether it is a Local Action Planning Group, or Trees For Life, or The Nature Conservancy—are doing great work. Some groups are there for political gain, and they are not doing the work so much but are out there agitating through the media process. But by and large those people who really care are out there doing the work.

There are so many volunteer groups. They are out there doing bird counts. They are out there doing tree counts on the river. They are out there making sure that our fish stocks are in good shape, making sure our biodiversity is front and centre. I would like to thank all the volunteers, first and foremost, for the great work they do and the care they put into it. They are the eyes and the ears not only for me as a local member, not only for the Minister for Water and Environment but for the decision-makers—the legislators in this place—so that we can put a better process in place so we do not miss the target of biodiversity. It is dealing with our water management; it is dealing with our soils; and it is dealing with pests and weed management.

As I said, the NRM has become centralised. It has come away from the grassroots and, sadly, it has now become so wrapped up in red tape that it almost has itself wrapped up and unable to be nimble and manoeuvrable so that it can implement good steady change and effective management. Red tape is not a man's best friend. In particular, it is not a farmer's or a landowner's best friend. They know they are there for the good. They are the eyes and ears of their land and their soils. The majority of those landowners and farmers are good custodians. They are there to make a dollar. They are there making sure that their soils are well looked after and well managed.

When we look around today, we see no till farming and we do not see the big dust clouds that we once saw. Once upon a time in the dusty period of the season, early autumn and into spring, we would see graders grading bitumen roads. We saw large amounts of land blowing away and sand up to the fence lines. Those days are gone. We have some small pockets where it happens but, by and large, the landowners are great custodians and they work well with the volunteer groups as the eyes and ears for the decision-makers. Again, the extensive consultation has proved worthy that this Landscape SA legislation will be successful. It will see movement in the right direction, and I think it will see a new era within the management of our water, soils and pest and weed management.

Some of the feedback from the industry has been that that consultation process has been very valuable. The South Australian Wild Dog Advisory Group pointed out that pest animals do not adhere to borders and boundaries and hence the pest animal management requires a landscape-integrated approach. I think that is very clear and is probably something that I have only just touched on, particularly with the impact of wild dogs and the way they are being managed.

However, wild dogs are decimating not just sheep flocks. They are decimating young calves and also having a significant impact on goats. All these red meat sectors are large export opportunities. They are all there helping to feed the world, helping to grow our economy and make sure that we look at ways to better serve our lands. Primary Producers SA said that greater autonomy for boards to control their budgets and employ staff for water management, planning and soil and land management were the two key areas raised as part of the reform.

The wine industry had concerns about rises in the levies in recent years and cost shifting diminishing the on-ground funds. Again, it is pointing to the centralisation, the large administrative burden on those levies, and that is why our levies continue to rise at a great rate of knots: because we are paying and providing buoyancy for a large bureaucracy that was never there. We are now seeing that bloated bureaucracy consuming a large amount of levies and we are seeing fewer programs and services delivered on the ground.

We talk about Ag Excellence Alliance, decentralised decision-making, a whole-of-landscape approach with community and landowners at the centre with a renewed focus on soil, water and pest plants and animals—just like Agriculture KI, with decentralised decision-making and less red tape. There is a theme there, and the theme is that we see too much red tape and not enough levies actually hitting the ground. What we are seeing instead is, again, those levies getting tangled up in red tape.

A summary of the reform is that there will be eight new regional landscape boards plus Green Adelaide, the metropolitan body. Each board will have three members from a local community elected democratically and four members appointed by the minister, also from that community. The boards will be decentralised, putting the decision-making authority in the hands of the community. I think that really tells a great story. The feedback that the minister has received and the feedback that I have received—and I am sure the feedback all the MPs here have received—is that we need grassroots decision-makers. We do not want people sitting in glass towers making decisions from faraway places.

Normally, those decisions made are safe decisions without any real understanding and without those people getting their boots dirty. By and large, if you come to the Riverland and walk around you are going to get prickles in your boots and sand in your socks, but that just shows that you are out there getting a better understanding of what the grassroots input will mean to those boards.

The land and water levies will be capped by CPI and the boards will be responsible for setting and managing their own annual budgets and expenditure. The new bill will streamline and simplify a range to process to remove red tape that gets in the way of more effective on-the-ground management. Boards will set their own budget and business priorities unless a change to land or water levy arrangements is proposed or the plan is inconsistent with the regional landscape plan. There will be some boundaries and some constraints for those boards, but it is about keeping them in check. It is making sure that they are back to basics and doing what those levy payers, landowners and farmers need.

We will set up the grassroots grants and the landscape priorities fund to increase partnership opportunities, and boards will have a clear mandate to enter financial partnerships to deliver on-ground projects. That is music to my ears because I am seeing that there will be money hitting the ground for those grassroots programs. There will not be money hitting the offices or propping up large fleets of vehicles. You drive into a current NRM office block and there is a car park full of vehicles, and that is something that we need to have a look at.

The new regional boundaries will better enable communities to work together in managing landscapes. Some of those boundaries are the Alinytjara Wilurara area, South Australia Arid Lands, Eyre Peninsula, Northern and Yorke, Murraylands and Riverland, Hills and Fleurieu, Limestone Coast, Kangaroo Island and, of course, Green Adelaide. It is great to see that the minister has made sure that all South Australia will be part of the solution. I think it is a great initiative.

As part of the reform, each regional area will have a newly elected board, and the regional landscape boards will have three directly elected members and four appointed members by the minister to ensure a good mix of skills, knowledge and experience as well as a broad community representation. As I said, they will get their own budget. They will be able to develop their own business plan and, where there are plans, deliver them through regional landscape boards. That will be the tell-tale of how successful those individual boards are.

I would like to think that those boards will talk regularly and compare notes on how money is being best spent and how some of those projects are working so that we can have a work in progress, a work in motion, so that levy payers are getting good value for spend. I think that is critical. What

we have seen is that the levies that will be collected in the regions will be part of the region, except for a portion for priority landscape-scale projects and services to underpin cross-regional outcomes.

In response to overwhelming community support for distributing some of the levy funding from the metropolitan area to regional South Australia, a new statewide landscape priorities fund will enable investment in large-scale integrated landscape projects to address subregional, cross-regional and statewide priorities. A percentage of the Green Adelaide land and water-based levies will be dedicated to the landscape priorities fund. It is really about understanding, sharing and making sure that South Australia is the beneficiary of the Landscape SA Bill.

What we have seen with the introduction of this bill is that this legislation will be a win-win for South Australia, not just for regional South Australia, not just for metropolitan Adelaide. I think it is a great outcome and a great initiative. It is an initiative by a minister who is dedicated to reforming NRM, making sure that Landscape SA is a success story. I am sure that my constituency in the seat of Chaffey is very excited about the opportunity that Landscape SA presents.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** I understand that the new rabbit control officer is hopping into action—your words not mine.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (17:33):** The proposed landscape South Australia act will give us less red tape, it will help us to better manage our natural resources, it will lower costs for South Australians and it will give us grassroots decision-making. The bill establishes eight new boards and a Green Adelaide board that will focus on important priorities to help Adelaide become the most ecologically vibrant city in the world. It will also cap increases to land and water levies, helping to ease cost-of-living pressures for South Australia.

Very importantly, this reform addresses one of the key priorities for the promises I made to my King electorate to help find solutions to lower the cost of living: the land and water levies being capped by CPI and boards being responsible for setting and managing their own annual budgets and expenditure with much more control. This is incredibly important because the cost of living continues to be one of the most important priorities for people living in King.

Not very long ago, while serving the community on the Tea Tree Gully council, I remember very clearly my concern and subsequently robustly questioning the NRM representative who was attending that meeting on why the council was required to pass on a 6 per cent plus increase in NRM rates from the NRM board to ratepayers. This concerned me greatly because while on council we were aiming for rate increases of less than 3 per cent, and we were continuously aiming—I know I was—to keep rates as low as possible during my time on council. As a result, we were able to achieve the lowest rate in that term than we had had in a decade.

When we were discussing the NRM levy, what was just as concerning as the high rate rise was how difficult it had been to establish exactly what the levy had been spent on in the past and what it would be spent on specifically in the future. Despite much questioning, I still could not determine what value my community members were receiving from this spend of their money, which was going up. At this time, I formed the opinion that this was a great opportunity to increase transparency, accountability and efficiency in NRM charges and operation.

In my 10 months of doorknocking and holding community forums, I became even more aware of and understood the more deep-seated concerns my King community members had about the NRM operations and outcomes. That is the second key reason I am so supportive of our government's Landscape SA reforms and believe that they absolutely reflect our community's desire for change and for better and more accountable outcomes. Importantly, these reforms will encourage more on-ground action so that regional communities can become more actively involved and empowered in natural resources management programs and initiatives.

I am heartened that the Marshall Liberal government has a strong focus on practical environmental outcomes that protect our environment and benefit our communities. Prior to the 2018 election, the Liberal Party made it clear that our communities wanted reform of natural resources management. Across SA, we have listened to communities, especially in our regions, who told us that there were good parts of NRM delivery, that they felt completely disempowered from decisions and that NRM was not working effectively for us at all.

It was clear: the NRM system established by the previous government in 2004 had lost the confidence of the public and particularly of regional communities. This was the result of a heavy, over-regulated and centralised system that focused more on nice business plans and glossy brochures rather than on outcomes. As a result, we proposed reform of NRM and a new start that refocused natural resources management on a back-to-basics approach to land, pest plant and animal species, and water management.

The legislative crux of this is the proposed replacement of the Natural Resources Management Act with a new landscape South Australia act. We believe that this reform will create resilient landscapes that are biodiverse and sustainable. It will also give our regional and rural communities a greater say in the management of our natural resources and provide more security and confidence in the system.

As the people in King know, I value their views and their experience, and they deserve to have their ideas and issues respected and built into future plans, and this is exactly what is happening. That is why it is an excellent outcome that the bill was extensively consulted on within the South Australian community, with local members attending sessions and hearing directly from the community on what needed to change as part of any reform. I was active in giving out paper copies of these consultation sessions to my electorate to make sure they could participate.

This bill deserves bipartisan support and addresses the concerns of metropolitan and regional South Australia. This bill puts people at the heart of our landscapes. As part of our election promises, we made a commitment to get the bill into parliament within a year of taking office and we successfully did this, with the minister introducing the bill last parliamentary sitting week. We have worked closely with the minister throughout this extensive reform and commend the huge body of work that has gone into the creation of this new landmark environmental bill.

For the record, this is a summary of the reform. The new act will replace the NRM Act. There will be eight new regional landscape boards plus Green Adelaide, the metropolitan body. The boards will be decentralised, putting the decision-making authority in the hands of the community. Very importantly, the land and water levies will be capped by CPI and boards will be responsible for setting and managing their own annual budgets and expenditure. Green Adelaide will focus on seven key priorities and work towards Adelaide becoming one of the most ecologically vibrant and climate-resilient cities in the world.

The act will take away the requirements for extensive bureaucratic business plan development and focus on real outcomes for our natural environment. Landscape is a broader concept than natural resources and reflects an integrated Hills to sea approach. Clause 3(2) of the bill defines landscape as being made up of three key components: firstly, the natural and physical environment, including coast and seas adjacent to the state's land; secondly, natural resources, including land and soil, water resources, native vegetation and animals and ecosystems; and, thirdly, the different ways people value and interact with their environment, including environmental, social, cultural and economic values.

Our coast and seas immediately adjacent to the land are important parts of the landscape, and these have not had the care and attention they so rightly deserve. This government is one that recognises the immense value of our 5,067 kilometres of pristine coastline and seeks to protect it through our broad and strong environmental reforms. This broadened focus will enable the impact of on-land practices on our coasts to be considered in an integrated Hills to sea approach to natural resources management through decision-making and investment as appropriate.

What do these reforms mean? Broadly, the reforms provide a simpler, more accessible system that will be delivered through a legislative framework that is more focused on outcomes than prescriptive processes, with processes to be set out in regulations or policies to enable them to evolve as circumstances change. They will replace unnecessary administrative processes and they will futureproof how information is shared, ensuring transparency and making the method for publishing information technology neutral.

New regional boundaries will more strongly align with the connections between regional communities and local government boundaries and better enable communities to work together in managing landscapes. The proposed boundaries have been shaped and informed by the extensive

consultation completed in 2018. A key benefit will be for the primary production sector and will stem from reducing costs to businesses and household cost of living pressures by the CPI cap.

The minister, boards and other decision-makers will be required to be informed by local knowledge and expertise, together with the best available science, in planning and making other decisions. It will require our regional landscape boards to consider the local situation, conditions and other factors before requiring landholders to prepare and implement an action plan to address land degradation issues on their property.

This will give greater ability to take swift action against neighbouring landholders who are failing to control pest plants and animals on their properties. Boards will continue to work alongside landholders to provide support, advice and a helping hand where needed to empower them to deliver sustainable primary production and natural resources management outcomes. Levies collected in a region will be spent in the region, except for a portion for priority landscape-scale projects and services to underpin cross-regional outcomes.

Grassroots grants will also be available. Grassroots grants will be administered by each board, rather than from a centralised fund. Feedback strongly supported regions having more autonomy and control and a move away from central administration. This is about putting control back with their regions rather than decision-making about local issues being made by a central bureaucracy, and it will be a way to connect boards with local volunteers and community groups. For most regions, grassroots grants will be funded from land and water levies collected within that region.

For the first time, climate change will be embedded in a legislative framework for how we manage our natural resources. Greening Adelaide's streets and parks will be a priority for Green Adelaide, helping to build the resilience of the city to changes in climate. The new boards will also have an express mandate to fund projects to achieve resilient landscapes in the face of change. For our urban communities, Green Adelaide will deliver initiatives to confront the challenges of a changing climate and urban density and to pursue an agenda to transform our city into a world-leading, sustainable, green and climate-resilient city.

This will underpin Adelaide's livability, environmental sustainability and economic prosperity for future generations. This will also provide broader benefits to other urban communities through Green Adelaide's role in sharing knowledge and expertise across the state. Boards will need to consider biodiversity in making decisions and continue to fund programs that deliver biodiversity outcomes such as revegetation, rewilding and fencing.

We know that weed control is a critical component of preserving biodiversity in the regions. The bill places an emphasis on declared weeds. Each board will be able to work in partnership with their local community and relevant authorities to work out what the best approach is for the region and local circumstances. I am sure my Friends of Cobbler Creek will be very happy to support this, given they work in partnership today, and that means this can happen more in the future and more across South Australia.

The bill does away with action plans and replaces them with action orders. Currently, authorised officers can require landowners to prepare an action plan if they fail to take action to destroy or control declared pest plants and animals on their property. In response to feedback that there needs to be a simpler and faster process, rather than the landholder identifying what action is needed going forward, the authorised officer will be able to issue an action order setting out what action needs to be taken. The same penalties will apply. Action orders are a tailored, intermediate order that are specific to pest plant and animal control.

On the adverse impact of native animals, regional landscape boards will have a defined role in helping manage native species that are causing adverse impacts. Permits will continue to be required under the National Parks and Wildlife Act for the destruction of any protected native animal. On water reform, we have been clear from the start that water reform is not part of this reform process, given the complexity of water-related matters and the need to comprehensively engage further. The bill will not affect existing rights of water holders or make any changes to the way water is allocated or shared.

What we heard during our consultation on the landscape reforms was that people want streamlined yet fair pathways to compliance. Regulatory compliance approaches will be

proportionate to the risk involved. This is one of the most fundamental principles underlying the bill. Removing the distinction between state and regional authorised officers will increase compliance capacity and enhance responsiveness on-ground in the regions.

For the first time, supporting the interests of Aboriginal people is included in the objects of the bill and will underpin decisions made by the minister and regional landscape boards. Currently, the Natural Resources Management Act only requires Aboriginal heritage to be considered under a principle of ecologically sustainable development. The bill introduces a new general principle of ecological, sustainable development that decision-making should be informed by local knowledge and expertise and traditional Aboriginal knowledge together with the best available science. This is a much broader concept of informed decision-making than previously mandated.

The reforms were extensively consulted on in 23 engagement sessions with key peak bodies such as Primary Producers SA, the Conservation Council SA, the Local Government Association of SA, NRM partners, NRM board presiding members, the statewide native title group, First Nations and the South Australian Region Organisation of Councils. We held 26 community forums across metro Adelaide and regional and outback locations. They were attended by a good mix of land managers, volunteer groups, industry experts, Aboriginal nations, primary producers and other tiers of government and advocacy organisations. There were 15 regional staff sessions with employees from the Department for Environment and Water.

I commend the minister for this bill, which acts on the feedback from our community across the state when we asked South Australia how we should manage natural resources. This new act will give our state a sustainable framework and approach to help Adelaide become the most ecologically vibrant city in the world. This reform will deliver better services to help protect our landscapes. It will cut red tape. It will lower costs to South Australians and prioritise providing resources to hands-on and on-ground efforts. This is another important example of how we are listening, acting and delivering for all South Australians.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

**SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PUBLIC HEALTH (EARLY CHILDHOOD SERVICES AND IMMUNISATION) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:53 the house adjourned until Tuesday 30 April 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

**633 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018, how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the Financial Services branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

Following machinery of government changes, Financial Services and ICT Services are now a part of the Organisation and Governance Branch. This branch also incorporates people and performance and electorate services. As at 31 December 2018, the number of funded FTE positions for this branch is 139.5.

Class	FTE
SAES2	1
SAES1	3
MAS3	1
ASO8	11
ASO7	16
ASO6	24.83
ASO5	19.87
ASO4	11.6
ASO3	22.6
ASO2	6.0
ASO1	0.6
CHFR	22

**TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT**

**634 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee)** (27 February 2019). As at 31 December 2018 how many total public sector FTE positions were funded in the ICT Services branch of the Department of Treasury and Finance?

1. What is the number of funded FTE positions by classification level?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

I refer the member to my answer for Question with Notice number 633.

**MOTORCYCLE LICENSING**

**677 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (19 March 2019). When will the minister respond to the recommendations of the CASR report of 31 January 2018, entitled Recommendations for a Graduated Licensing System for Motorcyclists in South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** Work is continuing to be undertaken by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure in response to the recommendations of the CASR report.

**MOTORCYCLE LICENSING**

**678 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (19 March 2019). As at 1 February 2019, had the Minister read the Departmental response to the public consultation on the CASR report of 31 January 2018, entitled Recommendations for a Graduated Licensing System for Motorcyclists in South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** Yes.

**MOTORCYCLE LICENSING**

**679 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (19 March 2019). When will the Minister make the Departmental response to the CASR report of 31 January 2018, entitled Recommendations for a Graduated Licensing System for Motorcyclists in South Australia, available to the public?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** Shortly.

**MOTORCYCLE LICENSING**

**680 Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth)** (19 March 2019). Why did the Minister not consult with motorcycle Riders groups regarding the contents of the CASR report of 31 January 2018, entitled Recommendations for a Graduated Licensing System for Motorcyclists in South Australia?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing):** Consultation has occurred and is ongoing.

**MINISTER'S RECREATIONAL FISHING ADVISORY COUNCIL**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 March 2019).

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

No, the government has not.

**MINISTER'S RECREATIONAL FISHING ADVISORY COUNCIL**

In reply to **Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition)** (21 March 2019).

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier):** I have been advised:

The process undertaken was in accordance with the simple procurement policy for procurements up to and including \$33,000.