

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 16 May 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

### *Parliament House Matters*

#### **PARLIAMENT HOUSE BROADCAST**

**The SPEAKER (11:01):** Before I call Mr Clerk, I wish to make a statement about digital manipulation of broadcast material. The broadcast of the proceedings of the Parliament of South Australia is made available to provide greater access to the legislature. Unfortunately, it has been brought to my attention that isolated instances exist of the broadcast material of the proceedings of the House of Assembly having been digitally manipulated and subsequently rebroadcast.

The standing orders that govern the broadcast and rebroadcast of the proceedings of the House of Assembly, together with the conditions surrounding access to the live streaming of proceedings on the parliament's website, both have the condition of use that the broadcast material shall not be digitally manipulated.

I draw to the attention of those people and organisations who rebroadcast the proceedings and excerpts of proceedings of the house that standing orders outline various penalties for noncompliance with these rules and the directions of the Speaker. Further, any violation of the terms and conditions that govern the use of the broadcast material may constitute a breach of parliamentary rules and may also be a contempt of parliament.

Since the inception in late 2017 of the live stream broadcast, it is encouraging to see the viewer uptake and the general adherence to the terms and conditions of use. While I am extremely reluctant to impose penalties on people's access to the broadcast material, if breaches continue of the conditions of use this demonstrates a wilful disregard for the standing orders and current policies, which is not tolerable, and therefore I will have no option but to act.

### *Parliamentary Committees*

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GOLDEN GROVE ROAD UPGRADE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:03):** I move:

That the 14<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Golden Grove Road Upgrade, be noted.

Golden Grove Road is a key arterial road and a major commuter road in the north-eastern suburbs of Adelaide. The road upgrade aims to improve safety for all road users and reduce the likelihood of road crashes. The road upgrade will adopt safe system principles, which aim to reduce points of conflict and minimise the risk of right-angle and rear-end collisions by providing sheltered right-hand lanes and the installation of safety barriers.

The proposed upgrade involves several road infrastructure improvements on a 3.4 kilometre section of Golden Grove Road between Park Lake Drive and One Tree Hill. Some of these improvements include the construction of a roundabout at the Golden Grove Road-Hancock Road junction, additional traffic lanes, sheltered right-turn lanes, improved pedestrian and cycling facilities, the installation of safety barriers where required, as I mentioned, and road pavement resurfacing. The estimated total cost of the proposed works is \$20 million and construction is expected to be completed by June 2020.

The committee thanks the member for King in particular for the evidence she provided to the Public Works Committee's recent hearing for the project; it was particularly useful. The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and the committee has

been assured by officials from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor that the works and procedures are lawful.

I report that the committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (11:05):** I am so excited on behalf of my King electorate that I can finally provide this update on when the work will start on the Fix Golden Grove Road project today. On 28 February 2019, I took the opportunity to present to the parliamentary Public Works Committee to advocate on behalf of my electorate for the critical upgrade of the perilous Golden Grove Road. I have lived in Golden Grove for 20 years and seen this region develop into one of the best suburbs in the world. It is a delightful tree-lined area and my residents are always out walking and jogging.

We have numerous walking trails, creeks, parks such as Cobbler Creek Recreation Park, great playgrounds, early settler landmarks, orchards and well-kept houses and gardens. We also have an excellent choice and combination of public and independent schools. However, in Golden Grove there is this one section of road on the border of the development which, after 25 years, remains an ignored, untouched, unsafe, dilapidated and potholed country road. This is the section of Golden Grove Road that I have campaigned to have upgraded on behalf of my community for over four years.

This section of Golden Grove Road is an essential road and is used each day by thousands of locals of the north and north-eastern suburbs. People from Gawler, One Tree Hill, Greenwith, Golden Grove and Surrey Downs regularly travel this section of road. Businesses such as Garden Grove and local quarries, trucking companies and real estate companies must frequent this road. Right now, the Tea Tree Gully council is moving its depot and its truck and car fleet to this same section of Golden Grove Road.

There has been insufficient investment in this section of road for over 20 years. Numerous housing developments have taken place and our local population has grown, and this has led to many issues. It is too narrow to cater for existing traffic flows of cars, bikes and B-double trucks, and turning cars and stopping buses create chaos. The poor condition of the road surface and the lack of overtaking lanes create significant safety risks. Locals have no safe place to walk. A lack of footpaths along the road and near bus stops forces people to walk on very uneven dirt, on the road and often on muddy tracks.

Insufficient stormwater drainage causes the road to flood every time it rains, creating dangerous situations for pedestrians and cars. This stormwater run-off towards the adjacent houses is an issue, with make-do dirt mounds directing the water flow. The notoriously busy intersection of Hancock Road and Golden Grove Road is unsafe for local traffic. People need to grit their teeth and plant their foot just to get across the road safely.

Commuters, cyclists and joggers risk their life along this section of Golden Grove Road. The extremely poor condition of the road causes excessive noise for residents as countless trucks bump along this road, and the unevenness of the road causes quarry and garden trucks to unintentionally release dirt into the air, which covers our homes and outdoor areas.

Local residents and businesses are all heavily dependent on this stretch of road, and my King community made it abundantly clear to the previous government in 2017-18 that upgrading this section of road is a priority for people and businesses in King and Newland. As a councillor on the Tea Tree Gully council, I and my co-councillor Bernie Keane gained unanimous support to write to the previous state government to ask about the plans to have this section of Golden Grove Road upgraded. The previous state government replied that this was not a priority.

A year or so later, because my local community continued to share its grave concerns and frustrations with me, I again wrote personally to the previous state government on behalf of my community requesting this upgrade to be prioritised and to ask for department plans. I received an

acknowledgement from the previous minister's office but no response from this previous Labor minister.

Throughout this time, I was told that the City of Tea Tree Gully staff were also advocating for DPTI to upgrade this road to address the community concerns about safety. In addition, they told me they endorsed this upgrade and needed it so that they could attend to the long-overdue call for kerbing, guttering, drainage and footpaths along this stretch of road. Many times I had to relay to local residents that the council could not address the need for footpaths and landscaping until this road was one day upgraded.

As background, in 1983 the South Australian Urban Land Trust contracted Delfin to develop the land. There was an aim to create a safe, pleasant and risk-minimised community landscape. Construction started in 1985, with the last parcel of land being sold in 2002. The Golden Grove development was perceived as an opportunity to set new standards in urban development.

Today, we certainly have a strong, beautiful, united and very engaged community living in Golden Grove, with over 1,200 people signing my Fix Golden Grove Road petition asking the government to prioritise the upgrade of this road. In addition, we had the support of local businesses, such as Garden Grove, the local hairdresser 1385 The Hair Bar, local cafe and pizza bar Aroma, and Sam Doman from Ray White sharing the petition urging locals to support the petition to fix the road. Even the Tea Tree Gully Mall Walkers gave me a petition full of signatures. My colleagues the member for Newland and even the Minister for Innovation and Skills came out and stood on the side of the road and asked people to honk their horns for an upgrade and to sign the petition.

During consultation on the first draft of the plan, hundreds of locals came out to have their say on the upgrade and personally gave their time to provide feedback on the concept plans. Furthermore, the Minister for Transport has kept me up to date throughout all the stages leading up to the works that are going to start in July. I take this moment to thank residents, local businesses, my friends and colleagues, and the minister for the colossal effort to prioritise the fix of Golden Grove Road.

My local King community has been waiting over 20 years for this stretch of road to be safe and to reflect the standard of roads throughout the rest of the Golden Grove development. My community is eager to see a new roundabout at the junction of Golden Grove Road and Hancock Road; protected right-lane turns to keep traffic moving safely; on-road bike lanes in each direction; improved pedestrian facilities, including footpaths and pedestrian crossing facilities; indented bus bays; kerbing, guttering, drainage and road resurfacing; as well as new and upgraded road lighting.

The businesses on this road are keen to have their needs incorporated and to have the build be sensitive to their operations. That is why I have personally visited their premises to make sure that I understand their operational needs, and I have put them directly in touch with the people who have designed the plan for the upgrade. Thank you to the Public Works Committee and the Minister for Transport, in anticipation, for listening to the wishes of my residents and the requests from local businesses to upgrade this important section of Golden Grove Road.

This is a most important project for the King community and I am glad that the road has finally received attention and that the Marshall Liberal government is once again delivering for people and businesses in King. The works begin in July—#KingMatters.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:14):** I also rise to speak today on the 14<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee in regard to the Golden Grove Road Upgrade Project. The actual report we tabled here in parliament examines the history of the proposal and the efficacy of South Australian taxpayer funds to the Golden Grove Road upgrade.

Golden Grove Road itself is a key arterial road in the north-eastern suburbs and provides an important link in the metropolitan road network. Golden Grove Road is under the care and control of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, between North East Road and One Tree Hill Road. DPTI also has responsibility for the intersecting side roads, that is, Hancock Road, Yatala Vale Road and The Grove Way. All other intersecting roads are under the care and control of the City of Tea Tree Gully.

The road itself is a two-lane, two-way road that transverses urban and semi-urban land. This stretch of road is a major commuter route for the expanding residential area of the north-eastern suburbs. The crash history on the section of Golden Grove Road between Park Lake Drive and One Tree Hill Road reveals that between 2013 and 2017 there were a total of 48 crashes, including one fatality, 18 injuries and 19 cars with property damage only. The predominant crash type is a rear-end collision, followed by right-angle and right-turn types of crashes.

During March 2018, traffic surveys were also undertaken on Golden Grove Road at various locations between Park Lake Drive and One Tree Hill Road. Those traffic surveys found that average annual daily traffic volumes on this section of Golden Grove Road ranged between approximately 9,300 and 16,500 vehicles. Of those, about 8½ per cent were commercial trucks, so it is used by some quite large trucks.

As we heard from the member for King, before speaking here on this report she helped the committee in its deliberations to better understand the importance of this project to her local community and also to the north-eastern suburbs by attending as a witness. The member for King informed us that she had lived in Golden Grove for 20 years and that over that time has seen that suburb grow. However, in the Golden Grove area, while many of the roads are in quite good condition, this road, being heavily used—it is on the border of developments where there is a large residential population—has remained untouched and old. It really is a potholed country road.

I can also remember using that road myself each day. I used to go along it as I travelled to the Holden factory in Elizabeth during my short time working on the production line. I used to drive along Hancock Road, coming from Tea Tree Gully, and I then used this road to get through to Main North Road. I remember driving along there that there are some really big gum trees quite close to the side of the road. There were no shoulders at all, and it was very close to the trees, so, especially when it rained, it was quite slippery and you had drive carefully.

Another feature at that stage was that it had not been touched by residential development. You used to be able to drive along at over 60 km/h (I think the speed limit was at least 80 km/h), so you did have to be careful driving along. There were not too many cars on that road at the time, which shows how it has grown over time, and the member for King informed us that it really is used quite a lot these days. I suppose the summary is that even back then the road condition was in need of improvement, yet here we are in 2019 and the road has deteriorated since, and it has a much higher volume of traffic; the minimum estimates of 9,300 vehicles bear that out.

If we fast-forward to today, it is an essential road used by thousands of north and north-eastern suburbs locals each day. In terms of its catchment, it brings in all the north-eastern suburbs, and people from Gawler, One Tree Hill, Golden Grove and Surrey Downs also regularly travel along this road.

The member for King, in her witness statement, noted that the road's current condition, which I have elaborated on, has led to many issues including that it is too narrow to cater for the existing traffic flow of cars, bikes and B-double trucks. About 9 per cent of the traffic is made up of these commercial vehicles. A lot of the problems stem from turning cars and buses that are stopping and causing chaos with the other traffic. There is a high degree of rear-end crashes and right-hand turn crashes which can be attributed to the poor condition of the road surface and a lack of overtaking lanes which create these significant safety risks.

In addition, insufficient stormwater drainage causes the road to flood every time it rains, which further exacerbates and creates dangerous situations, for not only cars but also pedestrians. Recognising this, the member for King in her previous role as a councillor for the Tea Tree Gully council, moved a motion that resulted in the council writing to the former government asking for this stretch of Golden Grove Road to be upgraded.

The response back to the council was that it was not a priority for the former government. The member for King gave evidence that a year or so later, because her local community continued to share these concerns and frustrations with her, she wrote again to the previous state government on their behalf requesting this upgrade be prioritised and asking about the plans. She received an acknowledgement from the minister's office but no response. You can see that there was no appetite for it to be upgraded by the former government.

Taking this on as the candidate for the seat of King leading up to the election, she conducted a substantial number of on-site rallies, meetings and sign waving. She spent many mornings and afternoons on Golden Grove Road, particularly on the corner of Hancock Road where traffic, as she explained before, had to get across that road very quickly so as not to be involved in a collision. She also collected signatures of people in support of her campaign, pledging to fix Golden Grove Road. About 1,200 signatures were collected. Overall, she has mounted a very visible campaign to get this fixed. All credit should go to her for seeing this through; in fact, that is what happened.

In its first year of government, the Marshall Liberal government delivered on the member for King's election promise by allocating \$20 million for this upgrade in its first budget. The upgrade itself involves a number of proposed road infrastructure improvements on that section of Golden Grove Road, approximately 3.4 kilometres in length between Park Lane Drive and One Tree Hill Road.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Park Lake.

**Mr PATTERSON:** Sorry, yes, Park Lake Drive.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Park Lane is in Monopoly, next to Mayfair, just in case you want to get it right.

**The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell:** Don't pass go, mate.

**Mr PATTERSON:** It is a lovely part of the world, although probably worth more on a Monopoly board. Absolutely.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Mawson, it is not Monopoly.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** Perhaps you should visit it occasionally.

**Mr PATTERSON:** If you were here before, you would have realised I drove that many times on the way to Holden.

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Member for Morphet, get on with it.

**The Hon. A. Piccolo:** And you still can't get it right.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Light, be quiet.

**Mr PATTERSON:** This is what we are doing: we are fixing it. It is magnificent work by the member for King in getting it fixed. It will involve the construction of a roundabout at Golden Grove Road, with the Hancock Road junction, of which I am aware, but also where the member for King campaigned relentlessly.

It also involves the construction of additional traffic lanes at the Golden Grove Road signalised intersection with The Grove Way and Yatala Vale Road. It includes a second right-hand turn lane from The Grove Way approach and a second through lane on the Golden Grove Road approaches. In addition, there are sheltered right-hand turn lanes on Golden Grove Road at the unsignalised junctions which will reduce the rear-end crashes which were so prevalent between 2013 and 2017.

The upgrade will also take into consideration the announced proposed O-Bahn extension to Golden Grove to ensure that any potential interfaces between the projects are allowed for, so we are also looking forward. Importantly, drainage infrastructure will be improved to better manage natural stormwater flows through this upgrade site. The works will include upgrading the kerb and gutter on both sides of Golden Grove Road and the replacement of a number of stormwater culverts to manage these water flows where necessary. That is really important in terms of getting water off the roads.

This upgrade will certainly improve the safety for road users by adopting solutions that align with safe system principles to minimise the potential of road crashes by reducing points of conflict and minimising the risk of right-angle and rear-end collisions. In summary, as I conclude my remarks in the short time left to me, the Public Works Committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Golden Grove Road upgrade. Based upon that evidence, especially the evidence of the member for King, the Public Works Committee decided to report to parliament and recommend this proposed public work.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:24):** I rise in support of this motion, and I can do so proudly because it was actually our government that funded the project. It was funded in the Mid-Year Budget Review about four or five months before the election. It is interesting that good works have many parents and bad works have no parents. We made the decision to fund it. I will make a few comments about bits and pieces of the record that members opposite either overlooked or were not aware of. I will elaborate for the benefit of the house.

I would like to thank the member for Lee, who was then the minister for transport and convinced the treasurer to make money available for that project. It is good to see that this is one project we committed to that the Liberals have not cut. All the Liberal Party have done is honour a commitment that we made in government. That is what we did. It is really great to see one project that we in government funded—amongst a few others such as Tulloch Road; there was a cost blowout, but that is another story for another day—that the Liberal Party have not cut. We did fund it.

Listening to the two members who just spoke, some of the language was a bit different. The member for Morphett was much more precise in his language because he is actually on the Public Works Committee. He corrected something that was said in the committee, which I am glad he picked up. Despite the committee Chair's best endeavours, the member for King could not quite get her facts right before the committee. The Chair even tried to provide some guidance to her on the day, but she could not get it right.

The member for King said that she collected a petition to the government or the minister, but she had to admit, after examination by the committee, that she never presented that petition to any minister in the government of the day or the parliament. It was never tabled. For her to use that petition as a basis to—

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Point of order, sir: would it be fair to assume that, if the committee found fault with any evidence given to it, the committee—

**The SPEAKER:** What is the point of order?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** There isn't one.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Light, sit down. What is the point of order?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Sorry, this is a point of clarification. Would it be fair to assume that, if the committee found fault with any evidence given to it, the committee would have made that clear in its report?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, that is not a point of order.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** A point of clarification.

**The SPEAKER:** It is not a point of clarification.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It is bogus. It should be thrown out.

**The SPEAKER:** It is a bogus point of order, member for Light. In fairness to the minister, however, the member for Light is starting to drift into areas that might provoke government members. They will have a right of reply if they have not spoken. Member for Light, keep to the substance of the report, please.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I thought of it as my preamble. I apologise if the truth provokes the government members, but the reality is that, when the committee heard evidence, the member had to admit before the committee that neither she nor another member had tabled the petition in this place nor given it to the minister. Her petition, as the member for Morphett correctly said, was 'collected signatures'. That is exactly what the member did: she collected signatures, not a petition, because it never went anywhere.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** To cut a long story short, it is good that this project is going ahead. It is a worthwhile project, and that is why, as a Labor government, we funded it.

**An honourable member:** Under pressure.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask members please not to make personal reflections on other members, as difficult as it may be.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (11:28):** I rise today to speak to the 14<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee of this parliament on the Golden Grove Road upgrade. I would like to commend the committee members for their important work in this area. Certainly, the upgrade of Golden Grove Road has been a long time coming. Whilst the north-eastern suburbs continued to expand at a rapid rate and traffic volumes increased dramatically, the road barely changed in almost 30 years. It has been fantastic to see this area grow and become much more vibrant. We have a new shopping centre and a number of businesses along there now, and the Tea Tree Gully council is about to move its depot up there, so upgrading this stretch of road has certainly been a long time coming.

In particular, the upgrade will occur to the 3.4-kilometre stretch of road between Park Lake Drive and One Tree Hill Road. This road is not physically located in Newland, but quite a number of people within my electorate use this road and have certainly raised concerns around the safety of this stretch. Some of the greatest concerns that have been raised by people in my electorate are around the intersection between Hancock Road and Golden Grove Road, which meets at an awkward angle. Given the much greater volume of traffic along there now, making a right-hand turn from Hancock Road onto Golden Grove Road has become a lot more difficult.

As others have mentioned, there are issues with the width of the road, given the increase in traffic, particularly larger vehicles. There are issues with drainage, with people standing in mud waiting for the bus. There are issues with the road clogging up as people are caught behind cars that are wanting to turn right into the various roads that intersect there. There is also inadequate pedestrian access to bus stops. Between 2013 and 2017, there have been 48 crashes: one fatality, 18 injuries and 29 cases of property damage. In the busiest sections, traffic volumes had increased to more than 16,000 vehicles per day.

There is no question that the previous government had been well and truly asleep at the wheel on this issue. They had 16 years to do something about this, and it was only on the eve of an election—as the member for Morphett just pointed out, apparently it was not a priority before that—that it suddenly became an issue of concern. After ignoring the issue for a long period of time, they were dragged—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Dr HARVEY:** —to the party by the hard work and advocacy of the member for King. On a number of occasions I had seen firsthand the hard work of the member for King advocating for this issue, standing on the side of the road and getting people to stop. I tell you, it was not hard at all to get signatures because people had been calling for this for a long time. I was very pleased to give her a hand on a few occasions.

Because we had been listening, we already knew the community wanted it. What we wanted to do was demonstrate to the government and try to convince the government of the day that the community cared, because the government at the time certainly did not. For a long time the community had been crying out but, as was the case with so many issues, particularly in the north-east, the previous Labor government was just not listening. It is quite galling for the member for Light to claim any kind of credit and try to split hairs over issues that, quite frankly, the community do not care about.

At the end of the day, what the community want is the road to be upgraded. They want an upgraded road, and that is actually what they are going to get. I know firsthand from much communication with people in the community that they know who is responsible for this because they saw the member for King out there day after day calling for this, whereas the Labor Party were completely absent and asleep at the wheel. No amount of spin and vacuous political rhetoric from

the member opposite will change the mind of any member of the community. Labor had 16 years to fix this road—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**Dr HARVEY:** —and they did not do it. The Marshall Liberal government committed to it before the election. We were listening and now we will be delivering it.

Specifically, the project will include the construction of a roundabout at the intersection of Golden Grove Road and Hancock Road with some realignment between the two roads. There will be additional traffic lanes at the Golden Grove Road intersection with The Grove Way and Yatala Vale Road. There will be sheltered right-hand turn lanes at the intersections of Golden Grove Road, Highgrove Road, Kunzea Way, Einstein Drive, John Road (which is a particularly busy one) Greenwith Road, Satsuma Crescent and Ross Road.

We will also improve pedestrian access and cycling facilities, with particular improvements to pedestrian crossings within close proximity to bus stops. Road lighting will also be assessed and upgraded as necessary. Drainage will also be improved to better manage the stormwater issues in that area.

Excitingly, the upgrade will also take into account the potential extension of the O-Bahn to Golden Grove to ensure that any potential interfaces between the projects are taken into consideration. Consultation with the community was also conducted by the department. I would like to commend the staff of the department for their work on that; they did a fantastic job. It was great to meet some of the engineers who had been working very hard on that project.

This is a very exciting development for our community in the north-east. It will improve road safety for motorists, pedestrians and cyclists. Unfortunately, though, it is just another example of the previous government failing to listen to the community, but now we are cleaning up the mess. We were listening. We are now delivering and I am very excited to see these works completed.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:35):** I take my opportunity to make a few remarks. We have heard from previous speakers about the details of the work that has been done. I left Adelaide 20 years ago and moved to the north of the state. Before that, I used to spend quite a lot of time in the north-eastern suburbs, but things have changed and things have come a long way since then.

I will not pretend to know more about the details of this project than others, but what I do know about this project is that it would not have happened without the advocacy of the member for King. In the lead-up to the last election, the member for King campaigned on this issue and many others on behalf of her electorate. What she did is what every good candidate who is running for the right reasons does, and that is to try to bring to light areas that need support, whether it be a road upgrade like this, whether it be a service, or whatever it might be.

By bringing issues to light, regardless of the outcome of an impending election, a candidate can make a big difference for his or her electorate. That is exactly the spirit and exactly the way in which the member for King campaigned. With that method of campaigning and that good, genuine, decent, positive spirit that she took to the election, it is not surprising that she was elected and that the Marshall Liberal government was successful as well.

When you do things for the right reasons, things usually turn out the right way. The member for King, through her effort in her local community to bring this issue to the forefront, has been able to deliver this project for the people of the north-eastern suburbs.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:37):** The member for King and the member for Newland have been diligent, hardworking advocates for this project. The hard fact of the matter is that the former government had 16 years to deliver this project and they did nothing to deliver it until the absolute death knell. The reason they took that step is that the member for King and the member for Newland put their heart and soul and their shoulder to the wheel into preparing and building a case from the ground up.



They went out, they secured signatures and they put pressure on to ensure that there would be a commitment, and that commitment was made. The reason that no signatures were presented to this place was that the job had been done. There was a commitment, and it was clear that this project would be brought forward. Without that diligent, hardworking, consistent and persistent advocacy, we would not be here today. I would not be on my feet indicating that a case had been built and nominating the member for King and the member for Newland as the instigators, the agents who brought that much-needed change. Of course, they are much respected for the case they built.

The project will be seen through by this government. This is a piece of infrastructure that was desperately needed, and I am sure that it will now be widely used. I am incredibly frustrated to hear the member for Light suggest that there was no useful purpose to the member for King's advocacy. There was significant purpose: it was needed and much appreciated, and now we are delivering the project.

Some of the remarks that were made were meandering and confused. I am pleased that we have had the opportunity to correct the record. I am also pleased that I have had the opportunity to reflect briefly on the evidence given by the member for King. There was, as the minister quite rightly pointed out, nothing in the report that contradicted that evidence. I must say that, as Presiding Member, I was very grateful to have had the benefit of that evidence before us so that we could make a decision about the utility and the need for this project. I commend the report.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ZERO COST ENERGY FUTURE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:39):** I move:

That the 15<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Zero Cost Energy Future, be noted.

SA Water is one of the state's largest electricity users. Based on current business-as-usual forecasts, SA Water's electricity costs are expected to increase to more than \$60 million by 2020-21. In response to increasing electricity prices and to reduce CO<sub>2</sub> emissions, SA Water has developed a plan focused on self-generation and storage. This plan is expected to change SA Water's electricity cost structure and enable the delivery of lower and more stable customer prices. The proposed works aim to reach zero net electricity operating costs from 2020 to 2021.

To achieve this, SA Water intends to install an estimated 152 megawatts of solar photovoltaic and 35 megawatt hours of storage at approximately 80 sites. The installation of the solar generation and storage will be on SA Water land or land abutting SA Water sites, purchased from willing sellers. The committee has been informed that a more efficient and effective electricity system is expected to reduce the average household water bill, improve the resilience of water supply services during energy market disruptions, improve environmental outcomes through using clean renewable solar energy and contribute to modernising and strengthening South Australia's electricity network.

The committee wishes SA Water well with its implementation of this project. The estimated total cost of the proposed works is \$390.3 million. Construction is expected to be completed by July 2020. The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to the Zero Cost Energy Future project and has been assured by SA Water officials that acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor that the works and procedures are lawful.

The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects, as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:42):** I also rise today to speak about the 15<sup>th</sup> report of the Public Works Committee, entitled SA Water's Zero Cost Energy Future. I note that the report examines the history of the proposal and the efficacy of the application of South Australian taxpayer funds to the Zero Cost Energy Future project.

SA Water is one of South Australia's largest electricity users, with a lot of energy-intensive pumping and treatment operations that consumed approximately 220 gigawatt hours in 2016-17, with a cost of around \$55 million per annum. It also includes consumption at the Adelaide Desalination Plant. Other projects around SA Water investigated by this committee, including some of the pumping stations and water treatment plants, highlight that a lot of that consumption is based upon pumps and electricity use.

SA Water uses a large amount of electricity. I think it accounts for approximately 5 per cent of the energy usage of the whole of state, so it really is one of the key users in South Australia. As I said, it is one of the largest electricity users with its energy-intensive pumping and treatment operations. Because of this, SA Water has direct access to the wholesale electricity market, which eliminates significant retail margins charged by energy retailers.

Even in light of this, SA Water has experienced growing and more volatile prices over recent years. The wholesale rights have been trending up, impacting these increased electricity prices, which will certainly result in higher costs being passed on for the supply of water to customers, who are the people of South Australia. These costs are under the regulatory framework applied by ESCOSA; nonetheless, it really is a key consideration and forms a component of the actual price charged to consumers.

There have been recent cost reductions in solar generation that have allowed many businesses to install their own electricity generation at a cost similar to that available to the larger energy retailers. That does make it possible for energy users such as SA Water to take control of their own energy costs by installing energy-producing assets that will complement the operational requirements of SA Water, thereby reducing energy costs.

In particular, with the reduction in solar photovoltaic costs and the anticipated reduction in electricity storage costs we have seen—lithium batteries are being made available on a commercial scale and are a necessary component because if you are looking to generate your electricity on a significant scale you also need to complement that with storage—SA Water can install its own generation at a significant financial benefit. It also helps to manage market risks associated with the Australian wholesale market. We have seen spot prices, especially under peak demand, really skyrocket, so this will help ameliorate those costs for SA Water.

As well as reducing costs, a number of other additional benefits will come out of this, such as improving environmental outcomes by decarbonising their electricity consumption. As well, it will provide a stimulus to local industries, where we have companies that can help with the installation around that. It will also improve the resilience of water supply services during energy market disruptions if they were to occur.

A feature of the pumping that goes with SA Water is that by being able to predict weather conditions, pumping can be done in advance to make sure the water is in place, which will also minimise or reduce electricity usage in the South Australian grid overall. Hot weather, in particular, is when there is peak demand; that can be anticipated and pumping done prior to that, an advantage SA Water has because it can reduce its draw on the electricity grid during those peak loads and help provide resilience in the grid.

Increasing SA Water self-generation and storage capacity will also enable savings on its net electricity costs through consuming the energy generated by installed solar photovoltaic rather than consuming from the grid. Also, as I said, at times when they are not using it they can pre-plan water pumping and they can export excess electricity into the national grid when it is economic to do so. It will help reduce network costs through reduced reliance on the national grid, and SA Water will also obtain income from the sale of Renewable Energy Certificates that come with the solar photovoltaic panels that will be installed.

SA Water has proposed to install sufficient self-generation and storage to reduce its net electricity costs to zero from 2020-21. The cost of this will be about \$390 million, and hence it has been referred to the Public Works Committee by the minister to have the proposal examined. The scope of the capital works would include the design and installation of 152 megawatts of solar photovoltaic generation and as well as 35 megawatt hours of storage. A control and analytic system will be located on or adjacent to approximately 80 of SA Water's high electricity usage sites.

In carrying out this examination, the committee heard from witnesses and representatives from SA Water. We had the project manager from Zero Cost Energy in. He explained that SA Water has approximately 1,700 sites connected to the electricity grid and the aim of this project was to examine and find an optimum number in the order of about 70 sites at the moment.

Having this generation installed here will provide about 70 per cent of the electricity usage, and then those other means that I mentioned before, such as exporting some of the electricity back into the grid, will look to trend the cost for SA Water down towards zero. The key aim of this project is to design and construct 152 megawatts of solar photovoltaic but also the 35 megawatts of storage, which is a very important component. This project does not look at just the generation side, because it is intermittent and could not be considered base load, but factoring in this 35 megawatt hours of storage really does assist in providing a reliable electricity supply to SA Water.

It will also provide local jobs and economic stimulus because, as we can see, those 1,700 sites, of which 70 are earmarked, are throughout the whole state. They are not in just one particular location. Doing this will also eliminate the risk of SA Water's exposure to high and volatile electricity prices from the wholesale market. The outcome sought by doing this will principally be to reduce the average household water bill because of the zero electricity costs here. It will also improve the resilience of the water supply services during energy market disruptions, if they were to occur—hopefully, that does not happen—as well as improve environmental outcomes through the use of cleaner energy sources.

It will also help modernise and strengthen the state's electricity network overall because being such a significant consumer of electricity in the grid has advantages there. I talked before about being able to predict weather conditions in advance and modify electricity usage because of this and because of the storage, which certainly will help strengthen supply and make it more reliable in South Australia. Briefly, there were other alternative generation technologies considered before using solar photovoltaic. Many hydro plants, micro wind farms and large-scale pumped hydro were looked at and, because of the costs involved and the technologies, these were evaluated, but we went for the solar PV.

In summary, we certainly did as a committee investigate this proposal quite fully. We think it is an exciting proposal. We commend the Minister for Water, the member for Black, for his work in bringing this forward. It is really good for the state and, based on that evidence, we will recommend this proposed public work.

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:52):** I thank the deputy chair of the committee, the member for Morphett, for his assistance, other members of the committee and committee executive officers, and I commend the report.

Motion carried.

#### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: MOUNT GAMBIER AIRPORT REDEVELOPMENT PROJECT**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:53):** I move:

That the 16<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled Mount Gambier Airport Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Mount Gambier Airport is a major regional airport for people travelling to the region for business or tourism purposes and for air freight logistics. The airport services a catchment of approximately 150 kilometres and serves a population of over 80,000 people. The committee heard that the airport currently has operational limitations due to the length of the runway, which limits the types of aircraft that can use the airport.

The proposed airport redevelopment will provide critical air transport infrastructure, upgrade and extend the airport's capacity to cater for larger aircraft and facilitate air freight logistics. Key features of the redevelopment include lengthening the main runway, with grooving for increased safety and jet aircraft capability; a new heavy aircraft and fire bomber apron area; an upgrade to the terminal building; and a covered passenger drop-off zone.

The airport redevelopment will be delivered by the District Council of Grant and is funded by the Australian and South Australian governments, the District Council of Grant and the City of Mount

Gambier. The estimated total cost of the project is \$9.2 million. Construction of the works is expected to be completed by late 2020 with operation from 2021 onwards.

The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and the committee has been assured by officials from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor that the works and procedures are lawful. The committee heard evidence from the member for Mount Gambier and the member for MacKillop, as well as Mount Gambier Airport manager, Ian Fritsch, and District Council of Grant Economic Development Adviser, Mike Ryan. The committee would like thank these witnesses for their very helpful evidence.

The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

### **PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH PLYMPTON NEW BUILD APARTMENTS**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:55):** I move:

That the 17<sup>th</sup> report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament, entitled '134A Pleasant Avenue, South Plympton: new build apartments' be noted.

134A Pleasant Avenue is located on the former South Australian Housing Trust site of Goodman Court in the Adelaide suburb of South Plympton. The previous Goodman Court housing was constructed in the 1950s and was considered unsuitable for diverse tenant households. All existing tenants were successfully relocated from this site prior to the old flats being demolished. The South Australian Housing Trust will be retaining one of the two parcels of land for the design and construction of a purpose-built apartment building to support senior living for older South Australian Housing Trust tenants.

The proposed three-level building will have 29 social housing apartments and age-specific design features. These features include a lift, improved security for tenants, and dwellings that are designed to maximise natural light, ventilation and views. The area is also within 10 kilometres of the Adelaide central business district and close to public transport, community support services and retail precincts. The estimated total cost of the proposed works is \$9.7 million and construction is expected to be complete by December 2020.

As well as hearing from SA Housing Authority witnesses, the committee also took evidence from the member for Badcoe, as the project is located in her electorate. The Public Works Committee has examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and the committee has been assured by officials from the South Australian Housing Authority that acquittals have been received from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department of the Premier and Cabinet and the Crown Solicitor that the works and procedures are lawful.

The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

### **LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 15 May 2019.)

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:59):** I am proud to speak to the Landscape South Australia Bill. It is a much-needed birthday for the Natural Resources Management Act 2004. There is a whole range of reasons, which I will go into shortly, why it is a much-needed birthday, but just for the clarity of the house and for full transparency, my wife, who is an environmental scientist—as I have explained when I have spoken about natural resources before—was heavily involved in the establishment of what was called in the day 'integrated natural resources management'. The interesting thing is that before I was even elected into parliament—yes, I was preselected in 2004 and then elected in 2006—I had a little bit of inside knowledge of the operations of the act and how it went forward in the so-called management of our natural resources.

One of the main issues for me as a farmer and landholder is that over time farmers and other landholders have switched off, basically. They have switched off to how this legislation, the old legislation, was supposed to assist us as members of parliament and assist the state and departments in managing natural resources across the state. In the old days, we had pest plant boards and soil management boards, and there was much more activity on the ground when these boards were in place.

Sadly, what has happened with natural resources management over time is it has morphed into a huge bureaucracy. I was saddened at the time when the 300-odd staff who work in this space, instead of being semi-independent to a degree—because I do not know if they were fully independent—were morphed into what at the time was the department of environment, water and natural resources and so essentially became part of the system.

I think that was a real tragedy and I have seen firsthand, at ground level, how the old legislation has not worked. As I indicated, my wife, Sally, was heavily involved in setting this up in the early days and I learnt firsthand that a lot of the rules around management of this act and management of resources were more about replacing plans and reviewing plans. These were extensive plans.

They would be either three-year plans or five-year plans that had to be reviewed. Volumes and volumes of work was done in this space. Sadly, as a practical person, it worries me that it was buried in paperwork and not on-ground works. Do not get me wrong: there have been some great projects, especially during the Millennium Drought, in regard to the river, land management on the River Murray flats and other proposals, but the problem is that over time those good projects have been too few and too far between.

As I said, the whole issue has caused a lot of frustration, so that, sadly, a lot of landholders, farmers and others have just switched off. In fact, during the Millennium Drought, when the shorelines of Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert crept so many hundreds of metres out and Lake Albert nearly completely disappeared, there was an issue of boxthorns and other weeds on the floor of these lakes.

What happened at the time was that the department—and I am not putting a slur on the public servants at all—would go out there and GPS document where these weeds were, but by the time anything was about to happen to them the water came down the system and they were all covered with water, so it seemed fairly pointless. If you are going to GPS something, why not just deal with it with the appropriate chemical treatment that is safe to use in the particular environment you are dealing with, and get on with the job?

In regard to the legislation, this government, under Premier Steven Marshall and minister David Speirs, have a very strong focus on practical environmental outcomes that protect our environment and benefit our communities. They are the two key messages that need to go together. If we are to have one, we need to have the other one. We made it clear before last year's election that communities wanted a reform of natural resources management. We understood that there were good parts of NRM delivery in communities, especially in the regions where a lot of us on this side live, but most people felt disempowered regarding decisions and that natural resources management was not working effectively for them.

As I have indicated, the system became centralised and heavily over-regulated and focused more on nice business plans rather than on real outcomes for landholders. We have introduced a

back-to-basics approach to land, pest plant and animal species, and water management. The Landscape South Australia Bill aims to replace the Natural Resources Management Act with the new landscape South Australia act. With this legislation in place, we will have resilient landscapes that are both biodiverse and sustainable.

We want communities, especially our regional and rural communities, to have a greater say on the management of our natural resources, and this legislation will provide more security and confidence in the system. There has been extensive consultation across the state and right across the South Australian community, with local members attending sessions and hearing directly what needs to change as part of the reform. The bill puts people at the heart of landscapes and deserves bipartisan support. Part of the reform will include cost-of-living relief through the capping of land and water levies by CPI. This is another way the Marshall Liberal government is delivering real outcomes for all South Australians.

One of at least 300 promises that we made to the electorate at the last election was that we would make sure that this bill would come into parliament within a year of taking office, and we did this, with minister Speirs introducing the bill. We have worked closely with the minister throughout this extensive reform, and I commend the huge body of work that has gone into the creation of this new landmark environmental bill.

Under the legislation, there will be eight new regional landscape boards, plus Green Adelaide, which will be the metropolitan body. Each board will be elected, with three members from the local community elected democratically. That is a great outcome for community input. Four members will be appointed by the minister, but they will also come from within the community. Another great aspect of this new reform is that the boards will be decentralised, putting the decision-making authority in the hands of the community—right where it needs to be.

In regard to the metropolitan area, Green Adelaide will focus on seven key priorities. It will work towards Adelaide becoming one of the most ecologically vibrant and climate-resilient cities in the world. Another great part of this bill is that, when it becomes an act, it will take away the requirement for extensive bureaucratic business plan development and focus on outcomes for our natural environment. The bill will streamline and simplify a range of processes to remove the red tape that gets in the way of more effective on-ground management, which community people have long been hanging out for.

There is a broader definition of 'landscape' under natural resources than we have seen in past legislation. The scope extends to an integrated hills-to-sea approach and defines the landscape as being made up essentially of three components: the natural and physical environment, including coasts and seas adjacent to the state's land; natural resources, including land and soil, water resources, native vegetation and animals and ecosystems; and the different ways people value and interact with the environment, including environmental, social, cultural and economic values.

This expansion into the coasts and seas will make sure that these areas have the care and attention they deserve. We also recognise the immense value of more than 5,000 kilometres of pristine coastline, which we seek to protect 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.

As I have indicated, these reforms will provide a simpler, more accessible system that will be delivered through a legislative framework that is more focused on outcomes rather than on prescriptive processes, with processes to be set out in regulations or policy to enable them to evolve as circumstances change. These reforms will also simplify the planning load for boards, who will prepare high-level five-year regional landscape plans, but they will be focused on five priorities for regional areas and seven for Green Adelaide. That localised management will enable boards to 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 also be a change in how natural resources management outcomes are delivered, with grassroots grants and the landscape priorities fund increasing partnership opportunities. Boards have a clear mandate to enter financial partnerships to deliver on-ground projects. Also, the

prescriptive consultation requirements will be replaced with contemporary and effective consultation and engagement arrangements to enable communities to be engaged in a manner that is right for them and for engagement practices to evolve over time.

Unnecessary administrative processes will be replaced—for example, the requirement to gazette a notice as to the basis of assessment of water taken each year, with a provision for a notice to remain in place unless the basis is changed. Certainly, there will be futureproofing of how information is shared, ensuring transparency and making the method for publishing information technology neutral.

In regard to proposed boundaries, new regional boundaries will more strongly align with 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 period, completed last year, involving (and I apologise for my pronunciation) Alinytjara Wilurara, SA Arid Lands, Eyre Peninsula, Northern and Yorke, Murraylands and Riverland, Hills and Fleurieu, Limestone Coast, Kangaroo Island and obviously Green Adelaide for the metropolitan board. I have talked about how those board members will be selected.

As part of this process, there will be a clearly defined role in assisting with the management of the impact of native animals. The new state government elected last year, and I as part of it, are very keen to see some better outcomes in the management of native animals. I say this as someone who has farmed country next to a national park, Ngarkat, when I leased some country out the back of Tintinara, and also as someone who is well aware of the impact of overabundant native species in my community and in neighbouring communities—for instance, in the seats of the members for MacKillop and Finniss. This includes not only the invasion of animals like kangaroos and emus, especially during the drought, but also the ever-present corella invasion.

I think it is odd that local governments are the principal people in charge of corella control. I think it should become a focus of the government so that there is a more defined reproach. Hopefully, we can work towards that because corellas are a huge problem. I have spoken in this house before about the Coorong council. Sometimes, I have not been entirely kind about the Coorong council, my home council, but with regard to corella control they have been on the front foot. From what I understand, they have relocated well over 20,000 corellas to a better place, and we will never see them again.

Too many communities and local government sectors are nervous about taking this management issue head on. From neighbouring communities and my community throughout the Fleurieu, I know the destruction these birds can cause, whether it is on bowling greens at Milang or particular trees—and usually quite significant trees—in communities like Langhorne Creek and Strathalbyn in the neighbouring electorate of Heysen, where corellas cause major destruction. We really need to put in place some decent control.

Everyone knows my little baby is the management of long-nosed fur seals. These fur seals need management. Sadly, I see on so many levels that people are nervous to take on this issue as it should be. I have advocated that there should be a sustainable management plan, including a sustainable harvest and, yes, I will use the word, a cull of these seals. I do not think it would be an extremely hard cull per annum. I talked about it before, and I have presented to the Natural Resources Committee, in terms of the invasion of these seals of the inland waters of the state in the Coorong area and Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert. I note that these seals have invaded well up the River Murray around Murray Bridge.

They are not native to the area; the local Aboriginal population will tell you that. I note the work that Darrell Sumner has done in raising this issue, and he copped quite a bit of grief over this. Not only is he a local Aboriginal elder but he is also a Vietnam veteran, and I certainly take notice of what he has to say; not everyone does, but they should. It frustrates me that we live in a society that appears too timid to do the hard yards and do what needs to be done.

I am sure that management plans could be put in place, similar to what happens in some areas of the United States, where there is a program of sustainable harvest. These seals are rounded up, taken away and then sent to a better place for the betterment of the community. Some people

say that we do not need to cull animals. Well, if we do not need to cull animals why do we have rabbit culls, kangaroo culls and fox culls and shoot deer from helicopters? It is a simple fact of life that, unless we manage these pests appropriately, we will be invaded and overrun, as we have been over time with a lot of these overabundant native species.

I hope that, with the passing of this legislation, in the future we will not be so timid on all levels to take the appropriate steps we need to manage our landscape appropriately and get real outcomes on the ground with regard to pest plants and animals to make sure that we can get those outcomes for environmental and community benefit.

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (12:19):** I rise today to speak in support of the Landscape South Australia Bill 2019. The bill is a great next step forward to put the focus on practical management, protection and enhancement of the South Australian landscapes. I congratulate that the Minister for Environment and Water on the vision he has shown in developing the bill in response to a demand from a community that wanted to see reform in the way we manage our natural resources.

I also congratulate the minister on the efficient and effective way the bill has been developed and consulted upon within the community. I understand that the consultation process in the Limestone Coast, with meetings in Mount Gambier, Bordertown and Meningie, were all well attended and provided a valuable opportunity for the community to identify what they thought needed to change in relation to the management of our landscapes, all of which has occurred within a year since the election of the Marshall Liberal government, meeting another Marshall Liberal government election commitment.

The introduction of the bill signals yet another way the Marshall Liberal government has listened to the communities and, importantly, the regions of our state. It is fair to say that, despite the commitment and good work of our community representatives on NRM boards across the state, some sectors felt that natural resources management had become too centralised and had lost focus on the delivery of on-ground outcomes under the Natural Resources Management Act 2004.

Our government has listened to these concerns and ensured that we have developed a bill that has a new focus on the management of our landscapes. This is a focus that is particularly important for my electorate of MacKillop and the wider Limestone Coast, given that it is home to significant agricultural and natural assets and people committed to utilising, managing, sustaining and benefiting from these resources.

A key focus for the primary production businesses of the MacKillop electorate is optimising the productive potential of agriculture enterprises, such as cattle, sheep for wool and meat, viticulture, broadacre cropping, horticulture and forestry. Each of these industries and their associated processing industries are valued by the community of the electorate for the economic and social benefits they bring to the region and the character they bring to the landscape.

The new Landscape South Australia Bill will provide a framework for the involvement of the community and the management of these local assets to minimise impacts from pest plants and animals, protect and enhance the region's productive soils, protect valuable soils, protect valuable water resources, and maintain and enhance the productive potential of the landscape. This is important, as we know that the Limestone Coast region as a whole contributes about \$5 billion per annum towards the South Australian GDP, with more than 30 per cent of the state's GDP produced by the Limestone Coast agricultural sector.

The volume of groundwater across the Limestone Coast is significant, with more than 1,300 gigalitres of water allocated, which is notably more than half of all the water allocated across the whole of South Australia. This groundwater, available in an upper unconfined aquifer and a deeper confined aquifer, provides a significant advantage to the productivity of the region and has enabled and supported the establishment of productive pastures, lucerne and other small seed crops, horticulture, forestry, viticulture and the dairy industry. The bill continues to provide the protective measures that regulate and manage the allocation of these waters.

The measures in the bill, which have been brought over from the NRM Act almost in their entirety, are important to protect the prescribed groundwaters of the region. Our government appreciates that a cautious and consultative approach is required for water reform and has been clear from the start of the process that water reform is not part of this landscape reform process. My



electorate is known for and home to a great many natural assets, including unique and biodiverse tracts of native vegetation and associated unique and rare flora and fauna.

It is home to an extensive and unique system of wetlands and their associated ecosystems, including the Ramsar-listed wetlands of international importance: the Coorong and Bool Lagoon. The region is also home to an extensive, beautiful and rugged coastline, an extensive system of coastal lakes important to migratory birds, rare plants and animal species, and a range of flora and fauna. It is also an attractive tourism destination, and the landscape from the border to the coast holds significant cultural values for the Aboriginal people of the region.

The Landscape South Australia Bill provides an important framework to ensure that the community can be involved in decision-making that will sustain and capitalise on these unique assets while protecting them for the long term. The bill is a reflection of community needs and is clearly important for my electorate and for the rest of the state. It provides a framework for the back-to-basics approach, which was developed through consulting with the community.

It is a bill that gets back to what the community wants from the management of our landscapes: on-ground delivery. It supports seeking to ensure our pest plants and animals are controlled, our soils and landscapes are well managed and protected, and that our important water resources are managed in a sustainable way. The bill reflects contemporary views of our natural systems and the communities within them. The three components reflected in the bill include:

- the natural and physical environment, including coasts and seas adjacent to the state's lands;
- the different ways people interact with their environment, including environmental, social, cultural and economic values; and
- natural resources, including land and soil, water resources, native vegetation, animals and ecosystems.

The emphasis on these three elements will enable landscape boards to take an inclusive values-based approach to the management of the whole of our landscapes and the natural resources that form part of them. This approach will assist in decision-making that will support investment and effort in landscape management. The benefits of replacing the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 with this Landscape South Australia Bill are several, including the bill's focus on ensuring that we have sustainable, biodiverse, and, importantly, resilient landscapes.

We know that it is more important than ever for our communities, their businesses and our landscapes to be adaptive to the increasingly variable climate. Importantly, the Landscape South Australia Bill provides an opportunity to restore community confidence in the management of our natural resources and provides a range of opportunities for our communities to have a say and, importantly, get involved in the management of our natural assets. The bill also delivers cost-of-living relief through the capping of land and water levies to CPI. This approach instils a responsible approach to levy raising and shows that our government has a strong and enduring appreciation and commitment to keeping household and business costs down.

The bill proposes new governance arrangements for managing our landscapes, which I know will be welcomed by many sectors of the community. There will be eight new regional landscape boards. In addition, there will be a metropolitan body known as Green Adelaide. Each board will provide for the democratic election of three members from the local community and four members who are also community members, appointed by the minister to ensure a good mix of skills and experience.

This approach provides opportunities for interested and suitably experienced and qualified individuals to be part of a landscapes board and provides the opportunity for balanced membership that comprises business and environmental representation in which the wider community can be confident. For my part and my experience, it will be important to ensure the board membership represents economic and environmental perspectives in a balanced way that enables wins for the economy and the environment.

Importantly, the structure of the bill is focused on ensuring the authority for decision-making sits with the community, moving away from a more centralised approach to management. I spent a term in the late 1990s on the South-East catchment water management board. This board operated under the now superseded Water Resources Act 1997. My time on the board was a time when important decision-making rested with the board. I am pleased that the bill seeks to return to this approach. I found that the local members of the board had a great corporate governance approach and control of its expenditure and fostered a strong approach that was accountable to the region and community.

I know how important it is to have a good range of skills and experience and how important it is to have the perspective of a cross-range of the community and of different sectors involved. The boards will have the task of preparing a five-year strategic high-level regional landscape plan and annual business plan. These time frames will enable the boards to be agile in addressing new and emerging priorities and monitoring and reporting on the outcomes delivered.

Additionally, under the bill, the board will have a clearly defined role in assisting with the management of the impact of native animals. The bill provides for a responsible and accountable approach to budgeting and income generation through levies. The bill provides for accountable processes for boards to enable them to propose changes to the base and quantum of the levy.

The government has listened to the community and the support was evident to ensure some levy funding is redistributed from the metropolitan area to regional South Australia. This will occur through the attribution of a percentage of Green Adelaide's land and water-based levies to the landscape priorities fund. The establishment of this new statewide landscape priorities fund will provide for this redistribution and enable investment in large-scale, integrated landscape projects to address subregional, cross-regional and statewide priorities.

The collection processes for land and water-based levies will remain much the same as at present, with land levies continuing to be collected through council rate notices. Councils can recover unpaid land levies at the same time as they recover unpaid council rates. Collection of land-based levies by local councils via council rates is the most cost-effective method of collecting levies in council areas, maximising the funding available for on-ground delivery.

The planning processes will be streamlined through this bill. The act will take away the requirement for extensive bureaucratic business plan development and focus on outcomes for our landscapes. I am pleased that the landscapes bill has sought to be less prescriptive in relation to processes. A benefit of this process is that the sometimes cumbersome planning process for boards will be simplified. Processes for planning will be set out in regulations to enable them to evolve and be responsive to the relevant issues and the needs of local communities. This is something that I know will please constituents I have heard from and who feel at times overconsulted and at times disillusioned by planning processes.

Partnerships are a key feature of the Landscape SA Bill. It encourages and requires the board to work in partnership to deliver beneficial landscape outcomes with a range of other organisations, volunteers, landholders and non-government organisations. The bill will support ensuring the delivery of a grassroots grants program, increasing partnership opportunities and embedding a direction so that boards have a clear mandate to enter financial partnerships to deliver on-ground projects.

On the matter of regional boundaries, the bill provides to improve their alignment. The new regional boundaries will now better align with communities and other traditional local government boundaries. As I frequently highlight in this chamber, the primary production sector is a fundamental and key driver for the economy of the regions and the state. The bill is enabling and has enshrined the principle that the boards will work in partnerships and collaboratively with primary producers and local communities to deliver real outcomes on the ground.

I look forward to any opportunities the implementation of the landscape scale restoration projects, through the landscape priorities fund, may deliver for our primary producers and the broader communities of my electorate and, indeed, the state. I also appreciate the role of the bill in providing a role for the board in the management of declared weeds, which are a threat to both our natural biodiversity and agricultural produce.

I see many benefits for our regions and communities in the implementation of this new landscape bill. I look forward to the passing of the bill and seeing it implemented across the state. I again congratulate the minister on his leadership in the delivery of this bill and commend the bill to the house.

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (12:33):** I rise today to support the Landscape South Australia Bill 2019. This bill is a central pillar of the Marshall Liberal government's reform of natural resources management that will replace the Natural Resources Management Act 2004. Prior to the 2018 election, the feedback from the community indicated a loss of confidence in the Natural Resources Management system that had been in place since 2004. It is fair to say that in principle the NRM was supported at its introduction but had, over time, become over-regulated, increasingly centralised and overly focused on business plans rather than on practical outcomes.

In the lead-up to the 2018 election, the Marshall Liberal team committed to reform natural resources management with a back-to-basics approach to the management of land, animal and plant pests and water. The approach recognises the disconnect that had grown between the system of management of these resources and the communities that protect them and depend on them. The approach will decentralise the management system and empower local communities, giving them a greater say and greater control over the management of these resources.

Key to ensuring that this new system would achieve this end was the extensive process of consultation that was undertaken from June through October 2018. The early engagement phase, which included meetings concerning native title, primary production, regional councils and conservation of the environment, was followed by a series of 25 community forums across the whole state, including the regions and metropolitan area.

Groups, including land managers, primary producers, volunteer groups, industry groups, representatives of Aboriginal nations, other tiers of government and advocacy groups, were able to offer their views on their priorities for natural resources management. We believe that this important reform will create resilient landscapes that are both biodiverse and sustainable whilst also providing more confidence in the system of the management of these resources by giving our communities a greater say.

The bill sets out the establishment of eight new regional landscape boards: the Alinytjara Wilurara, South Australian Arid Lands, Eyre Peninsula, Northern and Yorke, Murraylands and Riverland, Hills and Fleurieu, Limestone Coast and Kangaroo Island, plus a board for the metropolitan body, Green Adelaide. These new regional boundaries have been drawn up to better collect communities of shared interests together into shared regions as well as accounting for the boundaries of local government areas. The process for drawing up regional boundaries was also informed to a significant extent by the views of regional communities collected through the consultation process that was carried out by the government in 2018.

Each board will consist of seven members. Three members will be elected by the community through a democratic election process, with the remaining four (also from the local community) to be appointed by the minister. This process of appointing members to the board will ensure that much greater control of boards is held by the local community whilst also ensuring that there is a good mix of skills, knowledge and experience.

Boards will provide strategic leadership on five priority areas set out in the regional landscapes plan, with seven priorities for Green Adelaide. The focus of the activities of the board will be to facilitate landscape management, in particular the management of soil and land, water resources and pest plant and animal control, as well as a defined role in the management of the impact of native animals. Boards will also have responsibility to set out their own budget in annual business plans, the income of which is gathered through land and water levies.

Every region will be responsible for administering a grassroots grant program to support the work of volunteer groups and other not-for-profit organisations on local projects. This will provide much greater opportunity for local partnerships and, in particular, encourage financial partnerships. Each region will also have a general manager who will be responsible to the board for managing the business of the board and who will be responsible for employing and managing staff. The board will repair water affecting activity control policies and landscape affecting activity control policies.

The bill cuts unnecessary red tape by removing requirements for extensive business plan development and will refocus attention on achieving substantive outcomes for the natural environment. Red tape reduction will also include a streamlining and simplification of other processes that in the past have restricted the achievement of real outcomes for the environment and the community.

A key commitment of this reform is to ease what had been a constantly increasingly burdensome financial cost to the community by capping the increases to land and water levies to CPI. This is just another example of the Marshall Liberal government fulfilling our commitment to deliver lower costs for South Australians. Increases in land and water levies by a greater rate than CPI would require the local board to apply, with final approval to be determined by the minister. If such an increase were approved, the minister would be required to table a report in the House of Assembly, where the proposal can be disallowed or amended.

In council areas, councils will continue to set the land levy rate under the Local Government Act based on the amount that they are required to contribute to the relevant landscape board. Outside council areas, the regional landscape board will gazette the levy rate and be responsible for collecting the levy. In areas where the land levy is charged based on property values, the CPI cap will limit increases to the rate set by councils.

As is currently the case, increases in the capital value of a person's home and the capital value in a council or region will impact the levy calculation. In the case of water levies, the cap will apply to the rate that is set by the minister and the minister will be able to approve increases to the water levy above CPI if they are satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstances to do so, which would then be subject to the approval of parliament.

The minister will only be required to approve a business plan if it is inconsistent with the board's regional landscape plan or contains a land or water levy proposal to increase the land and water levies above CPI; to impose a levy in an area of the state where it has not previously applied; or to change the basis of the land or water levy. In these cases, there would be a structured process to put such a proposal to the parliament.

Land levies are collected through council rate notices and the collection of these fees by local councils is the most cost-effective method of collecting levies in these areas, maximising the funding available to achieve real outcomes for the natural environment. Importantly, though, levies collected in each region will be spent in the region, with the exception of a portion for the priority landscape scale projects and services that support cross-regional outcomes. This portion will be held in a new statewide landscape priorities fund.

It is important to note that the primary production sector is a significant driver of our state's economy and South Australians from right across the state, including the metropolitan area, benefit from the success of this sector. Therefore, it is important that this sector benefits as much as possible—of course, in a sustainable fashion—from these reforms. The primary production sector will benefit from these reforms to the management of our natural resources.

Firstly, the pressures of the costs of doing business for these businesses will be eased by the cap to levy increases. The principle that boards will work in partnership with primary producers in local communities to deliver real outcomes on the ground will be enshrined in legislation. The landscape priorities fund will deliver landscape scale restoration projects and provide greater opportunities for natural resources management focused programs and initiatives to benefit our primary producers.

The minister, boards and other decision-makers will be required to be informed by local knowledge and expertise, together with the best available science and planning, in making other decisions. Local landscape boards will be required 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.

There will be a greater ability for action to be taken quickly against neighbouring landholders who are failing to control pest plants and animals on their property and boards continuing to work alongside landholders to provide support, advice and a helping hand when needed to empower them to deliver sustainable primary production and natural resources management outcomes.

Green Adelaide, which is the metropolitan region, will have a particular focus on greening Adelaide's streets and parks, with priorities to manage our coastal environment, urban rivers and wetlands, green streets and parklands, water-sensitive urban design, controlling pest plants and animals, nature education, and flora and fauna in the urban environment. 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 and green climate-resilient city.

This work will play an important part in ensuring Adelaide's livability, environmental sustainability and economic prosperity for years to come. This bill represents a fundamental shift in the management of our natural resources—a focus on real outcomes, rather than bureaucratic processes—and a shift to much greater control for local communities. This major reform also ensures that cost increases are kept to an absolute minimum.

It is easy when discussing reform of this magnitude to get lost in the technical details of the bill which perhaps distract from the very real positive impact that this bill will have on the everyday lives of South Australians. Soon after my election as the member for Newland, I held a community forum in Kersbrook. A number of local residents, many of whom are farmers, raised concerns with overregulation and increasing costs, often with particular reference to NRM boards.

Concerns of this type have been consistently raised with me whenever I speak to my constituents within the Adelaide Hills. It is clear to see and understand the frustration that people have had with NRM boards. The disconnect between local communities and the boards has resulted in a sense from locals that they are being dictated to on things they have been doing for decades.

These people care about the environment and, in fact, they rely on it very heavily for their own livelihoods, and our reforms will fundamentally address these concerns and make a tangible difference to the lives of South Australians, particularly those living in the regions. I am certainly proud to be part of a government that empowers local communities to have a greater say within their own communities. This is very much a general philosophy of this government, and we are seeing it applied in many other areas, another notable example being the introduction of boards for local health networks.

Where in the past we have seen a push towards the centralisation of decision-making, which is generally felt to be imposed on local communities by a castle in the CBD, this government respects and understands the fact that local communities, with appropriate support, are best placed to make decisions for themselves. I commend the minister for his work on the bill, which represents a significant body of work, and I commend the bill to the house.

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:44):** I rise to make a contribution on the Landscape South Australia Bill today. From the outset, I would like to congratulate the minister, his staff, the Department for Environment and Water and the many people from around the state who have contributed through the consultation process to the drafting of this new bill. It is certainly a great body of work.

I want to talk initially about part of my life's journey and part of the reason I came to be in this place, and that is that I spent 30 years as a farmer on Eyre Peninsula, mostly growing grains but also keeping sheep for wool and meat. I and farmers around Eyre Peninsula, around the state, around the country and around the world are essentially landscape managers, and it is beholden on us to do that as well as we possibly can. This bill particularly highlights the role of primary producers, and I certainly appreciate that.

As farmers in the Australian environment, we have altered our natural landscape significantly to produce agricultural goods. Given that Europeans have only occupied this land for a relatively short time, it is possible for us to remember in relatively recent history what the natural landscape was like, what it looked like and the balances that were part of that landscape. In other parts of the world—Europe is the prime and probably best example, but there are others as well—the farmed landscape has come to be regarded as the natural landscape itself, so it is a different mindset. There are different parameters around primary production in other parts of the world.

Europeans are very much still new in the Australian landscape, and we have certainly changed the landscape significantly. We have upset many balances. I think that part of what we are

doing today is attempting to restore a balance—not the original balance but a balance—back to our landscapes, our environment and our production systems that we rely on. Our aim as primary producers always has been to use the landscape productively yet sustainably, and therein lies the challenge.

I have a theory in my own mind that the more productive a farming system is the more sustainable it is, but that can be for a whole range of reasons, not just economically but environmentally as well. We have seen our farming systems evolve significantly over the last 150 years. I have often talked in this place about how South Australia was key in developing some of those farming systems. In fact, they were transported right around the world to similar environments, across southern Australia, through the Middle East and even to parts of America that enjoy a similar climate and temperature.

Very soon after I started farming, I recognised that there were some environmental issues not just on our property but in the district as a whole. For us, they were primarily around waterlogging and salinity. I began planting trees almost immediately. I am sure that the member for Hammond will appreciate that it was a number of years before I realised that the best way to ensure that trees survive is to fence them off, otherwise they become particularly palatable fodder for whatever livestock is running around. Protection of those planted trees was a good thing.

I often think that, in these days of much discussion about climate change and the efforts we might make to address that, the single best thing any of us can do is plant a tree. An even better thing would be to plant many trees, but I digress. I began planting trees and by the mid-1990s I found myself living down the road at Edillilie. I was an inaugural member of the Edillilie Landcare Group. We formed the Landcare group, coming together as like-minded land managers. I am very proud of the work that we did as a Landcare group. Almost every day, I still drive past the very first plantation of trees that we put in place and fenced off, thus they survived.

Whole-farm planning was a big part of those early days. It was before Google Maps. Those of us who took part in this program had to purchase a large aerial map of our property, and with various different coloured textas we drew soil types and drainage lines. I see a few nods in the chamber. Other people have been through that as well. It was a really important part and it fitted into what we wanted to do in relation to a catchment management plan.

I think there were about 50 farmers who lived within the Cummins-Wanilla Basin and over a couple of years almost all of them took part in this farm management planning program. From that, we developed a catchment management plan, which we worked on diligently for a number of years. In the early days, funding was available for landscape and environmental works, generally on a one-for-one basis.

The groups were able to apply for funding to both federal and state governments and match that from their own input, often in kind, actually doing the work themselves to fence off creek lines and those trees that we did not want the sheep to eat. That was a really exciting time. I joined the Lower Eyre Peninsula soil board. I particularly enjoyed that because of course the soil is our primary resource and we are reliant on that for everything that we grow and produce.

One thing led to another, and in 2004 the Rann Labor government installed the NRM Act and established NRM boards around the state. I applied and was successful in being appointed to the first Eyre Peninsula NRM board. In a way, I cut my teeth with NRM during that time. We had some very capable board members at that time. I particularly mention Brian Foster, the presiding member and chair of that committee. Brian is a wonderfully capable farmer from Lower Eyre Peninsula. He brought some insights and skills to that board that we really appreciated.

At that time, we were establishing the NRM board as a driver for natural resources management across Eyre Peninsula and across the state, I think we did a good job. What ultimately happened was that the bureaucracy became more centralised and as a board we had less authority and more and more decisions and directives were coming from North Terrace and Victoria Square. People started to realise that and became frustrated with the way that NRM was going. I spent one term on the board because I got busy doing other things, which ultimately led my to being in this place. It was a really important project for me.

As I said, people were becoming increasingly frustrated with the way that NRM was being managed and with the lack of on-ground works. Through the nineties and early 2000s we, as a group and as individual landowners, were able to access funds and do some really important on-ground works, such as fencing off creek lines, natural vegetation and remnant native vegetation. In a way, that frustration has led us to where we are today. I congratulate the minister on recognising that and on the bulk of work he has done in bringing the bill to this place.

Ultimately, we need a landscape that is more resilient than we have and we need to be adaptive in the way we create that. We are not going to go back to the original, pre-European landscape; there are far too many of us who rely on the natural environment for our livelihood. In fact, the average Australian farmer produces enough food for about 70 other people in the world, so much of what we produce is exported. We are also more than capable of feeding our own population.

We need to be adaptive along the way, and part of being adaptive is developing those farming systems. No farming system is perfect. Just when you think you have all the problems solved and a system working, something is thrown up to challenge that. It might be resistant rye-grass, a plague of conical snails or wombats in the Far West. I will come to that as we talk more about the landscape bill.

This new bill, however, establishes a new framework for how we manage our state's natural resources based around the vision that provides a simpler and more accessible system by removing unnecessary bureaucracy, simplifying procedures to improve responsiveness and providing greater flexibility for improving best practice over time. Key elements of this reforming bill are replacing regional natural resources management boards with new arms-length regional landscape boards and giving communities and landholders a greater voice in how natural resources are managed.

We have been talking during this debate about Green Adelaide. This is a relatively new concept, and it will be a new and separate board. That board will be focused on seven priorities that will help Adelaide, our capital city in which 75 per cent of our population lives, to become the most ecologically vibrant city in the world—a challenge indeed. There will be a cap on increases to land and water levies to reduce cost-of-living pressures for all South Australians, and there will be more action on the ground with a focus on partnerships, a simpler approach to planning, and creating opportunities for natural resources management, focused programs and initiatives in regional communities.

This is an election commitment that we made to the people of South Australia. It was quite clear to us that our communities wanted reform of NRM. We listened to those communities. There were good parts of the pre-existing NRM delivery, but people felt disempowered regarding decisions and that NRM was not really working effectively for them. The result was a heavily overregulated and centralised system that focused more on nice business plans rather than outcomes. I know one of the real banes of previous boards was having to spend so much time preparing business plans and environmental plans that really were continually being rolled over. A lot of time, effort and resources were being put into that.

As a result, we propose a reform of NRM and a new start that refocuses 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, which hopefully this afternoon will pass through this place. 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 natural resources and provide more security and confidence in the system.

I mentioned earlier that extensive consultation occurred throughout our communities and right across the state. I thank the minister for the opportunity that we had on Eyre Peninsula in both Ceduna and Port Lincoln to take part in that. They were both well attended, and all that was contributed by those who were there was taken on board. The measures that come into play also deliver cost-of-living relief. That is a big part, as people will understand, of the Marshall Liberal government. We are doing that, in this instance, through the capping of the land and water levies to the consumer price index (CPI).

As I said, the new act will replace the NRM Act. There will be eight new regional landscape boards, plus Green Adelaide, which will encompass the metropolitan area of South Australia. In relation to the electorate of Flinders, the Eyre Peninsula board will cover the bulk of the electorate of Flinders—the electorate that I represent—but also the Alinytjara Wilurara board has some overlap with the seat of Flinders. In fact, they have offices in Ceduna, which I visit from time to time. I must congratulate those regional staff who put a lot of work into natural resources management and working with local communities. I am sure that will continue. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

*Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.*

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### QUESTIONS ON NOTICE

**The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:00):** I rise on a breach of the sessional orders. The Premier has unfortunately failed to respond to a question on notice put to him over three months ago. I shall hand you the details of the question.

**The SPEAKER:** Thank you, member for Lee. I will conduct the necessary search and come back to the house if need be.

**The Hon. T.J. Whetstone:** We are still waiting for an answer from you to a question from two years ago.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries will not taunt Her Majesty's Loyal Opposition.

#### *Petitions*

### SERVICE SA MODBURY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey):** Presented a petition signed by 99 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.

### TRANSPORT SUBSIDY SCHEME

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale):** Presented a petition signed by 218 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to reverse its decision to discontinue the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme from 31 December 2019 and to continue the scheme indefinitely, akin to other Australian jurisdictions, or to engage with the disability sector in helping to create a new scheme enabling South Australians the transport freedom and flexibility they deserve.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** I welcome today Saint Ignatius College year 6 students, who are guests of the Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. Marshall:** A very smart class.

**The SPEAKER:** Indeed. Also, we have several guests from the Lions Club of Mitcham, who are here on behalf of the member for Elder. I also welcome year 6 students from Enfield Primary School, who are guests of the member for Enfield. Welcome to parliament.

### ANSWERS TABLED

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

### PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:



By the Speaker—

Independent Commissioner Against Corruption South Australia and Office for Public Integrity—A twelve-month review of the Police Complaints and Discipline Act 2016 Report May 2019

By the Minister for Child Protection (Hon. R. Sanderson)—

Children and Young People in State Care in South Australian Government Schools 2008-17—Report July 2018

*Ministerial Statement*

**MINISTERIAL STATEMENTS**

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:04):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is sought; is leave granted? There being a dissenting voice, leave is not granted.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I table a ministerial statement about the achievements of an artist on the APY Lands, which the opposition clearly are not interested in.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Hammond and the Minister for Education are all called to order.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is called to order; the member for Hammond is warned.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We can do this all day if you like. Minister for Child Protection.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:06):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is sought; is leave granted? Leave is not granted, there being a dissenting voice.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I table my statement.

*Parliamentary Committees*

**PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE**

**Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:06):** I bring up the 21<sup>st</sup> report of the committee, entitled Penola Northern Bypass.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time*

**UNEMPLOYMENT FIGURES**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Why is the South Australian unemployment rate now the equal worst on the Australian mainland?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** I am so pleased that the Leader of the Opposition has seen fit to ask a question about jobs in South Australia. We went to the election with a strong plan to create more jobs here in South Australia and that is exactly and precisely—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —what we've done. When I look at those ABS statistics today, what I concentrate on is the fact that there are 2,000 more people employed in South Australia—this year, this month—than last month: 12,700 additional people employed in South Australia over the last 12 months. This is something—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to absolutely celebrate. Only those opposite could talk down the economy in South Australia at the moment. We have the highest small business confidence in the nation and we've got an economy which is feeling more buoyant about the future.

When we look at the specific statistics of additional hours worked and additional wages paid this month over the previous month, it's a \$92 million injection in our economy. This is fantastic news. Yes, the unemployment rate may have moved, but that's a function of the fact that more people in South Australia are feeling confident about our state and they are deciding to participate in our economy.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The participation rate in South Australia continues to increase. This is good news for our state. People who under the previous regime had given up hope of ever finding a job in South Australia, had exited the job market, have all of a sudden decided that there is hope for them in South Australia. They have joined the quest for a job in South Australia, and the good news is they are finding those jobs in South Australia—2,000 more people employed in South Australia this month than last month. This is something to celebrate.

I have to say that we are delighted with this outcome. More people employed in South Australia is a good outcome. Only those opposite could be talking about this being bad for South Australia. I remember—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —when the Labor Party was in government—oh! Anyway, when they were in government they made a promise to the people of South Australia. They said that, in a six-year period, they would create 100,000 new jobs. How many did they actually create?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What was it again?

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** It was 10,000.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** So 10,000. You missed it by that much. We have created 12,700 new full-time jobs in the past 12 months. We feel very proud about that, and the reason why those jobs have been created is that the policy settings in South Australia are now correct. We have removed payroll tax for all small businesses in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** On 1 January, there was a situation that was put into place where all businesses in this state with a payroll of up to \$1½ million will not pay a cent in payroll tax. Under the previous government that threshold was \$600,000. It is now \$1.5 million here in South Australia.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We put \$200 million into creating apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia. We have halved the emergency services levy. We will be working every single day that we are on the treasury bench to advance our economy and to create more jobs in this state.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Leader of the Opposition, I call to order the following members: the member for Kaurana, the member for Badcoe, the member for Wright, the member for West Torrens, the member for Playford, the deputy leader, the member for Ramsay, the member for Reynell, the Minister for Innovation, the Minister for Child Protection, the Minister for Police, and I warn for a first time the members for Badcoe, Playford and Hammond. The leader has the call.

#### EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why 6,400 more unemployed South Australians are currently in the state than since he took office in March 2018?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my previous answer.

*Mr Boyer interjecting:*

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

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

**The SPEAKER:** Premier!

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I might do that. I'm trying to give your leader the call. The Leader of the Opposition has the call.

#### EMPLOYMENT FIGURES

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12):** Thanks, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier's decision to abolish 29 job-creating programs contribute to South Australia now having the worst unemployment rate in the mainland?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir: are they claiming that whatever programs they were were job-creating? There is argument in the case.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is a rational one. I am going to allow the Premier an opportunity to respond.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:13):** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to my first answer. It was comprehensive and outlined why South Australia is doing well—creating more jobs.

#### ROAD UPGRADES

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:13):** My question is to the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Settle down.

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr DULUK:** I hope so.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Waite.

**Mr DULUK:** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister inform the house on the Marshall and Morrison governments' plan to bust congestion and fix nine intersections across metropolitan Adelaide?

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:13):** Thank you, Mr Speaker. I very much appreciate the opportunity from the member for Waite to answer this question and note his continual advocacy—some might say pest-like behaviour—in looking after his electorate and his desire to see congestion busting through the Mitcham Hills and down into the Adelaide metropolitan area.

We have been unveiling more and more of our plans over the past months since the federal budget, having worked with the federal Liberal Morrison government to deliver much-needed congestion-busting infrastructure here in Adelaide. It is a comprehensive plan that is going to see us unlock and get people out of their cars, not sitting at traffic lights and tearing their hair out but actually getting them to work and home from work, picking up the kids, and getting them to sit down at night. This is what happens when you have a grown-up relationship with the government of the day, and it is delivering for South Australians. It is delivering for South Australians over the course of the next four years.

We have the Torrens Road, Ovingham, level crossing upgrade, one that you, Mr Speaker, will note the member for West Torrens didn't want to support because he was trying to make a cheap political point. We have the Brighton Road, Hove, level crossing, something that I know the member for Gibson, the member for Black and the member for Morphet have been advocating for for a long time. This is a much-needed upgrade to a stretch of road that has become worse in terms of the traffic congestion that's on that road.

We have also the Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection upgrade at the bottom of the Mitcham Hills corridor. Those frustrated motorists, who have been winding their way down Old Belair Road, will now have a quicker ride once they get to the bottom of that stretch and be able to get through into the city much faster than they do now. We have the \$100 million upgrade to the Portrush Road-Magill Road intersection—Portrush Road being the most congested road in Adelaide and that intersection being one of the worst.

Finally, we are able to sit down, with fifty-fifty funding with the federal government, to put \$100 million on the table to upgrade this very important stretch of road. We also have the Springbank Road/Goodwood Road/Daws Road intersection—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —one that has received a lot of attention. It has taken 30 years to try to get something done—not much happening—and money delivered in the budget to deliver this intersection by 2022. That is a record that we are very proud to stand up and spruik all day long. We also have the \$35 million upgrade—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —of the Glen Osmond Road-Fullarton Road intersection.

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** Hear, hear!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I thank the member for Unley for his advocacy, noting that this is the intersection in his patch of the world that receives more complaints than any other. The crash statistics for that intersection are abhorrent, and we are going to fix it. We are going to provide that upgrade at a very key intersection of our network.

We also have the upgrades to the Main North Road-Nottage Terrace section of Main North Road at Scotty's Corner, a very congested part of our road network. We also have an upgrade to Main North Road/McIntyre Road/Kings Road—again, further out north. Main North Road is a road that has been neglected for a long period of time by those opposite. We are putting money on the table to fix it.

We also have the Grand Junction Road-Hampstead Road intersection upgrade, a very key part of the existing freight network and a key freight productivity improvement that we are putting on the table to make it much safer for trucks to move around our city. This is what happens when you have a Marshall Liberal government and a Morrison Liberal government in charge, at federal and state levels, here across our state, and it is delivering in spades for the people of South Australia.

#### **DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:17):** My question is also to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister assure the house that the cost of repairs to the two sections of the collapsed roadway of the Darlington project are not currently being funded by the consortium from the \$620 million Darlington project budget?

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

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Not really, no.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:18):** I would never defy your ruling in that way, sir. I have answered this question publicly a whole series of times, after providing the almost daily updates that we have done since this issue first came to light, and that question of cost has been asked. The answer at the moment is that it's too early to say.

We are in a phase at the moment where testing is being undertaken. A whole series of testing is currently being undertaken to get to the point where we can make those decisions about what the fix is going to be at the Darlington interchange. Cone penetrometer testing is being undertaken along the 220-metre section of road in question, between Sturt Road and Flinders Drive. There will also be the same CPT works being undertaken along the other 1,300-metre section of the lower motorway, again, to provide that additional assurance.

We also have piezometer testing being undertaken to look at water table levels in conjunction with SA Water. Again, it is another step we are taking to get to the heart of how it is that this water got behind the shotcrete wall. We also see works starting on site today to scrape back those two sections that have subsided so that we can actually get a physical look at the profile of the soil behind where these issues have occurred, and there will also now be some soil testing undertaken along those sections in the coming days. All of this will happen and unfold over the coming weeks because we are taking—

**The Hon. A. Koutsantonis:** Who's paying for that?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens interjects, 'Who's paying for it?' and he is warned.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We are undertaking a very thorough process. The Aurecon independent experts are there to provide us that pathway. We are essentially doing this testing to give them the assurance that they can sign off that this fix is going to be complete once and for all. We are taking a very cautious approach to that. I know there are those, especially the member for West Torrens, who would love nothing more than to point fingers but, first and foremost, our responsibility is to get this right and to get this fixed and that is what our focus has been.

This is a design-construct contract. This means that, when this project was first put together, back in 2015, 2016 and 2017, the design works were being undertaken by the constructor. Those design works are done by a design house and then go to an independent private company that verifies those designs, and then the department does their own internal drawing checks as well. That

work all happened before we came to government. What we then see is the contractor going on to build. There are again verification processes in place at each step of the way that the work is being undertaken.

While I was on site last week, I had the opportunity to meet everybody, so the people from the contract who are undertaking work, and they were doing their own verification checks. There was then the private company that was providing the verification of that work and, then again, departmental staff who were undertaking their own checks. That process has been done all along in building this very complex piece of road.

What we have at the moment is a group of experts from Aurecon who are going step-by-step—back from when this project was first thought of, was first funded and first got underway—and working their way through a methodical process to get back to today and make sure that, at every step of the way, everything has been done correctly.

We will wait for that advice before deciding on the next steps, but South Australians can have every assurance that this government is taking every step necessary to make sure that this issue, which isn't good enough, not only doesn't happen again but that the fix we put in place for these two sections does the job once and for all.

#### **DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Is the taxpayer funding the cost of the investigations of the cause of the collapse at the Darlington South Road project?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:22):** I refer to my previous answer.

#### **DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:22):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How much money from the \$620 million taxpayer-funded budget to build the Darlington north-south corridor project has been spent to date on investigations and remedies relating to the collapse of the embankments at the Darlington project?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:23):** Again, that's the third way to ask the same question, and I will refer to the first answer.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens is still interjecting and he is warned for a second and final time. If he wants to be ejected today, he is going about it the right way.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Well, it might end up that way. The member for Finniss has the call.

#### **AGTECH**

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:23):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on the government's approach to capitalise on opportunities in agtech and grow agriculture in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:23):** I thank the member for Finniss for that very important question. He knows, as a dairy farmer in a previous life, just how important technology in particular can be to help primary producers and keep them globally competitive. A key focus for this government is going to be agtech and the adoption of technology on farm, the growing of agriculture, the growing of horticulture and how agtech can be an enabler to not only be more competitive but also make us produce more with

less. I think it is very, very important, but the fact is the primary producer is now looking for tools to make them more competitive, more productive, and agtech will be the answer.

Just this week, nominations closed for my agtech advisory group. There was very, very strong interest. I was overrun with almost 70 nominations for the eight-person panel. What that group will do is provide me with independent advice on opportunities and long-term strategies for greater adoption and commercialisation, particularly with the R&D programs that we see. Many of the universities and many of our research stations nowadays have done some outstanding R&D work, but it's the next step. How do we commercialise that? How do we adopt that? The agtech sector is one of the sectors that will continue to evolve. As part of the agency, I am going to make sure the department have agtech as a priority.

I can also announce to the house today that we will be hosting the agtech industry forum in September, prior to the Growing SA conference. The Growing SA conference has been an outstanding success. Growers are attracted to that conference from all over the country, and I would like to think that South Australia is now in the box seat not only for promoting agtech but for being a leader in adoption and adopting some of those R&D projects.

Agtech is producing efficiencies in the supply chain and often providing cost savings to our primary producers who are competing on a global stage. Whether it be drones, robots, lasers, nanoscale sensors, blockchain, greater data measurements or analytics, technology is helping to create greater market access and return a more premium price to farmers and growers. For them to be able to do that, for a government to be able to assist them to do that, it will make them more competitive. They will then be able to forward invest, making sure that they can grow their businesses, be more competitive and put the produce that the world expects us to put on those people's tables.

Those new technologies can support agricultural businesses to drive growth, and one of the mantras of this government was that we would drive growth, that we would be better custodians of food production and that we would support product traceability. The agtech sector has the potential to be a significant economic enabler and here in South Australia we want to be a part of the national target. The national target is for primary production to be of a value of \$100 billion by 2030 and South Australia must be onboard. We must be a part of that and I am hellbent on making sure that South Australia is a leader not only with agtech but with food production and being globally competitive.

#### **DARLINGTON UPGRADE PROJECT**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:27):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Who is meeting the costs of the services from Aurecon that the minister mentioned in an earlier answer to the house?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:27):** This is the same question now for a fourth time.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! We have the question. I would like to hear the answer.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Can I say that it is still too early to be pointing fingers.

**Mr Picton:** To know who is paying?

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** What we are doing at the moment is undertaking the work necessary to get this issue fixed, but I can reassure South Australians of two things; firstly, the contract is very robust. The contract protects the government and the taxpayer to a huge extent. What the South Australian people should also know is that they have a government that will protect their interests to the greatest extent possible using every tool that we have in the contract to hold those who build this project to account. We will continue to do that, but we aren't going to let issues like this get in the way of undertaking the testing, designing and remediating of this site and getting on and finishing this project.

For motorists who are driving on the surface road each day, who drive past this project, who so dearly want to be utilising this upgrade to its full extent, they want us to get on and deliver this as quickly as possible and that is precisely what we are doing. We will use our existing levers to make sure that we protect taxpayers to the greatest extent possible, but we aren't going to be catastrophising anything. We aren't going to be pointing fingers before we are ready to, but we will act in a mature and grown-up fashion and we will get on and deal with this issue.

### ROAD FUNDING

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:29):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister assure the house that the state government will match the funding announced by both political parties at the most recent federal election to grade separate Torrens Road at Ovingham, Brighton Road at Hove and Cross Road at Westbourne Park?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29):** There were actually some incorrect statements in that question. What is interesting is that I have actually been seeking, since the federal budget was handed down, for there to be bipartisan support for the nine projects that are there in the federal budget. It doesn't necessarily need to be bipartisan support for—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Deputy Premier and the member for Badcoe are called to order.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** These projects are in the budget. The issue that we could see is, if there is a change of government on Saturday, what happens to the projects that the member for West Torrens didn't just talk about. What happens to that money? Does that mean that a future government is going to try to take that money away?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, sir: this is clearly debate, now.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, with respect to the member for West Torrens, the minister is beginning to deviate. I ask him to come back to the substance of the question, thank you.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The question was about bipartisanship for projects.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the question.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** All I am calling for is bipartisanship on projects that are already in the federal budget, but obviously that is beyond those opposite.

In relation specifically to the Cross Road intersection in Westbourne Park—again, the question tried to suggest that it was in the federal budget and it's not; it is an election commitment that has been made by the Labor Party—we very clearly want to wait for the outcomes of our GlobeLink planning study that's being undertaken at the moment. We expect that to come down and be handed to us in coming months. We said very clearly before the election that we want to explore this visionary idea, that we want to put the facts of it on the table. We put \$20 million in last year's budget to make that happen—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —and that is currently underway. We want to make sure that we get that evidence, we want to see what it says and then decide what is best to happen in that corridor. Until that happens, I think the most important thing is for there to be bipartisan support for all of the money that is in the federal budget for infrastructure projects for South Australia. Before we start talking about any new ones, I think that we should see—

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

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



**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —an unequivocal commitment from Bill Shorten and Anthony Albanese into those projects before we go one step further.

#### FEDERAL ELECTION

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:31):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney update the house about cases of bullying of political candidates over the last 24 hours?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:32):** I thank the member for her question; she was clearly a candidate under fire, when she came into this parliament, of the tactics used against candidates. Nobody in this room—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** —would be objectionable to understanding that during a political campaign there will be robust debate, there will be comprehensive questioning and there will be scrutiny in relation to announced policies; everyone accepts that. But the information that has come to my attention in the last 24 hours of the most disgraceful display of material across the campaign office of the member for Boothby is utterly shameful. It should be condemned by everyone in this house. For those who haven't been apprised of what has occurred, please be aware that the most crude and offensive descriptor has been sprawled across the front of the campaign—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Well, you can say, 'What does it say?'

*Members interjecting:*

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

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left and right, be quiet. The Deputy Premier has the call.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** The dollar fee claimed for a sexual act is also sprawled across the campaign office, across and traversing the posters of Ms Flint. This behaviour is not acceptable by anyone's standards. Every one of us welcomed two members of parliament to this parliament recently, one of them, the member for Enfield, a woman who has stood as a candidate for the Labor Party in the election. Neither she nor anybody else should be the subject of this type of behaviour. It is not acceptable, therefore, that when a federal candidate, the member for Boothby, Ms Flint, is the subject of this disgusting behaviour, that she, too, should have universal condemnation from all sides of politics.

We stand to say that this behaviour is offensive, it is abusive, it is rude, it is unacceptable, it is ugly, and it must be condemned. I ask the Leader of the Opposition to make a very clear statement that he also condemns this. We don't know yet who is responsible for this disgusting behaviour, but it should be universally condemned, and I am appalled that the Leader of the Opposition has not come out and made a statement to that effect.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left and right! I know that the federal election is imminent. I expect the decorum of this house to lift in the next half an hour, or members will be departing today. The member for West Torrens has the call.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left, be quiet, or you will be leaving the chamber. I don't care who you are; you will be leaving the chamber if this continues. The member for West Torrens has the call.

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:35):** My question is for the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Why does the minister persist in telling South Australians that public transport patronage is down when his own budget papers show that Adelaide Metro patronage is at record levels and forecast patronage will continue to rise?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:36):** The information that I have received, which has been made public, shows that, in the three years to 2017, we have seen a drop in total patronage, across our network, of—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —500,000 people. That is the information that I have been supplied. It is supplied to me by the people who collect the information, and I am confident of its veracity and accuracy.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:36):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Has the backlog of foster and kinship carer assessments and the backlog of child protection investigations been cleared?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:37):** I will take that on notice and get a full answer back to the house.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:37):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. After 30 June, will there be any reduction in full-time workers currently employed in response to the Nyland royal commission recommendations?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:37):** The budget will be announced, as it is every year. You can wait and find out what happens after that.

### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:37):** Can the minister inform the house how many FTEs employed in response to the Nyland royal commission recommendations are due to expire on 30 June?

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:37):** The FTEs announced under the Nyland royal commission were for a short time period, a set time period. Any of those that will be extended or are ending will be announced in the budget.

### SOUTH AUSTRALIAN FILM INDUSTRY

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:38):** My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister update the house on the increasing activity within the screen industry here in South Australia?

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:38):** I can and I will. I thank the member for Heysen for his interest in the screen sector here in South Australia. The Liberal government's huge announcement on Tuesday—and it was a big announcement—was that the South Australian Film Corporation has secured the production of the movie *Mortal Kombat*. Just to refresh your memory, Mr Speaker, \$70 million has been invested in South Australia. There are 600 jobs and—the thing I am most excited about—1,500 extras. I was one as a teenager. It was a great experience, and I would recommend it to anybody. Of 1,500 comments on the *Tiser* Facebook

page, every second comment was an inquiry about how to be an extra in *Mortal Kombat*. But I digress.

I am excited to announce today that a new TV drama will begin production in South Australia. It is a six-part series called *Stateless* and it will be produced at the Adelaide Studios at Glenside. Filming will commence next month. It will star a multi award-winning cast, including Yvonne Strahovski; Jai Courtney; Asher Keddie, famous for her roles in *Paper Giants* and *Offspring*; Fayssal Bazzi; Dominic West; and Cate Blanchett, who is also part of the co-creating team.

*Stateless* is financed with the support of the ABC and the South Australian Film Corporation. It will be distributed—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** —by NBCUniversal to be viewed by audiences worldwide. It is another international production by the Adelaide Film Corporation. It is another significant gain for the South Australian film and production industry right here, right now in South Australia, which is expanding at a rapid rate as the state's reputation as a world-class screen production hub gains further recognition. The South Australian film industry contributed a record \$119.5 million to the state's economy in the last financial year.

*Mortal Kombat* and *Stateless* are both exciting announcements and they highlight the importance of the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to support the creative arts as an industry that is delivering exciting career opportunities for South Australians, and young South Australians in particular. Young South Australians can stay in South Australia and have exciting careers without having to move to Sydney, Melbourne or overseas.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Of course, they are producing terrific opportunities right around the state, whilst enabling the screen sector to update technologies and techniques to keep pace with a rapidly changing international industry.

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

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

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** The Chief Executive of the South Australian Film Corporation, Courtney Gibson, said she was pleased to be supporting the development of a landmark series, featuring an all-female writing and directing team. Full production and post production will occur at the Adelaide Studios and locations around South Australia.

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:41):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Is the minister outsourcing the assessment of foster or kinship carers to a Victorian company, Assessments Australia, or any other private or non-government organisations?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:42):** No.

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

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

#### CHILD PROTECTION

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:42):** My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. How does the minister plan to achieve her savings task of \$4.4 million starting from 30 June?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:42):** As I have mentioned before, you will have to wait and see when the budget is announced.

**Ms Stinson:** You don't even know the answer to that one. It's actually in the budget papers.

**The SPEAKER:** Is there another question?

**Ms STINSON:** No, there's not, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** In that case, I will switch to the member for Colton. I will come back to the leader.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** I ask that that shouting discontinue.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! The Premier hasn't been ejected in a while from this house. The member for Colton.

### CLIMATE CHANGE

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:43):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is seeking to restore our precious coastline through world-leading seagrass projects?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:43):** I thank the member for Colton for his question in relation to seagrass. I know he is a passionate advocate and champion for the coastline, not only in his own electorate of Colton but also across our state. We have 5,067 kilometres of coastline in South Australia. The Marshall Liberal government believes that caring for that coastline is an incredibly important part of the front-line fight against climate change.

We went to the 2018-19 state election with a commitment to significantly increase our spending by \$5.2 million on coastal protection and coastal projects. We are committed to putting funding towards practical projects that have a clear impact on climate change, whether that is adapting to climate change, mitigating the impacts of climate change or reducing our emissions.

We know that blue carbon is a particularly interesting and growing sector within the carbon sequestration economy. Blue carbon—that is, using marine environments to store carbon—actually provides a much greater opportunity to effectively store carbon than on-land efforts. While they are more challenging to get established, it is worth directing effort towards blue carbon projects because, if we can get those to establish, if we can develop methodology around them and if we can get them working really well for us here in South Australia, we can of course take that knowledge and leadership to other parts of the world as well.

We are a leader in dealing with climate change here. That is something that has occurred under the leadership of governments of various political persuasions—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —and it is something that this government is continuing. When it comes to seagrass and blue carbon, we get multiple benefits. That includes not only having a place to sequester carbon but also creating habitat for wildlife and for conservation purposes, and also slowing down the speed of wave action, which of course results in less erosion and a reduction in the effects of increasing storm events. We know that one of the impacts of climate change here in South Australia, with our particularly vulnerable coastline, is the impact of storm events.

Our seagrass project will see \$1 million spent on re-establishing seagrass meadows across our metropolitan coastline. Over the last 50 years, we have lost around one-third of the seagrasses of metropolitan Adelaide, equating to some 6,000 hectares of lost seagrasses—largely as a consequence of nutrient outflows from our rivers, creeks and wastewater plants. We know that those nutrients have dropped off in recent years. It has become a really good time, with increasing water quality, to get seagrasses re-established.

At 15 sites, largely between Outer Harbor and West Beach, we will be looking at opportunities to implement a world-first type of seagrass restoration, using hessian sacks implanted with seagrass plants. We will be dropping those at 15 sites in June. Into September, we will be monitoring those to

work out how the recruitment is going. Then, in the following year, we will be looking at expanding those sites up to an area of up to one hectare of seagrass restoration. It's a really exciting project: it's good for our environment, it creates habitat and it sequesters carbon as well, which is key in our fight against climate change.

#### BRAND SOUTH AUSTRALIA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:47):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier stripped all funding from Brand SA?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:47):** It's quite clear to me that the opposition have run out of questions because they asked precisely these questions in the Legislative Council. They were texted up to the dream factory on the second floor: 'Kevin, Kevin, send me some questions.' Kevin would have run out, so he said, 'We've asked these in the Leg. Co. Give them a whirl down below.'

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order: this is just debate, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** The question was about whether funding was stripped from Brand SA. I uphold the point of order. I ask the Premier to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the answers that we have provided in the Legislative Council.

**Mr Brown:** Now we're cutting the answers.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Playford, you can leave for the rest of question time, under 137A. Thank you. When he does, the Leader of the Opposition will have the call.

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

#### I CHOOSE SA

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48):** My question is to the Premier. Has the I Choose SA campaign been defunded as well?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:48):** All these issues will be dealt with in the upcoming budget, but it's fair to say that we did commission, and have now received, the Joyce review into the operation of trade, tourism and investment in South Australia. Our focus in South Australia will be on putting our money towards promoting South Australia in interstate and overseas markets. The previous government had a single focus on promoting South Australia, particularly in the lead-up to elections. That was one of their favourite areas of exposure. They would often promote tourism opportunities to come to South Australia in cinemas in South Australia just before an election.

We thought it would be better to promote coming to South Australia to people who weren't living in South Australia, and it is fair to say this will be our focus. We have an ambition for South Australia. We want to grow the size of our economy. We want to bring more people from interstate and overseas. We want to bring more investment dollars from interstate and overseas and so we will be doing everything we can to promote those opportunities outside of this state.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:49):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Does the minister stand by his statements to the house that there will be no cuts to train services across the Adelaide Metro network?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:50):** Yes.

#### COMMUNITY TRANSITION AND LEARNING CENTRE

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:50):** My question is to the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services. Can the minister advise the house on the joint state and federal government's investment in a new community transition and learning centre, and how this will improve support to Indigenous offenders after their release from custody?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:50):** I truly thank the member for King for her interest in this. This is a great initiative and a very important project for South Australia. I am pleased to inform the house that this is another example of how well the Marshall government and the Morrison government have come together to jointly fund an exciting and innovative project. The new community transition and learning centre will be built in Coober Pedy and, again, this is how and why we are delivering better services for South Australia.

As everyone in this place is aware, there is a significant over-representation of Indigenous offenders in the South Australian justice system, with around one-quarter of South Australia's offender population being Indigenous, and that just isn't acceptable. Importantly, Indigenous offenders also face a higher rate of reoffending than non-Indigenous offenders at around 75 per cent. In a bipartisan manner, this place is very committed to reducing reoffending in the 10by20 program.

It is no surprise that Indigenous offenders, in particular Indigenous men from the APY lands, face additional challenges and complexities due to geographic isolation, social and economic disadvantage and intergenerational trauma. The Marshall government is committed to rehabilitation programs that reduce recidivism where possible and break down the cycle of imprisonment. The complex nature of Indigenous reoffending gives rise to the need to develop tailored rehabilitation programs, and experience shows that delivering services on or close to the APY lands can be very effective.

Since coming to this place, this government has been working hard to deliver the community learning and transition centre in the Far North of South Australia. I was up in the APY lands just a few months ago. There are challenges up there, and this is one project we think will very much help in aiding people in that community who have been put before our justice system. This exciting project is another example of how the Marshall government is working hard with our federal colleagues to deliver not only funding but better services for our community. Again, I thank the federal Morrison government for their support of this project. It is amazing what can be achieved when you have a good relationship with the federal government.

The centre will deliver a place based on response to the geographic exclusion and disadvantage Indigenous offenders face. We know there is disadvantage across the correctional system, and the challenges faced by Indigenous offenders are not always that different from the challenges facing all offenders, including lack of suitable accommodation, drug and alcohol issues and employment pathways.

However, there is no denying that the remoteness of our Far North communities results in additional disadvantages for Indigenous offenders. That is why we have worked with the federal Morrison government to secure joint funding for the community transition and learning centre project. I am proud that we are delivering this project and that we are addressing the needs of Indigenous offenders as they return to their communities on community-based orders.

A significant amount of work has been undertaken to enable this project to commence, not least of all through the federal government and their \$2.3 million investment and a strong working relationship with the Far North communities and landowners. It is my hope that the centre will result in long-term sustainable outcomes through the provision of targeted services, cultural support, skill development, future employment, and drug and alcohol support as well. By assisting Indigenous offenders to complete their custodial orders in the community, they will receive targeted support that ultimately will assist in reducing reoffending. I look forward to updating the house on the important project as construction gets underway.

#### **NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY ONLINE**

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:54):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Given that there are again problems with the NAPLAN online testing today, will the minister pull the plug and admit that the results will not be valid for the students who have experienced disruptions?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:54):** I thank the member for the question. Her continual catastrophisation of the way that this is going, I think, really sends a very different message from that which she expressed throughout her entire ministerial

career. The NAPLAN is not meant to be a high-stakes test that should determine the outcomes for students' future education, future life. This is not a students' SACE—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The deputy leader will get further briefings if she likes about how the school improvement model works, but the NAPLAN writing examination is indeed not relevant in that sense. The fact is that there were unacceptable problems on Tuesday.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The member for Croydon can get a briefing on how NAPLAN works if he likes, but his interjections are utterly irrelevant.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Perhaps you could get a briefing for the IT coordinator as well.

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

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** As I said on Tuesday, there were problems that were unacceptable on NAPLAN. The member for Lee's suggestion that these were South Australian government problems is possibly lent a lie by the fact that some other states had these problems, too. He can get on the phone and talk to New South Wales or Queensland or Western Australia or Victoria if he likes.

We are very disappointed that this has taken place. We have serious questions to ask of ESA, the company which is owned by all the education ministers and which provides the technical device that delivers the NAPLAN online checks. However, the advice I have received is that, as of 12.30pm today, from having 103 schools of the 500 report platform connectivity issues on Tuesday, today there were three, and that is significant improvement.

There may well have been more that have been reported in the last couple of hours, but it is clear that the issues are far diminished from two days ago, and that is good news. There are also a couple of things that the government in South Australia is responsible for which we have done to ensure our diligence here.

First, we put on extra technical support over the last two days, and those men and women have certainly been earning their money. Today, I can also advise the house that there are a number of schools that have used the other backup, which is of course the provision of paper and pen tests where necessary. We provisioned for that for all schools, and schools have gone through that protocol. There were three on the first day and six government schools on the second day have done that. So nine of those 400 or so government schools in the first two days moved to paper and pen.

The utterly overwhelming majority of our students have been able to undertake their tests with no or very minimal inconvenience. I invite you to reflect on the young student who was interviewed on the tele on Tuesday night. We sent the press to one of the schools when they invited us to give them an opportunity to film a classroom doing NAPLAN tests. We invited them to a school that had some of these issues, and the girl who was interviewed described the challenge that she had of waiting for a couple minutes for the server to connect, and then she was able to undertake the test. She didn't look too stressed, I have to say.

Other students had different experiences, and it is unacceptable when that happens, but the catastrophisation put on this by the member for Port Adelaide suggests that this is a high-stakes test that is going to determine a student's future. We should be taking the opportunity at all turns—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** —to reduce the stress level on students because this is not a high-stakes test that determines a student's future. This is not a high-stakes test that determines what sort of job somebody is going to get: it is a check on their academic progress, and something

they shouldn't be stressing about, shouldn't be worrying about. That is the important message for us to be telling all of our children, all of the students, in our system.

### NATIONAL LITERACY AND NUMERACY ONLINE

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:58):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Does he minister stand by his statement that paper tests and online tests are comparable?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:58):** The point I have made is that there was significant analysis into whether the 2018 online tests and the 2018 paper tests were comparable. The Education Council was hosted by South Australia, and I have to say that was a very enjoyable experience hosting the other ministers and bringing them to South Australia last year. South Australia also offered to host the review on behalf of the Education Council.

I understand that there is a very specific skill set in terms of analysing this data, and many of the academics in this area who have the skill set by and large have been involved, in one way or another, with ACARA or other bodies in producing this data and these tests over the years. The Education Council review of whether material is comparable or not did, in fact, go to the point of seeking academics who had never been involved. That review was undertaken and information was provided to ministers that the data was comparable.

*Dr Close interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** The deputy leader is now asking a different question because the deputy leader is now talking about the lags and dropouts we had this week. Obviously, that's something that we need to take seriously, and we will look into it.

### WOMEN'S SUFFRAGE ANNIVERSARY, SCHOOLS COMPETITION

**Mrs POWER (Elder) (15:00):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister please update the house on the research competition to mark the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of women's suffrage?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:00):** I am conscious of the time, and I want to ensure that the opposition has more questions, so I will update the house, but I certainly won't take four minutes to do so. I want to pay tribute—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Well, I'm hoping that the member for Florey and I will have the opportunity to ask and answer more questions on this issue in the coming weeks because there's a lot of very exciting work that's being done in the education department to celebrate and commemorate 125 years of women's suffrage here in South Australia. I for one have always felt privileged being in this chamber between these two magnificent tapestries that were part of the contribution to celebrate 100 years, and I pay tribute to the member for Florey and, indeed, all the other members of the house who spoke on her motion to form a committee to celebrate the 125<sup>th</sup> anniversary of suffrage.

One particular mechanism by which the education department is contributing to this historic event is through a project and a prize for students in years 6 to 9 in all South Australian schools. They are invited to enter a research competition, develop an understanding of the tireless efforts of so many South Australians over so many years, over decades in the 19<sup>th</sup> century, that brought us to this extraordinary achievement. It is one of the first places in the world to allow women to vote and the first parliament that I'm aware of to allow women to stand for that parliament. Standing in front of the portraits of Joyce Steele and of Jessie Cooper, of course, in the other place, we are reminded of that.

The competition is open until 30 August. I am going to be writing to all members of the parliament, along with my colleague in the other house Michelle Lensink, who is a co-sponsor of this event. I encourage all members to encourage students in their electorates to make a contribution, if



they are in years 6 to 9, between now and 30 August. Hopefully, members are doing newsletters and they can promote it through those as well. Student winners and high achievers will be invited to a recognition ceremony here at Parliament House on 19 November. This is not the only work that the education department is doing, but it's an important part of that work. I encourage all members on both sides of the chamber to get involved.

#### COUNTRY ROAD SPEED LIMITS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Has the minister received a cost estimate to implement his government's policy to increase speed limits on regional roads, and can he confirm to the house that the estimate is close to \$150 million?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:03):** I just want to know how the figure got made up. Did he make it up when he woke up and looked at himself in the mirror this morning? Did he make it up by writing it down on a piece of paper just now?

We are committed to delivering an election promise to deliver increased speed limits on the eight roads, and I receive continual representations from country MPs whose electorates are going to benefit from this.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries is warned, as is the member for Kaurna.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** We have said very clearly all along that we are going to fix those roads. As to this \$150 million figure, I can only dare imagine what dark recess in the mind of the member for West Torrens that has come from, but it's incorrect.

**The SPEAKER:** I ask members not to reflect on other members. The member for West Torrens has the call.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:03):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister rule out any increases in public transport fares in the upcoming budget?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:04):** I think that question answers itself. There is a budget that is being handed down on 18 June. I know that the member will eagerly await its delivery to this chamber, and I will help him find the page appropriate at that time.

#### PUBLIC TRANSPORT FARES

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. When will the government announce the outcome of a new public transport fare structure with the aim of significantly increasing patronage?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:04):** It's clear that the member for West Torrens has been reading our election policy document. I know that the member for Unley will be very pleased with that. There is some background work that's being done, but that is a job that the new South Australian Public Transport Authority will be tasked with working through. As I said, the background detail is being compiled.

As we announced last Friday, we are putting together a South Australian public transport authority, which will essentially be a division within my department, but a joined-up division within my department, as opposed to a set of disparate functions. There will be an advisory board that will provide advice not only to that body but also to me as the minister. This is a task that they will be tasked with completing and it will be done in an iterative fashion.

When you want to reform the public transport system, it doesn't happen overnight. It doesn't happen quickly because there's a whole series of change that's being undertaken at the moment.

Not only have we created this new authority, which comes to an effect on 1 July, but we also have a bus services tender, a bus supply tender and a demand-responsive transport tender out there, and all of these moving parts need to come together to provide one integrated network. There's a lot of change happening in this space at the moment. The fare review forms one of those actions, and I look forward to seeing the outcome of that when it's appropriate.

### MOBILE PHONE CHARGING STATIONS

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:06):** My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. How many mobile phone charging stations have been installed at train stops, as committed to by the Marshall government at the last election?

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:06):** Well, this is—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Thank you, Mr Speaker.

**Mr Malinauskas:** He doesn't have an answer.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I do have an answer.

**The SPEAKER:** Let's hear it.

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Don't respond to interjections; it's disorderly.

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** The reason I'm a little bit perplexed here is because this has actually been announced. We did go to the election with a commitment to deliver mobile phone charging stations on train platforms but, after looking into the best way to deliver the solution, it was decided to put mobile phone charging stations inside the trains because people sit inside the train for longer than they sit on a train platform.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** There's also—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** There are also issues that we know exist around vandalism of our stations. Again, we think the opportunity to put a mobile phone charging station inside the trains—and it's being rolled out first through the electric units on the Seaford line—is a great step forward. It gives the opportunity for people to be able to charge their mobile phones—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** —whilst they sit on the ride in the electric railcar on the way into Adelaide. It's a great outcome. It's again an innovation that's been born under the new government, one that quite clearly the former government thought too hard to get done. Once again, it's an election commitment being delivered on that is going to improve public transport here in South Australia.

*Grievance Debate*

### PUBLIC TRANSPORT

**Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:08):** I spent this morning chatting with commuters at Clarence Park at my local train station—constituents of Badcoe of course but also, very importantly, constituents of Boothby. Like many other concerned citizens who took to tram stops and train stations this morning, I was there to alert people to the grave risk that the Liberals pose to our public transport

network. Under questioning just two days ago, we discovered that the Liberals are looking at taking our train and tram services out of public hands and flogging them off to the highest bidder. That has sent a shiver up the spine of train and tram users in my electorate and, more broadly, in Boothby.

Speaking with locals this morning, they are worried, and it is little wonder. One of the great attractions of living in our area is its proximity to public transport. The Seaford-Tonsley train line runs right through the spine of the seat of Badcoe and, of course, Boothby, which those opposite might want to take note of. The tramline to Glenelg crosses its breadth and our bus services along main drags, like Marion Road, Cross Road, Anzac Highway and South Road, deliver thousands of people to work each day.

When you buy or rent a house in our area, real estate agents crow about the close public transport and the variety of public transport options available in our area. It is a really strong selling point, and it is the reason why many people live in our area and are increasingly attracted to making a life in Boothby. It promises affordable transport, but it also reflects the environmental values of many who live in Badcoe and Boothby. People in our area put a premium on public transport, unlike those opposite, and they expect it as a basic service from their government, so to have that threatened is deeply shocking.

James approached me this morning asking if it was true that the Liberals are examining privatising the network. He was incredulous that any politician with any idea about our area would think that was a good idea. He actually wondered if it was fake news. James takes the train because he believes that climate change is real, quite unlike the member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint. James wants to see a better, greener world and he is doing his bit by leaving the car at home. He is concerned that services will be slashed and maintenance will be reduced if train and tramlines are privatised. He has not decided who to vote for yet, but he assured me this morning that he is not voting for Nicolle Flint now.

Another young man, who is around 20 years old, said that the train is vital for him. He told me that he works shifts and is already concerned by the bus cuts the Liberals have rolled out. He is worried that the frequency of the trams and trains in our area will be reduced if they are privatised, meaning that he will have to leave earlier to get to work and get home later, leaving him less time to study—and he is right to be concerned.

But probably most worryingly was an off-duty tram driver with whom I spoke. I will not name her, but she told me that she was grateful we were out there in the cool weather this morning fighting for her job. She and her colleagues know that their jobs are on the chopping block if the network is sold off. She talked about the pay and conditions for bus drivers being diminished when the Liberals privatised the bus network, telling me they copped a 30 per cent pay cut. She has now been talking with her family about whether to leave and find another job. Considering that she told me that it takes seven months to train a train driver, let's hope that this does not spark an exodus of skilled drivers who are now very nervous about how they will put food on the table for their families.

To her, and to all the other people who stopped this morning to give their thoughts, I say: we are here and we will fight for you and we will fight for your public transport network. Labor's candidate for the seat of Boothby, Nadia Clancy, was among those at train and tram stations this morning. You know what? Nadia Clancy is here for you as well. She will fight for you and she will fight for your public transport network. This weekend, the people of Boothby, people who value our trains, trams and buses, have a really clear way to express their fury at the Liberals: vote Labor this Saturday. Vote No. 1, Nadia Clancy, and vote for our public transport to stay in public hands.

### GLOSSOP HIGH SCHOOL

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:13):** It gives me great pleasure to rise today to speak about and celebrate a \$17.2 million commitment made by the Marshall Liberal government to Glossop High School, one of the oldest secondary schools in the electorate of Chaffey. Importantly, last week the government announced that Glossop High School will receive funding to boost the redevelopment of the senior campus, to bring those from the middle campus to one campus to create efficiencies and to bring a regional area up to world specification, which is really important.

The history of the school is that they have been operating since 1941. Glossop High School is the Riverland's oldest, with a current capacity of 650 students. A partial redevelopment occurred in 1974 and the school completed the final stages of a major upgrade project in 1997. A new senior campus was completed in mid-1998, when years 11 and 12 students moved into the facilities at Berri.

The school services the towns of Berri, Barmera and surrounding communities, where there are seven government and three non-government feeder primary schools. Currently, the split campuses are located roughly 10 kilometres apart: the middle school campus is in Glossop and the senior school campus is in Berri. The middle school campus is located on the Old Sturt Highway at Glossop and currently offers years 8 to 10. The senior campus offers years 11 and 12.

What this means is that the \$17.2 million in funding will create the capacity for 800 students, including year 7s for the first time, in 2022. The project will create a unified campus with modern, world-class learning facilities. It will deliver a new STEM space and the opportunity to create a new performance studio, new home economics and technology workshops, new administration buildings, additional car park spaces and upgraded home economics, performing arts and tech studies.

Students will have access to shared facilities with neighbouring TAFE amenities, including the sports fields, the newly built Berri sports stadium, the public library and other educational precincts. We know that the Riverland Special School is also neighbouring, so it potentially will become a Riverland educational precinct. By and large, it is something that the community has been looking for, but really it is about the students and giving them the opportunity to collaborate by bringing two campuses together and bringing the year 7s into high school in line with the national curriculum.

The distance between each of these campuses is approximately 10 kilometres. Currently, travelling time between those two campuses means that students, parents, teachers and staff are constantly on the highway between those two campuses. This creates serious time pressures for the staff and the administrators. We all know that access to quality teaching for all year levels will enable better preparation for the final years of high school and for the younger year levels.

The amalgamation and streamlining of the schools, particularly with the bus service, will create efficiencies. We know that Glossop has a large bus fleet that brings students in from a number of neighbouring communities. As I said, this is about giving the students better opportunities and a better educational experience. The Glossop High School enjoys a proud record and is strongly supported and valued by the community. The rich history of that school will continue and be preserved as the school moves forward with the amalgamations.

I want to acknowledge the staff at Glossop High School: the Glossop principal, Emily Griggs; the Glossop High School council; and the governing council chair, Ann Schutz, who I have worked with over a number of years to achieve this outstanding amalgamation. I have worked with three school principals at Glossop on the negotiations for this amalgamation and it gives me great satisfaction that we finally have a government that has seen the sense in amalgamating these two campuses.

I am really pleased to have been able to deliver what the local community has been advocating for. This project is a clear indication that a Marshall Liberal government is supporting our regions and our commitment to the long-term future of our regional communities, because #RegionsMatter.

### FEDERAL ELECTION

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:18):** We are in the middle of a very intense election campaign. Some people have made the comment that the federal election campaign is probably one of the more brutal, personal and grubby ones that this nation has seen. I think we all understand that democracy is robust and politics is tough, but this election is one that really matters.

There is a lot at stake. We are talking about the future of our nation. I want to take a couple of moments to talk not about the barbs or the campaign itself—I do not even want to say a single word about the opposition or their policies—but about what I think matters in this incredibly important debate that is going on within our country at the moment.

There are four things that are going to matter to me on Saturday. The first one is health. You are nothing without your health. I think that all of us in this nation subscribe to the idea that, if we can help people out by making sure that they are healthy all the time, that is a good thing to do. I think we all subscribe to the idea that your own personal health, the health of your family and children and the health of your neighbour should not be determined by the amount of money you have in the bank.

At this election, Labor has a serious proposition to put a lot more money back in our public hospital system. Public hospitals throughout the country are under an extraordinary strain, including right here in South Australia. Labor has a proposition to put in excess of \$2 billion extra into our public hospital network. They have a plan to put over \$2 billion into a specific Medicare cancer plan. That is about making sure that, no matter who you are, no matter how wealthy you are, you get access to cancer services that you need when you are facing one of the biggest challenges in your life.

The second is education. This world is changing at a rate that no-one has ever seen before in human history. It is becoming increasingly challenging to deal with the advancement of technology that is disrupting jobs, which we never thought was possible. If we are going to continue to have the standard of living that we enjoy in this country, we have to do everything that we can to invest in the muscle between the ears of our kids, in their heads.

We have to invest everything that we can to make sure that every last bit of human capital in this country, every last child, fulfils their potential. That is why public education is essential. At this election, Labor believes that, if we are serious about doing that, we have to invest more in public education so that every kid, regardless of their parents' wealth, has the opportunity to fulfil their potential. Labor has a plan to do that: a massive investment of over \$200 million right here in South Australia.

The third is the economy. We have a growing economy in this nation. We have one of the best standards of living anywhere in the world, but a lot of people are being left behind. Wages growth has never been lower in recorded history, for as long as the Australian Bureau of Statistics has been measuring it. Labor has a plan to do something about wages, including increasing the minimum wage. The minimum wage in Australia, for people who do not know, is a bit over \$37,000 per year. People in this place earn a lot more than that. I think that we can do a little bit more to help those people by increasing their wages.

Fourthly and finally is climate change. This is real. Saying that climate change is real can no longer be something that politicians say to tick a box on their way into parliament. When you are a political leader, when you aspire to be in parliament, and you say that climate change is real, that means you also take on the responsibility to do something about it. If we are serious about leaving this world a better place for our future generations, then we have a moral obligation to do something about climate change that will actually make a difference. Labor has a plan to do something about climate change. We do not just say it is real: we have a potential prime minister who is willing to do something about it.

The final point that I will make is in regard to Bill Shorten. I have known Bill for a long time. I know that lots of his policies are not universally loved amongst the electorate, but they are all about doing something regarding the list of things that I just talked about. When Bill came to parliament in 2007, Kevin Rudd made him the parliamentary secretary for disabilities, probably just to give him something to do and put him out of the way because he was clearly a rising star.

Bill took on that responsibility as parliamentary secretary for disabilities not as just some stepping stone but to use the power of government to do something about a community in this country that was largely forgotten. He turned the parliamentary secretary for disabilities into the National Disability Insurance Scheme. Imagine what he can achieve if he is Prime Minister of Australia. This weekend, I will vote Labor because I believe that climate change is real, I believe that every kid deserves a chance, I believe that every single sick person deserves the best health care they can get, and I also believe that this economy should deliver for everybody, not just the few.

### MOUNT GAMBIER GOLD CUP

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:24):** It is a bit hard to follow that griever, but I will give it a go. Last week, I attended Mount Gambier's annual Gold Cup racing carnival, which is one of South Australia's longest running—

**An honourable member:** Did you win?

**Mr BELL:** No, I did not win. It is one of the most popular regional race meetings. The racing industry is very well supported in our region and the Gold Cup Carnival is also a major economic contributor to Mount Gambier and the wider Limestone Coast. This year, six of the nine races were won by local trainers, so the prize money will go back into our local community to support local businesses and local jobs.

The flow-on effect from the Gold Cup Carnival supports trainers, jockeys, local hotels, caterers, hospitality staff, transport, accommodation, fashion businesses and the list goes on and on. The Mount Gambier Racing Club committee is to be congratulated on a successful event. I would like to acknowledge the president, John Fartch; vice-president, Mark Thompson; and members Barry Carrail, Tom Ellis, Graham Bell, Don Pegler, John O'Connor, Adam Creek and Maryanne Latchford.

The Glenburnie Racecourse has undergone a \$3.3 million redevelopment over the last two years to improve the track's drainage system and racing surface. Despite the success of this year's Gold Cup, there are some issues looming over our state's racing industry, which have recently been brought to my attention. Brett Watson is the General Manager of the Mount Gambier Racing Club and he has raised some concerns about the future of South Australian racing and in particular the point of consumption tax.

It is good that the minister is here today because he has offered me time in his office with his staff to talk about the point of consumption tax. Brett Watson has written to the Treasurer, and I quote:

We strongly believe our club is vital to the future of the racing industry...The future of our club is dependent on the current and future State Governments providing an adequate level of funding to remain both sustainable and provide for capital improvements.

As the only regional dedicated training facility, the current loss of revenue directly impacts the viability of many of the region's trainers, due to the reduction in prizemoney.

Apart from the fact the POC [point of consumption tax] is significantly higher than Australia's two largest states (New South Wales and Victoria), South Australia is now the only state which does not use the POC tax to provide any ongoing industry support.

Other state governments are supporting their racing industries, leading to an exodus of industry personnel looking for better returns across the border.

The current situation is not sustainable and is severely disadvantaging our industry [in South Australia].

Point of consumption tax is designed to generate revenue from online betting, and the tax is payable where the bet is placed; therefore, bets placed in South Australia generate revenue for the South Australian government. The rate differs state by state, but South Australia's 15 per cent tax rate is equal highest in Australia, along with Western Australia and Queensland, and significantly higher than New South Wales and Victoria, at 10 per cent and 8 per cent respectively. The state government retains about \$60 million a year from the tax. This tax is having a big impact on the racing industry.

In December last year, Thoroughbred Racing SA announced a \$2.25 million cut in infrastructure funding for its 25 clubs due to the impact of the tax. The body was also forced to cut over \$1 million in prize money. Frances Nelson, the Chair of Thoroughbred Racing SA, said that the body had 'no choice', as revenue was being directly impacted by the tax. She said:

The prizemoney cuts will also have a direct impact on...our ability to attract trainers from New South Wales, Victoria and NZ [New Zealand] as we have in the past. More importantly, it will also inhibit our ability to keep our trainers in South Australia, some of whom are already moving their operations interstate, with the resultant loss of jobs...

Quite often when industries come to you as a local member, the first thing you say is, 'Don't always come with a problem; come with a solution.' The racing industry have spoken to me about their solution and what they would like to see—because this industry supports more than 3,600 people

and generates \$400 million every year in economic benefits for South Australia—is the POC be reduced to 10 per cent and 75 per cent of that point of consumption tax returned to the industry. It is derived from the industry, so it goes back.

This would leave South Australia in a neutral position in regard to the state government, where the government does not put money into the industry but also does not take money away from the industry. More precisely, any money raised by the industry is returned to the industry.

### BEEKEEPING INDUSTRY

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:29):** Recently, I asked a question of the Minister for Agriculture. The question involved the importance of beekeeping and pollination services to the South Australian economy. In that question, I asked the minister if he would consider an advisory body for himself and the department to get the best possible advice on pollination in South Australia. Through my question, I made the case that such a body needed to bring together, under one umbrella, beekeepers and those people who require pollination services.

Currently in South Australia, annual honey production is worth up to an average of \$11 million to the South Australian economy. However, the importance of almond and lucerne production, which also requires pollination, is estimated to be worth around \$650 million to the South Australian economy. While in his answer the minister did not give an outright no to the suggestion of an advisory committee made up of beekeepers and farmers, he gave a less than emphatic response to this proposition, and I quote:

There is a capacity for PIRSA to look at a potential advisory group on how we can further support the apiary industry.

He further suggested that the department was working closely with beekeepers in South Australia. As I understand it, the reality is a little bit different from this. Only a fraction of the beekeepers involved in this vital South Australian industry are represented by the South Australian Apiarists' Association (SAAA). Unfortunately, many beekeepers do not seem to have a lot of faith in this organisation. I am sad to say that some have been actively shunned by this organisation, an organisation that must, as should any organisation that wants to be effective and inclusive, act democratically and always with the best interests of its industry success and wellbeing as its focus.

Whilst it is not an issue in this place, but perhaps should be elsewhere, I am told that some members of the association were expelled for going to a member of parliament with evidence that could point towards what could be described as loose or unethical practices. That is why the position of the department is so important in being seen to be at arm's length from any one group or individual. It needs to be seen as totally impartial, willing to be consultative, acting only on all the evidence and guided by best practice.

The relationship with the department must include more than a handful of SAAA members and ensure that as many voices as possible from the whole beekeeping fraternity are involved in decision-making. Apart from the expulsion of a couple of beekeepers from this association—an action that could in itself raise questions—there are other beekeepers who are raising serious concerns. This is too important a situation, where any adverse impact on the vulnerable biosecurity of bees could threaten the livelihoods of so many people and so much production. Could this be a case where a number of individuals have a lot to lose without due consideration of the common good?

South Australia would have much to gain from a broader, more inclusive and essentially voluntary body to give advice to the minister and his department. It might well be suggested that, through the Farmers' Federation and other organisations, farmers requiring pollination services have access to the department. There is no doubt that this is true, but what I am putting to the house here today, for the urgent consideration of the minister, is the necessity for him and his department to have access to an overarching organisation that brings in a broad cross-section—not a narrow one—of participants from within the beekeeping fraternity, together with those farmers requiring their services.

The minister has, I hope, given active consideration to this proposition since I brought it up in the house in a recent question and supplementary question without notice. I ask the minister and,

though the minister, his department to put in place the necessary arrangements on which I have elaborated today.

There is room for improvement. There needs to be an open and inclusive process that challenges the current status quo between a few beekeepers, rather than a broad number, and the department. A more widespread representative body, giving full and proper advice to the minister and his department, is the way to go—and sooner rather than later. I look forward to seeing this body brought together, and I will be watching the implementation of better, democratic and more consultative dealings between the department, the beekeepers and the farmers of this state.

### FEDERAL ELECTION

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:33):** I suppose politics in Australia has always been played pretty hard for many years, both at a South Australian level and across the nation. However, it concerns me that in recent years the tone, especially around election campaigns, has changed. Several instances certainly come to mind, and one is the infamous campaign in Mawson about putting your family first.

**The Hon. C.L. Wingard:** Dodgy.

**Mr DULUK:** It was pretty dodgy, as the member for Gibson highlights, and a pretty veiled deception for the voters in Mawson. Another recent one that comes to mind is 'You can't trust Habib', an absolutely racist, despicable attack on the then candidate for Elder in the 2014 election, who is of course now the member for Elder. I have to pay tribute to the Hon. Ed Husic MP, a New South Wales Labor member of parliament, who at the time condemned that behaviour in the whole disgraceful affair.

I do not recall anyone from the state Labor Party, nor the author of that flier that went out into the electorate, taking any responsibility. The former premier, the former member for Cheltenham, certainly took no responsibility as the front of that campaign in 2014. Since 2014, that has been the tone of the debate we have heard. I know that the member for Napier is representing the Labor Party, and I really wish he could atone for that on behalf of the party. That is the tone of where we are at. Here we are in 2019—

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Taylor, not Napier.

**Mr GEE:** Point of order: I draw your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

**Mr DULUK:** As I was saying, the whole torrid way in which politics is going started with 'Can you put your family first?' back in the 2010 campaign, and then in 2014 the disgraceful attack on the then candidate and now member for Elder, 'Can you trust Habib?', pure racism from those opposite, and now we are at the 2019 election. I will give the Labor Party at least some credit: they are outsourcing. They say they are not for privatisation, but they are: they are outsourcing a lot of their dirty work to GetUp!

GetUp! is undertaking the dirty work on behalf of the Labor Party. Of course, Bill Shorten was a founding board member of GetUp! and the AWU gave \$100,000 a year of seed funding. This organisation takes more foreign donations than almost any other in Australia. It is out there, part of a campaign putting swastikas on corflutes in the member for Kooyong's seat and defacing the corflutes of the wonderful member in Sydney, Mr Julian Leesa, with Nazi propaganda. Here in South Australia, we are seeing a disgraceful performance by GetUp! with its deceptive lies and misconduct. That really bothers me.

Closer to home, unfortunately 12 very small cage-laid eggs were thrown on my office overnight, and that is also the hypocrisy of GetUp! If GetUp! was a true organisation, it would have used barn-laid market fresh eggs. My office was egged overnight, and we made a joke of it because I think you have to make light of this; however, when politicians and people in public life cannot go about their business and interact with the community, that is very sad. We saw an elderly gentleman, a campaign volunteer and a retiree, have his anti Bill Shorten bus defaced on Tuesday night, which is a big concern—defaced by none other than a general practitioner. I hope that the AMA looks at that.



**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** A medical practitioner.

**Mr DULUK:** A medical practitioner. Then this morning we find out that the member for Boothby's campaign office was defaced with some disgraceful sexual innuendo. What I would like to do, and I know the Deputy Premier did this as well, is call on and ask those opposite to disassociate themselves from GetUp! and its foreign donations and its role in this federal election and from the behaviour that has been happening in my electorate and the member for Boothby's electorate.

We have seen someone charged for stalking the candidate Georgina Downer, in Mayo, and I believe that there is a court case on 22 May, and the AFP and police have visited an alleged stalker in Boothby. This person is associated with the City of Mitcham Residents Group. I noticed when I went back through Facebook and Twitter that the Labor Party has liked many tweets and posts related to the City of Mitcham Residents Group.

I want the Labor Party to distance themselves from the dirty smear campaign that is happening in Australian politics. We saw the Prime Minister at a Country Women's Association (CWA) campaign function. What have we come to if we cannot support the CWA and go to one of their events without being egged? We have seen Bill Shorten, the Leader of the Opposition, try to drag in our Prime Minister's beliefs, views and faith and the way he practices his religion as a campaign point.

The Labor Party have stooped to a new low in Australian politics. They are the ones who always cry wolf, but they are too often the ones who are happy to sit by and allow this disgraceful behaviour to go on unchecked. I call on the Leader of the Opposition and the secretary of the Labor Party here in South Australia, Mr Reggie Martin, to come out and condemn these disgraceful campaign activities.

#### *Bills*

### **LOBBYISTS (RESTRICTIONS ON LOBBYING) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:41):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Lobbyists Act 2015. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:41):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

Today, I introduce a bill that relates to the government's election commitment to ban any office bearer of the state governing body of a registered political party, or an associated entity such as a union, from becoming a registered lobbyist in South Australia.

The purpose of these reforms is to ensure openness, transparency and accountability and to avoid potential conflicts of interest, real or perceived. The opportunity has also been taken to address an unexpected risk of constitutional invalidity identified in the current terms of the act.

Under the Lobbyists Act 2015, it is an offence for a person to engage in lobbying of public officials unless the person is registered under the act. In essence, 'lobbying' means to communicate (for remuneration) with a public official on behalf of a third party for the purpose of influencing the outcome of government deliberations. The bill has the effect that:

- first, only external independent lobbyists are required to be registered under the act, and not employees or other office bearers or volunteers of an organisation who engage in lobbying on behalf of that organisation rather than a third party. This means, for example, that an in-house government liaison officer would not need to be a registered lobbyist or advocate on behalf of their employer's interests;
- secondly, an employee or other office bearer or volunteer of a designated organisation would not need to be registered under the act to lobby on behalf of that organisation or a client of a designated organisation. A designated organisation, for example, an industry body, a union and a welfare body; and

- thirdly, an employee or other office bearer or volunteer of a registered parliamentary party, or of an associated entity of a registered parliamentary party, must not engage in lobbying in respect of matters other than those by the person in the ordinary course of their employment or of holding that office or role.

The first two amendments address the constitutional risk referred to earlier. These changes accord with the original intention of the legislation but not currently reflected accurately in the act. The third amendment gives effect to the government's election commitment.

By virtue of the definition of 'associated entity' of the Electoral Act 1985, the restrictions in the bill are extended to certain bodies or persons with a significant relationship to a registered parliamentary party, namely, an incorporated or unincorporated body or the trustee of a trust:

- that is controlled by one or more registered parties; or
- that operates wholly, or to a significant extent, for the benefit of one or more registered parties; or
- that is a financial member of a registered party; or
- on whose behalf another person is a financial member of a registered party; or
- that has voting rights in a registered party; or
- on whose behalf another person has voting rights in a registered party.

In the bill, the persons who are considered to be an office holder of an organisation, and thus subject to the restriction, are generally the members of the governing body of the organisation, the organisation's employees and volunteers. However, this restriction does not apply to those registered lobbyists who merely act as volunteers for a registered parliamentary party, to promote the party or its candidates. The restriction would apply only for the duration of a lobbyist holding the relevant role in the political party.

This bill further adds to the government's key priorities to ensure openness, transparency and accountability, and to avoid potential conflicts of interest, real or perceived. This commitment, along with public hearings for misconduct and maladministration ICAC matters, shield laws and whistleblower protections, goes a long way in uncovering the secrecy from 16 years under the former government. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading the same.

Leave not granted.

**The SPEAKER:** Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Lobbyists (Restrictions on Lobbying) Amendment Bill 2019, explanation of clauses:

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Lobbyists Act 2015

4—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

Section 3 is amended to add definitions of terms used in the measure.

5—Amendment of section 4—Meaning of lobbying

Section 4 is amended to clarify when a person is taken to be communicating on behalf of a third party within the meaning of the section.

## 6—Amendment of section 10—Register of lobbyists

This clause inserts subsection (5) which is an evidentiary provision to facilitate proof that a person was on the register.

## 7—Amendment of section 13—Certain persons must not engage in lobbying

Section 13 is amended to restrict lobbying by office holders within prescribed organisations (being registered parliamentary parties, or associated entities, and any other prescribed organisations).

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gee.

**LEGAL PRACTITIONERS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Introduction and First Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:48):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Legal Practitioners Act 1981. Read a first time.

*Second Reading*

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:48):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Legal Practitioners (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019 amends the Legal Practitioners Act 1981 and makes various amendments that improve the efficiency and operation of the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner, as well as amendments to improve and preserve the ongoing viability of the Fidelity Fund.

As Attorney-General, I receive regular communication from the commissioner, Mr Greg May, around his work, themes within the profession and issues he is facing. This bill stems from the commissioner's work and experiences since 2014 in that role and seeks to streamline the commissioner's work for the legal community and clients.

The most complex amendments in this bill are the amendments that deal with the operation of the commissioner and the way in which charges are laid by the commissioner. The amendments centre on the time limits that apply to the commissioner laying charges against practitioners for misconduct and the ability for the commissioner to apply for an extension of time when necessary.

These amendments were requested by the commissioner after the Full Court of the Supreme Court, in the 2017 decision of *Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner v Fittock* [2017] SASCFC 169, held that an extension of time application is not an interlocutory matter and therefore must be heard by a three-member Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal rather than by a single member.

This decision has had a significant impact on the way the commissioner conducts matters and, if no legislative amendments are enacted, would greatly increase the expenses involved for every extension of time application. A number of improvements have been made to the provisions dealing with the extensions of time, along with the transitional provisions intended to mitigate the impacts of the decision made in *Fittock*.

The extension of time amendments do four things: firstly, the amendments allow for an extension of time application to be heard by a single member of the tribunal; secondly, the time for the commissioner to lay charges is extended from three to five years; thirdly, the time will now run from when the commissioner becomes aware of the conduct as opposed to when the conduct occurred and, as a result, it is hoped that fewer extension of time applications will need to be made by the commissioner; and fourthly, it will be made clear that an extension of time application can be heard at the same time as the merits of the matter.

The other amendment contained in the bill is the change to section 57A, which adjusts the levels of funding allocated from the interest that accrues in the moneys in the legal practitioners' trust accounts. Currently, the Legal Services Commission receives 50 per cent, the Fidelity Fund receives 40 per cent and the remaining 10 per cent goes to a person nominated by the Attorney-General. The

only person currently nominated is the Law Foundation of South Australia (the Law Foundation), which therefore receives the entirety of the 10 per cent.

The amendment to section 57A is being undertaken as part of a range of measures to improve the ongoing viability of the Fidelity Fund. The Fidelity Fund is administered by the Law Society, with one of its primary purposes being reimbursing people who suffer financial loss arising from an act or omission that involves dishonesty and results in a default of a law practice. The Fidelity Fund is also used to support various other functions under section 57(4) of the act, such as the commissioner and the ethics and practice unit of the Law Society. Revenue into the Fidelity Fund consists mainly of statutory interest allocation, which represents interest accumulated on law practice trust accounts, a proportion of practising certificate fees and investment income.

Due to a number of factors, including a decrease in the investment income, and increases in expenditure for the purpose of regulating the profession, the ongoing viability of the Fidelity Fund is at risk. The amended provision reduces the portion allocated to the Law Foundation from 10 per cent to 5 per cent and allocates the remaining 5 per cent to the Fidelity Fund. The amendments to the extension of time provisions will also assist the future viability of the Fidelity Fund by preserving the resources of the commissioner and increasing his office's efficiency.

The bill also contains other minor amendments, including an amendment that clarifies that a law firm may list the details of historical wills on the Law Society's will register without the client's consent without breaching the confidentiality requirements so long as a good faith effort has been made to contact the client to seek permission. Again, I thank Commissioner Greg May for his work in this area and the important role he plays in regulating the standards of South Australia's legal profession by investigating complaints of any suspected misconduct by lawyers.

I commend the bill to members of the house. I am happy to seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave not granted.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Accordingly, I indicate as follows the explanation of clauses:

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Legal Practitioners Act 1981

4—Amendment of section 14AB—Certain matters to be reported by Society

This clause corrects an error in cross-referencing.

5—Amendment of section 57A—Payment of interest accruing on trust accounts

Section 57A requires financial institutions to pay interest that accrues on a trust account maintained by a legal practitioner to the Law Society. The Society is currently required to pay 50 per cent of the money to the Legal Services Commission or a community legal centre, 40 per cent to the Fidelity Fund and 10 per cent to a person nominated by the Attorney-General. Under the section as amended by this clause, the Society will be required to pay 45 per cent, rather than 40 per cent, of the interest to the Fidelity Fund. The remaining 5 per cent will, at the direction of the Attorney-General, be paid either to the Fidelity Fund or to a person or persons nominated by the Attorney-General.

6—Amendment of section 72—Functions

Section 72 currently permits the Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner to fix, and require the payment of, fees. Under the section as amended, the Commissioner will also be able to waive or refund fees.

#### 7—Amendment of section 77N—Investigation of allegation of overcharging

Section 77N(7) provides that if the amount in dispute in an overcharging complaint is \$10,000 or less, the Commissioner may make a determination as to whether there has been overcharging. This clause amends the section so that the Commissioner can make a determination as to overcharging if the disputed amount is \$50,000 or less. The Commissioner cannot make a determination as to whether there has been overcharging unless there has been an assessment of the costs by a legal practitioner and the parties have been invited to make submissions on the assessment.

#### 8—Amendment of section 80—Constitution and proceedings of Tribunal

Section 80 is amended by this clause to make it clear that—

- the Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal may consist of only one member for the purposes of hearing extension of time applications; and
- the Tribunal may hear and determine an application for an extension of time to lay a charge at the same time as it hears and determines proceedings relating to the charge.

#### 9—Amendment of section 82—Inquiries

This clause amends section 82 so that a charge may be laid before the Tribunal within 5 years of the person laying the charge becoming aware of the conduct to which the charge relates. Currently, a charge must be laid within 3 years of the relevant conduct.

#### 10—Insertion of section 95E

This clause inserts a new section.

##### 95E—Wills register

Proposed section 95 provides that a legal practitioner does not breach a duty of confidentiality owed by the practitioner to a client for whom the practitioner has prepared a will merely by publishing on a wills register, without the client's consent, the name and date of birth of the client or the date of the will. This principle applies only if—

- the will was made before the commencement of the new section; and
- the practitioner has been unable to contact the client despite having taken reasonable steps to do so for the purpose of obtaining the client's consent to publication of the information.

#### 11—Amendment of Schedule 1—Incorporated legal practices

The purpose of the amendment made by this clause is to clarify that the term 'approved form' in Schedule 1 means a form approved by the Supreme Court.

#### Schedule 1—Transitional provisions

##### 1—Transitional provisions

The effect of the transitional provisions is as follows:

- the amendment to section 77N of the Act made by clause 7, which broadens the Commissioner's capacity to make determinations in respect of overcharging, applies in relation to a complaint of overcharging received by the Commissioner after the commencement of the amendment irrespective of whether the final bill to which the complaint relates was delivered to the client before or after that commencement;
- section 80 of the Act as amended by clause 8, which makes it clear that the Tribunal may consist of only one member when considering extension of time applications, applies to applications for extensions of time heard after the amendments commence irrespective of when the charges were laid or when the relevant conduct occurred;
- section 82 of the Act as amended by clause 9 applies in relation to a charge laid before the Tribunal before the commencement of the amendment if the charge has not been

finally determined and also to the laying of a charge after the commencement of the amendment irrespective of when the conduct to which the charge relates occurred.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Gee.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Point of order, Mr Speaker: I bring your attention to the state of the house.

*A quorum having been formed:*

## LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA BILL

### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:59):** I continue where I left off just before the lunch break. As part of the reforms, the government has sought to expand the scope of natural resources management. Landscape is a broader concept than natural resources, reflecting an integrated hill-to-sea approach.

The bill defines the landscape as being made up of three components: the natural and physical environment, including coasts and seas adjacent to the state's land; natural resources, including land and soil, water resources, native vegetation and animals, and ecosystems; and the different ways people value and interact with their environment, including environmental, social, cultural and economic values.

Our coasts and seas immediately adjacent to land are important parts of the landscape. Our government is one that recognises the immense value of our over 5,000 kilometres of coastline and seeks to protect it through our broad and strong environmental reforms. I am sure that I will not be challenged when I indicate to the house that the seat of Flinders has more of the state's coastline than any other electorate in this state.

There are benefits for the primary production sector. A key benefit from the act will include reducing costs to businesses and household cost-of-living pressures by introducing a CPI cap on land and water levies, enshrining the principle that boards will work in partnerships and collaboratively with primary producers and local communities to deliver real outcomes, and the landscape priorities fund will deliver landscape-scale restoration projects and provide greater opportunities for natural resources management focused programs. In other words, it is a whole-of-landscape approach.

I want to talk briefly in these last few minutes about water because it has been a significant part of my dealings in the electorate of Flinders since first being elected in 2010. The focus of the landscape reforms is on resetting how boards operate to deliver a simpler, more transparent system. As a result, water management has not been a focus in the consultations that have shaped the landscape reforms.

We were very clear about this from the outset in our extensive consultation process and publicly available discussion papers. As such, most water-related provisions in the act have been carried over unchanged to the new bill, continuing the existing role of water allocation plans and providing for the sustainable management of water resources and existing licensing and permit arrangements to manage water resources.

Water-affecting activities, such as building a dam or drilling a bore, will continue to be regulated. To enable the simplification of regional landscape plans and give greater consistency and clarity for consumers as to where policies on water-affecting activities are, these rules will be set out in a water-affecting activity control policy or a water allocation plan.

The bill also provides transitional arrangements for the winding up of existing natural resources management boards and the transfer of any assets and liabilities, with options to ensure continued delivery of services on ground. Critically, options to ensure a smooth transition from natural resources management boards to regional landscape boards have been provided for. Together, these reforms will deliver a fundamental change in how natural resources are managed in this state for the benefit of all South Australians and will move South Australia towards a productive and

sustainable natural landscape, upholding the landscape for both environmental and economic development of our state.

Before I commend the bill to the house, I indicate that a number of members of this parliament attended a Friends of Landcare meeting over the lunch break. It was capably and ably convened by the members for Heysen, Frome and Giles, and I note that the deputy leader was also at that meeting. I am going to quote from page 13 of Landcare Communities—Australia's Future:

Australia is beautiful, biodiverse and productive. Our land, water and biodiversity are integral parts of our national identity, our economy and universal life. They provide abundantly for our agricultural, tourism and resource industries, recreation, the clean air we breathe and the water we drink. They are our natural systems and the foundation of human existence.

I look forward to being actively involved in the newly formed Parliamentary Friends of Landcare group. I commend the bill to the house and look forward to its passage and implementation. I have to say that as Chairman of Committees I am also looking forward to the committee stage of the bill.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (16:04):** It is a pleasure to close the debate this afternoon on the Landscape South Australia Bill 2019. I would like to thank all speakers who have provided a contribution on the bill before the house. I particularly want to thank the deputy leader for her indication that the opposition will provide broad support for the bill.

I look forward to considering the foreshadowed amendments and responding to the particular clauses that are of interest to the opposition and the crossbenchers during the committee stage of the bill. I indicate that a number of amendments have been provided to me that we will not agree to in this house, but that does not mean that we will not come to a landing on those between the houses or in the upper house.

I want to make a few closing points. Lots of comments have been made on the bill, the merits of this reform and why we are doing this reform. Those comments have been made by members of both sides of the house. I think that it is fair to say that there is a general recognition that this area of legislation is ripe for reform after slightly less than 16 years since the introduction of the Natural Resources Management Act. It is time for us to take a good look at the legislation that manages the environmental status of the privately held landscape, the landscape that is owned by South Australians at an individual and corporate level.

Through this legislation, we need to ensure that we have a framework that manages that landscape effectively, ensuring that it is sustained for environmental, social and economic outcomes. We know that if the private landscape across South Australia, the farms and productive lands across our state, is not managed in an environmentally sensitive and environmentally sustainable way, then it will have a complete lack of ability to contribute to the state's economic output.

We know that agriculture and food production is right at the top of the state's economic agenda. It consistently and generationally has been at the very top tier of the economic development, economic growth and economic output for our state. We know that if we do not get the natural environment right, the natural environment that wraps itself around the economic output of our state, we will not have that economic productivity in our state, particularly in regional South Australia.

We have to get the environment right. We have to look after our water resources. We have to care for our agricultural lands. We need to look after the life-giving soil that supports our agricultural lands, and we need to look after the biodiversity of our landscape as well. Incredibly important within that is building resilience, and this legislation aims to build the resilience of the natural landscape. We know that biodiversity needs space to survive and to thrive.

As a consequence, we need to look for landscape-scale change that sustains biodiversity, whether that be a journey that a river takes from its source waters to its estuarial waters; taking a look at our coastal habitats in a coherent and linked way, all 5,067 kilometres of the coastline around South Australia; the quality of our air and the quality of our soils; the interface between our built environments and our natural environments; or the way that communities understand, appreciate, learn about and engage with our natural environments.

All these things lead to sustainability. They connect together to create an overall resilience within the natural landscape. Our natural environment faces so many threats, whether that be a growing population and increasing urban sprawl, or whether that be a change in climate which, of course, is the foremost challenge facing our natural environment. The environment is under attack from all sides. What we need to do is give it the resilience and the space to withstand those attacks.

We know that when we start getting things right recovery occurs quite quickly. Species can re-establish, whether that be plants or animals. When they are given a helping hand, ecosystems start to recover quite quickly and then start to sustain themselves. All across South Australia and Australia there are good news stories to be told.

Last night, I had the great privilege to have a 20-minute conversation with Jane Goodall, an internationally renowned environmentalist who has done so much incredible work across the world, particularly in Africa but really at an international level, promoting environmental sustainability and teaching people about the value of preserving and revitalising our natural environment. When I talked to Jane Goodall, we talked about the good news stories as well. I asked her about her views on the opportunities to sustain and having success with sustainability. She told me that there were many good news stories.

There are many bad stories as well, but it is good stories that we have to tell people because when we tell people the good stories it gives them hope. If you look at the environmental problems facing our planet at the moment, it could all be far too difficult and you could give up and not want to do anything. If you look at the individual success stories at the local level, which then can be linked together to create corridors of success and landscapes of recovery, that is when those good news stories start to create a whole narrative of success.

I am really hopeful that, during my time as South Australia's Minister for Environment and Water and while the Liberal government occupies the government benches, we are able to take significant steps forward with environmental sustainability in our state and ensure that investment, albeit limited at times, is going towards the right projects, those that link together to create those corridors and that landscape-scale change.

The recent summary report by the United Nations-backed Intergovernmental Science-Policy Platform on Biodiversity and Ecosystem Services highlighted that nature is declining globally and at unprecedented rates and that the rate of species extinction is accelerating. In Australia, we have been at the forefront of that. Our continent has given a tremendous set of very poor statistics when it comes to species extinction.

There has been some suggestion that our bill somehow removes nature from natural resources management and undermines our response to those challenges that were outlined in the policy platform's findings. It is my very strong view that it is quite the opposite. What this legislation aims to do is to mitigate species losses and build resilience into the landscape so that species, whether they be plants or animals, have the opportunity to hang on, to rebuild their population, to have their populations be sustained and spread their reach.

To assist policymakers and lawmakers, the UN-backed body I mentioned a moment ago has identified the top five drivers for biodiversity losses and extinctions. I think it is worthwhile to reflect on the identified causes of these declines and look at how the landscape bill, which is before the parliament at the moment, contributes to this.

The number one driver identified is enormous changes in land and sea use, with three-quarters of the land-based environment and two-thirds of the marine environment now being significantly altered by human actions. Second is the direct exploitation of organisms, on which this bill, or indeed the previous National Resources Management Act, can have little legislative impact to bring about change.

The third is climate change. We have really done a significant amount to insert in the bill the importance of taking a changing climate into consideration when it comes to decision-making, engagement and the allocation of resources. We have embedded that into the bill in a way that was not present in the previous Natural Resources Management Act, significantly as a result of the passage of time between the Natural Resources Management Act being enacted in 2004 and the



present day, when the understanding and knowledge around climate change and the impacts of climate change obviously have become much more advanced.

Yes, we were aware of those problems and those challenges in 2004, but the sophistication of response and the need to find responses have substantially advanced since 2004. This bill really attempts to capture the urgency and the necessity of embedding climate change and a response to climate change within the landscape legislation.

Fourthly, the panel finds that pollution is a significant reason for the extinction of species at a global level. Ambient pollution is primarily regulated under other legislation, including the massive pollution of plastic in oceans. There are many measures within this bill that complement other legislation to ensure that we sustain our freshwater sources. We can abate potential sources of pollution through clauses that are embedded in this bill and which were recently reflected in the NRM Act. I want to assure the house that those clauses are very much part of the legislation.

The fifth point that the UN panel made clear was the contribution of invasive alien species in a landscape—namely, pest plants and animals—to the extinction of species at a global level. This bill really puts this in the forefront. It highlights it as one of the most pressing challenges facing South Australia's natural environment and inserts it as a key policy driver and decision-making trigger point for landscape boards in the future. They have to take into consideration the environmental impact of pest plants and animals.

Along the way, I have received some criticism for this back-to-basics approach to natural resources management, including around pest plants and animals. I refute all that criticism. It is backward to make that comment because the UN, experts across the world and academics and conservationists in South Australia, in Australia and internationally have identified that dealing with pest plants and animals is a way that you can give our natural landscapes resilience. Through that, they can then take on those other challenges, the main one being climate change, but there is also the impact of increasing populations, urban sprawl and the increasing intensification of farming. All those things can be better withstood if our landscape is devoid of pest plants and animals.

It would be incredibly hopeful to think that we could wipe out pest plants and animals in South Australia altogether, but I really hope that this legislation and the back-to-basics approach that this legislation is founded upon create an opportunity to really get on top of the some of those invasive plants and animals that are having an incredibly negative impact on biodiversity in our state. I hope that they can get on top of the problem at a landscape level, not just with little envelopes of pristine vegetation and environment that are not linked to each other but connected corridors and connected landscapes of significant recovery and significant restoration. That is the legacy that I hope this legislation can trigger.

I want to finalise my remarks by highlighting some of the key reforms within this legislation. I have talked about the back-to-basics approach. I also want to highlight the decentralisation of landscape boards, handing power back to communities, relying on knowledge and understanding that is held within communities, and respecting communities for being the custodians of our natural environment, while also giving them support and education and sharing with them the knowledge and understanding of experts and governments but relying on their local knowledge just as much to get a strong outcome for our environment.

Decentralisation, which is synonymous with the ideology of the Liberal government, is something we can really benefit from with the establishment of landscape boards and the creation of elections to ensure that three board members on each board are elected by the community so that a community voice is present on these boards and that the wider community have confidence that they have representatives who are elected through grassroots democracy and are a part of natural resources management in their communities.

The legislation creates the grassroots grants program that again is about respecting local communities and giving local groups—whether they be friends groups, agricultural bureaus, NGOs, local councils perhaps or, even better, a combination of all these groups—the opportunity to come together and work together to come up with solutions for environmental problems and strategies toward sustainability. We are creating the grassroots grants fund that will enable a guarantee legislated stream of funding to go toward on-ground projects led by the community for the community.

I think this is a significant reform. We have grants handed down by NRM boards at the moment, but they tend to come and go, they tend to be inconsistent and they tend not to be guaranteed from year to year. The creation of the grassroots grants fund will enable us to have a guaranteed grants fund embedded within our landscape legislation.

The other fund that we are setting up, which I think is a real game changer, is our landscape priorities fund. That is taking some of the levy collected in the Adelaide metropolitan area and redistributing it into regional and rural South Australia, giving those boards the opportunity to bid for funds, to undertake large-scale, potentially multijurisdictional—when it comes to councils and when it comes to different boards that neighbour each other—landscape-scale projects.

These are the projects that will really make a big difference, will increase the resilience in the landscape and will ensure that big projects, potentially multimillion-dollar funding projects, can actually be delivered. That is something we are not getting enough of at the moment. When we get these amounts of money coming together with partners also contributing funds, we are likely to attract large portions of money from federal government sources or from large not-for-profit organisations in the environmental arena. We think that the landscapes priorities fund can really be a game changer for the resilience of our natural environment, giving boards the capacity to undertake big projects that will make that real environmental difference.

Interestingly, through a very thorough consultation process, there was no pushback from levy payers in metropolitan Adelaide about contributing to the regional landscape. It was apparent that people living in Adelaide understood that, by way of living in the city, they often go and enjoy the regions, they put pressure on the regions, they gain food from the regions and they understand the economic contribution that our regions make. Having this small levy distribution to the statewide priorities fund gives us the opportunity to really see Adelaide's levy base contribute to regional projects. I think that is a really substantial piece of reform that will be well received and can have genuinely very good environmental outcomes associated with it in the future.

Undertaking a significant piece of reform such as this does require a lot of effort, and we have still a way to go with that—the committee stage and the bill moving in the future to the Legislative Council—but I want to thank the public servants within the Department for Environment and Water for their role to date. I also thank the speakers from the government who made comments and contributions in favour of the bill: the member for Narungga, the member for Heysen, the member for Finnis, the member for Colton, the member for Chaffey, the member for King, the Attorney-General, the member for Waite, the member for Schubert, the member for Newland, the member for MacKillop, the member for Flinders and the member for Hammond.

Again, I thank the deputy leader for her contribution and the shadow minister for regional development (member for Giles) for his contribution, as well as the general support the opposition has provided throughout this process.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Dr CLOSE:** I am not going to use clause 1 to ask a lot of questions. I just want to check that I do not miss an opportunity to ask a question later. Therefore, my question is: in which section would I raise questions about the management of pests? Is it only in clause 183, or is it earlier that I should be asking those questions?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Deputy leader, I am advised that the best point would be the body of the bill where this is dealt with in most detail, that is, from clause 183.

Clause passed.

Clause 2 passed.

Clause 3.

**Dr CLOSE:** This is a lengthy clause that deals with definitions, so I am just looking at a way to orient where I am asking my questions. Essentially, subclause (2) has the definition of landscapes; that is on my page 25, and I assume we all have the same version. My question is about the way in which this act is anticipated to interact with various other acts that deal with elements of landscapes—for example, coastal protection, marine parks and, given the definition at (c), planning and heritage considerations.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** When we went out to consultation on the NRM reform, it was very much our view that, within reason, we wanted to make quite a clear commitment to those who were attending consultations. We acknowledge that there were other pieces of environmental legislation present in our state legislation that needed reform. Without naming any acts or giving an order of how reform would unfold, it is my intention to undertake legislative reform in other areas in the coming months and years of the Marshall Liberal government.

I have made commitments publicly, in public consultation forums, that we would be heading in that direction, whether that is around coastal protection or whether it is around water, and you would be aware that we have not gone into water reform in a lot of detail here. Of course, the act is open and subject to amendment, if that is the will of parliament, but it has been the government's intention not to go hard on the reform around water, with the intention to come back and look at water in the medium term. We have said that on a range of pieces of legislation. The National Parks and Wildlife Act is another one of those, and the Marine Parks Act could be one of those, and the planning and development legislation, which is subject to ongoing development of policies and regulations at the moment.

I say all that because this bill does not fundamentally change the approach that the previous Natural Resources Management Act took in engaging with those pieces of legislation. It is my intention as the minister responsible to move forward, subject to the passage of the landscape bill, and then start to talk to stakeholders about the modernisation of other pieces of environmental legislation, with the idea that the landscape bill is quite foundational in many ways when it comes to the management of our natural environment in our state.

So we get this reform right, hopefully, and then we can look at reforms to other pieces of legislation, which will be informed by this modern body of legislation that I hope will become the landscape South Australia act. It is also important for people who are using this legislation, whether that be boards, individual landholders or stakeholders who are using it for their day-to-day business—whether that is planning or general activities—to ensure that they are able to connect with the holders of other legislation, such as the Coast Protection Board and the Parks and Wilderness Council, and we will be encouraging those opportunities as part of this as well.

Through the process of engagement on this legislation, we have connected with the chairs of some of those bodies. We have had those conversations, particularly with the chair of the Coast Protection Board, Allan Holmes, who has an understanding of the planning system as well. We consulted with him quite extensively on this legislation, so we have had those conversations. That is a bit of a lengthy explanation, but I hope it answers the deputy leader's question.

**Dr CLOSE:** To tease that out a little bit more, when we come to talking about regional plans or even the landscape strategy for the whole of the state, does this legislation give any power to those instruments to guide or change activity that sits under those other pieces of legislation? Could they alter or encroach upon the responsibilities of the Coast Protection Board, for example, or are they required to nonetheless acknowledge the pre-eminence of those pieces of legislation relating to those elements of landscape?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Those other pieces of legislation remain pre-eminent. The planning legislation is of particular relevance and, given the stage of reform that planning legislation is at, it remains as per the current NRM legislation.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 to 6 passed.

Clause 7.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Close-1]—

Page 27, lines 32 and 33 [clause 7(1)]—Delete 'of the natural resources that make up or contribute to our State's landscape' and substitute:

of the state by establishing an integrated scheme to promote the use and management of the natural resources that make up or contribute to our State's landscape

I think that the changes I am looking to make are around the importance of the clarity of language in the way we talk about our natural resources, in that we talk about sustainable development. I think it is just an unfortunate turn of phrase to talk about ecologically sustainable development of natural resources. There are many, if not most, natural resources that should not be developed, so I have suggested in this clause that we return essentially to the language used in the existing act, which talks about the sustainable development 'of the State by establishing an integrated scheme to promote the use and management of', rather than the direct development.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I mentioned in my earlier speech that I was not going to accept the amendments from the deputy leader but did make it clear—and I have spoken to the deputy leader separately—that a number of the amendments she has proposed are amendments which I and the government are quite amenable to. Some amendments have changed in the last few days, including one that amends an amendment.

I have some processes I have to follow through and, as a consequence, we will oppose this amendment at this stage, and I will have a similar answer to some other amendments that are proposed by the deputy leader. However, we will continue to work on those with the deputy leader and other members of parliament between the houses and in the Legislative Council to see if we can come to a landing on this.

Amendment negatived.

**Dr CLOSE:** My question relates to the definition of 'intrinsic values' and what the minister understands by 'intrinsic values' or whether there is legislative precedent to define that. I refer to clause 7(1)(a).

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I have been advised that, regarding the mention of 'intrinsic values' in clause 7(1)(a), the use of the words actually replicates what was in the Natural Resources Management Act and really tries to capture the inherent value that our natural environment, landscapes and interconnected landscapes have to the community. It was in the NRM Act that we repealed and it has been brought across. I am also advised that the conservation sector, with which we had extensive and ongoing engagement as part of the development of this, sought to ensure that 'intrinsic values' was retained, despite it perhaps not being a phrase that people use a lot or necessarily have a stand-alone definition of.

**Dr CLOSE:** Unsurprisingly, I understand what the intrinsic value is and I am a supporter of it, but I am curious about not only recognising but protecting the intrinsic value and what legal weight that would have in the case where what people would regard as the intrinsic value of a landscape is under threat from any particular action, activity or development, and whether this has any weight or is just an acknowledgment that we regard the environment as having value on its own.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you for the opportunity to answer this question and to seek advice about it myself. All the objects and principles taken together will be taken into consideration by the decision-making body that might be using the act, whether that is the individual who is using it to guide their day-to-day work or, of course, at the other end, a court that is using the act to come up with findings about the merits, or lack thereof, of a particular activity. We are confident that the term 'intrinsic values' is one that the court would have to interpret, should it get to that point, and it would have to use that, taking into consideration all the other objects and principles found under section 7 of the act, to determine whether or not a breach had occurred.

**Dr CLOSE:** I am happy now to move on to my second amendment of schedule 1. I move:

Amendment No 2 [Close-1]—

Page 28, lines 1 to 3 [clause 7(1)(c)]—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

- (c) provides for the protection, enhancement, restoration and sustainable management of—
  - (i) land, soil and water resources; and
  - (ii) native fauna and flora, especially so that they are resilient in the face of change; and

My intention here is to correct what I think is a missed opportunity to talk about nature in natural resources. The current version provides for the protection, enhancement and sustainable management of land, soil and water resources. It omits to talk about the importance of native fauna and flora and also the importance of not only protection and enhancement but restoration, given the very dire state that so much of our ecosystem is in.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We will be opposing this amendment based on my previous comments. We do believe that the amendment would expand the object of the bill to include providing for the protection, enhancement, restoration and sustainable management of native fauna and flora. While I am not fundamentally opposed to that I do think—and I mentioned this in my speech a few minutes ago—that there has been some misunderstanding that the bill somehow diminishes the need to protect nature and the need to enhance biodiversity.

That is certainly why we have modernised the language. I believe that all through the legislation we have highlighted the importance of maintaining the vitality of biodiversity in our state. This is an amendment we are happy to look at, but we believe that the legislation does make very strong attempts to ensure that nature is protected and that opportunities are sought to revitalise biodiversity across our landscape in South Australia. The government will oppose this amendment.

Amendment negated.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Close-2]—

Page 28, lines 4 and 5 [clause 7(1)(d)]—Delete paragraph (d) and substitute:

- (d) promotes, protects and conserves biodiversity, and insofar as is reasonably practicable, supports and encourages the restoration or rehabilitation of ecological systems and processes that have been lost or degraded, and promotes the health of ecosystems so that they are resilient in the face of change; and

I will not be proceeding with amendment No. 3 [Close-1] but will instead move amendment No. 1 [Close-2], both of which deal with paragraph (d). It is entirely consistent with the point that I have just made about the importance of talking not just about flora and fauna and biological diversity but also the idea of ecosystems and the need to restore and rehabilitate them.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The government will also oppose this amendment on the basis that we believe the promotion of healthy and resilient biological diversity and ecosystems is an object of the bill and is inherent throughout the legislation.

Amendment negated.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 4 [Close-1]—

Page 28, line 6 [clause 7(1)(e)]—After 'environment' insert:

(including a recognition of the need for mitigation and adaptation)

Although I applaud the far greater presence of climate change in this bill than in the existing act and, as the minister said in closing his second reading speech, the nature of the passage of time and our greater understanding of the importance of climate change and its impact, I would like to explicitly talk about the need for mitigation and adaptation. I believe that much of the work that these boards will be undertaking in the future will be about adaptation to a changed climate rather than hoping that we can halt its course altogether.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Again, we will be opposing this amendment but have very significant interest in exploring this mitigation and adaptation to the impacts of climate change. It will absolutely

be a significant role for landscape boards when they come into being. It is a significant role of the current natural resources management boards that are found across South Australia at the moment.

In the context of South Australia dealing with climate change, adaptation and mitigation are incredibly important. We know that our relatively small impact in an international context does not mean that we should not show leadership and that we should not continue to demonstrate opportunities to not only reduce emissions but store emissions and mitigate and adapt to the challenges that we are currently facing and inevitably will face more of in the future.

It is important to note that the landscape legislation is not a stand-alone solution for climate change. The state's climate change legislation—I think it was amongst the first in the world—is one of those acts that I should have referred to earlier when the deputy leader asked whether there are other pieces of legislation that this legislation would interact with. We see the interaction of the future landscape act as being very much about tackling climate change and adapting to the impacts of climate change, and we are very keen to look at opportunities to strengthen and enhance the legislation between the houses.

Amendment negatived.

**Dr CLOSE:** If we can move on to subclause (2)(b), I have a question about the definition of 'life-supporting capacities'. Does that refer exclusively to supporting human life, or is it a wider definition?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** That definition is not specific to human life. It would take its ordinary meaning, which is obviously broader.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 5 [Close-1]—

Page 28, after line 41 [clause 7(3)]—Insert:

- (ca) environmental factors should be taken into account when valuing or assessing assets or services;

Essentially, this amendment adds an additional paragraph after subclause (3)(c) to say that environmental factors should be taken into account when valuing or assessing assets or services.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I advise that the government opposes this amendment.

Amendment negatived.

**Dr CLOSE:** I did not hear anyone say no.

**The CHAIR:** It was a bit light on for noes. Deputy leader, I am usually pretty good with that, but thank you for picking me up. The amendment is not agreed to. I called it.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 6 [Close-1]—

Page 29, after line 4 [clause 7(3)]—Insert:

- (da) consideration should be given to the conservation of biological diversity and ecological integrity;

This amendment seeks to include consideration of biological diversity and ecological integrity.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I note that this is one of the existing principles in the natural resources management legislation. One of our aims in all this legislative reform is simplification of legislation, trying to get a piece of legislation together that is accessible and workable. It is felt that this amendment is not needed because biodiversity is canvassed as a very substantial object of the act. On that basis, we oppose the amendment.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

**Dr CLOSE:** I have a question on subclause (1):

(i) as the Minister thinks fit, to take any other action that may promote the preservation, protection, management, enhancement, restoration or rehabilitation...

It is nice to see restoration and rehabilitation there. I am wondering why there is such discretion being given to any future minister and whether there are any limits that are within this piece of legislation as to what those actions might be.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for her question. The minister's use of discretion would of course have to be made in reference to the objectives of the act. These are protective principles in nature: preservation, protection, management, enhancement, restoration or rehabilitation of the state's landscapes. It is our view that the protective nature of all these words as a class of words means that they are positive and seek to enhance the environment, rather than exploit it, so that in itself is a limitation on the powers that the minister has under this catch-all discretionary clause, which, as the deputy leader correctly highlights, does appear to be broad in its nature. It is broad in nature, but it is limited by its context in the positive around environmental sustainability.

Clause passed.

Clause 10 passed.

Clause 11.

**Dr CLOSE:** I have a couple of questions before I move my amendment and they are in relation to the establishment of regions. I understand that the legislation creates the power for a government or a minister to declare or gazette regions and that the minister has expressed an intention to revise the boundaries, including, of course the creation of Green Adelaide but not exclusively to do that. My first question is: why has the minister chosen to remove any consideration of catchments, given that that was the foundation of this system from even before the current act came into place?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The deputy leader is right to raise this. This is quite a significant part of the reform. It formed quite a significant part of the community consultation and engagement that occurred around the creation of this legislation. We did want to create a body of legislation that was more inherently connected to communities and so as part of the engagement process we specifically posed these questions to the attendees, asking: did geographical communities of interest in large part outweigh what a catchment was?

The deputy leader is very accurate and completely right to highlight the previous Natural Resources Management Act, which came from the integration of a whole range of things, including pest control boards, soil boards and water catchment boards. Under an integrated system, they then evolved into natural resources management boards and were formulated under water catchments.

We found that this led to some geographical perversities, where a town like Mount Barker, the largest town in the Adelaide Hills and the fastest growing town in South Australia, found itself in the SA Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board because the water catchment that serves Mount Barker heads in an easterly direction towards the River Murray and the mouth of the river.

However, we were intent on creating a Hills and Fleurieu board for a range of communities of interest reasons. Not to have the largest Hills town of Mount Barker in that board would not have made sense from the point of view of keeping coherent communities of interest intact. When we had a consultation in the Hills, we specifically put this question to people living in that community who attended, and they said that they felt that communities of interest trumped water catchments.

Notwithstanding that, we have embedded into this legislation the ability, the need and the requirement to work across boundaries and for boards to work together when there are cross-boundary issues. One of these will be water catchments and water catchment management. It is an imperfect tool, in many ways, to pick communities of interest over water catchments but, equally, to pick water catchments over communities of interest is not an ideal outcome either. So we have made a call with this legislation, based in the overarching spirit of the legislation, to make it more accessible

for communities at an everyday level. We have made the commitment to move towards communities of interest.

I picked Mount Barker because it is probably the best example of this, but there are a handful of other examples where you see a water catchment disconnected from its board. The community of Burra in the state's Mid North is currently in the SA Murray-Darling Basin board, but it will move across to the Northern and Yorke board because that is more in line with its communities of interest, as opposed to being connected to the Riverland and Murraylands towns. This is no doubt a challenge. It is difficult to pick how this works. We chose communities of interest over water catchments for this legislation.

**Dr CLOSE:** I have to say that I do not think that the legislation requires the decision to be made. The legislation merely requires that attention be paid not that it be settled one way or another, which is why my amendment gives attention to putting catchment back in. Before I move that amendment, and I will move it, I have a question about what work was done within the department—and, I hope, brought to the minister's attention—about the potential negative effects of moving away from using catchments as the region boundaries.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The department undertook analysis around water allocation planning and how that would interact under the new legislation. That is obviously addressed in the component of the bill that covers water. There have been lots of discussions about this. This was one of those wicked problems within the legislation as it currently stands under the Natural Resources Management Act, and we made a call on this.

The deputy leader is right: I was too enthusiastic in the strength of my language around 'requiring', but I would like to think that boards would pay attention to water catchment areas, as the deputy leader's amendment suggests, as part of their good governance. That makes sense. There is no doubt that there are more discussions to be had on this because water catchments are a critical part of our landscape, a very substantial part of our legislation. We will discuss this between the houses and give particular consideration to this amendment.

**Dr CLOSE:** I have one more question before I move the amendment, and it is largely around the transition. Presuming that the change is made subsequent to this legislation coming into force, and that there will be changes to boundaries, what is the intention with the regions within the environment and water department? Will they be matching these new boundaries, or will you have a mismatch of boundaries?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The deputy leader might be aware there is a restructure being undertaken in the department at the moment led by the chief executive. That is something we are working through at the moment. It makes sense for alignment and, in my view, from an administrative point of view. That is being looked at, and how it will unfold will be a structural and administrative reform within the department. I do not want to give anything definitive on what is happening operationally with the chief executive's restructure of the department, but it is certainly being looked at in line with this legislation.

**Dr CLOSE:** As a preamble to moving the amendment, I would offer the gratuitous advice that, although it is convenient to have the boundaries aligned, it would be a pity if the environment and water department did not have any attention paid to catchment boundaries as being a primary driving force, particularly given the predisposition of our climate to go into drought. I move:

Amendment No 7 [Close-1]—

Page 32, line 30 [clause 11(2)(a)]—After 'environment' insert:

and give particular attention to water catchment areas

This amendment is to allow water catchments to be considered by the minister in formulating boundaries.

Amendment negatived; clause passed.

Clause 12 passed.

Clause 13.



**Dr CLOSE:** Environmental groups have come to see me, as I am sure they have come to see the minister, and one of the areas they are concerned about in this bill is the absence of the requirement for particular types of consultation. Before I move my amendment, could the minister explain his thinking, for example, in not consulting with any particular organisations in establishing the boards?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for her question. I come back to the point with this legislation: our aim is to create a simpler system, but we did not want to be overly prescriptive. We have embedded the importance of engagement—and this is very important to me personally and professionally as minister—and, to get engagement right, we have embedded it though the legislation and, I feel, ramped it up in many ways.

The prescriptive nature of engagement has not been followed through. We have tried to step away from the prescriptive nature of the previous act. We felt that one of the things that was quite cumbersome in the previous act was the prescriptive nature of engagement and consultation, so we have stepped away from that approach and, while requiring engagement at various points throughout the act, we did not go into detail as to what that would look like, and the main reason for that is around simplicity.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 8 [Close-1]—

Page 34, after line 8 [clause 13]—Insert:

- (4a) The Minister must, before publishing a notice under subsection (1) or (3), consult with the bodies that are, in the opinion of the Minister, the peak bodies concerned with the environment and land use in the state.

This amendment requires that the minister consult with bodies that are, in the opinion of the minister, the peak bodies concerned with the environment and land use in the state. The nature of the feedback that I have had, which I am sure has also come back to the minister's office, is not that there is any concern in particular about the current incumbent, nor perhaps should there be in a change of government with respect to the current shadow; it is concern that the legislation going on the existing act will last a decade or more and that they wish to make sure that they are not reliant on the goodwill of a particular minister at a particular time.

Amendment negated; clause passed.

Clauses 14 and 15 passed.

Clause 16.

**Dr CLOSE:** I suspect the answer to my question will be couched in simplicity again, although the bill, I think, is about the same length as the existing act. I was contemplating introducing amendments, and so I signal now that there may be amendments in the other place either from me via my equivalent in the other place or perhaps from another party. The question is whether the matrix that is currently used for having a clear sense of the range of skills required to make a functional board ought to be captured either in a schedule or in legislation.

However, rather than bring in an amendment now, I would like to give the minister an opportunity to explain how, particularly given that there will be the election of members, the minister will ensure, and a future minister will be required to ensure, that there is the right balance of interests and experience and skills.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** On this point, deputy leader, this is an interesting area of our reform because we are inserting the elections into the process. In some ways we are trading off the ability for a minister to have more options when it comes to selecting a good skills range and a mix of skills against having that community voice.

It is absolutely important for ministers who have responsibility for this legislation to be required to ensure that that skills mix is in place. Of course, there needs to be quite a level of discretion because different regions need different skills. My view would be that it is not just skills: it is also dealing with geographical distribution in some of these boards because you would not want all board members on the Eyre Peninsula board to come from the town of Cummins, for instance.

You might get three elected from that community and the minister is going to have to select people from around the district to create that balance, and not only geographical distribution but also potentially gender as well, so you would want the minister to have the discretion to take those into consideration.

We have put under clause 1 the idea that 'the minister will determine the skills, qualifications, knowledge and experience that persons should collectively have'. I think the word 'collectively' is important because it ensures that, when the minister comes to appoint their members, they look at the group as a whole. It is certainly my intention with the first round of establishing these boards to appoint a chairperson, then have elections and then appoint board members.

For the first round of creating these boards from scratch, the minister (being me at this stage) would have the opportunity later on in the piece to distribute geographically in terms of skills and gender and to take those things into account once three elected members were in place. I am not sure whether the deputy leader was aware of that. It is not implicit in the legislation but certainly, from a policy point of view, that is the approach I will be taking in the first instance.

The word 'collectively' is one of the keywords here in terms of how we will make this work well. As we move further down, clause 16(3)(a) provides:

- (a) must demonstrate that they have any skills, qualifications, knowledge or experience determined by the Minister (and the Minister may put in place processes to ensure that members of regional landscape boards have those skills, qualifications, knowledge or experience);

I think the words 'and the Minister may put in place processes' are also important because that will create structure or rigour around the selection. While it says 'the Minister may put in place processes', it is certainly my view that we would be looking to ensure that there were appropriate selection criteria to map members' skills, geography and gender against. I have gone a little broader by talking about geography and gender as well, but I think that is important for a minister to take into consideration when getting these boards right.

**Dr CLOSE:** Nonetheless, the law only requires that the minister be satisfied, rather than there being any objective criteria or any process by which the minister is required to seek the advice of others on what that particular minister's view is on what is the collective composition of the board.

I wonder whether the minister has considered or might smile upon an amendment. I know you cannot agree to any such amendment, particularly as it is not being moved today, or perhaps he might contemplate one between the houses, including a clause that at least requires the minister to undertake a process of consultation on the skills composition that the minister is determining. That would give more comfort to the people who have raised the concern with me that, under this piece of legislation, there might be boards that are not well balanced in their view, although the minister will say, 'Well, I have the discretion and they are in my view.'

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Again, this is one of the outcomes of the attempt to simplify the legislation. Of course, we would be happy to contemplate an amendment between the houses or, in fact, in the upper house, if one is presented to us.

**The CHAIR:** Before I put the clause, I note that the minister used the town of Cummins as an example in one of his responses, which of course is my home town. We do note that. I was born in Cummins, minister, and I know you have a soft spot for Elliston as well.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes. We might talk about Elliston.

**The CHAIR:** We might talk about Elliston.

Clause passed.

Clause 17.

**Dr CLOSE:** This is where we have the introduction of the idea of board elections. As I think I indicated in my second reading speech, we will not be opposing the principle, either in here or the other place. However, I do have questions about the practicality of the introduction. My first question is: how will people know that a nomination process is available? If someone would quite like to be

one of these members, how will they be informed about it? In order to make this shorter, if you would like to talk about how you see these elections working, that might answer some of my questions.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** This is an area that will be prescribed through regulations. There will be a detailed set of regulations dealing with elections. The election side of things is, I think, a really worthwhile reform. I strongly hope it will inject a level of confidence and goodwill into these boards—that is certainly my hope—and get that community voice as part of them and engender confidence as a result.

I acknowledge that this reform is one of the trickier ones in terms of administering it. We are working through what that looks like at the moment. It may be that the first elections are slightly different from ongoing elections, and there may be a transitional set of elections. I want to ensure that the regulations that are brought into being are flexible enough to allow electronic collections, potentially.

We have also talked along the way of aligning local government elections with the landscape board elections. There is no doubt that the alignment of those elections would boost turnout. It is my view that, in terms of turnout, we will have to embark on a publicity campaign of sorts to really encourage people to nominate and to encourage people to turn out to vote. I expect and acknowledge that voter turnout will likely be lower in the first elections. That should not be seen as a failure of the legislation, but it should be seen as something that we need to build on.

I do not have a crystal ball; I am not sure that will be the case. However, I think if you look across the world, when you bring in these sorts of non-compulsory community elections, turnout is low in the first case. We need to try to lift it, but I think aligning it to local government in the out years will lift knowledge, understanding and awareness of this. There will be a substantial campaign that is inevitable to promote these upcoming elections. There will be a drive to try to encourage people to stand.

It is likely that board chairs will be appointed before elections take place. We have chairs in place at the moment, and some of them are very capable and show a great deal of capability in promoting the value of landscape boards, or NRM boards as they are currently stand. I would foresee the chair of these boards taking quite a significant role in promoting upcoming elections and opportunities particularly through regional media. We know that regional media is a way to get those messages out into regional communities. I do not want to go into much more detail because this has to be agreed to by cabinet and come in through regulation. There will be a significant recruitment campaign to encourage people to stand. There will be a significant amount of promotion around the elections.

**Dr CLOSE:** Do you have an estimate of how much the initial election will cost and where that money will come from?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We will undertake a procurement process for this. We are looking at that at the moment. Obviously, we will be looking for the most cost-effective method to deliver these and a process that has a high level of integrity because that is completely critical to ensuring that there is community confidence. We are working through that process at the moment.

**Dr CLOSE:** I draw your attention to the second part of my question because you must have anticipated, if not exactly how much it will cost, whether it will come out of NRM resources that would otherwise be going to the management of natural resources.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes, the intention is that it come out of NRM board budgets.

**Dr CLOSE:** Will each board be responsible for their own cost, regardless of the size of their budget?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We are working through those issues at the moment. I acknowledge that particular boards with smaller budgets do not scale up equally. For a board with 4,000 people, the election will not cost a tenth of a board with 40,000 people. We are working through that and looking for ways to make sure that occurs in the most cost-effective way that does not detract from the business of the board.

Clause passed.

Clauses 18 to 21 passed.

Clause 22.

**Dr CLOSE:** This question has come from discussions that I have had with members of the environment movement and various organisations under that umbrella. There was a concern about the lack of requirement for transparency, therefore I will be moving amendment No. 2 [Close-2]. I think there might have been a slight tidying up by parliamentary counsel, but it essentially reintroduces the requirements for the meetings to be held in public and for the minutes and agenda to be made available.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** The only reason this was not in the act was that we felt that it could be accommodated in the regulations. We were fully intending to transfer this component into the more administrative part of the act through regulation. It certainly was not an attempt to avoid or circumvent transparency and it was our intention to go down this track anyway in regulation.

I should say that the proposed amendment would mean that boards could hold an in camera session in any circumstance that they consider necessary and appropriate. Currently, the NRM Act prescribes the circumstances when boards can hold an in camera session. I am not sure if my role is to ask the deputy leader questions on her amendment, but I was interested—

**The CHAIR:** Minister, you can do that.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** This is the first time I have done this, so I am learning.

**The CHAIR:** But we have not got to the amendment yet.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Yes, the deputy leader moved it.

**The CHAIR:** My understanding is that we need to deal with clause 22 first because what the deputy leader is proposing is a new clause.

Clause passed.

New clauses 22A and 22B.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [Close-2]—

Page 39, after line 32—Insert:

22A—Meetings of boards to be held in public

- (1) Subject to this clause, a meeting of a regional landscape board must be conducted in a place open to the public.
- (2) A regional landscape board must give public notice of its intention to hold a meeting that will be open to the public in accordance with the requirements prescribed by the regulations.
- (3) The notice must state the time and place at which the meeting will be held.
- (4) The regulations may dispense with the requirement to give notice in prescribed circumstances.
- (5) A regional landscape board may order that the public be excluded from attendance at a meeting if the board considers it to be necessary and appropriate to act in a meeting closed to the public in order to receive, discuss or consider any information or matter in confidence.
- (6) A member of the public who, knowing that an order is in force under subsection (5), enters or remains in a room in which a meeting of the board is being held is guilty of an offence.  
Maximum penalty: \$2,500.
- (7) If an order is made under subsection (5), a note must be made in the minutes of the making of the order and of the grounds on which it was made.

22B—Agenda and minutes of meetings open to public to be made available

- (1) A regional landscape board must make available for inspection and purchase by members of the public, copies of the agenda, and copies of the minutes, of each meeting, or the part of each meeting, that is open to members of the public.
- (2) An agenda must be made available under subsection (1) at least 3 days before the meeting to which it relates is held except where the meeting is held in urgent circumstances.
- (3) A regional landscape board must not charge for inspection of an agenda or minutes and must not charge more than the fee prescribed by regulation for sale of copies of an agenda or minutes.

I will take this opportunity to answer the question that was asked about the simplification of language from the existing act. It could be that, were this to pass, it could be amended in the upper house if the minister were so minded, but the advice I have received is that the way in which in camera matters are dealt with in more modern legislation is to allow that discretion, rather than to seek to bind in advance.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** That does fit with our aims for simplification, obviously. It is still our intention to deal with this in regulation, but it is something we can deal with between the houses. We will oppose the amendment, but we will look at it between the houses.

New clauses negatived.

Clause 23.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 9 [Close-1]—

Page 39, line 39 [clause 23(1)(a)]—After 'landscape management' insert:  
and biodiversity conservation

I have both questions and amendments for clause 23. The section that establishes the functions of the board is really crucial. Along with the objects and principles of the act, it really says what these creatures do. I was disappointed to see what I regard as a lack of emphasis on biodiversity and conservation and much more about management and, again, the mantra of back-to-basics water resource, pest animal and plant control.

It does talk about integrated landscapes, which is a good concept, but it requires practical application. Therefore, I move this amendment, which adds the words 'biodiversity conservation' after 'landscape management' in order to be specific about this being a bill that is also about nature and not just about the management of resources from which we extract productive use.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I am going to oppose this, but this is certainly an area that we are very open to having further discussions on. We believe that clause 23 already provides for biodiversity outcomes to form part of the board's functions through the concept of integrated landscape management.

Delivering multiple outcomes is central to the internationally recognised concept of integrated landscape management. An integrated landscape management approach enhances human livelihoods and wellbeing, improves agricultural production and conserves biodiversity and ecosystem health. That is from the United Nations definitions. However, we will be taking a really good look at the deputy leader's amendment, and I am extremely open to accommodating that.

Amendment negatived.

**Dr CLOSE:** I move:

Amendment No 10 [Close-1]—

Page 40, after line 24 [clause 23(1)]—Insert:

- (ea) to undertake an active role in ensuring, insofar as is reasonably practical, that the board's regional landscape plan, landscape affecting activities control policies, water allocation plans and water affecting activities control policies, advance the objects of the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* and promote the conservation of wildlife as envisaged under the *National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972*; and

This is an addition after paragraph (e). What both (e) and this new paragraph (ea) are talking about is the interaction between the plans for which the board is responsible, other legislation and other legislative instruments. Paragraph (e) is specifically around the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. In my amendment, I am seeking to restore interaction with and advancement of the objects of the Native Vegetation Act as well as the National Parks and Wildlife Act. The amendment brings back in the importance of native vegetation and wildlife and the interaction with protected areas in constructing the objects and effect of the plans that the boards will write.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We will oppose this amendment, as we have all of them. Again, we think that there is very substantial merit here, and we will probably amend the amendment, and we will do that between the houses in consultation with the deputy leader. We understand the intent of what she is attempting to achieve here and broadly support that direction.

To an extent, it comes back to what I said earlier about the need to modernise some of our other pieces of environmental legislation in South Australia. I believe that the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972 is one of those. The Native Vegetation Act, the Coast Protection Act, etc., are others that could require some modernisation. It has been my intention to look at the intersection of the new landscape act with those acts down the track; however, I think that we can reach a landing on this between the houses. For now, we oppose the amendment, but I flag my intention to support something similar.

Amendment negated.

**Dr CLOSE:** I will move to subclause (1)(h), which is the last part of this clause I have questions about. I believe that this brings the capacity to manage native animals into NRM for the first time. Previously, it sat with the National Parks and Wildlife Act. It would be good to confirm that this is a reform, a change, but my question is about how this will work.

I absolutely appreciate that there are overabundant native species and that they are a problem for themselves, a problem for productive lands and also a problem for ecosystems, but they are not always all of those. It is possible that a native species can be a problem for productive use of land but not otherwise cause harm or be overabundant, in the sense that its removal and destruction would not cause a problem with its general population, if I am not speaking in too many circles. Subclause (1)(h) begins:

...the management of any native animals that adversely affect the natural or built environments, people or primary production...

How does that sit with the need to consider the native animals in their own right and within their own ecosystem and not just the way in which they affect human activity?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Firstly, I want to inform and reassure the committee that permits, largely permits for destruction but also other animal-related permits, will continue to be administered under the National Parks and Wildlife Act 1972.

However, the deputy leader raises a vexed problem and she would be more than aware that the Natural Resources Committee is undertaking an investigation into overabundant species at the moment. As the minister, I certainly look forward to hearing the outcomes of that investigation because I think the government will benefit from the recommendations of that committee.

As a government and certainly from the point of view of the Department for Environment and Water, we think there needs to be a role for natural resources management boards in assisting the management of overabundant species because they are boards that are inevitably, and certainly under the new legislation, closer to communities and will have a greater understanding of the impacts of overabundant native species. We really did want to have this clause in here to say that we are trying to find a legislative response for what is a very tricky issue for any minister for environment and water historically in this state, and that is dealing with overabundant native species that could be having a social or environmental impact but could also of course be having a negative economic impact on the landscape.

This does not necessarily need to be a negative outcome for native species, for example, resulting in their destruction. There is also an opportunity here, when landscape boards are taking a community-level approach to the management of overabundant native species, that could include

NRM boards having their education role activated, providing people with advice and knowledge about how to manage their land in a way that potentially discourages native species without destroying them. It might include support for fencing, wildlife corridors, native plantings and things like that that would detract from the species using the agricultural landscape for food, etc.

This is one small section in the act. We could talk about it for days, but we actually do see a role. What we want to create is an opportunity for landscape boards to be involved in this space. We do not want it to be a role just for the Department for Environment and Water. That is why we are broadening responsibility. I emphasise that we think there is a positive opportunity here for boards to work alongside the communities that they represent to manage wildlife, rather than destroy wildlife.

When we went out to regional South Australia with the 20-plus regional forums, this was something that was repeatedly asked for during the consultation phase. People continually brought this up as being an immediate and very visible problem. Part of that, no doubt, is because of the dry impacts in parts of our state. When we were out consulting, parts of our state were under pressure, and still are, from long periods of dry weather. This was enhanced in the minds of people—top of mind—particularly those working the land. It came out in many of our forums across the state. Of course, that was usually in relation to kangaroos, but not always.

**Dr CLOSE:** I just signal that I will look at whether there is a form of words that might give some comfort that this activity could not happen in isolation of understanding the potential ecological or biodiversity conservation impacts of these kinds of mechanisms. Again, through the houses, we will see if we can find something so that we are not in the position where boards are supporting mechanisms that might exclude animals from having access to water, for example, because those animals are causing a local problem for a farmer, because that could cause a negative ecological impact. I am sure that is not what you are intending. So we might just see if we can find a form of words.

Clause passed.

Clause 24.

**Dr CLOSE:** Before I move my amendments, I have some questions about the way in which the Green Adelaide board itself, or on the basis of interaction with its community, will be able to determine what matters. In a document that is otherwise quite light on specificity and is designed to enable the capacity for boards or the minister to make decisions, I find it curious that the number seven has been chosen and that those priorities have been established through legislation.

I would like to understand where those seven priorities came from and whether there has been any consideration of the capacity to change them at some stage. There are probably many examples of priorities that one could think of that are not in the list, but the one that particularly leapt out at me was climate adaptation, given that is a pressing issue already in the urban environment and will also be so in the very near future.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I thank the deputy leader for a very reasonable question on this point. When we established the seven key priorities relating to Green Adelaide, we were very keen to try to capture, in a broad sense, all the main bodies of work undertaken in the context of the metropolitan environment by the current Adelaide and Mount Lofty NRM Board. It is my view that these items, if done well, achieve what is probably an overarching outcome that the deputy leader refers to as climate adaptation. We really want this body to focus on the effective environmental management of the urban environment.

We think that having a body like this is, in many ways, an Australian first. In the greening of our city, we have the opportunity to be an international leader. If we get priorities A to G right and get them functioning well, it is my view that the overarching climate adaptation outcome will be achieved. I would go further than the deputy leader and, rather than inserting something like climate adaptation as one of the seven priorities, I actually think that is part of the resilience that we are aiming to build with respect to climate. That is found in point 1, immediately above the outline of the seven priorities. I think climate resilience is actually the overarching objective of the body to be known as Green Adelaide.

The fulfilment of the seven key priorities as they stand, including the greening of the city to reduce the urban heat island and the creation of more resilience in the natural habitats within the metropolitan environment, would achieve that. I have given a rationale for not having climate as one of the seven but, to go back to the reasoning for the seven being picked, that was as a result of an analysis of the work that the current NRM board undertakes in the Adelaide context.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Matter of Privilege*

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (17:49):** Today in question time on 16 May 2019, the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier the following question:

Has the Premier stripped all funding from Brand SA?

In response, the Premier told the house, and I quote:

I refer the Leader of the Opposition to the answers that we have provided in the Legislative Council.

In the Legislative Council, the Hon. Kyam Maher asked the Hon. David Ridgway, and I quote:

My question is to the Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment. Has Brand SA been stripped of its funding, and has the successful I Choose SA campaign been dumped?

In response, the Hon. David Ridgway, Minister for Trade, Tourism and Investment said:

I thank the honourable member for his question. As members would know, the Marshall Liberal government undertook a major review of trade and investment, which was called the Joyce review, to help drive exports and investment growth. We are going to be making some changes as to how we promote South Australia to ensure that we are focused on promoting South Australia both interstate and overseas rather than within South Australia.

A supplementary question from the Hon. Kyam Maher:

...as part of the Joyce review, which the minister mentioned, will he rule out that Brand SA has been stripped of its funding?

Minister Ridgway responded:

As my colleague the honourable Treasurer said earlier, we are not going to play the rule in, rule out game. It's a game the opposition has played. We are not going to play the rule in, rule out game. We have a budget on 18 June, and that's when all will be revealed.

The Legislative Council was informed by minister Ridgway that no information would be published until the 2019-20 state budget is delivered to this house on budget day. Therefore, this house was directed to that information given to the Legislative Council by minister Ridgway by the Premier.

The opposition has received a copy of correspondence to Brand SA that the Premier personally signed, addressed to the chair of Brand SA, Mr Peter Joy, dated 16 May 2019. It was delivered to Mr Joy before question time today, and I quote:

Dear Peter,

Thank you for your letter of 13 May 2019 in relation to government funding to Brand South Australia.

I can confirm that following the Joyce Review, the government has decided to refresh how South Australia is promoted to drive economic growth. Accordingly, funds that previously were provided to Brand South Australia to promote the state will be reallocated.

I thank Brand South Australia for the role they have played over recent years and trust that individuals and businesses associated with Brand South Australia will continue to be strong advocates for this wonderful state.

Yours sincerely,

Hon. Steven Marshall MP

Premier of South Australia

16/5/2019

I believe the Premier has deliberately and intentionally misled the House of Assembly to disrupt the business of the house by misleading it about when a government decision would be announced in



relation to Brand SA's funding to halt further questioning on the matter during question time. The Premier's letter makes it clear he was aware that Brand SA's funding would be removed and the timing of the receipt of that letter proves that he knew before he received and answered his question from the Leader of the Opposition.

I believe that a prima facie case exists for the establishment of a privileges committee. I ask that the Speaker give consideration to my matter of privilege and rule if a motion to establish a privileges committee should be given precedence over other business in the House of Assembly.

**The DEPUTY SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, given that you have raised a matter of privilege, I will refer this to the Speaker, obviously, so if you could bring to me any documents that you might have there, I will forward them to the Speaker for his consideration.

### *Bills*

## **SENTENCING (SUSPENDED AND COMMUNITY BASED CUSTODIAL SENTENCES) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Final Stages*

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

- No. 1. Clause 5, page 3, line 8—Delete 'definition of *terrorist act*' and substitute:  
definition of *serious offence*, (c)
- No. 2. Clause 7, page 4, after line 11—After subclause (4) insert:  
(4a) Section 71(5), definition of *designated offence*, (a)—delete '12, 12A'
- No. 3. Clause 7, page 4, line 36 to page 5, line 3 [clause 7(7), inserted subsection (6)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:  
(a) the defendant was, at the time of the offence, 20 years of age or less; and  
(ab) the circumstances of the offending, including the victim's age and the age difference between the defendant and the victim, are such that it is appropriate that a home detention order be made; and
- No. 4. Clause 10, page 7, lines 4 to 6 [clause 10(2), inserted paragraph (ab)(i)]—Delete subparagraph (i)
- No. 5. Clause 10, page 7, lines 7 to 9 [clause 10(2), inserted paragraph (ab)(ii)]—Delete 'unless the court is satisfied that special reasons exist for the making of an intensive correction order'
- No. 6. Clause 10, page 7, lines 24 and 25 [clause 10(3), inserted subsection (5), definition of *designated offence*, (b)]—Delete paragraph (b)
- No. 7. Clause 10, page 8, lines 6 to 9 [clause 10(3), inserted subsection (5), definition of *prescribed designated offence*]—Delete the definition of prescribed designated offence
- No. 8. Clause 14, page 12, after line 22—After subclause (2) insert:  
(2a) Section 96(9), definition of *designated offence*, (a)—delete '12, 12A'
- No. 9. Clause 14, page 14, lines 12 to 18 [clause 14(6), inserted subsection (10)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:  
(a) the defendant was, at the time of the offence, 20 years of age or less; and  
(ab) the circumstances of the offending, including the victim's age and the age difference between the defendant and the victim, are such that it is appropriate that the sentence be suspended; and
- No. 10. Schedule 1, page 16, lines 13 to 22 [Schedule 1, Part 2, clause 2(2)]—Delete subclause (2) and substitute:  
(2) Section 75—after subsection (1) insert:  
(1aa) If—  
(a) a person is sentenced to imprisonment for an offence committed while on parole; and

- (b) the court orders that the person serve the sentence subject to a home detention order or an intensive correction order under the *Sentencing Act 2017*,

the person is liable to serve the balance of the sentence, or sentences, of imprisonment in respect of which the person was on parole, being the balance unexpired as at the day on which the offence was committed (and the person will serve that balance subject to the conditions of the home detention order or intensive correction order (as the case requires)).

Note—

Section 45(2) of the *Sentencing Act 2017* provides that the sentence for the offence committed while on parole will be cumulative on the sentence, or sentences, in respect of which the defendant was on parole.

- (3) Section 75(1a)—delete 'Subsection (1) applies' and substitute:  
Subsections (1) and (1aa) apply
- (4) Section 75(2)—after 'subsection (1)' insert:  
or (1aa)
- (5) Section 75(3)—delete 'in prison under this section' and substitute:  
under this section in prison or under a home detention order or intensive correction order (as the case requires)

No. 11. Schedule 1, page 16, line 23 [Schedule 1, Heading to Part 2]—Delete 'Transitional' and substitute:  
Savings and transitional

No. 12. Schedule 1, page 16, lines 26 to 28 [Schedule 1, Part 2, clause 3(1)]—Delete 'the offence for which the defendant is being sentenced was committed before or after that commencement.' and substitute:

- 
- (a) the offence for which the defendant is being sentenced was committed before or after that commencement; or
- (b) the defendant is being sentenced at first instance or on an appeal against sentence.

No. 13. Schedule 1, page 16, after line 36 [Schedule 1, Part 2, clause 3]—After subclause (2) insert:

- (3) An amendment effected by a provision of this Act does not apply to or in relation to a home detention condition included in a bond under section 96(7) of the *Sentencing Act 2017* (as in force immediately before the commencement of section 14(2) of this Act).

Consideration in committee.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that the government welcomes the amendments as scheduled from the Legislative Council and will support the same. In short, they are amendments that were introduced by the Treasurer, substantially, although amendment No. 12 was from the Hon. Mr Maher, who presented an addition to the suite of amendments. I do not propose to discuss it any further, other than to indicate the government's acceptance of the same. I look forward to the swift passage of the bill and the new regime that will follow for suspended and community-based custodial sentences in the future.

**Mr PICTON:** I rise to make a few comments in relation to this bill and to the amendments that have been presented from the other place. While the opposition is supporting this and does not want to stand in the way of the bill, we do highlight that we are disappointed that the government did not support the Labor Party's amendments to strengthen the bill. We believe that it is, sadly, a weak bill that leaves open the door for dangerous paedophiles to be released on home detention. It has also been rushed and riddled with drafting errors, as is clearly evidenced by the sheer number of amendments that the government themselves—

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** Point of order: I raise the question of reflection on a vote in the other place. Rather than dealing with the amendments, the member is referring to his view about the

vote in relation to amendments that were presented and rejected in another place and I ask that he discontinue.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Kaurna, I will listen carefully. I do not believe you really were reflecting on the vote as such, but I will ask you to make your comments and we will take these amendments in hand.

**Mr PICTON:** Thank you very much, Chair. I appreciate your very sensible ruling on the point of order from the Deputy Premier. We believe that this was a rushed bill, riddled with drafting errors, as is evidenced by the significant number of amendments that have been presented here to this house today to supposedly clarify provisions that were filed by the government in the other place.

We do not want to stand in the way of the bill, but we highlight that we believe that our amendments would have strengthened this bill and would have ensured that paedophiles, such as Vivian Deboo, would stay locked up behind bars and that in the future the circumstances that arose in regard to paedophile Paul Thomas would not have resulted in his being released into the community.

Unfortunately, we did not get that support and that is not proceeding. We hope that there are not downsides from the government's decision in that regard in the future. Ultimately, we will not stand in the way of this bill and will allow it to proceed with the amendments being moved through the Deputy Premier to address the many drafting issues the Deputy Premier had in her original bill.

Motion carried.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Tuesday 4 June 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***CHILD PROTECTION**

**786 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What are the funding arrangements for the Office of the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People over the forward estimates?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education):** I have been advised of the following:

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People has a budget of \$416,000 per annum indexed over the forward estimates.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**787 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What is the FTE allocation for the Office of the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education):** I have been advised of the following:

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People has a full-time equivalent staff allocation of two and has access to additional resources as needed from the Office of Commissioner for Children and Young people and the Department for Education.

**CHILD PROTECTION**

**788 Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (14 May 2019). What is the breakdown of FTEs by position in the Office of the Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Moriaita—Minister for Education):** I have been advised of the following:

The Commissioner for Aboriginal Children and Young People FTE breakdown is as follows:

- 1 SAES 1 (Commissioner)
- 1 ASO 5 (Project Officer)

**MENTAL HEALTH SERVICES**

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (15 November 2018).

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has advised:

I am pleased to advise that in April 2019, the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network appointed a suitably qualified psychiatrist to fill the vacancy at the Centre for Disability Health, to ensure adults with intellectual disability and comorbid psychiatric illness continue to receive treatment.

With respect to the Mental Health Assessment Unit, the former Labor Government closed the temporary Mental Health Short Stay Unit (MHSSU) at the Lyell McEwin Hospital (LMH) on 15 December 2017, which at that time had eight beds.

The former government was not planning a new unit until 2021.

Since November 2018, an existing transportable building has accommodated a five-bed unit and will do so until a new permanent Mental Health Assessment Unit is delivered in 2021 as part of the \$58.0 million LMH Emergency Department Redevelopment project.

**LYMPHOEDEMA PATIENTS**

In reply to **the Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome)** (20 March 2019).

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining):** The Minister for Health and Wellbeing has been advised that:

It is not possible to accurately advise the number of people who have a lymphoedema condition in the electorate of Frome and surrounding areas. Country Health SA does not keep a database of lymphoedema patients. Many patients are treated in primary health settings by private physiotherapists and/or their general practitioner.

The Port Pirie GP Plus services reports ten patients with lymphoedema are currently receiving outpatient services including massage therapy. Seven people with lymphoedema are waiting for outpatient services.