

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 28 November 2019

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

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

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:01): I move:

That the fifth report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2018-19, be noted.

Sir, I know that you will be very excited to hear about some of the activities that our committee has been undertaking since 1 July 2018. The current membership of the committee includes me as the Presiding Member, as well as the members for Colton, Finniss, Lee, Morphett, Ramsay and Wright. I would also like to acknowledge the member for Narungga, who was a member of the committee until 31 July 2018, when he was replaced by the member for Finniss. I thank all members past and present for their contributions to the committee throughout the 2018-19 period.

The committee tabled two reports in the reporting period. On 28 November 2018, the committee tabled its Annual Report 2017-18, and on 6 June 2019 the committee tabled its report on the emergency services levy for 2019-20. It is probably important at this point, because I have not been able to make a contribution more broadly to the debate this week, to thank all those emergency services personnel who fought in the bushfires not only in our home state of South Australia on Yorke Peninsula in the member for Narungga's electorate but over in New South Wales as well.

Our community volunteer organisations are the backbone of their communities, and right across country South Australia and indeed in parts of peri-urban Adelaide, including my own electorate, we know that the CFS plays a huge role. In fact, on Saturday morning just gone I hosted my annual CFS fundraising barbecue, together with the member for Boothby and the member for Davenport in this house.

I was talking to James from the Belair brigade. He had just come back from fighting the fires in New South Wales, and there were quite a few members of the Belair and Eden Hills brigades who were in New South Wales, as well as those from the Coromandel Valley brigade who went down to fight the fires in Edithburgh. Thank you to all the members of the Sturt group for the work they do in protecting our community.

The Economic and Finance Committee is, I believe, the hardest working committee in the parliament. In 2018-19, we heard from over 120 people at public hearings, 70 people at public hearings in our parliament here and 50 people at hearings throughout regional South Australia. I think it is really important that committees get out into the regions not only for members of the committee to get a stronger understanding of what is happening in our regional communities and outside the bubble that is North Terrace but also for members of regional communities to be able to speak to politicians from all sides of the divide. We have also had 41 hearings here in our parliament. So it is a very hardworking committee, and we are very grateful to the committee secretariat, Dr Josh Forkert and Mr Adam Marafioti, for their good sense of humour and diligence as they go about their work.

Over the reporting period, the committee conducted an inquiry into South Australian investment attraction policies. The committee received 27 submissions and heard from 47 witnesses across nine public hearings, including public hearings in Salisbury and Murray Bridge and a site visit to the Beston Pure Foods cheesemaking facility following the hearing in Murray Bridge.

The committee heard that there were many barriers and drawbacks in the previous investment attraction programs of the former Labor government, including a perceived focus on

picking winners and providing grants to individual businesses instead of improving the overall business environment, as well as a number of broader barriers and challenges, including a lack of access to appropriately skilled labour and poor coordination across levels of government.

The committee tabled the final report of this inquiry on 31 July 2019. The report made eight recommendations to inform the government's new approach to investment attraction to reinforce the strengths and address the barriers of past programs. The committee also made a number of recommendations to help increase investment in regional areas through supporting infrastructure projects and cutting red tape in planning processes.

I am really glad that this is happening. There was some news in recent weeks about the way the government is investing in infrastructure programs across the region in the member for Stuart's electorate with the Joy Baluch Bridge, and of course in the member for Narungga's electorate at Port Wakefield and the Horrocks Highway as well. So the government is investing in our regions, which is so important. That is something that we need to fast-track for productivity and for safety and to ensure that our economy continues to grow for the betterment of all.

In August 2018, the committee resolved to inquire into and report on the economic contribution of migration to South Australia. This is certainly a very important committee, and I note that the federal parliament has just begun an inquiry into the economic contribution of migration as well. We are a migrant nation. In South Australia, if you look at our growth statistics over the last 16 to 20 years, if it were not for migration in this state and people coming and choosing to live in South Australia our population would indeed have gone backwards.

So migrants, especially skilled migrants, and international students make an incredibly important contribution to the economic prosperity of this state. The inquiry is almost about to wrap up and we hope to table that report soon. I think the inquiry was very fulsome in its business. As I said, we received 40 submissions and heard from 84 witnesses across 14 public hearings. In March this year, as part of the inquiry the committee travelled to the Limestone Coast and held public hearings in Penola and Mount Gambier.

We visited Balnaves of Coonawarra (who make some beautiful chardonnay) and Holla-Fresh in Tantanoola to discuss the role of migrants in addressing local workforce shortages. In June 2019, the committee held public hearings in Murray Bridge and visited Costa Adelaide Mushrooms at Monarto South. In October this year, the committee visited the Osborne Naval Shipyard to hear about the impact of migrants on the defence industry and the skills that are needed in that sector.

It would not matter where we held public hearings in terms of migration, there are so many businesses—whether it is Holla-Fresh, Big River Pork in the member for Hammond's electorate, Thomas Foods or Costa Adelaide Mushrooms—who pretty much predominantly rely on what we describe as a migrant workforce to ensure that those businesses survive. These are businesses that feed South Australians and feed Australians. Attracting skilled, and indeed unskilled, labour into those businesses in regional centres is so important.

Everything government can do to break down red tape and bureaucracy and encourage people to come to South Australia and to Adelaide—but, really importantly, to come to regional South Australia—is so important. The committee heard that many businesses and industries across South Australia rely on migration to fill skills shortages that cannot be met locally across a wide range of industries, from agriculture and food processing in regional areas to emerging technology and defence industries in Adelaide.

During our trip to the Limestone Coast, we heard that many of the major employers in the regions, like meat producers JBS at Bordertown and Teyes at Naracoorte, rely on migrant workers. Mr Ian Lines, owner and Managing Director of Holla-Fresh at Tantanoola, which is one of the leading hydroponic growers of fresh herbs in Australia, told us many times that without migrant workers his business would struggle to exist—and they are the biggest supplier of herbs to the Woolworths Group in South Australia and the Northern Territory.

The committee also heard about many accounts of the positive impact that both skilled and humanitarian migrants have made to local communities in the South-East. We heard that humanitarian migrants bring new life to towns like Naracoorte, Bordertown and Mount Gambier and

support local businesses, schools and communities. However, we were concerned to hear that businesses in our regional areas still struggle to attract local workers and migrants.

At Murray Bridge, we heard that lack of workers is limiting the ability of businesses like Swanport Harvest to grow and expand and that attracting and retaining workers is one of the most important issues in our regions—as we have discussed many times—especially in Murray Bridge, with the expansion of Thomas Foods International and, of course, Costa Adelaide Mushrooms. We are currently considering our report into this inquiry, and I hope to report back to the house by the end of the year, so I encourage the members of my committee to read the report so we can table it.

I thank the City of Salisbury, the Rural City of Murray Bridge, the City of Mount Gambier and Wattle Range Council for hosting the committee's public hearings in their respective districts; Mr Troy Bell MP for his help in organising the Mount Gambier public hearing; and Mr Nick McBride MP (member for MacKillop) and Mr Adrian Pederick (member for Hammond) for highlighting the issues that their respective electorates face when we were having our public hearings. I would also like to thank the many businesses, local governments and others who met with us.

The committee has also performed its various statutory functions during the reporting period, including reporting on the annual emergency services levy, reviewing changes to public body charters and tender processes for public transport services, considering the sport and recreation fund allocations and, of course, hearing evidence from the Auditor-General in relation to his annual report.

Along with the member for Colton and our secretary, Dr Josh Forkert, I was very lucky to go to Canberra recently for ACPAC—two days of very exciting deliberations about public accounts and audit committees. I had never been so excited to hear about audit and audit functions of government bureaucracies.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr DULUK: It was a very exciting two days, member for Stuart, you will be pleased to know. We met with similar committees from across Australia, as well as the public finance and accounts committee of the federal parliament. We also met with members of the New Zealand parliament and the parliaments of South Africa and parts of the Pacific. It was two days of stimulating ACPAC and learning more about how our public accounts committees can perform their functions as jurisdictions, as prudential management and by holding the executive to account in the parliament.

The committee plans to continue our busy work schedule throughout 2019-20. As noted in this report, the committee commenced an inquiry into the motor vehicle insurance and repair industry in South Australia in September 2019, and to date we have received 50 submissions. The committee has already held several public hearings and aims to report back to the house in early 2020. On behalf of the committee, I thank all those who have made a contribution to our inquiries and assisted the committee in this important work over the past year. I commend the Economic and Finance Committee's Annual Report 2018-19 to the house.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I welcome to parliament today, on behalf of the member for Florey, guests of the Uyghur community, particularly special guests Mrs Roshan Abbas and Mr Abdulhakim Idris, from America. Welcome to parliament.

Parliamentary Committees

ECONOMIC AND FINANCE COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REPORT 2018-19

Debate resumed.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (11:13): I also rise to speak on the Annual Report 2018-19 of the Economic and Finance Committee that has been presented here today. I had the privilege of joining this committee one month into that financial year to help accommodate a colleague's conflict of schedule, and I have very much enjoyed having the opportunity to work with the member for Waite

as Chair, and the many other members, plus working with the staff and also listening to the witnesses who have presented to this committee.

Our committee has looked at many interesting things, such as the inquiry into South Australia's investment attraction policy and the regional visits in relation to that. The visit to the Beston Pure Foods dairy facility at Murray Bridge and listening to the issues facing those industries is certainly something that I have had an interest in over the years because of my former role in the dairy industry. I had not been to that facility for many years and the last time I was there it was run by National Foods.

I did a bit of research this morning and discovered that National Foods started in 1991, so it would have been in the mid-1990s when I was last in that factory. It is amazing what Bestons have done in the time they have had that factory after the turmoil with the closure at very short notice of those factories when the previous owners ran into financial trouble. I thank them for showing us through that facility and particularly what they have done in relation to the cheesemaking plant and how they are getting into new markets with the work that they are doing.

It was also pleasing to be involved in the inquiry into the economic contribution of migration to South Australia, which again allowed us to travel to the regions and hold hearings at Penola on the Limestone Coast, in a very cold town hall in the middle of winter, and at Mount Gambier. It was really interesting to hear about the issues facing those communities. We even heard from the local bakery about trying to get bakers to maintain a workforce to operate their bakery and the difficulties and challenges they faced in attracting and keeping staff in that region.

One of my highlights of that visit to the South-East was going to the Holla-Fresh facility at Tantanoola and looking at how they grow herbs and how well they have set up that business to supply both the Melbourne and Adelaide markets in particular. Being set up halfway and being able to truck both ways to get fresh herbs into supermarkets with a good shelf life is a credit to the community of Tantanoola.

Another highlight was the Costa mushroom farm at Monarto South. If you like sheds, that is the place to go because they have some really big sheds. That have done amazing things.

Mr Pederick: It's a big shed. They built another one.

Mr BASHAM: Yes, they have doubled the size with the second shed. It is amazing to see how the mushrooms are grown and how they have structured the facility to progress the growth of the mushrooms so systematically. They can pump mushrooms out almost at will, but that requires a workforce to do so, hence the need to have a talk to them about the importance of migration to their business.

We also had the opportunity to go down to the Osborne Naval Shipyard, something that not many people get the opportunity to do. If you thought the sheds were big at the mushroom farm, they are nothing on the sheds down there—they are huge. When you can put a full-size naval ship inside a shed, that makes for a big shed. In their case, they are building a shed that is going to fit two ships side by side. It was amazing to see those structures going up and the investment going on there. It is a credit to the South Australian workforce doing the work there with the project that is being put together. It was an absolute pleasure to be part of that visit.

We do have other inquiries. We are now starting to hear evidence in the inquiry into the motor vehicle insurance and repair industry (this is also mentioned in this report), which is fascinating. Unfortunately, I was not able to attend the site visit to the crash repairer last Wednesday as I had another commitment. It was around 40°—a lovely place to be, I would have thought, at a crash repairer on a 40° day. I am sure my colleagues enjoyed their time there. I thank very much the staff for pulling together this report and the member for Waite for bringing it before the house. I will leave my remarks there.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:20): I will also speak briefly about the activities of the Economic and Finance Committee and the matters addressed in the annual report of 1 July 2018 to 30 June 2019. It has been really interesting. The committee meets basically every week that parliament sits on Wednesday mornings, but we have supplemented that with site visits to help inform us in our current inquiries.

Just prior to this particular period of 2018, in June we had already commenced an inquiry into investment attraction. It has been really informative to look at how we can progress the economic development of this state, where we were previously and how we can look to improve it. As part of that, we heard from a number of witnesses. The report states that we received 27 submissions for this inquiry and also heard from 47 witnesses across the entire period, which ranged from June up until October.

We also went on two site visits. One was to Salisbury to look at some of the work that was being done out in the north, especially in light of the fact that Holden had closed down, and what opportunities were in place to try to replace that. We also heard from witnesses at Murray Bridge. We heard from not only the member for Hammond but also some of the local councils. I think both Murray Bridge council mayor, Brenton Lewis, and also the Mid Murray Council mayor, Dave Burgess, spoke and emphasised the importance that councils play in terms of the on-ground work of economic development.

We also heard from some of the local businesses there. We heard from Big River Pork and Thomas Foods and were able to do a tour of Beston Pure Foods to see what some investment attraction can do to help these businesses really progress. They invested money into their factory there. It is interesting to see the processes in place from that point of view as well. In terms of an overview of what we heard, there were certainly some barriers and drawbacks to some of the previous investment attraction programs, ranging from overly onerous application processes to ongoing reporting requirements.

We heard evidence that ongoing reporting did impact businesses and whether they thought it would be worthwhile even going through the process of trying to apply for grants. We also found there was a perceived focus on picking winners and providing grants to individual businesses instead of improving the overall business environment, even to the point where some businesses were shopping around for grants. They fully intended to outlay capital and then try to use the grant process to reduce or ameliorate the expenses they would incur from a capital perspective.

The inquiry also heard information around focusing on investments that occurred without government assistance. As I said, they would have gone ahead anyway, so it was not a matter of picking winners but actually trying to improve the overall business conditions here in South Australia so that all businesses can compete on a level playing field.

Interestingly enough, it seemed that there was also a lack of attention to supporting businesses already located in South Australia. They have done the hard yards and set up their business, and they were then finding that they were having to compete against businesses that had been provided funding to set up here. There were certainly concerns around that, acknowledging the great work that existing South Australian businesses do in helping our economy here. We also heard a number of broader barriers and challenges that come with trying to attract investment here to South Australia.

The member for Waite mentioned trying to reduce red tape. Also there are the high energy and waste removal costs and then maybe the lack of technology infrastructure. High-speed internet is becoming very important for businesses now to be able to compete in global markets. Businesses generally are exposed to the effects of globalisation more and more because of the internet. Certainly, if our businesses in South Australia can have access to high-speed internet, it will really assist them to compete and open up access to international markets.

We also looked at the access to appropriate skilled labour. I suppose that can be a segue into one of the new inquiries that the Economic and Finance Committee launched in the financial year 2018-19 in regard to the economic contribution of migration to South Australia. That inquiry started on 1 August 2018. Over the time of that inquiry, we heard from 84 witnesses across 14 public hearings and received 40 submissions in regard to that.

We also made site visits to try to understand the effects of migration. In March 2019, the committee travelled to the Limestone Coast and held public hearings both in Penola and Mount Gambier, and that was certainly very informative as well. I think the member for MacKillop came along and presented and spoke of some of the challenges. He also identified some of the challenges

regarding access to housing and the fact that local councils play an important role as well on the ground level.

The member for Finniss mentioned that we also visited Balnaves in terms of the wine production there and saw some of their challenges around skilled migration. I remember speaking with one of the chief winemakers there, who said that one of the problems is that their youth are schooled in the Limestone Coast and then many of them go to university either in Adelaide or in other states. They become skilled, but then there is a lack of those skilled jobs for them in the Limestone Coast, so they do not return after doing their tertiary studies. That then impacts in terms of the workforce there. Therefore, migration certainly becomes very important to these businesses looking to grow in the regions.

We also visited Murray Bridge, again in relation to migration, and heard from a number of businesses. The member for Hammond presented, and he was really forthright in his comments and very helpful to the committee. The two mayors from Murray Bridge and Mid Murray also came along and gave evidence, as did local businesses such as Big River Pork and Thomas Foods. It was really interesting to hear from Thomas Foods and the impact of the DAMA that has been struck by the state government and the federal government. That was one of the key reasons for them staying where they were in and around Murray Bridge. Thomas Foods is really vital for Murray Bridge and the local economy there. The access to skilled migrants is certainly going to be very important to Thomas Foods and many other businesses.

Another perplexing point that was raised was that, while these businesses are screaming out for skilled labour, at the same time Murray Bridge suffers from higher than average unemployment rates, so they do not seem to mix. I think there certainly needs to be attention paid to encourage workers to look for worthwhile work in their local area, which will also help to combat the unemployment rate.

We also considered some more statutory functions. We looked at the emergency services levy that was presented for this year, and we investigated that in June 2019. As did the member for Waite—while not speaking directly on the fires on Yorke Peninsula and the 69 fires that occurred across the state last Wednesday during those catastrophic fire conditions—on behalf of the community of Morphett I pass on my thanks to not only the firefighters on Yorke Peninsula but all those many CFS brigades who came from throughout the state to help out fellow South Australians and protect the town of Edithburgh.

We are all very thankful for them and the work that the emergency services levy provides to not only the CFS but all our emergency services. You can really see it is very worthwhile, when put into the consciousness of Wednesday, and how important it is that our emergency services personnel are supported.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:30): I rise to make a brief contribution on the annual report of the Economic and Finance Committee and certainly appreciate their good work in various inquiries, whether it is on investment attraction or skilled migration. I acknowledge the hearings and the reference they are studying in relation to the crash repair industry, which is an interesting industry in that in my mind the insurance industry thinks it can manipulate it in regard to preferred repairers, and I am sure they are getting good evidence on that.

I was very pleased to host the committee in the Rural City of Murray Bridge and proud to outline something we celebrated only a few weeks ago in Murray Bridge: the investment of over \$1 billion that is going into the region, not just centrally in Murray Bridge. There is a lot going on: there have been investment attraction policies, and obviously migration attraction has assisted with this work.

Thomas Foods International are going ahead with their build of the beef rooms. They are going to get onto that very shortly before the lamb plant is rebuilt as well. Also, there is Big River Pork with their expansion and Costa Mushrooms with their \$70 million expansion. Beston Global, doing great work under Dr Roger Sexton, won another award the other night—I think it is No. 114—at the Premier's Food Awards. I was very lucky to be present to see that award presented. What a great success story Stacycrisp lettuce is in what they have achieved there next to the river, sometimes

on very low allocations during the Millennium Drought. Don Ruggiero and his team have done a great job.

I want to emphasise a point that has already been made: a lot of these businesses are absolutely reliant on skilled migration. I note there was a federal inquiry meeting in Murray Bridge the other day as part of a national Senate inquiry. It is vital to my community because, as has already been noted by the member for Morphett, we are reliant on that migrant workforce, yet quite a bit of the time we have a higher than average unemployment rate, which is an issue that needs to be addressed and which we are working through. I absolutely salute those migrants who come in and not just work in the area but raise that cultural awareness and add colour and fun, if you like, to the community. In a lot of ways, they can show some of us how to contribute to society in a range of ways and not just in the workplace.

Just quickly, I note that the committee visited Holla-Fresh at Tantanoola. What a fantastic company. They have a generator machine that helps keep their glasshouses at the right temperature using waste wood products. A world-first generation machine costing \$3 million has been put in place. It is a fantastic use of spent wood materials—something that is quite abundant in the South-East region and cannot be used anywhere else. We saw that recently with the Environment, Resources and Development Committee in regard to our research on recycling.

I think I will leave it there, but I really appreciate what this committee is doing around the state. I appreciated hosting them locally, and I will be very interested to see their final report into the crash repair industry.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:35): I thank the members for Finniss, Morphett and Hammond for their contributions. It was probably a bit remiss of me not to go into a bit more detail about ACPAC. I know you are very interested, as is the member for Stuart. ACPAC, of course, was the 15th Biennial Australasian Council of Public Accounts Committees Conference held in Parliament House in Canberra between 6 and 8 November.

Some of the agenda items included 'Maintaining trust in the parliamentary process, PACs and officers of the parliament' and 'Fostering engagement: the powers of PACs to access expertise, call for documents and witnesses'. Session 3 was 'Finding the way forward: the role of "big data" in maximising service delivery and policy outcomes' and 'Measuring the effectiveness of public accounts committees'. Then there was 'Working towards change: how parliamentary inquiries influence policy', which I actually think is an important one for all members of the house. It was all very beneficial.

One thing I found very interesting, and a great reminder for people who love parliament and history and Federation, was the talk of Rosemary Laing, the keynote guest speaker at the dinner on Thursday night. She is the former clerk of the federal Senate. She talked about the role that Sir Richard Baker played. Of course, his portrait is opposite me in this house. He was the Attorney-General of this state in the 1870s. He was President of the Legislative Council and the first President of the Senate at Federation.

Sir Richard played a role in giving parliaments the authority to have an audit function of the executive and public funding for the Auditor-General for their role of keeping government accountable. The concept of public accounts committees is actually very important and it takes its history from people like Richard Baker, who wanted to see good governance of the colony of South Australia and, of course, the federal parliament. The work that we do today in our committees is not new. It is very important and it plays a long and significant role in the history of our federation and for that, I commend the report for noting.

Motion carried.

Motions

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE ACT REGULATIONS

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:38): I move:

That regulations made under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, entitled Planning, Development and Infrastructure (General) (Development Assessment) Variation Regulations 2019 and laid on the table of this house on 2 July 2019, be disallowed.

I rise to move this disallowance motion. In doing so, I want to firstly acknowledge that the development assessment regulations, tabled in this chamber on 2 July, form an important part of the state's transition to our new planning system. In accordance with the provisions in the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, the development assessment regulations prescribe the processes through which development applications will be assessed under the state's new planning rules. As the Labor opposition has previously indicated, much of the policy intent contained in the regulations is desirable. I have already indicated that setting time limits for development assessment processes is also desirable.

Residents, landlords and businesses should not have relatively simple development applications held up because of inefficient bureaucratic processes. It should be acknowledged that many councils already have exemplary records. One that comes to mind is the Salisbury council, which has a very good record in this area in processing development applications quickly. But there exists an inconsistency across the local government sector, which can be improved through the establishment of maximum assessment time periods.

It should be remembered that the act made provision for deemed planning consent, whereby a development application can be approved once the applicable maximum development assessment time period has been exceeded, but, as with any piece of legislation, the devil is in the detail and, in this case, the regulatory detail. Consultation with councils and planning practitioners has revealed an unease about the inadequacy of some of the time frames set down for performance assessed development applications under the development assessment regulations.

Under the deemed planning consent model, there is concern that some development applications may be refused because inadequate information has been submitted by a proponent prior to the expiration of the relevant assessment time period. In these circumstances, more assessment time could result in the planning authority and proponent reaching a mutually agreeable development application and subsequently achieving development approval. By this I mean that the regulations could actually have the reverse effect: rather than speeding up the process, they could result in councils refusing an application because of lack of time and not allowing it to be deemed refused. I have heard that from local government circles.

In light of this, Labor believes it would be prudent if the development assessment time periods were reviewed in consultation with councils and planning practitioners. Planning practitioners also expressed concerns about the development assessment regulations' extension to accredited professional land surveyors of the authority to provide planning consent for deemed-to-satisfy land divisions.

Many planners have expressed significant doubt about the independence of private certifiers in the planning system. It is feared that a conflict of interest may arise for the land surveyor in this instance, given their service to their client, a development proponent, and their obligations as a planning authority. Concern has particularly arisen amidst evidence of the shortcomings of private certification in the building industry, where private certifiers throughout Australia have approved apartment buildings with dangerous and flammable cladding as well as other features also found to be noncompliant with the Building Code of Australia. I have one such example in my own electorate; it was certified but subsequently found not to comply with the Building Code of Australia.

Ongoing consultation with planners and other interested stakeholders has also revealed further unease about the development assessment regulations, and the Labor opposition will continue to consult to ensure that transition to the state's new planning system avoids any damaging consequences. The Labor opposition is therefore moving this disallowance motion because we believe the Marshall government should also engage in similar consultation with the parliament, councils and planning professionals as well as the development industry so that the development assessment regulations can be improved to facilitate appropriate developments. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:42): I rise on behalf of the Liberal government to oppose

this disallowance motion and to put on the record that we believe this is a reckless and disgusting attempt to thwart good planning processes in South Australia. In fact, I think a lot of the comments that have just been made by the member for Light show that even as the shadow minister for planning he has not taken the opportunity to actually engage in the processes that have led us to the decision we have got ourselves to here today.

The Hon. A. Piccolo: That's wrong. That's not true.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This legislation is not legislation that was of the government's making. This was a bipartisan piece of legislation that was passed back in 2016 that outlined and put into place the very things that the shadow minister, the member for Light, is now saying he no longer wants.

What is interesting here is that instead of raising concerns or, for instance, putting amendments to the current Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act legislation to effect the change he seeks, what he does is come into this place and put a disallowance motion on the table that is going to thwart and stop development in the outback areas of South Australia. Right at this moment there are 30 applications that are being assessed by my department which, if this disallowance were to get through, would have to be put on hold.

It is absolutely reckless, especially for regional communities that are crying out for growth; 30 applications on the table would have to be paused while we deal with the mess that the member for Light is seeking to create here. More than that, what he is actually stopping is increased consultation time frames that were embedded as part of the assessment pathways—an increase between 50 per cent and 100 per cent increase in time frames given for consultation by the community on individual development applications. If a 50 per cent and 100 per cent increase are not good enough, then maybe the member should have given us an idea about what he thought would be appropriate.

Again, we have had open consultation on the assessment pathways for something like over 12 months. This has not got to this place without there having been proper consultation. In fact, this has been done in a coordinated step-by-step process, talking with the very councils that the member for Light believes we have not spoken to, getting feedback from the community, actually listening to that feedback and then acting upon it. What these assessment pathways also do is give greater certainty for the first time to people who put in applications that they can get something assessed in a reasonable period of time.

What is interesting here is that the member for Light rails against the deemed consent provision that he believes is going to lead to issues. It was his government that put this thing in place in the first place, but did he bring back a legislative amendment to repeal the deemed consent provision? No. Did he raise any concerns during the consultation process? No. What does he do? He comes into this place and moves a disallowance that rips all this off the table, leaves us with nothing and puts in jeopardy 30 applications that are on the table right at this very moment.

The member for Light also raised concerns in relation to the way that private certification is going to operate in the new system. Again, this is a set of laws that his government put in place. But we are not actually seeking to emulate the issues that we know have existed, especially in New South Wales in regard to their issues around private certification.

We have put in place legislation—again sponsored by the member for Light's government—around an accredited professional scheme that is going to provide one of the toughest and most rigid set of standards that have been put in place anywhere in the country to make sure that people of appropriate skill are actually the ones making this decision. It is essentially a four-step pathway whereby people need to show ever-increasing degrees of experience and competence to be able to move to a higher level to be able to assess more complex applications.

What these increased requirements do is give greater confidence than even what is in place now around making sure that those people who are making decisions on behalf of the planning system in general have the skills and qualities necessary. In fact, this accredited professional scheme

is exactly what the Shergold Weir Building Confidence report had in mind when it said that we should develop a system with rigour like this.

Again, this was bipartisan back in 2016, and it reminds me of exactly what the member for Light did when it came to opposing our rate capping legislation; that is, flip through the paper and try to find every individual instance where somebody has had a grievance, put together a grab bag of measures, and then come together and try to put in some sort of reform bill. All he has done there is take everybody who has ever had a negative consequence about any aspect of anything and put them together as a reason to knock out the entire thing, which is reckless, it is dangerous and it shows exactly why they should be sitting on that side of the chamber.

Here on this side of the house, we have undertaken a thorough and comprehensive consultation process. What we have done is put in place a system that not only gives greater certainty to applicants but also gives greater certainty and opportunity for people to undertake consultation with increased time frames.

We on this side of the house want to get South Australia moving. We want to see growth and development in South Australia, but these assessment pathways are not just about saying yes more often: they are just about saying yes or no more quickly. Again, I understand that this is going to put pressure on councils to assess things within a time frame. It is going to put pressure on my department to assess applications within a considered time frame, but what is interesting is that we know that there are councils out there that can do it.

If I think about the City of Charles Sturt, or I think about the City Salisbury, or, in fact, if I head out to the Barossa and Light, these are four councils that have no problem in getting and dealing with assessment pathways within the time frames that this legislation talks about. In fact, the City of Salisbury, off the top of my head, is able to assess complying individual dwelling applications within three days. But what we have are councils at the other end of the spectrum that are taking far too long and putting increased cost upon applicants who have to pay holding costs while the council sits there and makes a decision.

Again, what we have done is listened to those applicants and said, 'We're going to provide a pathway that delivers you certainty that you will get a decision within a reasonable period of time.' What we have also said to those people who want to get involved in the process is, 'You will have increased opportunity to get involved.'

With respect to what we currently call a merit-based application in the new system—performance assessed—we are now putting a requirement as part of this, which the member for Light wants to knock out, to stick a sign on the front of the development that says, 'This is what's happening at this spot.' At the moment, it is only neighbours, people within 60 metres, who are able to make a submission on the planning application. What we have actually said is that anybody who sees the sign, or in fact anybody in South Australia who wants to put a submission into this process, should be allowed to have their say.

This system, and what the member for Light is seeking to knock off today, is precisely what we have put into these development assessment regulations. It is also interesting that, over the course of the last couple of months since the member for Light put his holding motion on the table, we have been seeking to get from the member for Light what his concerns are. Why? Because we actually want to listen to the feedback. We want to understand what the concerns are so that we can either allay them if they are incorrect or deal with them if there is a genuine point there. But that again is not what happened.

What has happened is that the member for Light is seeking to play politics with development applications in the outback by coming into this place and making assertions without actually coming and testing any of those assertions with us, when we have provided ample opportunity and have followed up on a number of occasions to try to seek out and genuinely understand what his concerns are. This shows that today is simply about base politics from a bloke who quite clearly does not understand what is going on and who is being reckless and dangerous with the hard-earned money of people in the outback who want to get on and grow South Australia and grow part of our state that is underutilised. He is putting dollars at risk and putting jobs at risk here in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: I remind the minister to address the member for Light by his electorate name, not as a 'bloke'.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:51): Mr Speaker, I listened to the minister and it is clear that he did not listen to a thing I said. It is typical of the minister because he always demonstrates his arrogance and hubris. That is why this motion will probably get up in the other chamber for a whole range of reasons, the main reason being that the minister does not listen, despite what he says. He and his department do not listen to people. They have a whole range of consultation processes and they listen to nobody. In fact, I did have discussions with his department and I did actually discuss these concerns with his department. The fact that the department has not conveyed those concerns to the minister is his problem, not mine.

We have actually met with the departmental officers and his office on a number of occasions to explain why we have certain concerns. To say that this concern is expressed by a few malcontents is the minister again showing his complete disregard for the whole sector, particularly local government, for which he seems to have some disdain. In fact, the concerns raised in this motion of the Labor opposition were actually raised by the Planning Institute of Australia and also by the LGA, amongst other organisations.

The minister comes here in his usual bombastic way and tries to character assassinate me and others, as he normally tries to do, but he actually ignores the key issues. The key issue is this: these regulations are the minister's regulations, not the previous government's. He should perhaps start acting like a government minister and own his regulations. They are his regulations and he should own them. If he thinks they are so good, he should stand by them and defend them, which he did not do today. Also—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Mr Speaker, I gave the minister the courtesy of not interrupting him, so perhaps he could do the same for me. In fact, I actually did say in my speech that the regulations have quite a few desirable policy outcomes and that we would support them. I also said that setting time limits is desirable. What we are saying is that we do not agree with the time limits that he has set—not the previous government, but that he has set—in his regulations.

I know that the minister and other ministers have tried to deflect their decisions by blaming the previous government. Well, you cannot on this occasion. These belong to you, minister. They are your regulations. If they get chucked out of parliament, it will be on your head, not the previous government's head, because you do not consult and you do not listen.

In fact, he does not listen on a whole range of development issues. He goes to public meetings that are staged. He actually makes communist China and former communist Russia look really good because of the sort of staged stuff he does, where you have to put your questions in before you go to the meeting and you can only allow certain questions, etc. These are the sorts of meetings, engagements and consultations that the minister involves himself in. I can tell you, out there—

An honourable member: Chairman Knoll.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That is right, Chairman Knoll. Out there in voter land people do not believe that the minister has engaged. They do not believe that he has actually engaged in a genuine way. What he does at those meetings is what he did this morning: he shows his arrogance and hubris when he talks down to people and does not listen. If he did listen, people would be prepared to negotiate.

Certainly, people were prepared to talk to us about their concerns. We have raised it with the minister, and we have certainly raised it in the other house. This matter has been on the table in the other house for some months, so the minister would be aware of the concerns that we raised. For him to say that I have sprung it on him today is just absolute nonsense. This is the feedback we were getting. Unfortunately, this motion will be defeated on party lines in this chamber; however, the minister does not control the other chamber.

The minister has to start listening to people's concerns and not do what he did here today by acting in such an arrogant manner. I gave the example of Salisbury council in my speech, where these issues of time limits are not an issue. There are probably other councils as well, but Salisbury comes to mind because I am familiar with that one. But as the minister correctly points out, there are other councils who do not meet those requirements and they should meet requirements. Some councils are in regional areas and, because of a lack of resources, they need better time frames.

Regional councils, country councils, have raised concerns with me about time frames. They say that, if they cannot assess it in time, they will refuse it. So the so-called certainty and timely decision-making that the minister is calling for is not going to happen under these proposed regulations. Obviously, my recommendation to this chamber would be that the minister actually listen, rather than pretend to listen—as he has done so far. The regulations might survive the upper house, but at this point in time they are unlikely to.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 20
 Noes 25
 Majority 5

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
 Brock, G.G.
 Cook, N.F.
 Hughes, E.J.
 Michaels, A.
 Piccolo, A. (teller)
 Szakacs, J.K.

Bettison, Z.L.
 Brown, M.E.
 Gee, J.P.
 Koutsantonis, A.
 Mullighan, S.C.
 Picton, C.J.
 Wortley, D.

Bignell, L.W.K.
 Close, S.E.
 Hildyard, K.A.
 Malinauskas, P.
 Odenwalder, L.K.
 Stinson, J.M.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
 Cowdrey, M.J.
 Ellis, F.J.
 Knoll, S.K.
 McBride, N.
 Pederick, A.S.
 Sanderson, R.
 Treloar, P.A.
 Wingard, C.L.

Bell, T.S.
 Cregan, D.
 Gardner, J.A.W.
 Luethen, P.
 Murray, S.
 Pisoni, D.G.
 Speirs, D.J.
 van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Chapman, V.A.
 Duluk, S.
 Harvey, R.M. (teller)
 Marshall, S.S.
 Patterson, S.J.R.
 Power, C.
 Teague, J.B.
 Whetstone, T.J.

Motion thus negatived.

Parliamentary Committees

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

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Treloar:

That the report of the committee be noted.

(Continued from 4 April 2019.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:01): It is my pleasure to take this opportunity to speak in relation to the work done by the select committee earlier this year after the bill first introduced into this place on 28 November last year was, on 5 December last year, referred to a select committee to consider, in particular, the matter of proposed powers to direct.

The Chair of the committee, the member for Flinders, has spoken in relation to the work of the committee on the occasion of his having brought up the report of our committee on 4 April this

year when he moved that this house note the work of the committee. I certainly commend that motion and the report and recommendations contributing, as they do, to what is an amended bill that is now brought before the house for its consideration.

It was one of the more significant and enjoyable opportunities for me to participate in the work of the select committee in January and February of this year. It provided one of those opportunities for this parliament to go about engagement with the wider community. That is, in my view, one of those particularly valuable aspects of the work we can do in this parliament.

The select committee certainly took up that opportunity to engage thoroughly and in a widespread way across the state. There were four public hearings that took place and they occurred across South Australia, as well as one of them being in Adelaide. The committee had a hearing at Port Lincoln and also at Balaklava and at Keith. It took the opportunity on those occasions to hear from 62 witnesses in all. Those witnesses are set out on pages 37 to 39 of the report that constitutes appendix B of the report. That is in addition to the 39 written submissions that the committee received. Those are set out at page 35 of the report in appendix A.

The select committee's work, as I have indicated, was focused on an examination of clause 23 of the bill, as it then was, in relation to proposed powers to direct. The report made a number of recommendations in relation to those proposed powers and how they might be amended more appropriately to reflect the work that volunteers in the CFS do and the nature of their engagement.

Before I turn to the 10 recommendations that we ultimately made, I want to highlight in particular that the parallel work, if you like, that really loomed large in the course of the committee's hearings alongside the bill was the pre-eminent code of practice that is relevant in this space, the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice. That is set out at page 5 of the report for reference purposes.

It is a code that has been in place for many years and has been refined over the course of its life. I want to highlight in particular the work that has gone into the development of that code, its adoption and use on a voluntary basis by growers over a period of time, and the cooperation in the work in relation to that code that has gone on between the CFS and Grain Producers SA, as well as the government.

The existence of the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice was something that we returned to regularly in the course of committee hearings in all the locations. It is, I think, a fair summary of the sentiment to say that the code of practice was really regarded as the gold standard by growers throughout the country. In terms of framing best practice in this space, we had a voluntary code of practice that is highly regarded and we heard was applied and respected by growers throughout the state.

In terms of the recommendations that the select committee made, first and foremost it was clear from all the evidence that there was widespread support for the introduction of the proposed powers to direct. That is number one. Secondly, what we heard from volunteers was that there needed to be some consideration of the role of volunteers in relation to those proposed powers.

I just highlight here that, if there was a consistent theme coming through in the evidence, it was that we are dealing with people who are volunteering as firefighters in their local area. They are likely to be, as often as not, also themselves engaged in harvesting activities. It was very clear that we needed to think carefully about the burden that comes with a power to direct actions of fellow community members. We heard, for example, that it was one thing to volunteer in a local brigade and to work with neighbours in the harvesting industry; it was another thing to then be regarded as someone who was exercising mandatory powers.

There was a consistent view across the board that the power ought to be there but that it ought to be exercised properly by the body that is responsible for enforcement in other areas as well and that South Australia Police were best placed to take the lead role in exercising those proposed powers. We will have an opportunity to consider what is being brought now in terms of the amended bill.

Suffice to say, for present purposes the committee heard on the one hand from the volunteers about their not wanting to have the burden of what they regarded as an inappropriate

responsibility for them and, on the other hand, a positive desire for there to be powers and that they be exercised by the responsible enforcement power in the form of South Australia Police, so I am pleased to see that that has found its way into the bill. As I say, I look forward to the opportunity to debate those aspects more fully as the bill progresses.

The corollary to the power being exercised properly by South Australia Police was that we also wanted to consider the need for police to have reference to relevant codes in terms of enforcing those powers. As I said at the outset, the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice loomed large as a leading exemplar in this space. The committee heard that the code of practice ought to be considered in terms of exercising the power, but more than that, the committee heard that there were a number of ways in which codes of practice might be more fully developed along the lines of the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice. In strongly supporting the development of such codes, the committee was of the view that codes that might be developed in this space will continue to be a necessary guide for police as they properly enforce powers to direct.

I also want to emphasise that the committee heard a considerable amount of evidence on the extent of private investment in measures to mitigate harm by those who are in the harvesting and grain growing industries. We bear in mind that in considering these matters we are considering events that are very much affecting the lives and livelihoods of the growers who are also the volunteers and who as often as not have more to lose personally through things not being managed as best as they possibly can. There is a very thorough ongoing personal investment in this area, and in good policy accompanying and supporting members of the community for all those reasons.

Sadly, we have seen that on display in recent weeks, as recently as last Wednesday and before that in the environs of Port Lincoln. Where a fire gets away, it will burn through rural areas, it will burn through crops and it will affect the lives and, more particularly, the livelihoods of those who live in rural and regional areas. They are invested in a very real sense in this policy space being the best it can be, and they see the consequences of fires more than any of us. It would be remiss of me not to note as well the development of legislation in this space and the committee's work and the communications that go on in the CFS and throughout the organisation.

The committee found it was necessary to observe that relationships between the CFS administration and the volunteers need to be very much to the fore and could benefit from improvement. That is a matter that is addressed specifically at page 33 of the report, where the committee observed that to a relevant extent there had been, in relation to the formulation of these powers, an unfortunate disconnect between the CFS administration and the regional communities that they serve. The committee observed that there was a contrast between what the CFS administration at the time was proposing and the evidence that we were hearing on the ground from volunteers.

To illustrate that, the evidence of Mr Max Wilksch to the committee on 31 January at Port Lincoln was very clear insofar as, on the one hand, the commitment of volunteers to serve their communities in an effective and practical way and what might be a broader administrative agenda from the CFS hierarchy on the other. In relation to this question, I had the opportunity to question the then chief officer Mr Nettleton on 4 February about what appeared to be an approach that would adopt for the CFS parallel powers to direct along the lines of those described in section 36 of the act as applying to the MFS.

In that sense, just touching on what was, on the one hand, apparently the purpose or object of the administration, it did not accord with either the desires or the needs of volunteers on the ground. Having referred to Mr Max Wilksch's evidence on 31 January, I emphasise, as he did, that the morale and commitment of CFS volunteers is as strong and willing as ever, and what we need to do is to be ever better at listening to and engaging and working with those volunteers so that we deliver the best possible policy outcomes through legislation. With those brief words, I commend the motion.

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:22): I, too, rise to make a few remarks in relation to the select committee inquiry into the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. It was very much a privilege to sit on that committee and listen to particularly farmers and their concerns about what fires do to them and how managing the risks around fires can also cause difficulties for them.

As a farmer in a previous life, I certainly have dealt with several fires over my time on the farm at Mount Compass. One of them was as recent as last summer. Not many days after we heard the evidence in Port Lincoln, there was a fire at Mount Compass, on 3 February, that was heading towards our farm. I went out to the farm and moved cattle around and prepared for the fire that was heading our way. It is quite daunting to sit in your car, just watching and getting prepared, because that is all you can do once the fire is going. The worst thing about fires is that once they are going they are relatively hard to stop.

I think, though, of how much of an improvement we have seen over time in firefighting. The fire that started in February of this year started in almost exactly the same place as one that started in 1997, from memory, and that fire did reach our property. The big difference between the two days was that there was no aerial support back in 1997, whereas for the one this year there certainly was great aerial support and they did a fantastic job of limiting the spread of the fire.

The key thing about this select committee inquiry was very much about making sure these fires do not actually start, and trying to stop risky behaviour from individuals leading to fires starting. Looking at this particular issue, we had to examine that risk, but we also had to allow farmers, particularly, to continue their business, and make sure we do not put their businesses in jeopardy by restricting their ability to do what they need to do to harvest crops, etc.

The old saying of 'make hay while the sun shines', in my experience as a farmer, is not quite true for making hay: the best time to make hay is at night. That seems strange, but it means we are minimising our risk of fire because we are doing it when the dew levels are a bit higher. We are trying to limit the risk of fire, but it is also an easier time to make hay, unlike for grain growers, who need the humidity and moisture levels in the grain to get down to a level suitable for harvesting. They actually need it to be a little bit on the drier side, so they do need to work on days when it is a bit warmer.

The key issue is to know when not to work. The industry, the grain growers themselves, must be commended for the work it has done in putting together a code of conduct. Grain growers are able to operate under that code and work out whether or not it is safe to operate. A key thing out of our report was that it was recognised how important that code is, and making sure that farmers understand—by putting in some data and working at what the fire danger index is for their particular location—whether it is appropriate to be harvesting or not.

Then comes the dilemma of those who choose to ignore that—a very, very small percentage. Farmers do not want to put their crops at risk and they do not want to put their neighbours at risk. They try to do the right thing. Occasionally people make mistakes, and occasionally rogues will go even beyond making mistakes and just operate recklessly. That is what we need to address, those rogues. It is about trying to find the right balance in how to do that.

As we went around the different regions there was very much a concern, and the message was quite clear across all the inquiry sites we went to, that it was about wanting to make sure we were putting in what was right for them to keep operating and also making sure we stop that very small percentage who actually puts others at risk. There was concern about who should be the person who tells them to stop. A very common view right across the state, from all the people we spoke with, was that it should not be the CFS themselves.

The CFS should not be out there enforcing the rules: they should be out there making sure that things are safe, not out there demanding someone stop. They are not trained to deliver that sort of message, and it was felt it was much more appropriate for that responsibility to be held with SAPOL. South Australia Police give directions to people to do other things, and it seemed quite logical to those giving evidence to the inquiry generally that SAPOL was the logical party to hold that authority.

I think we have very much landed in those recommendations that have come from the report, that we want to see that authorised power being given to South Australia Police officers. They are able to go out there with the authority and under the guidance and expertise held by the CFS and others. They are not acting on their own in this case: they are actually looking at what is needed, what needs to be assessed.

There are many tools out there now. I was just looking at an app which you can download and which gives you an indication of what the fire danger index is by entering a few pieces of weather data: what the crop level in tonnage is, what the wind speeds are, what the temperature is, what the humidity is and how much the crop is actually cured. So, with a few numbers being entered, you get a very good indicator of what the fire danger index is. We need to make sure that once it gets up into those extreme levels that people are not operating.

Now that the intent is to give the South Australian police this authority, we will see these codes of conduct—the first being the grain producers code of conduct—as a great model. There are many other activities that occur on farms and on dairy farms in particular. I know from my experience that there are many things that we have to do on total fire ban days, and we need to make sure that we do them safely.

Often we will have to take the tractor out to feed cattle on a total fire ban day. We need to make sure that our tractors are operating well and do not have a risk of starting fires, but we still need to be able to operate them. As long as we do what is required, they are safe vehicles to operate in those circumstances. Likewise, before milking we have to get the cows in, and on those really hot days I do not want to walk. We have to get out on the motorbike. Again, we need to make sure that our motorbikes have good exhaust systems, etc., so that we are not putting the community at risk.

There is very much a responsibility on farmers and others to do the right thing, but we need to make sure that we also give the police the power to direct these people to stop if they are doing the wrong thing. We do not want those people out there continuing to put others at risk and put themselves at risk. It is very much about helping the whole community. The key objectives of the bill are to improve the ability of emergency services to deliver key public safety outcomes.

The Marshall government has already acted to improve the capacity of the emergency services to fight fires, committing almost \$10 million to purchase more firefighting aircraft and another \$5 million over two years for CFS stations, appliances and equipment upgrades. We have also ensured the passage of legislation to recognise the volunteer charters into the Fire Emergency Services Act. Every South Australian is responsible for fire safety, and during the select committee inquiry into this bill we were very impressed with the high level of community initiative, leadership, innovation, cooperation and support for fire prevention.

This bill in which the key recommendations of the committee have been adopted is very much in keeping with the spirit of the community's fire safety efforts. I strongly believe that we will meet the community's expectations about the role of government and key agencies in preventing fires. As we have seen recently, both in our state and across Australia, bushfires have been and always will be an ever-present threat to life and property. Our emergency services professionals and volunteers risk much when fighting these fires, so we must do all we can to reduce the risk to them where possible. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:34): I rise to make a few brief comments on the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. I guess that it was a bit of footage from the Yorke Peninsula fires quite recently that triggered memories I have of Ash Wednesday. Maybe they were suppressed, I do not know. The ferocious winds that were whipped up, seeing a camera crew talking to a farmer on Yorke Peninsula with fire burning in the background, hearing that wind and seeing the ferociousness of the fire brought back memories of 1983 and Ash Wednesday. I think we need to remember just how deadly that fire was. It was fanned by winds of up to 110 km/h an hour. There were 500,000 acres burnt, 75 deaths and countless injuries.

In fact, the dad of one of my best friends at primary school was out on his farm when the fire front came over. He survived by shooting a cow and lying underneath the cow—lying under the ute with the cow blocking it. He was severely burnt and had years of bandages and horrific scarring all over him, but at least he survived. It was that memory and seeing that footage last week or the week before that really brought home to me the importance of fire prevention and having good policies and procedures in place.

When the original bill was put up, I had CFS people come to talk to me and tell me that they did not want to be directing farmers. They wanted to be out fighting fires and not pitting themselves against their neighbours or their friends. As the member for Finnis quite rightly said, 99.9 percent of

people do the right thing and are sensible. If there is an element of people who are not doing the right thing, we need to have a mechanism to direct them, and I fully support the move towards SAPOL having that role.

Down in the South-East, we have another complicating factor, namely, pine plantations that are privately owned. There is a huge acreage of privately owned plantations that have their own firefighting ability, and of course it is in their best interests to make sure that they have preventative programs and adequate resources. On a catastrophic day, which may lead to a catastrophic event, the ability to coordinate private resources to form a united front is really important. I am glad that has been addressed as well so that the command or the people in charge will have the authority to direct private brigades to give the best defences we can provide.

What most people forget about Ash Wednesday—and I would hate to see that occur again—is that it is not perhaps the initial fire that does a lot of damage. If a northerly is blowing, obviously a fire will travel north to south and extend out over a distance of hundreds of metres, if not kilometres, and as the front progresses forward the fire is burning behind. With the unpredictable nature of fires, a lot of the damage occurs when the wind shifts. The worst wind shift is a 90° wind shift from north winds to an easterly or westerly wind.

Once you have the front going forward one, two or three kilometres and you have a 90° wind shift, you then have a front that is not 50 or 100 metres wide but one that is perhaps 10 or 15 kilometres wide and blowing in a totally different direction. A lot of loss of life occurs because fire crews are predicting forward of the front what is coming and then, when it turns at 90° or variations of 90°, you have a massive front burning in a different direction, and it is very difficult to prevent that as it unfolds in front of your eyes.

I also want to talk about where we need to focus our attention coming out of this bill, and that is around volunteers. As we head into a very busy bushfire season, I have spoken at length to Grant Fensom, the Kingsley CFS Group Officer. He has told me that over the years the numbers of volunteers have dropped off quite considerably. Just in his group section, numbers have dropped from about 140 members a few years ago to about 80 this year, with only 50 of those members active firefighters.

Grant says that brigades such as Blackfellows Caves and Mount Schank are facing the possibility of not having enough members to staff trucks this year. His area takes in Allendale East, Blackfellows Caves, Donovans, Kongorong, Mount Schank and Port MacDonnell. The Tatiara group in the Upper South-East has also told Grant that they may lose a brigade due to dwindling numbers. This of course is deeply concerning.

The current situation we have seen on Yorke Peninsula, as well as in Queensland and New South Wales, demonstrates how serious this year's fire season is going to be. Whilst most visitors come to the South-East and see pretty, lush green paddocks, the CFS officers tell me that the index they use for soil moisture shows that it is the driest it has been in decades. In fact, the soil moisture of the pine plantations is extremely dry.

Blackfellows Caves got a brand-new \$300,000 truck this year, which we are obviously grateful for, but they have only three members. In recent years, there has been funding for new trucks, equipment and station upgrades, which again is fantastic, but there is none for regional volunteer recruitment and support. This is a critical area that needs to be addressed. There is not much point having the equipment sitting there if you do not have trained volunteers able to use it at a time of need.

Grant said that around 10 years ago many regions had a paid role for recruitment and volunteer support. He works hard as a volunteer to get the word out and to recruit people, giving presentations at breakfast meetings and visiting local schools to educate students. I can attest to Grant Fensom's work. He is a dedicated community member. He did a fundraiser for our philanthropic organisation, Stand Like Stone, and raised tens of thousands of dollars for a bus for the Port MacDonnell community.

The problem of dwindling volunteer numbers is a story I hear time and time again. It is a sign of the times in which we live. Everyone is time poor, with lots of commitments for young people, and

they are not replacing older volunteers. Grant wants people and businesses to understand that the job adapts to the time that you have, not the other way around. At a recent breakfast meeting, he gave a presentation to a group of local businesspeople and said that he was surprised at how little understanding there was of the involvement of a CFS volunteer.

Employers have misconceptions that volunteers have to devote every waking minute to the job, but of course this is not the case. Grant is involved in four businesses and employs eight CFS volunteers, so he understands the impact on businesses. We need to ask ourselves: what is the cost to our communities if people do not sign up and get involved? Volunteers give up their own time at odd hours of the day or night and during summer holidays while the rest of us are enjoying time off with families.

All told, South Australian volunteers contribute three million hours each year for the 425 CFS brigades to attend road crashes, bushfires, grassfires and hazardous material spills. When we call 000 in the time of an emergency, many of us take for granted that the help we need will arrive. As Grant says, you can have all the bells and whistles in the world, but if you do not have people the best equipment and facilities are useless.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (12:45): I rise also to speak on this motion and note that on 28 November 2018 I introduced the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2018. The bill enacts a range of long overdue technical issues identified from previous reports to government, some dating back as far as 2013.

In summary, the bill aims to improve building fire safety provisions, recognise command structures of the SES and protect volunteers called to emergencies so they are not liable to be dismissed or prejudiced in their employment. Following the introduction of the bill on 5 December 2018, it was referred to a select committee of this house.

The terms of reference for the inquiry directed the committee to inquire into proposed additional powers for the South Australian Country Fire Service outlined in clause 23 of the bill, which relate to section 82 of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005—Power to direct. Clause 23 of the bill was predicated on recommendation 16 of the 2013 review of the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005, completed by the Hon. Paul Holloway.

This was a recommendation made following submissions to Mr Holloway at the time by South Australia Police. The committee was ultimately tasked with considering two main questions: firstly, whether section 82—Power to direct, should be amended to include the power to order the cessation of harvesting or any other activities that, because of the weather conditions, may cause a fire; and secondly, if the power is to be amended, who should be given the power of direction.

The committee was chaired by the member for Flinders and I thank him very much; he did a marvellous job. The other members of the committee were the members for Finnis, Heysen, Mawson and Giles. I thank them for their contribution to this committee. The committee received 39 written submissions and heard from 62 witnesses over four public hearings in Adelaide, Port Lincoln, Balaklava and also in Keith. The committee handed down its report on 4 April 2019.

The committee ultimately concluded that the proposed powers outlined in clause 23 of the bill to be introduced with the power to direct be provided to South Australia Police. In line with the recommendations of the select committee, on 14 November 2019 I filed amendments to the bill. In addition to the amendments, as a result of the select committee a few additional changes are proposed, which I also filed as amendments. At this juncture, I recommend the passage of the bill with minor government amendments.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (12:47): I rise to also make a brief contribution to the motion to note the select committee report. It is worth reflecting, though, on how we got here. I will not dwell too much on the bill itself. I think there is plenty of time for that; hopefully, this afternoon we will get to that. As the minister said, we received the first iteration of the bill in this house on this day exactly a year ago.

At the time, I made note that there was a significant lack of consultation with particularly the opposition, which was my main concern, but also with various bodies directly affected by the bill: the

volunteer associations and the unions that were involved. At the time, it seemed there was a distinct lack of consultation with the minister's own party room. This culminated, of course, in the select committee report. That was about this idea that became known in the media as 'the harvest ban', which is section 23, the power to direct cessation of certain activities. It is in and of itself not a bad idea. As we all know, prevention is better than cure, as SAPOL have made clear in their contributions and submissions to the Holloway review.

As the minister said, the Holloway review back in 2013 recommended that we consider the amendment of section 82 to include the power to order the cessation of harvesting or any other actions because the weather conditions may cause a fire if igniters get out of control. Again, it is a good recommendation. The question revolved around who should have that power.

There was a lack of consultation, as I said, and the member for Flinders knows this well. He moved to establish a select committee, the select committee met, as has been outlined quite thoroughly by the member for Heysen and others, and reached certain conclusions, one of which was that SAPOL should have the power outlined in section 82 of the act, which was initially granted to the CFS. We will be debating this later this afternoon.

It is worth noting, though, at this point (and we will be debating this later) that on 4 February Assistant Commissioner Bamford appeared at the committee. He is responsible for security and emergency management. At the time, he was also SAPOL's representative—I note there has been some movement in the upper ranks—on the State Emergency Management Committee and Chair of the State Response Advisory Group, which feeds up into that committee.

If we take his words as reflective of SAPOL's view at the time, I think it is fair to say that he was particularly lukewarm about the police being the lead agency and having these powers conferred on them by section 82. He was asked by the Chairperson of the committee, 'Do you see CFS coming in at a point before the police need to be involved?' This is in relation to the cessation of activities on harvesting land and so on. Assistant Commissioner Bamford replied:

Yes, we do. Just as the Metropolitan Fire Service have a range of authorities that they use themselves. I see that it is absolutely sensible that the same thing applies to the CFS. There are authorities that the police have, and some of them are openly used by all and sundry—

I assume he means other police officers—

others are limited to people of higher ranks. A lot of this I see as a matter for the Country Fire Service to determine at what level these powers are used. We certainly don't see it as a police role to be the first people to turn up and tell someone to stop using a header.

He goes on to say:

We don't see it's appropriate for a police officer to be driving around the countryside trying to measure local indicators and then giving instructions.

He goes on to make the point that sometimes police do have deep connections with the community, just as the criticism was made of CFS volunteers. That would be one of the concerns, of course, the same as the concerns raised that CFS volunteers are the friends and neighbours of the people who they are suddenly required to instruct on how to do their business or not. He then goes on to say:

I think it comes back to asking a police officer to make a decision based on some measurements and a number of indicators at a time and place, which is really not police core business. We are not really in the business of determining what the fire danger is and whether it is appropriate.

I was not privy to the committee's deliberations, but it presumably considered this evidence and made their recommendation that SAPOL should be the lead agency. One of the amendments we will be debating this afternoon reflects that recommendation. I will have plenty of questions on that later this afternoon, but I thought at this juncture it was worth reflecting on how we had arrived at this point.

It is worth noting, too, that the lack of consultation displayed last year by the minister was echoed this year. I do note that the amendments we are debating this afternoon were filed on 14 November. Perhaps I was remiss in not following the procedures of the house so closely. This committee reported in April, I think, and we have been waiting for this bill to come on since then. I was perhaps remiss in not following the activities of the house and noting that those amendments had been filed.

I certainly did not become aware of it until last Friday, when I was offered a briefing. In fact, the only slot I was offered for a briefing was half an hour before our own shadow cabinet deliberations. It is extremely difficult for me to form an opinion on those amendments, having just seen them late Friday afternoon, and equally difficult for me to make a recommendation to either the shadow cabinet or to my party room, which met the next day.

I have since been briefed. I think the amendments are relatively simple, particularly the one around section 23. I do note that the consultation with me was not adequate, but we will go into consultation with some other groups in the committee stage of the bill. I inform the house that we reserve our right to amend or oppose sections or the entirety of the bill as it becomes appropriate later in the committee stage or between the houses.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:54): I rise to make a contribution in support of the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill in light of what we are directly discussing now, that the report of the select committee on the bill be noted.

Coming off the land and as a CFS member, I have had plenty of experience with harvests and plenty of experience with fires—with controlled burns, uncontrolled burns and controlled burns that may have not stayed controlled entirely. It does give you a wealth of experience and it helps you understand the vagaries of fire and how you need to be absolutely switched on, especially in permit time after harvest when you are burning off stubble. Not much of it happens anymore, but it is good snail control if farmers get sick of spending tens of thousand dollars on snail bait to control a pest that infests cropping country later on.

Fire can be a very useful tool, but it can also be a very bad enemy, as we saw last week, on 20 November, at Yorketown, at Angaston and in the Mid North, and certainly in some recent fires in the Mallee and on the neighbouring property at Kildare at Coomandook, where, as I indicated the other day, a pile of pig manure spontaneously combusted, which can happen.

The matter of where property owners are directed in regard to a code of practice to manage whether or not they operate their harvesters or whether they operate in paddocks was addressed over a decade ago. It has been a voluntary code of practice which in the main is followed pretty well by people across the board.

As a primary producer, I understand when you are up against it and you just want to get your crop in before it gets spoiled by rain damage or something else. You try to do as much as you can, but you also have to deal with the realities of the risk of fire. I remember that terrible day of the Wangary fire on the West Coast. We were actually harvesting in the morning, but we pulled up pretty quickly because it was getting too nasty. We were on the other side of the state on my lease property at Tintinara.

You do have to deal with the reality of what can happen. That is why we as a government have looked at this legislation and at the powers to direct. As has been explained by other members, there are significant issues around the CFS in general having that direction because you do have people who are friends and neighbours. Everyone is very close in communities and everyone knows who's who in the zoo and who is doing what, but there is also that technology that comes to bear.

For example, people spend significant amounts of money on weather stations so that they know when the fire danger rating gets to the point that they should pull up. I commend those farmers who have done that. I think in one case you can spend \$5,000 on a weather station unit so that you know exactly where you are on a fire danger index, whether it is wind speed, heat, etc., and know when you need to stop. These weather stations are also used to guide farmers in their spraying practice, which is absolutely crucial in this day and age. With those remarks, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Annual Reports 2018-19

Art Gallery of South Australia

SA Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme

Auditor-General's Letters of Certification

Carrick Hill Trusts Annual Report 2018-19

Libraries Board of South Australia Annual Report 2018-19

Remuneration Tribunal—Determinations 2019

No. 9 of 2019—Accommodation and Meal Allowances

No. 11 of 2019—Salary Sacrifice Arrangements for Judicial Officers et al

No. 12 of 2019—Judicial Remuneration

Remuneration Tribunal—Reports 2019

No. 9 of 2019—Accommodation and Meal Allowances

No. 10 of 2019—Common Allowance for Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers

No. 11 of 2019—Salary Sacrifice Arrangements for Judicial Officers et al

No. 12 of 2019—Judicial Remuneration

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

Annual Reports 2018-19

South Australian Housing Trust

Department of Human Services

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

Annual Reports 2018-19

Coroners Court

Courts Administration Authority

Administration of the Freedom of Information Act 1991

The Law Society of South Australia

Legal Practitioners Education and Admission Council

Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner

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

Annual Reports 2018-19

Australian Children's Education and Care Quality Authority

Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee

Commissioner for Children and Young People

TAFE SA

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

Annual Reports 2018-19

Adelaide Film Festival

South Australian Film Corporation

Department for Innovation and Skills

Jam Factory Contemporary Craft and Design Incorporated

Construction Industry Training Board

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

Annual Reports 2018-19

Australian Health Practitioner Regulation Agency and National Boards
Chief Psychiatrist of South Australia
Controlled Substances Advisory Council
Health Performance Council
Health Services Charitable Gifts Board
Lifetime Support Authority
South Australian Mental Health Commission
National Health Funding Body
Administrator of the National Health Funding Pool
National Health Practitioner Ombudsman and Privacy Commissioner
South Australian Public Health Council
SA Ambulance Service

Health Advisory Councils Incorporated 2018-19 Annual Reports—

Balaklava Riverton
Barossa & Districts
Berri Barmera
Bordertown
Ceduna
Coorong Health Service
Eastern Eyre
Eudunda Kapunda
Far North Health
Gawler District
Hawker Memorial District
Hills Area
Kangaroo Island
Kingston Robe
Leigh Creek Health Services
Lower Eyre
Lower North
Loxton and Districts
Mallee Health Service
Mannum District Hospital
Mid North
Mid-West
Millicent
Mount Gambier Districts
Murray Bridge Soldiers Memorial Hospital
Naracoorte
Northern Yorke Peninsula
Penola & Districts
Port Augusta, Roxby Downs and Woomera
Port Broughton
Port Lincoln
Port Pirie
Quorn Health Services
Renmark Paringa District
SAAS Volunteer
South Australian Medical Education and Training
Southern Fleurieu
Southern Flinders
Veterans Health
Waikerie and Districts

Whyalla Hospital and Health Services
Yorke Peninsula

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

Annual Reports 2018-19
Dairy Authority of South Australia (trading as Dairysafe)
Dog Fence Board, South Australian
Department of Primary Industries and Regions
Veterinary Surgeons Board of South Australia

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

Annual Reports 2018-19
Animal Welfare Advisory Committee
Board of the Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium
Coast Protection Board
Department for Environment and Water
Environment Protection Authority
Green Industries SA
South Australian Heritage Council
National Environmental Protection Council
Native Vegetation Council
Parks and Wilderness Council
Premier's Climate Change Council
South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board
Stormwater Management Authority
South Australian Water Corporation

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

Electoral Commission of South Australia—Local Government Election Report 2018
Outback Communities Authority—Annual Report 2018-19

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:07): I bring up the 41st report of the committee, entitled Goodwood, Springbank and Daws Road Intersection Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 40th report of the committee, entitled Port Wakefield Overpass and Highway Duplication Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up 42nd report of the committee, entitled Paradise Interchange Park 'N' Ride Project.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Mr CREGAN: I bring up the 43rd report of the committee, entitled An Inquiry into the North-South Corridor Darlington Upgrade—Final Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Question Time***MCGOWAN, DR C.**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it is acceptable that an independent investigator has still not been appointed into the conduct of the Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan, two weeks after the independent investigation was announced?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): No.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order, as is the member for Morphet. Leader.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Considering the Premier is the Premier, what is he going to do about it?

Mr Pederick: Oh my God, sack whoever is writing your stuff.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): It is much better when the Leader of the Opposition just reads the questions that are sent down from the dream factory, because when he gets up and asks them off the cuff they are nearly always a bit—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Could the Premier be seated for one moment. The leader knows that it is unacceptable to refer to the Premier in the second person.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens has a point of order. I anticipate it is for debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, that is exceptionally well done by yourself. It is, yes.

The SPEAKER: In sync at this point in time. I am willing to allow the Premier some relevant preamble, but I suggest that if he starts in that sort of manner he may provoke some interjections. Premier.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am advised that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment is concluding her advice to us regarding the appointment of the investigator. This is a decision she will be making. I haven't received that advice that somebody has been appointed, but as soon as I am informed I will be sure to let the parliament know.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier today instead order a judicial inquiry into the conduct of Dr Chris McGowan, having it begin immediately for the sake of confidence in SA Health's leadership?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): No.

The SPEAKER: I will allow one more. Member for Kurna, then the member for Elder.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:11): My question is to the Premier. Would an independent investigator appointed by the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to investigate Dr Chris McGowan have any legal powers and, if so, what legal powers would that independent investigator have?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order, sir: the structure of that question seems to me to be hypothetical.

The SPEAKER: Technically the minister is correct. Would the member for Kaurua like to rephrase?

Mr PICTON: Thank you, sir. I ask my question to the Premier. What powers will the independent investigator have to investigate Dr Chris McGowan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:12): Unlike those opposite, I have every confidence in Ms Erma Ranieri, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I note that the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition, order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I note that the Leader of the Opposition loves to come in here—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

Mr Picton: What legal powers?

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Clearly the Leader of the Opposition is not satisfied with the work that the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment is doing—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —but, quite frankly, we on this side of the house have every confidence that Ms Erma Ranieri is conducting her work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham! Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —and we will leave the scope up to her. We note that this was pointed out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The members for Elizabeth and Ramsay are called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Let's just revisit this issue one further time. We note that Dr Chris McGowan referred himself to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment. We asked Ms Ranieri to look at this issue.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: She has made a decision to appoint an independent investigator. We support that decision. I would also like to update the house that yesterday I might have indicated that the independent panel that appointed Dr McGowan to the position of Chief Executive of SA Health had conducted advertising for that position. I am now informed that, in fact, the independent panel that was put in place to oversee that recruitment referred to an earlier search the previous government had done, a national and international search that the previous government had done.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It was available to them to go out to the market further, but they chose not to. They made the recommendation and Dr McGowan was appointed.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:14): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. On behalf of my local community and all South Australians, can the minister inform the house on how the Marshall government is building the infrastructure a strong South Australia needs?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the question contains debate and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the question. I hear the merits from the member for Lee. I have the point of order and I will remember it for future reference. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:14): Certainly on this side of the house we want to see South Australia strong. We don't want it to be weak, and I think it is a very pertinent part of the question to say that we need to make sure that South Australia continues to move forward at a growing rate of knots, rather than just accepting the genteel decline—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that existed, the malaise that existed, for so long here in South Australia. I thank the member for Elder for this question and certainly appreciate her real desire to see improved infrastructure outcomes in her local community—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —whether that be the extension of the train line to Flinders University and the new Tonsley train station that we are building—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens and the member for Lee are warned. The minister has the call.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Well, you've been upgraded.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —whether that be looking at the remaining sections of the north-south corridor, or whether that be the very important Goodwood/Springbank/Daws roads intersection, we are delivering abundantly for the people of the community of Elder and delivering a stronger South Australia as a result.

This task over the past 18 months has not been easy because the cupboard was bare when we came to government. For workers in the civil construction space, they were looking at a future that was 18 months long with not much else happening after that—18 months' worth of job security and after that a huge degree of uncertainty left because the former government didn't put some projects on the table to fill that pipeline. Over the course of—

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

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. Reference to the former government, sir, is debate.

The SPEAKER: It feels like we've been here before. I will allow some compare and contrast, and then I will decide whether or not the minister is engaging in debate. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is all fact, all hard-nosed fact. It's just uncomfortable, that's all. We had a job to put together a pipeline of work that was going to deliver certainty for South Australian civil construction workers and give them their job security but also give South Australians security that we were building a stronger South Australia for them.

So we went to the federal government at the first budget and secured money for four projects, but instead of welcoming that money, doing the job that they couldn't do, what did they do? They carped and whinged about the fact that too much of that money was sitting outside the forward estimates. So what did we do? We brought forward over \$600 million worth of federal funding to get these projects complete much more quickly, and those projects are the ones that are starting to see dirt being turned right at this very moment.

What we did in this intervening period was decide, as part of our strong plan for real change election commitment, that we were going to improve the rigour around the way that we deliver infrastructure projects and use this parliament to set up Infrastructure South Australia, a fantastic step forward that is going to deliver in spades over generations as we make better decisions on how we spend taxpayers' money.

But then comes the second budget where again we worked constructively with the federal government to get money for the north-south corridor, to get money for the urban congestion package, to get money for the regional roads package, which is now delivering a record amount of money into regional South Australia. Again, did we hear any positive affirmation from those opposite? No, we didn't. Again, they just carped and whinged about the fact that, 'Oh, too much of these projects is sitting outside the forward estimates.' I can hear the words of the member for Mawson ringing in my ear.

And what did we do? We sat down with the federal government and have now brought forward over \$300 million worth of projects into the forward estimates. What we have now also delivered for workers in this space is a 10-year pipeline of work. That is certainty for a generation of workers who could have been looking to the infrastructure boom on the east coast thinking that there were greener pastures over there, but we have now delivered certainty for them and their families and for their children that South Australia is a place that is going to continue to grow and is going to have a government that is going to invest and has a future for young people to live here in South Australia and help to make our society that much more prosperous.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Why did the government not advertise the vacancy for the chief executive of the largest government portfolio, and rely on applications received 16 months previously?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): I just refer the member to my previous answer.

Mr Teague interjecting:

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

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Was Chris McGowan an unsuccessful applicant for the Health CE position 16 months prior to his appointment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19): That was a decision that was made under a previous government. I am not privy to that decision.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee has been warned. The Minister for Transport is called to order. If the member for Cheltenham wants to leave, he is going about it in the right way today. The member for Kaurna.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Has the government ever sought advice regarding how the Chief Executive of SA Health, Chris McGowan, should appropriately manage the government's relationship with Silver Chain? If so, has that advice always been followed by Chris McGowan?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): Not that I am aware of.

Mr Malinauskas: He hasn't followed your advice?

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order. We have the question. The member for Kaurna and then the member for Morphett.

PREMIER MARSHALL

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Was he present at the Liberal Party Council Gala Dinner in Sydney on 23 June 2017, with guest speakers Malcolm Turnbull, John Howard and General David Petraeus?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): I am not aware of that. I know there were a lot of people there. A lot of people—

An honourable member: No, were you there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Was I there? Yes, I was.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier and the Minister for Energy and Mining are called to order, and the member for West Torrens is warned. The member for Morphett and then the member for Badcoe.

RESOURCES SECTOR

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:21): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house about the growth in the resources sector?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:21): Thank you, member for Morphett. Yes, I can update the house about the growth in the resources sector. I appreciate the member for Morphett's great interest and support for the resources sector, including his accompanying me and other colleagues of ours to Moomba and some other resources locations recently. We received record royalties in the last financial year: \$300.1 million of royalties were paid to the South Australian taxpayer from the resources industry, and forecasts continue to increase.

The resources sector contributes enormously in many ways. It contributes with regard to employment, with regard to capital expenditure, with regard to regional development and with regard to royalties, which of course contribute to government provision of very important infrastructure and services: roads, bridges, schools, hospitals, nurses, police, disability services, mental health care and all those sorts of things. So the resources sector growth is something that we should all be very pleased with—and we are seeing growth.

The Premier and I, and other members of parliament, were with Santos last night to celebrate their 65th anniversary as a great South Australian company. More importantly, last night it was the 50th anniversary of the Adelaide to Moomba pipeline—in fact, I should say the Moomba to Adelaide

pipeline because that's where the gas goes. It is a tremendous piece of infrastructure based on the resources sector.

Santos is going from strength to strength, and Beach Energy is going from strength to strength. In fact, Beach is seeing record production and record safety performance at the moment, which is something that all people would be very proud of. Cooper Energy, Senex Energy, all in the Cooper Basin, and Beach as well, in the South-East of South Australia, are all contributing to the areas in which they operate, plus the state more broadly.

From a minerals perspective, members would be very well aware of BHP's tremendous contribution: their in excess of 30-year history in South Australia and their extraordinary exploration find at Oak Dam West, not too far from BHP's Olympic Dam mine. But there are many others—many other organisations have truly outstanding exploration figures at the moment.

Exploration permits and permissions from the state government have increased again this year on last year, and we know that the more exploration is undertaken the more finds there will be, the more production there will be, the more jobs, the more capital, the more royalties, the more regional development and the better off our state will be, thanks to the resources sector.

We are also seeing growth in some more traditional areas. We are seeing some of the places where mines have been forecast to close actually staying open longer than predicted, stretching out employment further than expected and stretching out investment further than expected. While we often think of the key exploration and the key production companies, those actually running the mines, one of the greatest opportunities for South Australia at the moment is in the METS sector—the services industry that supports our resources companies.

We have an extraordinary opportunity in South Australia—in fact, world-renowned in many ways. This may not be known to members in this chamber, but this is also a very important export opportunity for us. We think of the resources sector as exporting the materials—ore (or processed) that comes out of the ground—but exporting our skills, our talent, our technology and equipment in the METS sector is another fantastic export opportunity for our state.

ROYALTIES FOR REGIONS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:25): Supplementary: my question is to the Minister for Mines and Energy. Is it still Liberal Party policy that 30 per cent of the royalties will go into a Royalties for Regions fund?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:25): Just to clarify, the short answer is yes. The more detailed answer is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —it's not a Royalties for Regions fund. Those opposite probably don't understand. They've got their coordinated chorus over there—their coordinated chorus of negativity. Those opposite might like to joke and josh about the resources sector, but on this side of the chamber we know what a valuable contributor it is—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Don't worry, there are 3½ minutes left to go. We know what a valuable contributor this industry is—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —to South Australia. For the member for Mount Gambier—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Waite!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —it is not—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, be quiet.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —a Royalties for Regions program. But very clearly before the election and after the election, it is our position. Thirty per cent of royalties from the resources sector go into transport and infrastructure projects in regional South Australia. So we are looking at very significant transport and infrastructure projects in regional South Australia.

You have heard the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government talk about the overpass just north of Port Wakefield, a very important safety initiative and transport efficiency initiative, funded in part by our resources sector. There are two lanes all the way through Port Wakefield, connecting up to the two lanes in each direction (which currently stops below Port Wakefield), all the way through to the overpass so that there is no need for people to take what we know from very sad statistics to be a very dangerous corner. There is no need for that corner to be taken anymore. Traffic will be able to flow right through.

We are looking at the upgrade, the duplication, of the Joy Baluch Bridge, a very important project as well with regard to both safety and transport efficiency. That bridge carries local people from the east side and the west side of Port Augusta, whether they be going from home to work or dropping off kids at school or whatever it happens to be or, very importantly, all the emergency services—police, ambulance, hospital, etc., all located on the eastern side of the gulf. If there is an emergency on the western side of the gulf, that bridge is incredibly important.

Members would know what a difficult task it has been over the last couple of years for pedestrians, people with prams, young children or people on gophers to try to get across the bridge since the Great Western Bridge was closed. This government, in cooperation with the federal government, will duplicate that bridge so that we have safe access for pedestrians, safe access for cyclists and, importantly, two lanes in each direction. This project is another one which will be supported in part by royalties from our resources sector.

We look at other road projects around the state, we look at Port Augusta West through to Perth, we look at the Barrier Highway and we look at the Horrocks Highway—probably our most dangerous road in South Australia at the moment. This government, again in cooperation with the federal government, has committed \$55 million to the upgrades of safety opportunities on the Horrocks Highway, which extends from just north of Gawler all the way up to Quorn, just north of my home in Wilmington. The upgrades of overtaking lanes, of shoulder sealing, of grade improvements will be absolutely vital for people who live in the region or those in Adelaide who head north for tourism or work or transport opportunities. The resources sector is helping to fund all these fantastic upgrades.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Premier, who were the members of the independent advisory body that recommended to you the appointment of Chris McGowan without publicly advertising the position?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:29): I don't have that detail, but I am happy to find out and come back to the house.

MCGOWAN, DR C.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Under the Premier's leadership, have any other chief executives been appointed without publicly advertising the position?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): Yes, Caroline Mealor, who was the acting chief executive of the Attorney-General's Department.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:30): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister agree with the Guardian for Children and Young People in her annual report that currently on a day-to-day basis children who are in state care are harmed or at imminent risk of harm from poor decisions by her department?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:30): I thank the member for her question. The guardian obviously is responsible for children who, under guardianship, contact her office and seek her support and help. We know that the system was in a bad way. We know that from the royal commission in 2014, and we know that from the inquests and the Coroner's inquiries and the Mullighan reports, that this was a system in crisis. That's why this Liberal government announced that we would have a dedicated minister to work on this system. Even Margaret Nyland herself indicated that this would be at least a five-year turnaround to make changes that are necessary.

I am doing a lot of work on every single area. We have approached this as a whole of government. Not only are we working on early intervention, which was mentioned by the guardian, but for the first time we are investing up-front in strengthening families and building supports so that fewer children will be coming into care. That's through the human services department. As the guardian actually mentioned, it's good to see that investment for the first time in early intervention and prevention. The guardian also pointed out—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe and the member for Waite!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —that there was a lack of forward planning, everything was knee-jerk reaction and responsive. As a whole of government, we are working on a systemic plan, a whole-of-government plan. Part of that is the early intervention and prevention through the Department of Human Services. We know that under the former Labor government the early intervention research directorate—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That is debate, sir.

The SPEAKER: There's a point of order for debate.

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

The SPEAKER: Point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: When the question is phrased in a way such as 'does the minister agree that', there are a range of ways that a minister might reflect on whether or not she agrees and therefore that point of order is not valid.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members, please! The Minister for Transport is not assisting at this point in time. The question had several aspects to it: whether the minister agreed with comments made in respect of the annual report. I think the minister was doing a relatively fair job at sticking to the substance of the question. Whilst I do allow some compare and contrast with former governments to a point, I will listen carefully and make sure that she doesn't deviate too far.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As the guardian also noted herself, it's like turning around the *Titanic*. We are making significant improvements. On coming into government, we closed the Queenstown 12-bed facility. This was a decade of recommendations by a previous guardian saying that you should not have large bed facilities. In fact, the Labor government not only ignored that but they built an extra 12-bed facility and had plans that were ready for me to sign on incoming for another 12-bed facility so that government has no track record on looking after our children. I have closed

our most troublesome unit, the Queenstown unit. We have opened up Aboriginal-specific and culturally competent houses. We have taken on more Aboriginal community-controlled organisations. We are doing extensive work to address the over-representation—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —of Aboriginal children in care and we are making significant changes. We are currently researching and investigating therapeutic residential care models that are world's best practice around Australia and overseas to look for better models of care. What we do know is that the models of care that were being used under the former government and that I was left with on coming into government as the minister were not working.

We are improving them bit by bit. Every single house, we are improving. We have capped the numbers so that our larger bed facilities aren't at full capacity. They are kept lower so that we can supervise and look after our children a lot better. Our staff are undergoing specific training around recognising and working with risky behaviours, including sexualised behaviours. We are doing a lot of work and we will continue to work hard to improve outcomes for children and young people in care.

PHONICS CHECKS

Mr DULUK (Waite) (14:35): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on the delivery of year 1 phonics checks?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:35): I am very pleased to have this question from the member for Waite, who I speak with regularly about education matters, both in relation to his electorate and, of course, issues such as this, which relate to all children across South Australia and, indeed, all government schools across South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: This year, for the second year, all government schools in South Australia undertook the year 1 phonics check. What we saw were some very strong improvements in the outcomes. The benefits of the year 1 phonics check are twofold. Firstly, it draws to our attention the system performance and the school performance so that those schools who potentially might have expected better results can take a look at their practice.

Indeed, what we have seen is that many schools in that circumstance have sought to introduce new whole-of-school approaches to early years literacy, and many of them are now introducing explicit synthetic phonics approaches for the first time. In particular, some of those schools have had very positive results. Some of them are now using decodable readers for the first time as part of that.

The second part of the phonics check that is particularly valuable is that for those students identified as not meeting the mark, particularly those who are not meeting the mark by some distance, early interventions are then able to be applied. Our department is working with our Literacy Guarantee Unit, our literacy coaches in that unit, and researchers from around the world and interstate, delivering best practice guides and support to schools so that teachers can put in place the interventions that are necessary. Teachers in schools are given the release time through the centralised funding arrangements so that they can plan for how best to support the students in their class who need more help.

There are some really exciting advances as a result of the first aspect, though, which is the improved and enhanced methods of teaching. Some of that is supported by the Literacy Guarantee coaches from our election commitment. Some schools have had all the teachers working with the principal and the early years literacy leader, or whatever position that might be, on those whole-of-school approaches. We have seen across South Australia the results of students meeting the expected benchmark improve, from 43 per cent last year to 52 per cent this year.

It is a significant step change and hopefully just the first of a series of changes and improvements that we will see in the years ahead. We have also seen that improvement reflected across all domains: Aboriginal students and non-Aboriginal students, students with disability and students without disability, students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds and students not from those backgrounds. Indeed, last year, students from culturally and linguistically diverse backgrounds outperformed students from English-speaking backgrounds quite significantly, and they outperformed them again this year, albeit by less. All domains saw improvement.

I was really pleased to see that 21 of the schools that had 40 or more students (15 per cent of them) had an improvement from last year to this year of more than 20 percentage points. That is a very substantial change over the period of one year and reflects the teaching practices. The member for King and I visited one of those schools not so long ago and we were able to talk to teachers and the principal. I visited one in the Leader of the Opposition's electorate, 36 points, and there is another school in the member for Light's electorate, at 36 points. Indeed, the one in the member for King's electorate had more than 50 percentage points improvement. That is very substantial.

What was reported was that teachers had embraced the new methods they had been employing in their school. Some of them had been reluctant and resistant early on, but upon seeing the extraordinary outcomes their students had they have now embraced it. Talking to those teachers, it was really impressive. I know that when the Deputy Leader of the Opposition had a trial in 2017 that was similarly a reflection of some of the schools that did that trial reported at the time.

Every member in this house can take pride from South Australia leading the nation in the year 1 phonics check. I think in the years ahead we are all going to be proud of the substantial improvements it will show for our children.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister agree with the Guardian for Children and Young People in her annual report that children removed from their families into state care right now are still not actually safe and that amounts to a crisis and a betrayal?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: if the member for Badcoe is seeking to quote from the annual report, as it seems that she was suggesting to do, she should seek leave of the house.

The SPEAKER: A point of order on the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, the annual report was tabled in this parliament yesterday, so it is not an introduction of facts. The facts are before the house.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I am going to allow the minister an opportunity to respond.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:40): I thank the member for the question. We know that children are removed from very dangerous situations. They are not removed lightly. In fact, the major three causes for why children are removed are drug and alcohol abuse, domestic violence and mental health. We know that under the former government many of those children were left in chronic neglect situations for many years and have irrecoverable damage. These children are removed at the will of a court.

We put forward a case based on reports to a Child Abuse Report Line, and it is the Youth Court that determines whether that child should be removed. I will not apologise for removing children from danger. It is our role to protect children. Bear in mind, and the guardian has noted herself, these are children—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —that have multiple and complex trauma in their history. These are not children who came from a happy family who are coming into residential care on a holiday.

These are children with complex behaviours who quite likely have experienced things that none of us here would ever like to care to read about.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Light!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We are dealing with difficult situations. These children aren't going to come into care and suddenly have perfect behaviours and not interact with each other.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We know that children are better off in family-based care, so we have had a focus on recruiting foster carers. In fact, in the 2018-19 year we achieved my goal of a 50 net increase in families. We also for the first time ever, last quarter, had growth in our numbers of foster carers in every single foster care agency in South Australia. We are doing amazing work with the non-government organisations to get children into family-based care because we know it is safe there, it is better for them there and there are better outcomes.

We have also made significant improvements on family scoping. Despite the numbers of children coming into care continuing to increase, more children are now in family-based care than there were last year and the year before, so we are making significant progress. There is a lot more work to be done and we need more families. If there is anyone listening or watching today: 1300 2 FOSTER.

We need more families so that we can reduce our reliance on residential care because, as is acknowledged widely by the guardian, by commissioners, by everyone, when you put children from traumatised backgrounds with complex behaviours together in residential care there is the likelihood of bad behaviours, so the goal is to reduce our reliance on residential care. We have capped the numbers. We are not at full capacity. We have already closed one, as I have said. We are looking at better models, new models, world's best practice of therapeutic residential care so that we can improve the safety of all children in our care.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Badcoe and then the member for Florey, the following members are called to order: the deputy leader is warned, the member for Hurtle Vale, the member for Badcoe is warned, and the member for MacKillop is called to order.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister agree with the Guardian for Children and Young People in her annual report that there is a current crisis in child protection linked to the number of children coming into care, which has risen by 457 children since the minister was appointed?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:44): I appreciate the opportunity to speak on this.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Our numbers coming into care for the last financial year were an increase of 8 per cent. The change for the last five years was an average of 9 per cent, so there is not an increase. It is still a number that we want to reduce, but over the last five years it is within equal number of what has been coming in.

Ms Cook interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: One of the reasons that the number is still high—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Of course, my goal is to try to get that number down. That is why as a whole of government we're investing early on, to prevent children coming into care. What we experienced coming into government is there were a lot of 'closed no actions', and there were a lot of children left in chronic neglectful situations the former government shamefully left in danger, and we are cleaning up their mess.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Has the minister concluded her answer?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The minister has concluded her answer, member for West Torrens, so we will move on to the member for Florey.

ELDER ABUSE

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:45): My question is to the Attorney-General. What consideration have you given to reform and national harmonisation of power of attorney laws to better protect older South Australians, especially from financial abuse, and have you considered including yearly reporting and auditing of financial statements by appointed substitute decision-makers in a similar form to that required in incorporated associations to ensure an extra safeguard and transparency for both the donor and potential beneficiaries?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:46): I thank the member for her question. Perhaps I will address the second issue first in relation to the auditing process to provide that extra security that has been referred to. Can I say that this issue—that is, providing extra security against financial abuse of older persons particularly—I don't doubt will be an important chapter that comes to us out of the royal commission that is currently underway; however, we don't want to wait that long and I don't think we should. Therefore, there's some work being done as to how we might better secure and protect older persons, and part of that, of course, is being able to have a power of attorney process that is effective.

The member might recall there had been some earlier work done on this by the previous government when they attempted to deal with the issue, which unfortunately only culminated in the advance care directive legislation and not the power of attorney rewrite and reform, which clearly is still needed. The former minister—I recall it was the Hon. John Hill—started that project. It got very difficult. He progressed the advance care directives and, as was evident from the reports that he made to parliament, he would look at these other aspects, the financial aspects, at a later time.

Unfortunately, that didn't ever happen. We think it is still important to review so that where possible, as people mature in age and perhaps need further assistance particularly, they be able to have the opportunity to determine their own financial future and manage their own financial affairs where possible. The power of attorney instrument is important in that regard and the reforms that are needed in that area I think will advance it. So, yes, that is under consideration.

Tomorrow, the Council of Attorneys-General will meet here in Adelaide and I will have the privilege of chairing that meeting. That issue, not only of financial abuse of our older citizens but also harmonisation of power of attorney work, will be reported on because we have a working committee considering that and, secondly, other areas of protection against direct financial abuse or exploitation of older persons.

FLAGSTAFF ROAD UPGRADE

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (14:48): My question is directed to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister please update the house on the Marshall Liberal government's infrastructure plan to build an additional lane on Flagstaff Road?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:49): Once again, all part of delivering a pipeline of infrastructure that helps to improve things for residents, and especially in the member for Davenport's electorate—those poor long-suffering residents of the southern suburbs there who have to figure out what time of day it is before they drive up a hill with two lanes or one lane or vice versa. We have

taken the next step in delivering this key project in South Australia. What is really important about this project is that you understand what it's called.

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Waite can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Waite having withdrawn from the chamber:

Mr Picton: Good decision.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna will be following shortly. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I just don't think the member deserves more of the house's time. I think there is a very important thing, first up, when we are talking about Flagstaff Road and that is to realise that it's actually called Flagstaff Road and not Flagstaff Hill Road. Quite a number of bits of correspondence that I have received from members—not the member for Davenport—suggest that Flagstaff Hill Road needs an upgrade. I went and had a look in my maps to try to find out where Flagstaff Hill Road was and I couldn't find it, but I think that they are referring to Flagstaff Road. What we have done now is not only have we put out to undertake the design work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Ministers, cease the provocation, if you can.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —for Flagstaff Road—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Some even pronounce 'Knoll' wrong.

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —but we are also doing it in conjunction with the Victor Harbor Road duplication, as well as the Main South Road duplication, understanding that these three projects are all within the southern area of our city, that all are road duplication projects and that there is an ability to deliver these projects concurrently in a way that maximises the use of taxpayers' dollars. We are out there in the field at the moment undertaking the work necessary.

This is a difficult project. This is a difficult project that has some significant utilities issues, especially in relation to the water that flows down Flagstaff Road from the Happy Valley Reservoir, and we need to make sure that we get that aspect right and also deal with the South Australian Power Networks' cables that also run down that road.

I think it's a bit like the north-south corridor, where it's easy to do the easy bits and you leave the hard bits to somebody else. This government is in the business of doing the hard bits and delivering the infrastructure that is key to growing our city. I think especially for those residents living in Aberfoyle Park and Happy Valley and Chandler's Hill—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —what they need is a government that is committed to getting on with the job of making their daily commute just that much more easy. What we will see, especially after the completion—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Once the Darlington Road project is complete, our attention can turn to Flagstaff Road to make sure that we spread out the roadworks for the poor people in the south

who are having to go through the gauntlet of Darlington every single day. We will be able to get on and deliver this much-needed upgrade that is going to help improve certainty for those people who travel up and down that hill every day.

As somebody who has had to drive that road on many an occasion, I must admit that the degree of uncertainty about figuring out whether or not, going up the hill, there is going to be a car coming at you from the other way in the same lane is one thing that needs to be rectified. It's one thing that this government has put some \$33 million on the table to fix and is out there in the field at the moment delivering on that commitment.

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Does the minister concede that she has broken her promise to reduce the number of children in care when it has gone up by 457 since she has been a minister?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Point of order: allegation of facts, but also argument.

The SPEAKER: Broken promise? If you can't say that in here, what can you say? Minister for Child Protection, I am going to give you an opportunity to answer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call, and if members on my left do not be quiet, they will be leaving. Minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:53): As I mentioned in my previous answer, the number of children coming into care in the last financial year was 8 per cent, and that is around the average number for the last five years—

Ms Stinson: That's an increase.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe can leave for the remainder of question time.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —so, no, I have not broken a promise.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe will leave in silence, and when she does the member for Lee might get a question.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, quiet. Deputy leader, I have been far too generous to you this week. You are called to order and warned. Member for Lee.

GOVERNMENT DEBT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:54): My question is to the Premier. How much will government debt increase as a result of the government's housing package announced yesterday?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:54): Can I just be clear: we haven't finalised that detail. That is the subject of a bill that is before the Legislative Council at the moment. We will wait to see how that—

Mr Malinauskas: The Treasurer announced it yesterday.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —program goes. Ultimately, there are a number of elements that we are still negotiating, but we are very much committed to improving housing affordability in South Australia. In round terms—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —that is a \$400 million commitment over the next decade. We are very proud of the work that has gone into the development of this policy. We have sought input

from a range of stakeholders for this policy, and those details will be presented as part of the Mid-Year Budget Review if they are finalised and, if not, in next year's budget.

GOVERNMENT DEBT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier aware of the Treasurer's comments in the other place yesterday regarding the impact on debt?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I haven't read the transcript of *Hansard* from the other place, but I stand by the answer I have just provided to this house.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:55): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on the important work undertaken by Forensic Science SA and the role it plays in our justice system?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:55): Indeed I can. I am very pleased to do so and I thank the member for Newland. It isn't just the police, courts, lawyers, and persons who are involved in the justice system who frequently get the public notoriety and the like in dealing with protecting our citizens through the criminal justice system. The Forensic Science SA team are our unsung heroes, and I would like to provide even more investigative information that they can now assist South Australia Police with, principally through techniques in DNA operations.

Specifically, these new technologies enable Forensic Science SA to detect and analyse ever-decreasing amounts of DNA, compare complex DNA mixtures against the national DNA database, identify potential relatives of an unknown DNA profile through familial searches of the database, and improve turnaround times for DNA analysis. Importantly, Forensic Science SA is using these techniques to assist SAPOL in both contemporary and urgent investigations and cold case homicides.

I acknowledge some of the recent urgent work concerning public safety that Forensic Science SA has responded to. In the recent case of the home invasion and attempted sexual assault in Seaford Meadows, staff worked to provide DNA matched to an individual on the national database within 12 hours, and in the last four months they have provided vital DNA evidence, matching individuals on the national database, within 12 to 24 hours in the following cases:

- firstly, the violent sexual assault of a woman walking through a Munno Para park at 7am;
- secondly, the homicide at Hackham West, where a 36-year-old man was allegedly beaten to death with a wooden stake; and
- thirdly, the aggravated robbery at the Woodcroft caravan park, where two home invaders stole pokie machine winnings from an 82-year-old grandmother.

I reiterate that this is complex work that they should be commended for, particularly when they carry out these duties outside working hours.

In the last two years, Forensic Science SA has used these new DNA technologies in 25 cold cases being investigated by SAPOL. Arrests have been made in nine cases where DNA work provided results, and in three of those cases—the homicide of Suzanne Poll in 1993, Dale McCauley in 1998 and Robert Sabeckis in 2000—DNA results were entirely responsible for the identification of a suspect.

Forensic Science SA provides independent, high-quality, expert, scientific evidence, opinion and information to the justice system and the South Australian community. It is an essential service, and I would like to place on record my particular appreciation to Professor Chris Pearman and his team for the vital work they do. Whilst the member for Newland, as a scientist himself, would be familiar with the significance of this, I am pleased to have the opportunity to update the house on the same.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:59): I have a supplementary for the Deputy Premier. Why has Forensic Science received fewer additional funds from this government than Henry Keogh?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:59): I am very pleased to again remind the member of the significant capital funds that were provided in this year's budget to Forensic Science SA for the acquisition of a CT scanner. The procurement of that piece of equipment is underway.

It was a high priority identified by Forensic Science SA to ensure that it did have a new means of assisting in inquests—really, in relation to all reportable deaths where an autopsy may have been required. The benefit of this was highlighted at the time, but I will repeat it for the benefit of the member because this was identified as a key priority by Forensic Science SA to assist not only in the assessment of the reasons or cause of death in cases where they are required to make an assessment but also to not have to undertake so many autopsies.

This was a massive load of work, and with the implementation of the CT scanner it is our expectation that it will very significantly reduce the workload for Forensic Science SA. It also has the added benefit of ensuring that family members of someone who has died, who are perhaps waiting for their relative so that they can make the funeral arrangements and lay them to rest, are—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Well, the member for West Torrens may not think this is important—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens can now depart for the remainder of question time, thank you.

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —but let me tell members that I think every one of the members in this house would have had circumstances where they have received correspondence from relatives who are deeply distressed when they are awaiting a coronial report to enable them to get on and ensure that they can make the funeral arrangements for the person they love and lay them to rest. This is not an uncommon piece of concern raised by the community.

As a new government, we felt it needed to be addressed. The best way and the most immediate way we could do that was to provide more money in this capital fund availability to ensure the acquisition of a CT scanner, and it will be a very, very pleasing day when it arrives and gets to work.

FORENSIC SCIENCE SA

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:02): I have a further supplementary for the Deputy Premier. Why was the payment for Henry Keogh expedited within the first 90 days of the Marshall Liberal government but it took more than 16 months for the announcement of this scanner?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:02): Let me just firstly say that a cash payment, which I frequently approve in relation to ex gratia payments for victims—for example, of sexual abuse cases where that process occurs—I would have thought would have been immediately obvious to the member is a little bit quicker to implement than it is to procure, select and, of course, then purchase a piece of equipment.

At the time that this was announced—not 16 months into the government—it was identified that it would take about 12 months to go through the procurement process, to enable it to be acquired and then installed. The one I visited, the CT scanner which is currently being used by Forensic Science SA and which is at a northern site, is also used to deal with scanning in this way of animals, so it has a multifunction purpose. It is obviously quite a way from the city and it requires the

transporting of bodies to this facility and back, sometimes directly back to a funeral parlour and the like. So it is quite a distance.

If the member is familiar with the installation of CT scanners, even once you have procured and had them approved and purchased, they then have to sit in a certain room that is built to certain standards, obviously, to ensure that those who work in the operation of the CT scanner are protected. It's a process that is a little more complicated than writing out a cheque. I hope that answers the question.

DESALINATION PLANT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:04): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier now managed to find an answer to the question asked more than two weeks ago about whether the state's GST payments will be impacted by the federal government's decision to pay South Australia to turn on the state's Desalination Plant?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:04): I provided an answer to the house on that yesterday. I have nothing further to update.

REGIONAL JOBS

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:04): My question is to the Minister for—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet.

Mr TRELOAR: My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. How is the government's investment in grassroots sport leading to jobs in our regions?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:05): I thank the member for Flinders for his question, and it's with great pleasure that I update the house on what the Marshall Liberal government is doing in investing in sport in South Australia, especially in our regions, and growing jobs as well. I know that the member for Flinders is very passionate about this. He is a big champion for investment in his local community, and that is what we are delivering.

Our government is focused on creating jobs, jobs, jobs, jobs. I am pleased to inform the house that 165 jobs have been created as a result of a number of important construction projects from our multimillion boost into sporting facilities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Reynell is warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are not just talking about jobs in the metropolitan area. They are also happening in our regions—jobs that put money back into local communities and grow our state. Our government is not only focused on growing jobs but also on growing our regions because, as my good friend the Minister for Primary Industries says, #RegionsMatter.

The member for Flinders knows how much our regions matter and how the Marshall Liberal government's investment in sport is benefiting his community. Have a listen to some of these investments: \$94,000 to the Port Lincoln Yacht Club, a club that plays a big role in the Port Lincoln community, particularly during the Adelaide to Port Lincoln yacht race, which celebrates its 70th anniversary in February next year. This significant investment made possible through the Community Recreation and Sport Facilities Program will see the existing change rooms upgraded, a new access ramp for the boatshed, extended storage and new sensor lighting at the clubrooms.

These extra upgrades are wonderful for the community and great for the sport of sailing and all the people who do that over on the West Coast. We know that our regions are very big into sailing, but it is also great for the community. This matches an investment into the Ceduna Sailing Club of \$135,000, which is a great investment. I was over there with the member for Flinders, having a look at this club and the number of meals that they turn out in the local community and what they do. Sailing is one part, but what you love about this club is that they are actually a community facility as

well, so it was great to invest in them and to see what they give back to the community. If you are over on the West Coast, make sure you call in and see the Ceduna Sailing Club.

The Port Lincoln Leisure Centre had a \$190,000 investment, and this is a real hub in the member for Flinders' electorate. Families, older people and younger people—people right across the board—utilise this facility, and it was great to call past and have a look at what they are doing there. There are some big developments going on, and the member for Flinders is really delivering for his electorate.

The Wudinna District Council benefited from \$368,000. Who can forget the investment in the Cleve Sporting Bodies multifunction sports centre to the tune of \$630,000? This is a great investment and another outstanding example of how regional communities come together and bring everyone in. Everyone can benefit from this investment. The emergency services will use this and the sporting clubs will use this. When I was there with the member for Flinders meeting with the locals—I might add, too, in the town that I was born in, a lovely part of the world over on the West Coast—the way they would all work together to make sure that this investment was going to get maximum bang for the buck for the community was to be admired.

Those on this side of the house know how important our regions are. Jobs in our regions are critical, and delivering projects like this means jobs for local communities. That's why in the last few months I have been to Gawler, Tanunda, Nuriootpa, Berri, Renmark and Hahndorf, talking to volunteers, councils and local clubs about the great investment the Marshall Liberal government is making in growing our clubs and growing our communities. We look forward to doing plenty more—plenty more into the future.

DESALINATION PLANT

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:09): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier guarantee to the house that South Australian taxpayers will be no worse off as a result of the operation of the desal plant at the request of the federal government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:09): I refer the honourable member to the answer that I provided to the house yesterday.

Grievance Debate

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (15:09): Before the Liberal Marshall government came into power, we were promised a revolution in child protection. We were promised there would be really big change. We would have far fewer children in care. In fact, we would see a reduction in the number of children in care. We would see scores more, even hundreds more foster carers come into our system. We would see kinship carers treated better. We would see a reduction in the number of Aboriginal children in state care. Indeed, it was a new era that we were promised and it was a top-line issue for this government. They were talking about it all the time when they were in opposition. Now we barely hear about it. We barely hear what they are doing, and there is a reason for that: they are not doing very much at all.

One thing we were promised was a single minister to look after child protection. Credit where credit is due, that was absolutely delivered: we got one single minister. The problem is she is a dud. She has already had responsibility stripped from her, with the early intervention and prevention work, which is so critical to arrest the number of children who need to go into state care, sent over to another minister in another place, and not a dollar more has been spent on early intervention and prevention.

On top of that, we have seen a tax on foster and kinship carers, with this minister penny-pinching and introducing new policies that reduce the amount of support our foster and kinship carers are given. If we look at the exceptional resources fund, which is meant to assist people to take on additional children to keep sibling groups together, that has been capped now, leaving quite a few people—and I hear from them—without the funds to be able to take on additional children, or struggling to keep the children they have, to whom they have so generously given their time and money, and be able to support them in our community.

We have also seen a slowing in the number of people going through to long-term guardianship. That is our most secure form of family-based care for children, yet we are seeing that drop off under this minister. Shamefully, we are seeing the rate of Aboriginal children in care rise, with the guardian reporting that now 34.9 per cent of children in care are from Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander backgrounds. Those who are in care are increasingly not being placed in accordance with the Aboriginal placement principle, which sees them placed with family members, kinship connections or at least another person from the Aboriginal community.

The fact is the minister has broken her promises. The number of children in care is up by a long way. There are now 4,040 children in care, according to the latest figures. That is 457 more since this minister has come to office. Think about that number of 457: that is multiple primary schools of children who are now in the state care system. From what we read in the guardian's report, they are not necessarily even any safer.

Why does it matter that there are more children coming into care? Well, the guardian tells us it does matter. She finds in her report that the pressure that is being placed on this department by having so many more children coming into care is leading to poor results for children. We are seeing that children who are removed from their families into the care of the state 'are still not actually safe', to quote the guardian. She says that this is a 'personal crisis and a betrayal' and that the number of children coming into the system and the shortage of family-based care is resulting in this crisis.

The shortage of family-based care is a critical matter. While the minister says that she has met her target, she simply has not. Fudging the figures and including in those statistics people who are not able to actually take on the care of children is no way to have openness and transparency about what is happening in our child protection system. There are also deficiencies in placement allocation and matching of children, and some children absolutely heartbreakingly have told the guardian that they would prefer staying in youth detention to going back to residential care facilities where they feel that they are unsafe and at risk.

This minister is a minister missing in action. After a bit of a scare last year, she barely bobs her head up now. We barely hear from her, with only three radio appearances or thereabouts this year. What is she doing? Who would know. We need someone to actually fulfil their promises and we need that now.

GIBSON ELECTORATE

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:15): I rise to speak on a number of important issues that are happening in my local community and my electorate and to update the house on the Hove crossing project. I have spoken in this house many times before about the Oaklands crossing project, and I am pleased to let everyone know that the continuing benefits in my community as a result of this project are being very well received. In fact, I get stopped in the street regularly by people who are so excited about the delivery of this project. After 30 or 40 years in the waiting, this has been a great result for everyone in my local area.

Recently, I met with a number of local residents from Hove and Warradale at one of the new Hove pedestrian crossings, which was part of the upgraded Oaklands crossing project. Residents living close to the Hove crossing raised their concerns with me about the frequency and duration of pedestrian crossing bells at Hove and the Seventh Avenue crossings. In particular, Carol and Emily from Hove were concerned about the noise and pitch of the crossing bells. The sound of the bells was impacting on residents as they slept in the early morning and late night. Emily is a shiftworker as well.

Following feedback from residents, I reached out to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government and relayed to him my concerns and the concerns of my community. Since speaking with the minister, DPTI signal engineers have checked the volume of the bells and the three activated pedestrian crossings and made sure that they are set to the minimal level while maintaining the required compliance. The tone and pitch of the bells have also been adjusted.

Already these improvements have provided a lot of relief for the neighbours and local residents. I would like to take this opportunity to thank the residents who contacted me and worked with me on the crossing, and I look forward to continuing to work with them to make sure we get the

best possible outcomes for our community. That switches us to the Hove railway crossing, which has been a longstanding problem in my community and for all those who travel along Brighton Road.

Having upgraded the Oaklands crossing, this is where our attention is now focused. It is one of the biggest concerns that is raised with me in my local area and it causes congestion and delays for motorists on a daily basis. Over 4,000 vehicles use Brighton Road each day and when the Hove crossing is down it means that the intersection is blocked by boom gates for 25 per cent of peak travel time. I have worked with my neighbouring MPs, including the member for Black (Minister for Environment), the Minister for Transport, and our federal colleague, the member for Boothby, Ms Nicolle Flint, to solve this local issue for residents and commuters.

The federal and Marshall governments have announced \$171 million in funding towards the grade separation of the level crossing at Brighton Road, Hove. The upgrade, removing a road-rail crossing point, will mean reduced travel times for motorists, increased reliability for buses that use Brighton Road, safety for all road users—motorists, cyclists and pedestrians—and improve connectivity and livability for surrounding areas. It really is a big upside for our entire community.

The community and stakeholder engagement is an important part of this upgrade and the planning processes will continue. An extensive consultation with the landowners, businesses and residents has already begun, but it will continue and I will keep delivering updated information to my community, as I did with my Fix Oaklands Crossing campaign, with e-news and website updates. My community can find out more about the Fix Brighton Road project as it unfolds by registering their email on the Fix Brighton Road website or by contacting my office on 8377 3500. All they have to do is mention Fix Brighton Road-Hove Crossing, and they will be in our community and engaged through our email process, and we will keep them up to date with everything that is happening.

With the last couple of minutes that I have I would love to talk about the people who entered my annual Christmas card competition. This is a wonderful success in my local community. Congratulations to April and Levi from Stella Maris Parish School and Charlotte from Marion Primary School on their fantastic artwork. We have some wonderful artists, young artists, in our local community and they were the people who did the designs for my Christmas cards that I look forward to sending out very soon.

I also want to acknowledge the Marilyns. You have heard me speak about them before in this place. They are famous at the Brighton jetty swim and they raise a considerable amount of money for the Cancer Council SA. The member for Black and I had a winter warmer fundraiser earlier this year, where we raised more than \$1,600 to go towards the Marilyns and their Cancer Council fundraising. It was great to make that donation to them recently.

Finally, I want to talk about Ben Pethick Reserve in Marion. Earlier this month, I attended the Oaklands Estate Residents' Association AGM and was informed that the toddler play equipment at Ben Pethick Reserve would be removed by the local council. Understandably, residents were concerned that the equipment was going, because it was suitable for younger children. I wrote to the Marion council and I am pleased to report that toddler swings will now be installed at nearby Oaklands Estate and that the equipment at Ben Pethick Reserve will only be removed once the new swings are installed.

PARLIAMENTARY INTERNSHIP PROGRAM

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:20): Today, I rise to speak briefly about one of the programs that most MPs are involved in, and that is the Parliamentary Internship Program. It is a scheme that is run jointly by three universities—the University of South Australia, the University of Adelaide and Flinders University—where students undertaking their third year in a particular program have the opportunity to undertake an internship with an MP in this state.

The internship is essentially where a student is assigned to an MP, the MP or student suggests an area of research and a report is prepared for the MP on a range of topics. This year, I was fortunate enough to have five students assigned to me for the internship program and they were wonderful young people who delivered great reports. I was quite impressed by the quality of their reports, their depth of thinking and also their depth of writing.

Before I go on to mention the projects they undertook for me this year, I would like to also acknowledge that the Parliamentary Internship Program is celebrating 25 years this year. I have been involved with the program for the 14 years that I have been here. Over that time, I have dealt with Clem Macintyre, who was the first person I was involved with and is Emeritus Professor in politics at Adelaide University; Haydon Manning at Flinders University; and also, more recently, Wayne Errington at Adelaide University. I think that this is a very good scheme where not only do MPs get an opportunity to get some rigorous academic work done for them but it also gives an opportunity for students to engage with MPs and get a better understanding of the political process.

The students I supervised for the internship this year were Brayden Johns, Alexandra Herden, Rebecca Vandeppear, Beth Cox and Clara Finn. Between the five of them, they covered some very diverse topics. Brayden Johns' report was about South Australia. He did an investigation and study into South Australia as an international moral agent and his report referred to South Australia as a protagonist on the world stage. That research project looked into the capacity of subnational governments, like state and local governments, to play a role on the international stage.

As a state, we have had some success in that area. For example, previous premiers Rann and Weatherill were quite prominent internationally, especially in the energy area, where we led the world. They also took a position in some international organisations, leading the world in terms of renewable energies. Brayden also looked at other topics and at the capacity of state and local governments to influence the world political system or world outcomes. He made the observation that there are a lot of opportunities for local government to be involved more.

Alexandra Herden did a research project on the freedom of speech, which is very topical in this country at the moment. She looked at the general concept of freedom of speech and whether there is a difference between that and religious freedom of speech. She also looked into whether that is a special category and, if it is, why it is. She prepared a very thorough and interesting report.

Rebecca Vandeppear undertook a study into what can be done to increase the population in rural and remote South Australia. She looked at the various policies that would promote the growth of the population in rural areas. In fact, she prepared such a good report that it is my intention to send a copy to the various regional communities and regional local government associations that have actually asked for some support and advice on this matter. She did an excellent job.

Clara Finn, who is an international student from England, did a study into whether identity politics is actually a friend or foe of social democracies and worked out what is good for the Labor Party in terms of its policy in that regard.

The last report I would like to mention is by Beth Cox. Beth is a geography student at the University of Adelaide. She undertook a study into the southern rural areas of Gawler. She is looking at trying to find solutions to this policy issue in Gawler, which councils and the state government have not been able to resolve for about 20 years. I am looking forward to receiving her final report, which will provide some recommendations on how to resolve that policy dilemma.

MOUNT GAMBIER MIGRANT COMMUNITY

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:25): I rise to make a brief contribution about a wonderful community member in my electorate, Chanceline Kakule, and the work that she has been doing in a multicultural sense on bringing our community together.

There is no doubt that during the last decade Mount Gambier has become a city of many cultures. Hundreds of Burmese, Congolese, Karenni and Sudanese people have migrated to Mount Gambier to begin a new life, bringing their families and their cultures. Some have found employment in the agricultural or forestry industries, others have gone into higher study or volunteering and some have begun successful businesses. They share their cultures through events, dance, music and community dinners.

According to recent census data, more than 10 per cent of people living in Mount Gambier were born overseas. Mostly, the city has welcomed their newest residents. However, like anyone who moves to a new life in a different region, they can have experiences that are positive and experiences that are negative. Negotiating language barriers, housing, employment, schooling, even

shopping among residents who have lived in the town their whole life can be a challenge for both sides.

Chaneline Kakule moved to Mount Gambier when she was just nine years of age. She was born during a time of war, and her family fled from the Congo to Zambia, where they spent seven years in a refugee camp. When they first came to Australia, the family lived in Tasmania and then Geelong before relocating permanently to Mount Gambier. Another three children have been born into the family whilst living in Australia. Chaneline says Mount Gambier feels like home to her family and they enjoy living in there because they have been able to reconnect with people they knew from the Congo.

Earlier this year, Chaneline started a branch of the E-Raced program in Mount Gambier. E-Raced is a program that originated through the ABC's youth storytelling platform Heywire by a friend of hers in Queensland. It aims to combat racism one story at a time. The group understands that, while racism cannot fully be erased, young refugees and immigrants can play a significant role in decreasing it.

The group's members, who might be from Italy, the Congo or the Solomon Islands, speak at schools and events and talk about their experiences of integrating into a community. They have been invited to Harmony Day and Refugee Week celebrations, and their stories of war, poverty and personal experiences can have a major effect on people. Chaneline said it was important to connect with the younger generations as they are the future leaders of tomorrow. She says, 'If we can change their mindset in one way, we can make a positive influence and continue to pass the message along. We make a difference one step at a time.'

By sharing real-life stories about traditions and cultures, it counteracts the stereotypes and perceptions of immigrants and their way of life. One member of the E-Raced group shared a story of a little boy who came up to her before her presentation and said that he believed 'refugees are a waste of space'. After she spoke, he went up to her and apologised. Racism begins with a lack of education, a lack of understanding and a lack of acceptance. Chaneline says that if people are curious they should feel open to asking questions and not be worried about saying the wrong thing. The take-home point is to get to know people before you assume anything or judge them.

Working towards true social equity is as important for regional communities as it is for big cities and we can all play our part. It is important to feel connected to and valued in our community, and this group is working towards a more open and inclusive Mount Gambier. With strong community support, I am looking forward to seeing what this group can achieve in the future. I would like to congratulate Chaneline on her E-Raced program that she is starting in Mount Gambier, and any support I can offer I do so.

ROMA MITCHELL SECONDARY COLLEGE, SPECIAL EDUCATION CAMPUS

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:30): At this time of year, as members of parliament we attend many school events, often congratulating our year 12 graduates whose formal education journey in our school system has concluded. Of course, many will go on with further study at university, TAFE, trade training and other courses, while some will go on to enter the workforce. It is an exciting time that can also be quite daunting for these young people, who are likely to face unique challenges during the transition to adult life. There are many decisions for them to make: whether to continue along the path of further study, have a gap year or take up employment.

Next week, 3 December is International Day of People with Disability, a United Nations sanctioned day that aims to increase public awareness, understanding and acceptance of people with a disability, while also celebrating their achievements and contributions. Last week, I had the honour of attending the Roma Mitchell Secondary College year 12 graduation ceremony held in our historic Bonython Hall. It was heartwarming to see so many students passionate about their education and excited about the next steps in their lives.

Roma Mitchell Secondary College has a disability campus that is a purpose-built unit catering to the needs of children with intellectual disabilities and providing a high-quality education with a particular focus on the post-school pathways of these students. The college provides a secure and supportive environment for students to learn an interesting, structured and precise curriculum based

on SACE and the Australian Curriculum, designed to help each of them learn to become as independent as possible and confidently become part of their community.

The Roma Mitchell Secondary College Special Education Campus Medal is what the school describes as 'the highest of awards', and this year it was awarded to Ali Shah for always exhibiting the highest quality of the college values. His achievements included being a representative on the student leadership team, performing duties in his role as a special education prefect and being selected to represent Roma Mitchell College at the Special Olympics and soccer carnivals.

Another significant award, the Roma Mitchell Secondary College Special Education Senior Progress Award went to Chris Abbott, a student who over the five years he has been at the college has shown the most personal growth and development and engagement with his learning. Feifei Yin received the award for the year 12 modified SACE subject, mathematics. I congratulate Ali Shah, Chris Abbott and Feifei Yin on their achievements and on their graduation.

A total of eight students graduated: three from the girls' regional special classes, two from co-educational regional special education and three from the special education campus. One of the graduates, Ali Shah, is looking forward to spending time at Choice and Control, a post-school provider for young people with disability. Choice and Control is a not-for-profit organisation that is a registered NDIS provider based at Lewiston on an eight-acre property that specialises in skill and capacity building programs to get young people ready for the workforce.

In the lead-up to the International Day of People with Disability, schools, community organisations and workplaces are encouraged to start a conversation about disability to mark the day. One in five people (or 4.3 million Australians) have a disability. It is important to increase awareness because by having a conversation about disability you can challenge perceptions, educate others and normalise disability in everyday life. We all have a role to play to ensure people with disability have the same opportunities as others to reach their full potential.

I would also like to make special mention of Sheila, a former journalist, member of the Torrens sub-branch and local resident. Sheila suffered a stroke in 2001 that left her with a severe physical disability and she has faced many challenges in her life. What I admire most about her is her determination to keep on learning. She enjoys visiting our office most weeks, going to the local op shop to find some bargains and attending local programs, despite her physical disability restricting her to a wheelchair and the requirement of a full-time carer.

The participation of persons with disabilities in public and social life is crucial to fighting stereotypes, prejudice and, above all, exclusion.

MITCHAM COUNCIL

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:35): Today, I rise to voice my community's concern over what has happened at Mitcham council for the last 12 months. We have just come through the first 12 months of a new council and many ratepayers are just relieved to be getting to Christmas and feel lucky that the community is still there and surprised that Mitcham is in one piece. You may ask why, sir.

It is disappointing that we have seen repeated attacks by this council on the community that elected them. It appears that, when they are not trying to cancel Christmas, they are pushing for more subdivision powers that would replace our green streets and gardens with concreted driveways and wall to wall houses. Mitcham council's recent push to allow 250 square metre blocks is greatly concerning for me and many in my community, as Adelaide has gradually seen a loss of green canopy over the years.

As our climate warms, we need to be growing our green canopy to combat urban hotspots and provide relief and amenity, not advocating for policies that would see trees ripped up. The push for more subdivisions would also clog our backstreets with cars, making congestion and road safety worse, especially in Blackwood and Belair. In my view, it is an attempt to raise rate revenue at the community's expense, and it should be called out for the greedy cash grab that it is. Sadly, that greed has become a theme with this council, as earlier this year we saw the council pass the highest rate rise in metropolitan Adelaide at 3.67 per cent.

The unprecedented hip pocket raid was under the guise of providing better services, yet we have not seen any remarkable increase in service to my community. In fact, we have seen a reduction

in services with the Christmas carols debacle, whereby Mitcham council voted to can their annual well-attended carols event. That heartless attack on the community spirit was in part justified by some concern over the offence that the event might cause people of other faiths, yet no councillor or the mayor has been able to provide one example of someone coming forward with a complaint over the annual Christmas carols.

The decision, which has been reversed after a national outcry and to much embarrassment of council, was an attempt to sacrifice our traditions in our community at the altar of misplaced political correctness. I am so glad to say that this Saturday, in a couple of days' time, the carols are going ahead at Kingswood Oval. It tells the story of a council whose leadership is grossly out of touch with the community it is meant to represent. It is a council that has raised rates by 3.67 per cent, wanted to cancel our annual Christmas carols and, of course, now wants to see subdivision where block sizes in my communities can be as small as 250 square metres.

The story worsened this week when the council refused to commit funding in support of the Unley Jets Kingswood Oval upgrade. The Unley Jets is one of the fastest growing football clubs in South Australia, with over 30 teams and many new female teams as well. This year, it won the Amateur League Club of the Year and the A grade is going back up to division 1. At the 2018 election, the Marshall Liberal government committed \$100,000 towards the upgrade, and the club also received \$500,000 in federal funding from member for Boothby, Nicolle Flint.

The possibility of a further significant grant from the state as part of our sports grants fund is on the table, but this community club was hoping that Mitcham council would also come to the party with a contribution to complement existing funding to further enhance the case for co-contribution from the Office for Recreation and Sport, which is so needed.

Their hopes were dashed this week when council offered a paltry \$25,000 in funding towards the total upgrade—this is for a club that has already secured some \$600,000 in funding from state and federal governments. Adding further insult to this very real offence is the fact that Kingswood Oval is actually owned by Mitcham council, yet they refuse to invest in their own facilities as well as the players and families who use them.

The Marshall Liberal government has committed to the electorate of Waite when it comes to sports funding, and that is so important. As a government we have invested in the Blackwood Football Club, Hewett Reserve is having a fantastic upgrade at the moment (by the way, a facility owned by the Mitcham council), the Blackwood Bowling Club has received funding from our government, the Coromandel Valley cricket club and, of course, the Unley Jets. This is in addition to the other investments in our community, including \$20 million to fix the Main Road corridor through the Mitcham Hills and \$60 million for the Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection.

The state government is looking after the people of Mitcham. The federal government is looking after the people of Mitcham. I want the Mitcham council to look after the people of Mitcham.

Motions

ABORIGINAL LANDS TRUST LAND DISPOSAL

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:41): I move:

That pursuant to section 44(2)(a) of the Aboriginal Lands Trust Act 2013, this house resolves that the Aboriginal Lands Trust may dispose of land and buildings held by the trust at 50-56 Sussex Street, North Adelaide (Certificate of Title Volume 5546 Folio 989 and Certificate of Title Volume 5536 Folio 252).

The Aboriginal Lands Trust owns a property at 50-56 Sussex Street, North Adelaide. The property has an area of 1,538 square metres and comprises a former boarding house, a caretaker's house, an office, a small playground and a car park. The property was owned and run by various benevolent organisations before entering the trust estate in 1980, after which it was used to house Aboriginal women coming to Adelaide for medical treatment. It was last used for this purpose in 1995 and has been derelict for some time. In the meantime, the Aboriginal Lands Trust has been incurring considerable property maintenance costs.

The trust board considered improving the buildings and using them for office premises; however, a feasibility study identified that the building did not meet occupational health and safety

criteria, while Sussex Street is now zoned residential, precluding alternative uses. The current value of the Sussex Street property, based on SA Water ratings, is in excess of \$3 million. At its board meeting on 10 October 2019, the trust resolved unanimously to sell the property. This decision was informed by community consultation undertaken by the trust.

The trust is an independent statutory authority and receives funding of just over \$1 million per annum from the state government. About 20 per cent of its budget is allocated to rental costs for its current Adelaide CBD office. The trust intends to use proceeds from the sale of the Sussex Street property to secure its own premises, which will include multi-use spaces that can be used by Aboriginal communities as well as being available for hire to create a new income stream for the trust.

Earlier this year, the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee completed a report, as required by the Aboriginal Lands Parliamentary Standing Committee Act 2003, following its review into the operations of the trust. I recently provided a response to the committee's Presiding Member, noting that I have been in discussion with the trust about further action that could be taken to put the trust in a sustainable financial position. This includes the proposal for the sale of the Sussex Street property. Section 44(2)(a) of the act requires a resolution of both houses of parliament to approve the disposal of trust land. I commend this resolution to the house.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:44): I rise today to support this motion. The Premier has comprehensively covered what is actually going to happen. Clearly, the sale of the property will be of benefit to the Aboriginal Lands Trust. They will get new headquarters that will be fit for purpose and in addition they will have a surplus left over that they will be able to invest. I understand that the Indigenous Land Corporation is assisting the Aboriginal Lands Trust with advice on the business case, so that gives us a degree of confidence that things will be done as they should be done. As indicated, Labor supports this motion.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Committees

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

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Treloar (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:45): I rise to continue my remarks on the report of the Select Committee on the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. I was talking earlier about the actions being taken in regard to this report, and the core function I think we are mainly concerned about in this legislation is the act of direction, if there is going to be a direction, to someone harvesting. This can be a very tenuous decision, as I was hinting at before, but the issue is that there is a harvesting code of practice. It has been in practice for over a decade now, was developed in conjunction with Grain Producers South Australia and it is very sensible.

The other side of it, as I indicated in my remarks earlier today, is that science is helping us so much more with assessing when we should or should not be operating harvesting machinery, and you can use the same assessment in regard to operating sprayers with respect to farm-based weather stations. They are coming into their own, and I want to speak about that broadly for a little while because this is what is going to drive reality into the future.

When I talk about reality, I mean things like insurance claims. This does not apply to every time I have had dealings with insurance companies, but I did have a time once when a shed blew down on my property. I called my insurance company—I dutifully pay my insurance every year, several thousands of dollars for many, many years, as my father did before me—and they said there was no wind that day.' I said, 'Really?' I said that I knew where two other sheds blew down. So it gets to the stage where sometimes, because people are minimising their risk—I will say it the polite way—or minimising their costs, they will allege that something else may have happened or did not happen.

I think that for people to cover their backside, basically, relying on technical instruments and readings is probably a far better way. To be fair to everyone in the field, some people may not have direct access to weather stations, but with the technology we have now and the communications in the field—so long as there is mobile coverage, and it is getting better under our government—people

can have quick communication in regard to whether they should be operating a harvester or a spray unit, which I indicated is the other option that can be worked out under weather station management. So there are ways that people can soon find out.

It is all about wind speed, heat, humidity and a whole range of other factors. The issue is not just about whether you are burning down your crop or your neighbour's crop, or you are putting lives at risk if you do the wrong thing: the simple fact is that we have too many harvester fires. By a long shot, that is not necessarily so because you are operating in the wrong weather conditions: you have a machine that has many moving parts.

The technology behind a harvester, especially the old straw walker models and the initial technology that came out of the Ridley Stripper, has obviously modernised, but the technique of threshing grain has not changed that much, apart from the size of machines and the throughput, etc. Obviously, rotary machines are all slightly different, whether it be a Case machine with longitudinal rotors, a New Holland with twin rotors, a Deutz with the rotor around the other way (basically the thresher), or a Massey machine with a longitudinal rotor that threshes grain out right to the back of the rotor.

Part of the issue is the cleanliness of the machines, not necessarily a bad weather day. I think people are finding out and learning more about better maintenance of harvesters, especially when reaping something like lentils, which I have never grown personally. I understand that you can get a lot of fine material, especially in the flow headers around the rotors, and that is what can cause them to light up—and I have seen what happens when a harvester goes up. There are two rules of thumb: you either put the fire out really quickly or you hope the harvester burns to the ground.

That may sound a bit wrong, but once a harvester burns—there is not that much metal in them, really, as far as side panels and that sort of thing—it is twisted out of shape and all those shafts and bearings get out of line. I saw my neighbour's harvester that basically got fried (I will not mention the brand name because it could be any brand) and they spent a fortune on rebuilding it. They would have been better off walking away from it. However, that would be a matter the insurance company would have worked through, and it would have been part of the condition of getting the insurance payment.

Even with the utmost care and maintenance and a full bearing rebuild, the fact remains that there are many moving parts on harvesters—whether it is a draper front, like the big belt fronts that I think can now go out to about 60 feet or 18 metres, or the old tin fronts that some people used more early on. You have knives working, and you are usually working close to the ground with these big open-front headers, so you are right at the source.

There would be many more than one or two operators who suddenly realised, when they looked in the mirror or swung a corner, that there were little spot fires lighting up as they went along. That could happen on a 20° day with no wind just because something has become hot because the bearing has let go—no matter how good the maintenance regime of that machine. That is exactly why we need to have a harvesting code of practice and control—because stuff happens and it does happen beyond your control. You could get a bit of metal jammed in front that might grate for a while and all of a sudden it can start something up.

There was a lot of discussion on our side of the house about who should make the decision to direct someone to stop. As I indicated earlier, a lot of CFS members or their neighbours are fellow farmers. Without looking at the science or the weather stations and that sort of thing, people have different views on how hot, how windy and how often they blow out a harvester. It takes time to pull up and blow out your machine, and I must commend the many thousands of farmers who have very good systems. A lot of them basically use garden blower equipment. They fire it up, get up the back, get all around it, pull the guards off the side, open the sides up and blow the heck out of it. This is resulting in better outcomes.

The recommendations that came out of this report are about getting the right outcome. The committee noted that primary producers have a proactive approach to fire prevention through producer networks, messaging services and, as I indicated, an increased investment in on-farm equipment, data collection and continuing education. Evidence presented to the committee showed that producers are making use of localised data sources as these become more readily available,

and I think that is the secret as we move on. The following sentence in the committee's report sums it up:

Given the microclimates across South Australia, the Committee acknowledges the importance of localised data in responsible decision-making.

Recommendation 2 states:

Clause 23 of the Bill be amended to clarify which officers will be authorised to exercise the proposed powers to direct that a prescribed activity be ceased or not commenced. This power should be limited to South Australia Police officers.

We will probably get some questions on this from the other side at a later time. That will be part of the education process and lining up with the data sources that are available or not, depending on the case. That will certainly assist police if they ever have to make these decisions. If they have not had that direct experience in agriculture, there will be a little bit of training. Training someone in the use of data and science is a lot easier than relying sometimes on just direct experience.

Another recommendation relates to the government developing enforcement criteria and guidelines for the exercise of the proposed powers and the consultation that should go on with that. I think we can get there and get the right results, but we just need to make sure that everyone is on board so that we get the right outcome for the safety of our community. We must also take into account the profitability for people who are in the main self-employed and trying to do the best thing for their family.

At the end of the day, we have to make sure that we keep the community safe. Coming from a small regional area, I can assure members that getting the balance right will be an interesting exercise, but we need to get it right because it is a live issue. As long as we exist on this earth, there will always be harvester fires, but we need to minimise the damage and make sure that we can have a profitable industry into the future and a safe community as well. With those words, I commend the report of the select committee to the house.

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

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 27 November 2019.)

The CHAIR: I have a statement to read. I will not start the clock until I have done that. Yesterday, in the Committee of the Whole, when the Premier was being examined on the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 discussions ensued on whether questions could be asked on Report 8 of the Auditor-General. I stated to the house at the time:

Given that it also deals with 2018-19 year—it is not the annual report, but it does deal with the financial year in question—I am happy to accept those questions.

I have now had the benefit of examining Report 8, together with all the other Auditor-General's Reports that have been tabled in this house that relate to the financial year 2018-19. As it is only the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2019, being the annual report that has been referred to the Committee of the Whole for examination, the asking of questions on Report 8 or any other report of the Auditor-General in Committee of the Whole House is contrary to the referral.

Therefore, in order to clarify the situation and correct the record, questions can only be asked that reference Report 6 of the annual report for the year ended 30 June 2019. To be more specific, Report 6 of 2019 is comprised of three parts: Part A, which is the Executive Summary, Part B, Controls opinion and Part C, Agency audit reports. The financial reports of the agencies included in Part C are available at the Auditor-General's Department website. I hope we have clarified that from yesterday and for today.

We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General 2018-19 Report in relation to the Minister for Education. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions

have to be asked by members on their feet and all questions must directly reference the Auditor-General's 2018-19 Report. We will start the clock—questions, deputy leader.

Dr CLOSE: As we have discussed, I will be starting with the Department for Education. At page 78 there is a useful summary of the matters that the Auditor-General wished to comment on. In the significant events and transactions section, he notes that \$894 million will be spent over five years on various education sites, schools, the vast majority of which was allocated under the previous government and an additional \$185 million was added by this government to assist with some of the schools needing year 7 moves.

What I would like to know first is whether it is possible to be furnished with a timetable for completion for each of the projects relating to that \$894 million. If it is difficult to do all of them, as I appreciate they are not all yet at the same stage, I would appreciate having the timetable of completion for those expected to be completed by February 2022.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question. I can provide most of what you have asked, but there will be some that I will take on notice and I will provide some further information in due course. The year 7 to high school and the expansion capacity in the system, you have heard me talk about from time to time that we have two factors in relation to capacity. One is this bubble that is going to hit our high schools in a couple of years and one is year 7 to high school.

The year 7 to high school is not as simple as saying, 'How many year 7s are there? That's the number of students they need to hit.' The fact is that area schools, R-12 schools and a couple of 7-12 schools are already currently accommodating year 7s. There are, of course, some schools that have capacity anyway. The combination of year 7 to high school and expanded capacity is most of that \$185 million of extra funding.

Some of that extra funding is not specifically related to capacity, and I think there were about \$20 million of announcements that were in addition to capacity. I think the Unley High School master plan was not entirely located capacity. I think that was a master plan that had been—I suspect the deputy leader would have seen a version of it early on—some time in the waiting. In addition to that, there is also the merger of the campuses in the Riverland with the Glossop High School redevelopment. There were some increased funds in relation to that.

There were also the projects announced in 2017 by the member for Port Adelaide that have been carried through by the new government. Obviously, some of that funding will support high schools capacity, though much of it will not. It is a range of those projects. Separating budgets into classifications of year 7 and so forth is very difficult given the types of facilities. For example, one of the things that has come up from time to time is the investigation being provoked by the year 7 project; that is, what specialist learning areas does this or that school have? Are they sufficient for the school when the year 7s come in?

Some of them have identified schools that do not have sufficient specialist learning areas with or without the year 7s. If you are going to provide funds to enable a performing arts space or more laboratories in a school as a result of the year 7 project coming in, when the school would still be due that performing arts space or that science laboratory if you were to analyse their needs without the year 7s, do you assign that to the year 7 project or do you just assign it to enhancing the capacity in our schools? That is why there is this grey area, and I think the deputy leader is very much understanding of that.

In relation to a timetable, we can definitely provide some schools' project timetables. There are schools that have been scoped, tendered and so forth where there is an indicative timetable that may not necessarily tell the whole story, too. As the member would recall from all the STEM Works projects, what you often have is a project complete and children using a facility but still paperwork going on between the builders and the education department. There may well be projects that are identified as having a later completion date than handover to the school and being able to use it. We will try to clarify some of that in the provision of information.

There are also a number of projects that will probably be completed before February 2022, which is the date identified, that are not yet fully scoped. As I say, there will certainly be some projects that will be completed beyond February 2022. We will try to find as much information as we can

usefully provide for the shadow minister in relation to this, acknowledging that it will not be a complete list of those projects completed by 2022.

Dr CLOSE: I would also be interested, as part of this subset of the \$894 million mentioned on page 78, in the subset that is functionally expected to finish for February 2022, even if I absolutely accept the paperwork and ongoing final finish might take slightly longer. For those projects, what proportion of expenditure will be for general learning areas versus specialist learning areas?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will take that on notice and endeavour to provide the information that is possible to be provided.

Dr CLOSE: Also on that matter, can the minister inform me how many high schools in the last year have had the requirement to enforce their zones and how many more are anticipated to need to do that prior to February 2022?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I was going to add one thing to a previous answer, if you do not mind. The figure identified there, the \$894 million, I believe does not include the three new schools, which are in the order of \$350 million as well. Of course, they also will meet some of that high school capacity need. The Whyalla one is adding year 7s to the existing mix, and the north and the south schools are B-12 schools.

In relation to the member's question that she has just asked on specialist versus general learning areas, I will take it on notice and see what we can find. I remembered the other question the member just asked, which was in relation to enforcement and zones. I will take that on notice.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you for keeping track of my questions. Another question I would like to ask about the \$894 million on page 78 is: how much will be spent on how many transportable classrooms?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I cannot answer that directly because that will potentially depend on the scope of some projects. But when we talk about transportable classrooms, I want to be really clear that we are not talking about the wooden, asbestos-filled, 1940-50s builds that exist in too many of our schools. We do see a continuing diminishing of that really, really old stock as it is replaced by more modern modular facilities.

I certainly would encourage all members of parliament to look at the new modern modular facilities that are being produced—transportable to be sure but very high-quality facilities. The extraordinary investment, particularly in Victoria, New South Wales and potentially Queensland in recent years has seen investment by businesses in developing new technologies and new practices in the delivery of these classrooms. We will be benefiting from that in some ways.

I can say about the development of the school at Meningie, which the member would be familiar with because I think it was started before the member was the minister for education, is that was a site that was ultimately able, with some extra existing investment from the former government and some extra investment that we put in last year, to be redeveloped using modular facilities delivered using local tradies to do the installation. The quality was not in question. They are very, very much happier with the facilities they have now.

Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School is another one where we were able to benefit from the fact there was an urgent need there. Indeed, there was one modular that had been built with the Victorian education department in mind, and we were able to get that off the shelf very quickly and have another one completed very quickly. The Eastern Fleurieu school community were thrilled with the provision of those two modulars. They are of the same quality as a built classroom and were delivered very quickly.

While it is not possible to say before all the projects have been scoped and delivered how many will be modulars and how many will not, I do not think that there is a problem where there are modulars. There are some areas where modulars are just not appropriate. It difficult to imagine a big modular gym, for example. There are school sites where a modular is not appropriate, where there are lots of hills and where there are existing facilities that do not fit. On certain sites, modulars can be great; on others, they will not be appropriate. I hope that answers the question.

Dr CLOSE: Fulsomely. Minister, on page 79 the Auditor-General starts to look into funding not just for government schools but also for non-government schools. He references state funds that are provided for capital works, which I think is a reasonably small amount, but there are also the government loans that were provided under a scheme started by the last government for non-government schools. I would like the minister to report not just on how many schools are currently involved in taking loans, whether through application or already have the loans, but also on whether he is aware of any schools that had received approval and then have had that approval removed through going back to ask for a reshaping of the loan.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The advice I have received is that these loans are not in our books but in the Treasurer's, so I am not sure that I have any information there that can assist the shadow minister.

Dr CLOSE: I will seek that from another forum. Going on to the audit findings conveyed on pages 82 and 83, the Auditor-General raises a number of concerns about the way in which assets are managed, supervised, their condition assessed and site inspections performed. Rather than just asking the question globally, I am interested to know whether for all the schools that will have to take on year 7 in February 2022 there has been an appropriate site inspection, and whether there has been any school that has debated the proposition from the department about what they will require to have for year 7 on the basis of disputed evidence about the condition of the site and the use to which the site is put.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am advised in relation to this that of course site inspections are not the only way in which facility management service providers can identify failed or underperforming assets, collect condition assessment data, maintain lifestyle data in the Strategic Asset Management Information System, tag and record all plant and equipment, or adjust annual preventative maintenance programs, or identify the needs relating to year 7s as the member was alluding to. We have requested from the Department for Education a site inspection compliance report to be provided by DPTI facility services and I think that is much broader than just the year 7 question.

In relation to whether there are any schools that would like more things delivered than suggested by the Department for Education's infrastructure team, I think that would be a question that would get a yes for every single program in the history of the education department. Certainly in relation to STEM Works, I remember speaking to schools who wanted more than their \$1 million or their \$2.5 million or \$3.5 million or whatever they might get, especially once you consider DPTI's involvement in the project. I am sure the member remembers those conversations with joy. Whether under the process we are going through now or had there been a process if the Labor Party had won the election and chose not to move year 7 to high school, there is no doubt that the scopes of works desired by schools would have been in advance of the funding provided and allocated to those schools.

I hesitate to say without exception, but I would be stunned if there were too many exceptions where schools would like more than the money that was provisioned, and so we have a team in the education department focused on delivering the best possible outcome for those schools within the scope of the finances available. There will always be more to do. There will always be more opportunities for us to enhance the learning environments in which our children are studying, and I am really excited about the enhancements to those schools already funded.

There will continue to be conversations between the department, schools—that means governing councils as well as principals—that lead to agreed project scopes, and that is a process that has been underway for some time and will continue to be underway with all those other schools that have works. We also get reasonably regular correspondence and conversational anecdotes from principals and governing council members of schools who have not been provided capital works increases in some time, as I am sure the former minister would remember.

Dr CLOSE: Given the time, I thank the education department very much. I would like to speak to TAFE now. I will start with pages 442 and 443, which look at hourly-paid instructors. I see that the Auditor-General is concerned about the number of HPIs, as they are known, who are working more than the limit of hours that is required under the enterprise agreement. I see that 89 HPIs

claimed more than 400 hours and the highest claimed 684 hours. I invite the minister to comment on how this has occurred and what control measures are being put in place in order to ensure it does not occur next year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will provide what information I can to assist the member. If there is further follow-up, I am happy to take supplementaries, obviously. I am advised that TAFE SA human resources ensures that HPI arrangements are for less than 400 hours, as per the TAFE SA academic year, in line with the current industrial agreements, and that is the intent of that arrangement.

This year, TAFE SA introduced a monitoring process to ensure staff are alerted when HPIs are close to the 400-hour threshold, allowing sufficient time to make alternative teaching arrangements where necessary. Where it is expected that an HPI will work more than 400 hours, a fixed-term employment contract will be established. Both the HPI staff member and their employing manager are to be notified of this process.

TAFE SA advises that the overarching letter of employment for HPI staff also outlines the maximum hours allowed, and a signed copy of this letter is held by TAFE SA human resources. Anomalies are escalated to the Executive Director of Educational Operations for action.

Dr CLOSE: On the next page, there is reference to an issue that I know was in play when I was the minister some time ago, that is the independent review of altered grades. I see that TAFE has previously advised that it would implement an independent audit review and it has not yet taken place. Since April, which is when the Auditor-General comments on it, has this independent audit review occurred, or are there plans to put it in place?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am advised that, in relation to the identification the member has made, TAFE has developed a process to generate an automated report that crosschecks the grade changes in the student information system against the grade changes in the approved SmartForms. This allows for discrepancies to be identified. The process further clarifies who is responsible for reviewing the report and what frequency.

I am further advised that TAFE SA now has reviewed its resulting policy and that that policy is now out for consultation, which I am sure is advice the shadow minister would have enjoyed having about two years ago. TAFE SA has reviewed the policy to enable the required formal independent review of grades to be reported through TAFE SA's quality of education committee. The revised policy is set to be in place for semester 1 in 2020. To support the proper implementation of the revised policy, TAFE SA is ensuring that staff involved are being appropriately trained.

Dr CLOSE: Looking to page 445, highlights of the financial report, there is reference to employee benefits going from \$226 million to \$237 million from 2018 to 2019. What is the expectation for TAFE in either its increase or decrease for the following year, and is that based on an employee receiving more benefits, or is it based on more employees, or both?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will take that on notice.

Dr CLOSE: On page 446, there is a reference to Department for Innovation and Skills funding. Actually, it is throughout that page, but at the bottom it refers to DIS funding continuing to account for 72 per cent of TAFE's total income. I would like, first, to understand what the division of that is between paying for training versus paying TAFE to exist—I think it is given a different name, but it is not specifically for training hours—and also whether there is an anticipated percentage for the current year.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: This is 2018-19 you are asking about, obviously. That was an increase of \$12.6 million from 2017-18, with a total budget of \$259 million. That included new funding received from the Skilling Australians Fund, there was \$10.7 million in budget pressure relief, there was an offset of reductions, including \$2.9 million for excess staff that are no longer in TAFE SA, and a reimbursement of \$9.3 million to DIS for 2017-18 TVSP payments, as TAFE SA had received a direct reimbursement from the Department of Treasury and Finance. The Skilling Australians Fund increase was \$12.5 million. That is information I have.

Dr CLOSE: You might be able to comment on the percentage, the 72 per cent and whether it is anticipated to remain at that level.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will have to take that on notice.

Dr CLOSE: On the next page, page 447, there is reference, as the minister referred to, to the TVSP reimbursement. Can the minister inform me how many individuals received TVSPs in 2017-18 and 2018-19 and, if possible, comment on TVSP processes currently underway for the following financial year?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I will provide the information I can, and might take on notice to also provide some further information in follow-up. Some information that I can provide is that in the 2018-19 financial year 86.72 FTEs, which is 99.0 people, accepted TVSPs. I am advised that TAFE SA is currently considering how it will shape its business moving forward, and is in discussion with staff to determine how they may best do so without impacting their quality and service to the public.

Engaging with staff on potential changes is a fundamental component of consultation, and TAFE SA will continue to consult on major change initiatives. I will have to take some of the detail on notice and provide information as relevant to the question.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you; I appreciate that. On page 449 a graph shows the number of students enrolled in TAFE and the decrease that has continued from 2016 to 2017 to 2018 to 2019. Is it possible to give me the numbers, because it is a little hard to guess? Perhaps just the number of students at 2019 would be useful, and whether the planning for TAFE currently is taking account of a further drop in students. You might—and it might be part of the brief you are given—talk about training hours or individual students. I am comfortable with either.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: There was quite a lot in that last question, so to enable as many questions as possible I will take that on notice and bring back information to the house.

Dr CLOSE: I appreciate that. In fact, as we are nearing the end, I have only one more question. It relates to page 450, referring to the taking back in of the campuses into the management by TAFE. My question is whether there is any plan to close or sell any other TAFE campuses than currently is known in the public.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: That is currently open to the public?

Dr CLOSE: No, known—closures already known through the budget before last, I think.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am advised that there is no plan. There is certainly no plan that has been brought to my attention. There is no plan that I am looking at. The chief executive advises me that there are no plans. We are really excited about some of the opportunities that are there for us to enhance TAFE's offering. Not all those offerings happen on campuses, as we go into those new methods of delivery—whether that is online or whether it is more, as indeed most employers are keen on and many students are keen on, training in the worksite itself. That is very useful.

The decisions that were made and announced several months ago in relation to Urrbrae, Wudinna, Roxby and Coober Pedy—certainly those ones, where we are working with the education department, I think we have achieved some terrific outcomes whereby schools that are co-located in a couple of those examples have been able to enhance their relationship with TAFE. At Urrbrae, we have seen a number of administrators moved from the Urrbrae campus to a different campus, but in terms of the actual focus of training provision at Urrbrae, the experience for the student, there is no reason that cannot be enhanced in the new arrangements going forward.

There are opportunities for us to continue to work in exciting ways. Where there are indeed TAFE facilities that are not being utilised to their full extent by TAFE, then there are potentially some discussions about how to better utilise those facilities. It is no secret, for example, that the Onkaparinga council has been seeking for some time to come to an agreement with TAFE about the Noarlunga TAFE campus, including in relation to the use, for example, of the Hopgood Theatre, which is currently a TAFE site. I think that the Hopgood Theatre is not necessarily used for training provision.

There are examples that have been in place for some time—at Regency, for example, where TAFE has had a long-term relationship with the Le Cordon Bleu and the International College of

Hotel Management, and those non-government providers are able to use the TAFE facilities there. It is a very successful relationship. There is a range of ways in which TAFE can very successfully—

Dr Close interjecting:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: There was a semicolon. There is a range of ways in which TAFE is engaging very positively with the non-government training sector and other non-government agencies, and indeed some other government agencies I suspect, to gain full benefit from the campuses. I think that keeping those campuses with TAFE is very exciting in terms of some of the ways that some of those partnerships can even be enhanced.

The CHAIR: Thank you, Minister for Education, deputy leader and others involved. We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report for 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. I remind members that the committee is in normal session and that any questions need to be asked by members on their feet. All questions will be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's for 2018-19 Report. Member for Ramsay, do you have questions?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I do, thank you, Chair. My first question relates to Part C, page 246, other audit findings. Why did your department omit the measure about the expected number of training hours in the 2018-19 agreement?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am advised that at that time the number of hours were not finalised. There were ongoing negotiations at executive level to determine what was possible. As you would recall, member for Ramsay, TAFE was a complete mess when we took over in 2018, just after the election. I think a few months earlier there had been a sacked CEO, a sacked board and a sacked chair of the board, and there were two inquiries that came down with damning reports on the way that TAFE had been run under the previous government.

Obviously, our number one priority was to fix the training system here in South Australia. We knew that we needed to ensure that we could bring the non-government sector back into the tent as part of that process. When we first came to office, I think, just from memory, I am advised that there were 350 subsidised training courses on the Subsidised Training List, and only about 30 per cent of those were available to the non-government sector.

Over the last 20 months or so, with I think about three or four expansions of the Subsidised Training List, we have now expanded that to 850. Each and every one of those is available to the non-government sector. My role as the Minister for Innovation and Skills is to ensure that the best possible outcome in our skilling—

The CHAIR: Just a moment, minister. Do you have a point of order, member for Ramsay?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes, my concern is that it is debate and it is not referencing the question I asked. It was very specific, about a measure that was omitted under the agreement.

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay, this is the committee stage. It is not question time, so the minister and, for that matter, those asking questions are able to enter into some preface and respond in the way they see fit. I am comfortable enough, and I am sure the minister is getting to the answer to the question specifically. However, be assured that some flexibility is allowed in the way questions are asked and answered in the committee.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Thank you, Mr Chair. I thought I heard the word 'why' preceding the body of the question, so I am trying to give as full an explanation as possible as to why there were not specific hours in the first agreement. As a government, we have a view that training in South Australia is an all-encompassing private sector-public sector partnership. I was very pleased when a number of months ago TAFE announced that their curriculum and their facilities would be available for use by the non-government sector.

We are working with TAFE and we are working with the non-government sector in order to get the best possible outcomes with the funding money that we have. We had more money being spent in funding for skills training in South Australia in the first two years of this government compared with the last two years of the previous government. We committed to making a difference. Consequently, the short answer to your question of why there were not a specific number of training hours in that first agreement is that we were still negotiating that outcome.

In the reforms of TAFE—the fresh start for TAFE—we need to make sure that we are strengthening TAFE. We are not in the business of pulling the rug from under TAFE. At the same time, I need to ensure, as the minister responsible for purchasing vocational education, that we are getting the best possible value and outcomes for that spend.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, how many interim agreements were in place until the one signed in 2019-20, when the agreement became active? Without having an expected number of training hours as with previous agreements, I understand you had a series of agreements. How many were there?

The CHAIR: What is the reference for this, member for Ramsay?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It is the same reference: page 246.

The CHAIR: Thank you.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There were two.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Is your department now able to ascertain how many expected training hours were delivered by TAFE SA in 2018-19?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Can you advise where there is a reference to the actual numbers of training hours conducted by TAFE in the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Auditor-General very clearly raises the issue of the lack of expected number of training hours in the budget, and that is what I am asking you about today. He made it very clear that this was unusual and that is why he made reference to it. I raise it at page 246, Part C.

The CHAIR: For clarification, there is a paragraph on the top of page 247 that also refers to that, minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That is something that I think we will need to take on notice.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: You are saying that at the moment you cannot tell me how many training hours were expected to be delivered in these two interim agreements; is that what I am hearing?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I will take that on notice.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have to say, minister, that this is a very important metric. I heard you speak earlier about why this was omitted, but obviously the Auditor-General has said that this is an incredibly important part of your agreement with TAFE. Effectively, you have just written a blank cheque and said to TAFE, 'You don't need to give me these expected training hours.'

The CHAIR: The minister may choose to respond to that but, member for Ramsay, previous ministers under examination have also taken questions on notice, so bear that in mind. It is possible. I am sure that, if that is the case, the minister will then get back to you. Minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: If you read the Auditor-General's report, he actually was talking about the fact that there was not a target, not about the number of hours that were or were not delivered by TAFE. Your question is outside the scope of the Auditor-General's Report, but I am happy to see if we can bring something back to you.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: We may agree to disagree on that, but I will move on. How much funding did your department provide to TAFE SA for training during this reporting period in 2018-19?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: On page 246 of the report there is a heading, Other audit findings, Payments to TAFE SA and private service providers, and it states:

DIS provided \$259 million in funding to TAFE SA, with \$145 million of this for VET subsidies based on resulted hours by TAFE SA. It also provided \$48 million of VET subsidies to other service providers.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you for detailing that for me, but obviously the question was raised by the Auditor-General and he noted in here these expected training hours. You said you will take that on notice. My question is: were you briefed on the Auditor-General's concerns?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Of course I have been briefed on the Auditor-General's Report.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Was it of concern to you that this was omitted, given that in every other memorandum of administrative arrangements this had been quite a clear part of it in agreements with TAFE? Was that a concern to you?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: This is a financial report and the issue raised by the Auditor-General had no impact on the financial performance of my department or the relationship with TAFE.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Does your department measure training hours delivered with the other VET providers that have a funding agreement with your department?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We actually only pay them what they deliver.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Are there negotiations with TAFE SA underway now for the next agreement?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think that is out of scope of the Auditor-General's Report. The Auditor-General's Report is for the period 2018-19.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I actually disagree because I do believe he made comments on the fact that it was quite late when you had these discussions and he makes reference and concern that the updated agreement was executed on 3 July 2019. Obviously we take heed of what the Auditor-General says. Are you negotiating that now?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think you have answered your own question.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: What are the training hours that TAFE SA is expected to deliver this financial year?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The Auditor-General's Report does not refer to this financial year.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Auditor-General has raised quite a serious concern about an omission. I think you are being rather flippant about this. You have now subsequently signed two further interim agreements, and I assume expected training hours are a key part of that, given that he says it has now been addressed. Is this something that you have looked at? Will this be something that you are clear on that is in this amendment?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The Auditor-General's examination is for the Auditor-General's Report on the financial year 2018-19. Your question is outside the scope.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will now move to Part C, page 247. Minister, has a review of the use of the Victorian Purchasing Guide commenced?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: On that same page, you will see a paragraph that describes the department's response to the Auditor-General. It states:

DIS agreed with this finding in principle, noting that additional resources would be needed to effectively assess nominal hours. It advised it would investigate alternative solutions that are cost effective and aligned with the recommendation to review the VPG hours.

I have been advised and it is my understanding that a commitment has been given to the Auditor-General that that will be completed by the end of this financial year.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, what are some of the possible alternative solutions that were alluded to by your department?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I refer to my previous answer. There is an investigation that will be completed by the end of this financial year.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Does that investigation consider moving from a nationally endorsed training scheme to a state-endorsed training scheme?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I refer to my previous answer. There is still an investigation going on.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, is the VPG framework used for both TAFE SA and private providers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I will take that on notice.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Does your department determine the appropriate subsidy payment rate to training providers?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Yes.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: It is mentioned very clearly that we use this guide. How does this rate, on average, compare with other jurisdictions?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I think we might need to take that one on notice.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Can I get a guideline, Minister, to when you will be replying to questions on notice?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There are standing orders that deal with that, aren't there, Mr Chair?

The CHAIR: I will just seek advice on that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The answer is as per the standing orders.

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay, I will come back to you with the time frame on that. Perhaps you could go on to your next question.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The rationale for my question is that estimates questions have not been responded to. Obviously, I was in that committee at that time, so it remains a concern. I look forward to hearing when we will be getting those answers back.

The CHAIR: I am informed there is no order of the house as such compelling the minister to get back to you within any specific time frame, but he has indicated that he will take them on notice and I expect that he will get back to you.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Chair, I share your positivity about this. Perhaps the minister could provide me with some guideline on when he thinks he will be able to get back to questions on notice?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We will get back to them as enthusiastically as possible.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: What time is that enthusiasm for?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I refer to my previous answer.

The CHAIR: I might suggest, member for Ramsay, that we continue with questions, given that we are down to almost 10 minutes.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Looking at Part C, page 247, on the topic of grant payments, what are the typical types of grant obligations that your department would outline for a grant payment?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The standard protocols obviously apply, but we do have a very flexible process when it comes to designing what you would call 'grants' under the Skilling South Australia program, which is additional funding on top of the Subsidised Training List. What I can do is see if we can get back to you with something that gives you an understanding of the guidelines.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Thank you. Obviously, flexibility is important for you to be able to respond to the needs of skilling South Australians, but perhaps you can share with the committee what are the typical KPIs that you would have in a grant program?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We have one very clear KPI and it is that most of the funding is connected to a training contract, in the Subsidised Training List, when we came to office, I think there would be a round table of bureaucrats and unions that would decide on how many subsidised training places there would be in every category. We have actually removed that process now. If an employer is prepared to put their hand in their pocket, pay to train somebody through a traineeship or an apprenticeship, then we are prepared to subsidise that training through the Subsidised Training List.

There are no caps if the training is associated with somebody receiving a salary to obtain that training, which is in stark contrast to the system we inherited when we came to office. As a matter

of fact, the Subsidised Training List was often used for high school students to achieve their SACE. Consequently, there would be a focus on barista courses or other sorts of courses that did not lead to career pathways so that students who were falling through the cracks in numeracy and literacy could gain some SACE points by completing their certificate II or III in something like a barista course.

The unfortunate thing about that is that if they still were not work ready when they had finished that course there was no relationship with the school or industry for that student to move on. If they were fortunate enough to be offered an apprenticeship, the employer would then apply for that apprentice to have access to the Subsidised Training List and be told by the department, 'I'm sorry, that potential employee is not eligible for the Subsidised Training List funding because it has been burnt up on their cert III qualification for a barista course.'

We have removed that, member for Ramsay. We think that it is outrageous that that was the case. Consequently, the only qualification that we need in order to determine whether there is a demand for that course or for that skill in the workforce is when an employer is prepared to pay someone's salary to train them.

The CHAIR: Member for Ramsay, did you have a point of order, or are you about to ask the next question?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I felt we were going off the topic and I have more questions to ask.

The CHAIR: If you have more questions, please go ahead.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The Auditor-General stated very clearly his concern about paying funds before the terms and conditions of a funding agreement were met, because it increases the risk of mismanagement of allocated funds. What is your department's policy for noncompliance with an obligation?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: If you look at the last paragraph of page 248, it says:

DIS also considered that the risk of making payment was low due to the strong financial position of the recipient and advised that the required information had now been provided.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I have a question from your answer there: why did the department feel compelled to provide the funding to this recipient because they have a 'strong financial position'? Does this mean there are different rules for different organisations?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I would not say that they are rules; I would say that it is good financial management. We are very fortunate with the Department for Innovation and Skills in that it is not one of the mega departments. We have a flatter line of management and we do like to ensure that we are delivering for the industries that we represent, those that are participating in the training and learning of new skills for apprenticeships and traineeships. So, rather than putting all our resources into saying no when it comes to decisions being made, we would much rather see how we can deliver a yes and keep the apprenticeships and traineeships rolling out.

This was a decision that I am very comfortable with. If you look at the overall position that the department is in, if you go to page 244 of the Auditor-General's Report the financial report opinion states 'unmodified'. That basically means that the Auditor-General has given this department a clean bill of health. A couple of the areas it has raised are a very low level of risk. That is explained by the Auditor-General in his report, and the department has responded to those concerns that were raised by the Auditor-General.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Minister, who was the grantee that received this money before an agreement was signed?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: It was another South Australian government agency, I am advised.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I would like to move to page 251, the topic of grants. Overall funding for skills and employment grants has decreased by \$13 million during this reporting period. Which employment programs ceased during this time?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There has been a shift in emphasis with the new government. There has been a shift away from the employment programs that were favoured by the previous

government to training and skills programs through additional funding for TAFE and non-government providers in skilling South Australians to have the skills that they need for the jobs that are available here in South Australia. As a matter of fact, South Australia has the lowest skill levels of its workforce in mainland Australia. So, rather than the Labor Party approach of feeding people a spoonful at a time, we are preparing people to feed themselves.

The CHAIR: Thank you, minister, member for Ramsay and others involved in the committee. We will now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's 2018-19 Report in relation to the Minister for Energy and Mining. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions need to be asked by members while on their feet and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2018-19 Report. Welcome, everybody.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, I reference Annual Report, Part C: Agency Audit, statement of cash flows. I note with interest that this afternoon in question time the minister said that a certain percentage of royalties were hypothecated for regional infrastructure. Has the government created a fund to hold 30 per cent of government royalties collected by the state government?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: You would really need to ask the Treasurer about that. What I did say in question time today is the case: it was a commitment we took to the election. It is a commitment that we will deliver on—30 per cent of royalties set aside for infrastructure and transport capital expenditure in regional areas. With regard to exactly how that money is treated, I would suggest that is a question for the Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Without wishing to labour the point, my understanding is that royalties are collected in the name of the mining minister, not the Treasurer. The mining minister is the only other minister who collects taxes and can raise and lower taxes without the authority of the Treasurer, so those funds are administered and collected by the agency and not by DTF. I have here a document you published before the election. It is called Royalties for the Regions and it says the following:

What We'll Do.

If elected in March 2018, a Marshall Liberal Government will establish a Regional Roads and Infrastructure Fund to provide a dedicated funding stream for our regions for the next 10 years.

I do not dispute the minister's assertions to the house because I have no evidence to the contrary that you are hypothecating 30 per cent of those royalties. When those royalties are collected, is 30 per cent being deposited into a hypothecated fund as promised by the government, or is this simply no longer the minister's responsibility?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: As I expect the shadow knows, yes, the minister charges those royalties, but they are all passed on to Treasury. The department does not keep that money. All the royalty money is passed on to Treasury, so how DTF goes about the specifics of managing the money to be sure that the commitment is kept is something for DTF.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you for acknowledging it is a commitment because I think that is an important step, but the government did commit to establishing this fund. I am concerned that the minister has no knowledge if the fund exists. For the benefit of the committee, I am not disputing the minister's assertions in question time or now that the government is hypothecating \$90 million per year or thereabouts for its regional road infrastructure, as set out in this policy document, but the policy document mentions the fund before the amount.

I am imagining that there is a fund that is collecting money, apart from consolidated revenue, as committed to, that the minister is transferring 30 per cent of all royalties into, but from the evidence this committee has received that is not occurring. What is occurring is that all the funds are being transferred to the Consolidated Account in the hope that DTF allocates these moneys to another fund that has been established by the government, as it promised, for regional communities. The minister gave an answer today in question time that set that out. This was brought to my attention by some of the regional members of the parliament, that this document was unequivocal.

I have gone through the Auditor-General's statements, not only Report 6 of the annual report but also the statement of the Executive Summary and the financial statements released earlier in the year. I can find no mention of a regional roads and infrastructure fund, which was a commitment of

the minister to create if elected. I would be interested if the minister could take that question on notice and get back to the house some time by the end of next Thursday about whether or not this fund has been established and whether or not the royalties are being deposited in it rather than a direct transfer to DPTI.

I assume that to have a hypothecated fund just for regional communities the fund would be established and there would be a bidding process around that fund where things would be allocated. Otherwise, all you are simply doing is not using other discretionary funds that might have to be spent on regional roads and just requiring it to be totally funded out of royalties, which would mean a cut to regional road funding—and I am sure that is not the minister's intention. Can I have an assurance that the minister will take that on notice and get back to the committee?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The shadow minister has said quite a lot there. Let me just be very clear for the record. What I said was not a commitment with regard to whether there is or is not a hypothecated fund. I also did not say whether I knew there was one or not. What I said was that the commitment was for the money to be spent: 30 per cent of royalties to go to transport infrastructure funding, 30 per cent in regional areas.

What I also said was that while DEM charges the royalty, is paid the royalty, all that money goes across to the Treasurer. I also said that how the Treasurer manages that money to ensure that the commitment to spend a certain amount of it on rural roads and rural infrastructure is a matter for the Treasurer. I suggested that the shadow minister could ask the Treasurer that, or have one of his colleagues ask the Treasurer that.

With regard to the request to take it on notice, what I do assure the shadow minister is that I will take advice on whether it is a question that I should answer or whether it is a question that is better placed with the Treasurer. If it is a question that is appropriately placed with me, then I will come back with an answer. I also note that the Auditor-General has not expressed any concerns anywhere in the report that I am aware of with regard to this matter.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I just heard the minister say he did not make a commitment to establish a fund. I have here the Royalties for the Regions document. Again, for the benefit of the house:

What we'll do if elected in March 2018—

and they were—

a Marshall Liberal government will establish a regional roads and infrastructure fund to provide a dedicated funding stream for our regions for the next 10 years. Each year, 30 per cent of the state government's revenue from mineral and petroleum royalties will be paid into the fund.

That was the commitment. The document continues:

As most of the mining and petroleum production which generates this income occurs in regional areas, it is only fair that the regions get a reasonable share of this benefit.

That is unequivocal. The minister just told the committee that no such commitment was made. It is on *Hansard*. I am just concerned now, if this document is not accurate, if this is an error, that I am somehow unintentionally misleading the parliament by saying that this document did not say you would establish a regional road and infrastructure fund, because clearly it says that you would.

This is very concerning, I imagine, for a number of regional members who were told that if the minister became the mining minister he would deposit 30 per cent of all funds into this account. If that is not occurring, I think the people of South Australia have a right to know, but I will let the minister reflect on his statement to the parliament or perhaps some other way.

If I can turn to another matter, I note in the report by the Auditor that when the purchase of the generators was completed an amount was returned to Treasury in excess of \$50 million. Could the minister explain why that money was returned?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: In response to the first part of the shadow minister's previous contribution, for him to say that I said that there is not a fund is blatantly inaccurate. If he wants to check *Hansard* he is very welcome to. What I said was that in my answer

to these questions here today I did not say there was, I did not say there was not and I did not say that I knew or did not know.

We have probably gone about as far as we can splitting hairs on this. Let *Hansard* speak for itself; let the Treasurer speak for himself. I will take the question on notice, as I said, and if it is appropriate for me to come back with an answer instead of the Treasurer, then I certainly will, but I refute the suggestion that the shadow minister has made in regard to what he claims I said here in this committee today. I would ask the shadow minister to remind me again of the second part of his question.

The CHAIR: The next question was in relation to the generators. I might just ask the member for West Torrens whether he can give us a page number to reference that question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I refer to the statement of financial position, assets: property, plant and equipment, \$268 million, page 97. I understand that after the purchase of the generators was completed there was an excess amount of moneys remaining available to the agency that was returned to Treasury. What was the amount and why was it returned?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The amount returned was approximately \$50 million, but my adviser is seeking the details. He thinks it is just above \$50 million. While I answer the other part he will try to get the exact number for you. The money was returned because the money was not needed for its original purpose. A certain amount of money was passed from Treasury to the Department for Energy and Mining, or its predecessor to the Department for Energy and Mining under the previous government, for a very specific purpose.

When we came into government we did things differently, as everybody knows, from the previous government. The money was not needed for that purpose and so it was returned to Treasury, as is entirely appropriate. The amount of money, I am advised, is \$56.8 million.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What was the cost of the purchase of the generators?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The cost of the generators, from my memory, was \$227 million. My adviser will give me the exact number or tell me whether I am wrong. That is a cost that the previous government committed the state to. It was a contract that the previous government entered into and, upon coming into government, we honoured that contract on behalf of the people of South Australia. Yes, it was \$226.8 million.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On page 94 in Part C of the report, the Auditor says:

In response to a shortage of generation capacity, DEM operated the generators on 24 January 2019 providing recoveries of \$2 million, reported under other income, under the Australian Energy Market Operator's Reliability and Emergency Reserve Trader Scheme.

Where did that \$2 million go?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Approximately \$2 million came to the state government through the RERT proposal. As the shadow would know, the previous government entered into an agreement with AEMO, and we have chosen to do exactly the same while the generators are under state government control. The \$2 million was an income payment. I say also that it was significantly less than the \$10 million that the shadow minister estimated during a radio interview: it was \$2 million, not \$10 million. I am advised that an adjustment for that unbudgeted income was addressed as part of the budgeting process in the lead-up to the last budget and that that \$2 million was returned to Treasury.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So you are held in high esteem then. On page 95, which is the next page, it states that \$32 million was paid in grants and subsidies. Can you give the committee a breakdown of that \$32 million for the audit period?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that the \$32 million comprises—and my adviser will check this as I speak—\$12.1 million for the Renewable Technology Fund, \$9 million for the energy implementation fund, \$8 million for the Energy Productivity Program and \$4.2 million for the Remote Areas Energy Supplies scheme.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, they are mentioned in the report, minister. I wonder whether you could break them up for me individually, within each subsection? Or you can take it on notice and give it to me later; I do not mind.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am happy to take that on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again I refer to the same reference, if I may. In last year's budget, the government set a target for 5,000 batteries to be rolled out to households. I understand you achieved 1,300 installations, with about 800 waiting. For the audit period that is being completed, can you give us the actual number of batteries installed under the government's program?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The period that we are looking at, the last financial year, the Home Battery Scheme was open from December to June—so seven months. In terms of actually completed installations, there were 1,302. On top of that, there would be a significant number of essentially signed-up commitments for people who had been approved. While it is outside the current period, and I am always cautious with the shadow minister to step outside the current period, I can tell him that that number is significantly larger now. As we always knew it would, uptake started slowly and has been accelerating as expected.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Just to meet the forecasts in the most recent budget to meet the government's target of installing batteries for the budget period and the audit period over the next three years, would that mean 13,000 batteries installed per year?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, it would be a bit less than that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What would it be?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am not going to guess, but it would be a little bit less than that based on take-up so far. If the shadow minister were to assume that the rest of the four-year period would work at the same rate as the first financial year did, then he is quite right to think that the 40,000 would not be reached. If the shadow minister was to look at the uptake far more recently, which is outside the period, then I think he might be pleased to look at the number that would be installed after the four years.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The only reason I raise this matter is that the rate is assumed in the budget papers. The government have set a time period for this program to run out and they have made an assumption of 40,000 batteries over a four-year period. We have been through the first iteration of that in the first audit period, which I agree—I accept that the minister only had seven months to move 10,000 batteries. He was only able to move 1,302, through no fault of his own, and I am happy to put that on the record.

We were told at estimates that 800 were awaiting installation. I am not sure whether or not that number has changed, but that would mean that you have budgeted over the next three years for the remaining. I am not setting the uptake rate: the government is through their budget papers. My question is: are you meeting that expectation?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: That is starting to get a bit beyond the Auditor-General's Report for the 2018-19 financial year, but let me just try to be helpful. The intention is to have 40,000 of these batteries taken up by the private sector because then 40,000 battery owners will be the beneficiaries, plus we want to get to a certain critical mass so that the benefits then start to flow through with regard to other consumers who do not have batteries.

We took this program to the election. The previous Labor government also took their own home battery scheme to the election. Ours was the Home Battery Scheme, so that is why those words roll off my tongue. The previous government took their Tesla VPP to the last election. Most people assumed that whoever was successful at the election would run their scheme and ditch the other scheme. We were successful, so certainly we were going to deliver our scheme, which is the one we are talking about. We did, though, have a good look at it and realised that it was possible and in fact sensible to do our scheme plus the Tesla VPP, the Labor scheme. I thought very clearly, 'It's good for the public, so let's do both. If we can do both, let's do both.'

In some ways, those schemes have started to overlap each other just a little bit. We do still have clear guidelines and clear targets for both of them, which are separate and different, but we

want all South Australians to get as many benefits as possible out of these two schemes and that is exactly what we continue to strive for.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer the minister to Report 6 of the Auditor-General, Part A: Executive Summary, pages 14, 15, 16 and 17 regarding the Auditor-General's instructions and comments on outsourcing contracts and the Auditor-General's powers to compel cabinet. My first question is: has the Auditor-General requested a copy of the cabinet submission that outsourced or leased the state-owned generators?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The short answer is that I do not know and my adviser does not know. If that information were sought, we would have provided it. I am not aware of a specific request, but it does not mean that it did not happen. I am happy to take that on notice. If it is appropriate to share an answer about what the Auditor-General requested of cabinet documents, I will come back. If it is not appropriate, then obviously I will not.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On page 14 the Auditor-General talks about an example from the House of Commons Public Administration and Constitutional Affairs Committee Report, which I am sure the minister is familiar with—as I was. It talks about the problems of outsourcing the central government services and the role that governments should take.

The question I am asking the minister is: has there been an assigned officer in the department whose job it is to oversee the entering of the contracts, the management performance of those contracts and will there be regular rights of renewal and review throughout the contract period, as stipulated by the Auditor-General from page 14 right through to page 17, about compliance and management of these measures?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am advised that the Auditor-General had full access to all the contracts, all the information, all the details about embedded staff and the information that the shadow minister just referred to from that report, which we are both familiar with, and found no concerns whatsoever.

It is probably also worth putting on the record that I am advised that most of the outsourcing contracts undertaken by the Department for Energy and Mining in the last financial year, the period we are looking at at the moment, were actually contracts that were initiated under the previous government just by virtue of the timing of their work, the election and our work, and I am not aware of any concerns whatsoever raised by the Auditor-General in this area.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In terms of compliance management, can I take you to page 17 of subsection 1.7.3, managing contracts. Did the Auditor-General give any advice to the agency on how best to initiate the contract before you began negotiations with the two entities that have taken ownership of the lease arrangements for the generators? The Auditor-General talks about making the contracts available in advance before contracts are entered into. I just want to make sure that the department followed this same procedure that the Auditor is outlining. I am happy for you to take it on notice, as I know we are running out of time.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: To be sure that the member gets as much time as possible, we followed the full probative process, I am advised. Everything that would have been expected, we did. If there is anything else, I will take it on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In terms of the contract that was issued and the tender process that was conducted for the temporary generators that were then outsourced, I understand that part of the criteria that the minister talked about publicly was that the two operators who won the contracts to operate the generators did not currently have any generation in South Australia or, for lack of a better term, a book of customers they could use to go out and sell their electricity to. Was that given a weighting in the tender process, or was that a strategy or a policy of the government to award this to an operator who was not operational in the South Australian market?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I do not believe I ever said anything like that publicly whatsoever—that it was a condition or that a weighting was part of the process. As is appropriate, I was completely at arm's length from the process. What I did say publicly which is close to that and I stand by is that, all other things being equal, I would prefer that the generators were

leased to a company that is not already here. I also said that I would prefer that the generators were leased to a smaller company rather than a larger company to create more competition.

Those were personal preferences. They were described very clearly as such and they actually had no bearing whatsoever on the recommendations I received back from the department with regard to the proposals that were received and the department's assessment of those proposals. It might be interesting for the shadow minister to know, too, that I actually took the advice of the department as was given to me. I analysed it, I checked it over and I satisfied myself, but I did not seek any changes to their advice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will just finish off by saying that I understand today is the 125th anniversary of the South Australian mines department.

The CHAIR: Thank you, member for West Torrens—duly noted.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Bills

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (TRANSPARENCY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SPIT HOODS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (ADMINISTRATION OF COUNCILS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

Parliamentary Committees

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

Adjourned debate on motion of Mr Treloar (resumed on motion).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (17:40): I rise to speak on the report of the Select Committee on the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. In doing so, I want to put on record, first and foremost, my thanks for the fantastic work that is done by our emergency services, especially in and around the areas of the Barossa, Mid North and Adelaide Plains of our state. They are parts of our state that, because of mother nature and circumstance, have had to deal with some extremely tragic circumstances. On each and every one of those occasions, the work of the Country Fire Service, as well as the State Emergency Service and everyone else, every farmer on a farm fire unit, has helped to make us more safe.

In fact, the number of stories that I have heard over my time as a parliamentarian and even before then of where individual acts of selflessness have helped to stave off disaster have been too many to recount to this place in the mere 20 minutes that I have. We understand that these groups are part of the very fabric of society within South Australia. These are groups who are farmers themselves, who are volunteers from townships themselves, getting involved to help and keep their local community safe.

We know that in this modern era unfortunately there is a tendency to move away from volunteerism in society and move towards the professionalisation or, indeed, the increased advent of government providing services in our community. But this great bastion, the Country Fire Service, remains steadfastly true to the fact that it is a volunteer service. In fact, off the top of my head, of all the policies put to me in my time as a shadow minister in relation to the CFS Volunteer Association,

their number one priority is to remain a volunteer organisation, because they understand that this is a commitment that people give freely, a commitment that people give without seeking favour.

It has been my experience that it is a commitment that people make simply because they love the place they live in, and so I think we need to continually acknowledge that in this place. In fact, if indeed there were a day when we had to try to replace those volunteer hours with paid professional service men and women, the cost to the South Australian taxpayer would be immense. In fact, it would make it very difficult to actually administer because a lot of the time these people are not needed on a daily basis, they are not needed even on a weekly basis, but they are needed when things go wrong. They need to be able to respond at a moment's notice, and they need to be able to respond with all the knowledge, equipment and experience that comes with being a member of the CFS.

What we are dealing with here today is essentially this government's commitment to make sure that we consult with regional communities about issues that affect regional communities. Again, there have been very significant bushfires in my electorate, including the Krondorf fire back in 2013, the Eden Valley fire in 2013, the Sampson Flat bushfire in early 2015, and the Pinery fire in late 2015. Whether it be the Angaston fire that happened in my electorate just last week or whether it be a small fire that seems to have cropped up in Springton at 3 o'clock this afternoon, my community has been ravaged by fire in recent years.

What tends to happen in these situations is that the community looks for answers. I know with the Sampson Flat fire, having attended a Kersbrook community meeting post that fire, a lot of questions were being asked of CFS hierarchy about what exactly sparked that fire in the first place. I know that that is something the community was very keen to get to the bottom of. In fact, during the Angaston fire just last week it was suggested to me at the time that the fire was started because of spontaneously combusting horse manure.

It turns out that was not the case. There was a fire pit next to the pile of horse manure that had been used to burn things somewhere back in June or July, and after some three, four or five months of that fire having been put out there was a re-sparking of something that was smouldering deep within that pit. From there, in turn, it sparked the fire into the horse manure, and then on a catastrophic fire day with 42° and some decent winds coming from the north things tend to get out of hand extremely quickly.

I would also like to correct the record. I made a speech earlier in this place about the fact that there were 19 appliances that helped to fight that fire. In fact, there were 20. So to that 20th service, can I say thank you for the work that you did last week keeping my house safe, keeping everybody's house in Angaston safe and also keeping all those people safe who operate in our horse industry out the back of Angaston and around Collingrove Homestead and the Cornerstone Stud, as well as the Yalumba property that was evacuated last week.

Getting to the heart of where and why these fires start is of concern to communities and it is why we need to be extremely vigilant. At times, there is the ability for the conduct of individuals, whether they be a farmer on a header, somebody on a lawnmower or somebody out doing a bit of welding in the backyard when they should not be—there are a whole host of examples about where people's conduct can spark a bushfire—to spark a catastrophic consequence. Making sure that there are appropriate powers in place to deal with those eventualities is important.

We certainly understand that there is a central tension there: people wanting to be safe, but also not wanting to get in the way of people in regional communities being able to quietly enjoy and go about their business. I think that central tension is one that this fantastic select committee sought to deal with. They took their time. They dealt with this thoroughly. In fact, as I understand it, there were some 62 witnesses called forward to this committee, which I think is a phenomenal amount of people.

At this stage, what I would really like to do is put on record my thanks to the members of the committee who helped to undertake this very important work to essentially get to the bottom of the central tension that exists in regional communities. I particularly want to thank the member for Finnis for his work; the member for Mawson, whose Fleurieu communities and Kangaroo Island communities would very much be at the heart of this; the member for Giles, whose community out in

the Far North is certainly prone to bushfires when things get hot and dry; as well as the member for Heysen, whose electorate no doubt is prepared for and worried about bushfire every time things get warm. I must admit I was a bit young when the Ash Wednesday bushfires came through the Hills, but I know how important those issues are to his community and so I definitely understand his desire to make sure we get this right.

Mr Deputy Speaker, I would like to thank you for your chairmanship of this committee, as somebody who has a wealth of knowledge being on a farm somewhere north of Port Lincoln and around Cummins. It is God's country, as some would say. I think harvest still turned out alright this year. Thank you for your work on this committee.

Regarding the deliberations of this committee and the recommendations that they put down, I think that they have come to a very good and sensible solution. Those recommendations are essentially around proposing that the powers outlined in clause 23 of the bill be introduced, subject to amendments recommended by this report. They recommend:

2. Clause 23 of the Bill be amended to clarify which officers will be authorised to exercise the proposed powers to direct that a prescribed activity be ceased or not commenced. This power should be limited to South Australia Police officers.

3. The South Australian Government develop enforcement criteria and guidelines for the exercise of the proposed powers. The South Australian Government should consult with industry bodies and relevant stakeholders in developing these criteria and guidelines.

That is a very important and very sensible recommendation. They also recommend:

4. Clause 23 of the Bill be amended to require that the exercise of powers in section 82 must take into account any relevant industry-led codes of practice, including the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice.

Again, this is recognition of the fact that this is not an issue the grain farmers of South Australia have not thought about. When fire happens and things go wrong, it tends to be their crops first in the firing line. In fact, a hearing from the Minister for Primary Industries about the level of devastation and crops lost on Yorke Peninsula last week speaks to the fact that farmers have a pretty strong vested interest in making sure their crops do not burn before they get them off the land. So again the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice is an important measure to keep in mind.

We move on to recommendation 5:

5. The South Australian government support and encourage all relevant stakeholders, including peak industry bodies, to implement and review relevant codes of practice, including developing codes of practice for prescribed activities that may cause fires. This should include developing a mechanism to recognise codes of practice for the purpose of exercising the proposed powers outlined in clause 23.

Again, this is an extremely important measure. I commend this report to the house. I thank all members of this committee for their work, and I look forward to the further passage of subsequent bills to put into effect the very broad consultation this government has undertaken.

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

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.A.W. Gardner.

Bills

LAND TAX (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the suggested amendments indicated by the following schedule, which suggested amendments the Legislative Council requests the House of Assembly to make to the said bill:

Schedule of the suggested amendments made by the Legislative Council

No. 1. New clause, page 7, after line 27—Insert:

6A—Amendment of section 4—Imposition of land tax

Section 4(1)—after paragraph (b) insert:

(ba) land that is subject to a heritage agreement under the *Native Vegetation Act 1991* that is noted against the relevant instrument of title, or against the land, in accordance with section 23B(3) of that Act;

No. 2. Clause 12, page 10, line 35 [clause 12(1), inserted subsection (1)]—Delete 'for the 2020-21' and substitute:

clause 2 for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 financial years and in accordance with the table in Schedule 1 Part 2 clause 3 for the 2022-23

No. 3. Clause 12, page 11, line 3 [clause 12(1), inserted subsection (1a)]—Delete 'for the 2020-21' and substitute:

clause 4 for the 2020-21 and 2021-22 financial years and in accordance with the table in Schedule 1 Part 3 clause 5 for the 2022-23

No. 4. Clause 12, page 11, table after line 34 [clause 12(4), inserted subsection (3a), table]—Delete '\$1,600,000' wherever occurring in the table and substitute in each case '\$2,000,000'

No. 5. Clause 12, page 12, formula after line 4 [clause 12(4), inserted subsection (3b), formula]—Delete '\$1,600,000' and substitute '\$2,000,000'

No. 6. Clause 13, page 19, line 22 [clause 13, inserted section 13A(1)]—Delete '2020' and substitute '2021'

No. 7. Clause 13, page 28, line 25 [clause 13, inserted section 13J(5)]—Delete 'because of the operation of section 13G(5)'

No. 8. Clause 13, page 28, lines 31 to 34 [clause 13, inserted section 13J(6)(a)]—Delete paragraph (a) and substitute:

(a) that the land is being held for the purpose of being developed as a residential development of more than 10 allotments or lots; and

No. 9. Clause 18, page 31, lines 1 to 12 [clause 18, inserted Schedule 1, Parts 2 and 3]—Delete Parts 2 and 3 and substitute:

Part 2—Scales of land tax

2—2020-21 and 2021-22

Land tax for the 2020-21 financial year and the 2021-22 financial year is calculated on the basis of the taxable value of the land in accordance with the following table:

Taxable value of land	Amount of tax
Not exceeding Threshold A	Nil
Exceeding Threshold A but not exceeding Threshold B	\$0.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold A
Exceeding Threshold B but not exceeding Threshold C	LT (TB) plus \$1.25 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold B
Exceeding Threshold C but not exceeding Threshold D	LT (TC) plus \$2.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold C
Exceeding Threshold D	LT (TD) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold D

3—2022-23 and subsequent years

Land tax for the 2022-23 financial year and for each subsequent financial year is calculated on the basis of the taxable value of the land in accordance with the following table:

Taxable value of land	Amount of tax
Not exceeding Threshold A	Nil
Exceeding Threshold A but not exceeding Threshold B	\$0.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold A
Exceeding Threshold B but not exceeding Threshold C	LT (TB) plus \$1.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold B
Exceeding Threshold C but not exceeding Threshold D	LT (TC) plus \$2.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold C
Exceeding Threshold D	LT (TD) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold D

Part 3—Scales of land tax for trusts

4—2020-21 and 2021-22 (trusts)

Land tax for the 2020-21 financial year and the 2021-22 financial year is calculated on the basis of the taxable value of the land in accordance with the following table:

Taxable value of land	Amount of tax
Not exceeding \$25,000	Nil
Exceeding \$25,000 but not exceeding Threshold A	\$125 plus \$0.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over \$25,000
Exceeding Threshold A but not exceeding Threshold B	LT (TA) plus \$1.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold A
Exceeding Threshold B but not exceeding Threshold C	LT (TB) plus \$1.75 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold B
Exceeding Threshold C but not exceeding Threshold D	LT (TC) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold C
Exceeding Threshold D	LT (TD) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold D

5—2022-23 and subsequent years (trusts)

Land tax for the 2022-23 financial year and for each subsequent financial year is calculated on the basis of the taxable value of the land in accordance with the following table:

Taxable value of land	Amount of tax
Not exceeding \$25,000	Nil
Exceeding \$25,000 but not exceeding Threshold A	\$125 plus \$0.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over \$25,000
Exceeding Threshold A but not exceeding Threshold B	LT (TA) plus \$1.00 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold A
Exceeding Threshold B but not exceeding Threshold C	LT (TB) plus \$1.50 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold B
Exceeding Threshold C but not exceeding Threshold D	LT (TC) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold C
Exceeding Threshold D	LT (TD) plus \$2.40 for every \$100 or fractional part of \$100 over Threshold D

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I move:

That the Legislative Council's suggested amendments be agreed to.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I indicate that the opposition will be voting not to accept these amendments. Indeed, in doing so we indicate once again our opposition to this bill. I understand that despite the government not yet moving its guillotine, its intention is to once again guillotine debate on this land tax bill.

We have been through this before, of course, when the opposition came to this place during the original second reading debate and committee stage of this bill. The Liberal Party of South Australia, the now government, shut down debate, and those South Australians who had approached members of the opposition and members of the crossbench with dozens and dozens and dozens of unanswered questions they had put to the Treasurer or to Treasury or to RevenueSA and had not yet got a satisfactory answer relied once more on the people's house, the parliament of this state, and the opposition to try to get them some answers.

It is not lost on anyone in this place that we are being asked to vote on amendments that we do not even have. Apparently 90 seconds ago they came into the chamber and now we are asked to make a decision on tens of millions of dollars more of taxpayers' expense.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Remarkably, we hear interjections from ministers who say that they are tax cuts without realising that they are further expenditures from the budget. Maybe the Premier is not the only one who misses important cabinet appointments when it comes to considering land tax.

This is the final act in what has been a high farce from this government, led ineptly and incapably by the Premier. How on earth could any competent government find itself in the position

where at budget time they hand down a \$40 million tax hike only then to revise it to a \$118 million tax hike on thousands of South Australians who will face, in many cases, an abrupt impact to their livelihoods as a result? And what do they choose to do? Not use any of that additional revenue to try to smooth that passage on those people, but pick up the phone to talk to their close mates, their Liberal Party members who have infiltrated the Property Council of South Australia, and say, 'How much of this extra \$78 million would you like in your back pocket?' to the people who own literally millions of dollars worth of land.

An elector who owns three investment properties, their only source of income in their retirement, and it has been more than 10 years since they stopped working, with their net income of barely \$30,000 a year, sees a \$7,000 increase in their land tax bill, whereas, a corporation that owns at least \$5 million worth of property gets a \$65,000 tax cut thanks to this government. Where is the equity in that? How is that fair?

Each time we have seen a change from this government, the state has been flat out lied to. The government says, 'Well, it's this or it's nothing. If this isn't accepted, we will take the tax reform off the table and we will go and do something else.' That is what we were told in September, 2½ months ago. As soon as the next capitulation came, that was the green light to everybody.

We have seen every industry group and every crossbench MP come at the government demanding further changes, and there has been capitulation after further capitulation after further capitulation. So now, rather than a \$40 million tax increase, trying to bring more revenue into the budget, the government are coughing up something in the order of \$30 million a year. They have gone from a \$120 million over three-year budget benefit to a nearly \$90 million over three-year cost. That is the most incompetent effort at tax reform I think this state has ever seen.

A fish, they say, rots from the head, and I am not surprised that the Premier, the member for Dunstan, is not willing to speak on this because he will do his best to shake responsibility for this absolute shambles.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall: Wind it up!

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And now the Premier is telling me to wind it up. Yesterday, he was demanding I pay him more respect. The Rodney Dangerfield of the South Australian parliament 'can't get no respect'. Do you know why? Because respect has to be earned. You have to have runs on the board. You have to have some successes and some accomplishments, none of which this Premier has, not in this term of government. It has been failure after failure after failure, a symphony of incompetence by the Premier—absolutely extraordinary.

At the end of this, what have we got? Thousands of South Australians paying thousands of dollars more a year in land tax so that when the Premier travels interstate he can tell those corporate and commercial landowners, who own millions of dollars of land here in South Australia but do not actually live in this state, that they have massive land tax cuts. Well done, Premier—well done!

Once again, the Premier shows his chops when it comes to selling out South Australians. If it is not land tax, it is water; if it is not water, it is submarines; if it is not submarines, it is our automotive manufacturing industry—dead silence every time he sells out this state, and he has done it again. Shame on the Liberal Party of this state for once again selling South Australians down the river, if you will pardon the pun, as apt as it is. It is absolutely extraordinary.

They all sit there in silence knowing that they have to put up with him. They have to wear what they have been asked to do to South Australians—absolutely outrageous. They should hang their heads in shame for doing this to South Australians. Thousands of people will face massively higher bills so that Westfield, Centa Group or Centro can have tens of thousands of dollars of tax cuts. All 400 of them who have more than \$5 million worth of property, the 50 of them who do not even reside in South Australia, they are all getting tens of thousands of dollars of tax cuts. This is why they will not release the modelling: because they do not want their dirty little secret about their land tax reform to get out.

All those landowners who actually live in this state, who have actually worked hard for decades—who in many thousands of cases came to South Australia from Europe, who migrated to this place with nothing but the shirts on their backs, who worked seven days a week and more than

12 hours a day to put food on the table and to save up to buy a house and, once they had some more savings, try to provide for their own retirements—they are the people who are being left out in the cold by the Premier, the member for Dunstan, and all his colleagues so that they can show some further favour and make some further tax cuts for their corporate mates.

Well, shame on all of you. If that is not bad enough, we also know what is coming next, and that is the dead silence and the refusal to act from those opposite because they know that tens of millions of dollars extra per year are flooding into the budget from their revaluation process. These land tax bills not only will go up due to aggregation but they will go up, and up, and up.

I see the member for Unley has gone quiet because he knows that people are having their properties revalued in his electorate by up to 114 per cent. I tell you what: I would be staring at my phone if I were him as well. I would not want to engage. He knows the impact he is having on his constituents—absolutely outrageous. Shame on all of you. What a disgrace that you could do this to the people you are meant to represent. Shame on all of you.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: I rise to echo the remarks that I think were aptly put by the member for Lee. I think we have learned a lot throughout the course of this debate that has been consuming the entirety of the government's agenda and the state political process now for the better part of six months. At the heart of this exercise, I think it is important that the parliament reflects upon who is affected the most by this because this is not now just a political shemozzle.

This has not just been a disjointed piece of the legislative process that has now resulted in a bill the objects of which are fundamentally different from the first version that entered the parliament. What this is really about is people, real people who have gone out of their way over the last five months to express their very legitimate and grave concerns about the implications of this retrospective tax change on them. It is important in the lead-up to this vote that the house reflects on what those implications are for those real people as we cast our votes.

I would like to share with the parliament some real stories that we on this side of the chamber have heard firsthand—not through some farcical process of consultation where written submissions were ignored one after the other, not through some online survey, but through a traditional exercise of actually inviting people to come forward and have the courage of their convictions to express their views and convey to their political leaders, their representatives, what this means to them.

It was an incredibly telling exercise because we saw people coming along to these forums who have never done it before in their life—people who have come to this country with literally nothing at their disposal apart from their own hard work, people coming along sharing their stories about why they came to this country seeking nothing more than opportunity. They understood that Australia was a place where they would be able to come and work hard and then enjoy the benefit of that work. Those people, one after another, decided to come along and explain to us how this land tax change was going to fundamentally undermine their standard of living and that of their children and their children in a way that will never be able to be compensated for.

They were real people. I think of Helen, who came along to our forums that we held in Lockleys, a woman whose only crime, according to this government, is working hard, investing in land and then obeying the law of the land. The price that she is now paying as a result of the prospect of this law passing the parliament is having her retirement income decline in the order of 30 per cent to 40 per cent—and a modest retirement income it is.

These are people who have not had the benefit of ever having access to compulsory superannuation, people who do not have the luxury of owning shares, but instead have made a legitimate and lawful decision to invest in property through their hard-earned savings. Just at the point where they are reaching the opportunity to reap the benefit of that as they approach retirement, overnight none other than the Liberal Party of South Australia has decided to retrospectively change the law on them, move the goalposts on their retirement, and now their standard of living has been compromised. For the sake of what?

Is it for the sake of our budget now being in a position where we have more money to invest in schools and hospitals? No. Is it for the sake of reducing the dramatically increasing debt under this state government? No. The reason why those people are now paying an enormous sacrifice is

so that the people who invest in huge portions of land, in excess of \$5 million in the most part, are getting massive tax cuts.

I do not know if the Liberal Party in South Australia has been paying much attention to the global economy in the West over recent years, including in South Australia, but there is a challenge on our hands that policymakers around the world who have half a brain are trying to grapple with, and it is called income inequality. We now have an economy in most parts of the world that is not acting or not functioning in a way that is genuinely fair. We see working and middle-class people throughout the West, including in South Australia and Australia, continuously being left behind by bad public policy decisions, particularly when it comes to tax reform.

Now what we face is a piece of legislation that does not seek to ameliorate that problem but instead to exacerbate it in a way that we have not seen for generations. Working and middle-class people who have invested in land, approaching their retirement, are facing the prospect of the Liberal Party imposing upon them a retrospective tax hike in the order of up to 2,000 per cent so that people at the very top end of the land ownership scale get a massive tax cut. That is bad public policy that will exacerbate the problem of income inequality in this community, and it is a shame on the Liberal Party.

If there is one virtue in this exercise, it is that we now know what the Liberal Party in South Australia really stands for, because as sure as goodness it is not the middle class, and as sure as goodness it is not small business in this state. The other group of people who came out of the woodwork during the course of this exercise to start to engage in political advocacy, which they are not ordinarily accustomed to, was small business after small business.

I often reflect on the panelbeater who, again, started with absolutely nothing apart from his own father's hard graft. Over time, that family decided that once they started to accumulate a bit of wealth they would acquire the land on which the business operated. It helped protect the business. It helped de-risk the business from a landlord who would seek to jack up rents unreasonably, or indeed try to move their tenant on.

They acquired the land, which is exactly what we continuously tell people to do, making long-term investment decisions so they can employ people in this state. They then did a little better and acquired the next business and then that land, then the next business and that land, all because they wanted to do nothing more than provide an honest service to the community of this state and employ people in the process.

Now, as a consequence of making those investments, abiding by the law and following the advice of their accountant, they face the prospect of a massive retrospective tax increase. This of course does nothing apart from incapacitate them to continue to employ people—particularly young people—into the future. We heard these stories from panelbeaters, petrol station owners, bakers, GPs and physiotherapists.

We had one representation make it abundantly clear that this would actually compromise bulk billing rates in South Australia, particularly in outer metropolitan areas. GPs now face the prospect of massive increases in the rent they will have to pay their respective landlords. That will compromise their ability to continue to engage in bulk billing, and now people in outer metropolitan and regional communities face the prospect of losing a bulk billing service as a consequence of this land tax change.

Consequence after consequence, after consequence. Again, I come back to this point: for the sake of what? Nothing more than a face-saving exercise on behalf of a Premier who literally has no idea what he is doing. What we now see is the consequence of a party coming to government that had literally no agenda—a party that sought to promise everything to everyone in the lead-up to the election to finally break a cycle of losing four elections in a row.

They promised they were going to deliver more jobs. They failed. They promised they were going to deliver better services. What we have seen is cut after cut after cut. They promised they were going to deliver lower costs. This land tax hike on those middle-class families represents a very big cost indeed and they will now be opposed to them. They promised they did not have a

privatisation agenda. That has turned out to be the single largest broken promise of all. Group after group after group. Promise after promise after promise—and breaking every single last one of them.

Right now, in this place, we are going to see the cherry on top at the end of the 2019 calendar year: the ultimate broken promise of all. This Premier said to the people of South Australia that he was going to take an axe to land tax. What we are seeing now is the exact opposite for those working and middle-class people and small businesses who face a tax increase in the order of in excess of 2,000 per cent.

We have done our level best to rail against these tax increases. Alas, it appears that our efforts have not succeeded because the government have the support of the Greens. I think it is incredibly telling that they are now relying on the support of none other than the Greens to get their tax changes through. There will be an opportunity for the people of this state to have their say. It might not be right now, but it will happen in March 2022—

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Absolutely, correct.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: As the Minister for Energy and Mining interjects, I can say to him with a degree of confidence that if you faced a 2,000 per cent retrospective tax increase you would remember, too. We will continue to hold our consistent policy position, as we have throughout the entirety of this debate.

We are the only party that has had any consistency—unlike the Liberal Party and this Premier, who have chopped and changed all the way through, and unlike the Treasurer, who is taking his negotiation advice from the member for Black and capitulating every step of the way. We have remained consistent. We have remained true.

We are a party committed to making sure that hard work gets rewarded. We are a party committed to making sure that tax policy is founded on a principle that says that if you work hard and make the appropriate savings you should not be faced with retrospective tax hits. If you have the capacity to pay, you should acknowledge the fact that you should pay, but you should never face the prospect of a government exercising a policy of sovereign risk by retrospective changes. They know where we stand, they know where they stand and your time will come.

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

That consideration in committee of the suggested amendments from the Legislative Council on the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill be concluded by 6.30pm.

Motion carried.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In 1942, Robert Menzies gave a speech about his 'forgotten people'. I want to read to the parliament the speech that Robert Menzies made, which I think is pertinent to members here today. He said:

Quite recently, a bishop wrote a letter to a great daily newspaper. His theme was the importance of doing justice to the workers. His belief, apparently, was that the workers are those who work with their hands. He sought to divide the people of Australia into classes. He was obviously suffering from what has for years seemed to me to be our greatest political disease—the disease of thinking that the community is divided into the relatively rich and the relatively idle, and the laborious poor, and that every social and political controversy can be resolved into the question: What side are you on?

Now, the last thing that I would want to do is to commence or take part in a false war of this kind. In a country like Australia the class war must always be a false war. But if we are to talk of classes, then the time has come to say something of the forgotten class—the middle-class—those people who are constantly in danger of being ground between the upper and the nether millstones of the false war; the middle-class who, properly regarded, represent the backbone of this country.

We do not have classes here as in England, and therefore the terms do not mean the same; so I must define what I mean when I use the expression 'middle class'.

Let me first define it by exclusion. I exclude at one end of the scale the rich and powerful: those who control great funds and enterprises, and are as a rule able to protect themselves—though it must be said that in a political sense they have as a rule shown neither comprehension nor competence. But I exclude them because, in most material difficulties, the rich can look after themselves.

I exclude at the other end—

US—

...the mass of unskilled people, almost invariably well-organised, and with their wages and conditions safeguarded by popular law. What I am excluding them from is my definition of the middle class. We cannot exclude them from problems of social progress, for one of the prime objects of modern social and political policy is to give them a proper measure of security, and provide the conditions which will enable them to acquire skill and knowledge and individuality.

These exclusions being made, I include the intervening range—the kind of people—

Menzies claims he represents in parliament—

...salary-earners, shopkeepers, skilled artisans, professional men and women, farmers and so on. These are, in the political and economic sense, the middle class. They are for the most part unorganised and unselfconscious. They are envied by those whose benefits are largely obtained by taxing them. They are not rich enough to have individual power. They are taken for granted by each political party in turn. They are not sufficiently lacking in individualism to be organised for what in these days we call 'pressure politics'. And yet, as I have said, they are the backbone of the nation.

They are the people Menzies spoke about—the forgotten Australians—and this government is now introducing legislation that will hurt them and hurt them hard.

There are families today who, for the first time in their lives, are watching this broadcast live because they are the forgotten middle class. They are the ones who have traditionally always turned to members opposite. They have turned to them in the eastern suburbs, in the Adelaide Hills, in some of the inner suburbs. They are the artisans, the shopkeepers, the professionals, the farmers and so on. They are the ones Menzies described as unorganised yet not individualistic enough.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Farmers are exempt from land tax.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, for now—for now.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order! Thank you. Two things—

An honourable member: Time is up?

The CHAIR: Not quite. The member for West Torrens will not respond to interjections and those members who are in their seats will not interject.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is not a single forgotten Australian who would have thought in their wildest dreams that the Liberal Party would move this legislation. It is not beyond the realms of expectation that farmers who are watching this think that they are next because, if the Liberals would go after the middle class in the suburbs, why would they not go after farmers?

Importantly, those people Menzies spoke about traditionally looked to the member for Elder, the member for Colton, the member for Kavel, and the member for Heysen—those members who traditionally would have stood up and fought for them on these issues. But, unfortunately for them, for those forgotten South Australians, they are not standing up for them. They are standing up for the 400 corporations and individuals who are the major beneficiaries of this new measure, the ones who do not live in South Australia, the corporations, the Westfields—they are the ones that are the beneficiaries here, not the forgotten Australians.

Tonight, there are families who are watching or hearing about this who have never contacted political organisations, as the Leader of the Opposition said. They are the ones who, for the first time in their lives, have called Parliament House and asked to speak to the Hon. Mark Parnell, or the Treasurer, or the Hon. John Darley, or the member for Waite, who capitulated I think four versions ago.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Early.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Early—who gave in early. There is only one member on that side who can hold their head up, and that is the member for Davenport. He is the only one who had the courage of his convictions not to be part of this train wreck, not to be part of this disaster.

For those families who are watching this, who are going to watch this, who are going to read about this tomorrow—what has the government done? They have increased their anxiety. They have increased their fears. They have made self-funded retirees feel anxious about their future.

Governments are there to reassure, not to increase anxiety. The world is complicated enough without having the Premier and his cronies come along and retrospectively change tax rules on retired people.

I say to the member for Colton that he has a distinction in this house: he has, residing in his seat, the highest percentage of self-funded retirees in South Australia. The second is the member for Morphett. I look forward to the conversations that we will be having with the constituents in those electorates about what those two members are doing today.

Mr Malinauskas: There is still time yet, though.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: That would take courage, leader. That would take conviction. That would take what Menzies called standing up for the forgotten people. Of course, Menzies had great admirers, one of them being Sir Thomas Playford. Menzies and Playford were the ideal for the Liberal Party, looking after the middle classes. But the strange alliance between the Greens and the Liberal Party—where all of a sudden we are taxing low and middle-income people to reward 400 of the richest corporations in this state and in this country—is obscene. They will have to explain that in their respective constituencies.

The forgotten Australians will stop looking towards the members opposite because they no longer represent them. If they did, they would not be voting for this. They would be voting with us, the Labor Party. We are the ones who are standing up for the shopkeepers. We are the ones who are standing up for people who aspire to a little bit more. We are the ones who are standing up for people who, because of cultural issues, do not buy properties as an investment that they will one day sell to enjoy their retirement but who are buying them to hand over to their children. They cannot realise the value of these investments; they will not do it. They would rather die than sell these properties. But the Treasurer says, 'Well, if you can't afford the tax, sell a property. You are rich.' They are not rich. They are not rich.

While I know members opposite agree with everything I am saying, I do not understand for a minute why they are still going through this facade of support for this Premier and this policy. You do not have to speak to me about this. Speak to Senator Antic about it. Speak to the conservatives in the federal Liberal Party who are speaking out about this. They are tripping over in the corridors of Canberra to talk about how stupid this is and how the Premier has got this horribly wrong. They will tell anyone who will listen about how wrong the Premier has this and how strange it is that he is doing this. Yet members opposite seem quite comfortable with just following him off the cliff.

I have to say to you, the class of 2018: what does it say to you about your influence in this party which you are a member of, and for which you gave up your other careers—whether it be on the land, in a business or in the law—when you watch Tammy Franks having more influence on Liberal Party policy than you? The Hon. Tammy Franks has a direct line to the Premier. What does it say to you that the Hon. John Darley has more influence than the member for Waite? The member for Waite capitulated on this deal four iterations ago. If only you had hung out, Sam, who knows what else you could have got?

I have to say to those forgotten South Australians that the Leader of the Opposition is listening. We are listening because the Premier is not. We are the ones who are going to fight this. We are the ones who are standing up for you. We are the ones who are trying to lighten the anxiety, not make it worse. Tom Playford looks down in shame on you lot opposite.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The committee divided on the motion:

Ayes 24
Noes 21
Majority 3

AYES

Basham, D.K.B.
Cowdrey, M.J.

Bell, T.S.
Cregan, D.

Chapman, V.A.
Duluk, S.

AYES

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

NOES

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

Motion thus carried.

At 18:33 the house adjourned until Tuesday 3 December 2019 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***LAND TAX**

1464 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How many land tax payers are forecast to be liable for land tax in the 2020-21 financial year, with taxable land holdings between:

1. \$450,000 to \$755,000?
2. \$755,001 to \$1,098,000?
3. \$1,098,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

The distribution of revenue and number of land tax payers across the land tax brackets from 2020-21 to 2022-23 will be based on the land tax scales that apply in those years.

The land tax scales to apply will depend on whether the legislative amendments for the government's proposed land tax reform package are passed in parliament and whether there are any changes to the current proposal as detailed in the Land Tax (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2019 (the Bill). I understand proposed amendments to the bill introduced into the Legislative Council have been tabled by the Hon. Mark Parnell.

If the bill is passed, the impact on land held in trust and distribution of those impacts will also depend on whether trustees potentially liable for the higher surcharge rates of land tax pay the surcharge, or lodge a notification of beneficial interests for land tax purposes. Where a beneficiary or beneficiaries are nominated the trustee will be liable for the standard rates of land tax on the trust held land. The nominated beneficiaries will be treated as the owner for land tax purposes and their interest in the trust held land will be aggregated with any other interests in land that they hold as an individual.

The actual land tax scales, and therefore amount of tax, to apply from 2020-21 and future years will also be impacted by the annual indexation of land tax thresholds in line with average site value growth as determined by the Valuer-General.

To provide an independent view on the modelling of the impact of the reforms proposed by the government, PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) was engaged to review the methodology used by the Department of Treasury and Finance. PwC reviewed and supported as reasonable Treasury's methodology for constructing the estimate. PwC did not identify any alternative ways to use the existing data sets to improve the reasonableness of the estimates. The government has made the findings of this review publicly available.

LAND TAX

1465 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much land tax is forecast to be collected in the 2020-21 financial year, from taxable land holdings between:

1. \$450,000 to \$755,000?
2. \$755,001 to \$1,098,000?
3. \$1,098,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1466 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How many land tax payers are forecast to be liable to land tax in each of the following thresholds from taxable land holdings between:

1. \$450,000 to \$755,000
2. \$755,001 to \$1,098,000
3. \$1,098,001 and above that had not paid land tax previously?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1467 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). If the top land tax rate is reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent, what is the forecast of foregone land tax revenue between the following brackets of landholdings in 2020-21:

1. \$1,098,000 to \$2,000,000?
2. \$2,000,001 to \$3,000,000?

3. \$3,000,001 to \$4,000,000?
4. \$4,000,001 to \$5,000,000?
5. \$5,000,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1468 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). If the top land tax rate is reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent, how many taxable land holdings are there between the following taxable land values in 2020-21:

1. \$1,098,000 to \$2,000,000?
2. \$2,000,001 to \$3,000,000?
3. \$3,000,001 to \$4,000,000?
4. \$4,000,001 to \$5,000,000?
5. \$5,000,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1469 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). If the top land tax rate is reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent, what is the forecast of forgone land tax revenue between the following brackets of landholdings in 2021-22:

1. \$1,098,001 to \$2,000,000?
2. \$2,000,001 to \$3,000,000?
3. \$3,000,001 to \$4,000,000?
4. \$4,000,001 to \$5,000,000?
5. \$5,000,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1470 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). If the top land tax rate is reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent, how many taxable land holdings are there between the following taxable land values in 2021-22:

1. \$1,098,001 to \$2,000,000?
2. \$2,000,001 to \$3,000,000?
3. \$3,000,001 to \$4,000,000?
4. \$4,000,001 to \$5,000,000?
5. \$5,000,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1471 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). If the top land tax rate is reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent, what is the forecast of forgone land tax revenue between the following brackets of landholdings in 2022-23:

1. \$1,098,001 to \$2,000,000?
2. \$2,000,001 to \$3,000,000?
3. \$3,000,001 to \$4,000,000?
4. \$4,000,001 to \$5,000,000?

5. \$5,000,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1472 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). If the top land tax rate is reduced from 3.7 per cent to 2.4 per cent, how many taxable land holdings are there between the following taxable land values in 2022-23:

1. \$1,098,001 to \$2,000,000?
2. \$2,000,001 to \$3,000,000?
3. \$3,000,001 to \$4,000,000?
4. \$4,000,001 to \$5,000,000?
5. \$5,000,001 and above?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1473 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2020-21 from land tax payers with land holdings in trusts in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holdings in trusts are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1474 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2020-21 from land tax payers with land holding not held in trusts in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holding not held in trusts are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1475 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2021-22 from land tax payers with land holdings in trusts in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holdings in trusts are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1476 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2021-22 from land tax payers with land holding not held in trusts in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holding not held in trusts are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1477 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2022-23 from land tax payers with land holdings in trusts in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holdings in trusts are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1478 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2022-23 from land tax payers with land holdings not held in trusts in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holding not held in trusts are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1479 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2020-21 from land tax payers with land holdings in company structures in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holdings in company structures are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1480 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2021-22 from land tax payers with land holdings in company structures in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holdings in company structures are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1481 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much revenue is forecast to be collected in 2022-23 from land tax payers with land holdings in company structures in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

1. How many land tax payers with land holdings in company structures are there forecast to be in each of the thresholds to apply in that financial year?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1482 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much extra revenue is expected to be collected from each land tax threshold, and in total, under the proposed trust scales for each of the 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1483 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much extra revenue is expected to be collected from each land tax threshold, and in total, from aggregating land ownerships of individuals for each of the 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

LAND TAX

1484 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much extra revenue is expected to be collected from each land tax threshold, and in total, from aggregating land ownerships of corporate groups for each of the 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

GOVERNMENT APPLIED MODELS

1485 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). How much extra revenue was forecast to be collected if the government applied the NSW model and if it applied the Queensland model for each of the 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

FIXED AND UNIT TRUSTS

1486 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). What is the estimated cost in not grouping land owned by fixed trusts and unit trusts for each of the 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.

SUPERANNUATION FUNDS

1487 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (25 September 2019). What is the estimated cost in not applying the trust scales to superannuation funds for each of the 2020-21, 2021-22 and 2022-23 financial years?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

This question has been addressed in the response provided to the Question on Notice 1464.