

## HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

### Wednesday, 4 December 2019

The **SPEAKER (Hon. V.A. Tarzia)** took the chair at 10:30 and read prayers.

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

#### *Bills*

### YOUTH JUSTICE ADMINISTRATION (FUNCTIONS OF TRAINING CENTRE VISITOR) AMENDMENT BILL

#### *Introduction and First Reading*

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:31):** Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Youth Justice Administration Act 2016. Read a first time.

#### *Second Reading*

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (10:32):** I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

South Australia's youth justice system is of huge important to our State.

The evidence tells us that young offenders should not be treated in the same way as adult offenders. Their brains are yet to be fully developed, their decision-making capacity is often lesser, and prospects for rehabilitation are higher.

Our State's Youth Training Centre is a recognition of this. It is not a gaol or a prison—it is a secure place for young offenders to be supported, to undertake rehabilitation programs, and to be prepared as best they can to make a positive contribution to society as adults.

We know, too, that residents of the Youth Training Centre often have many factors which led to their offending in the first place.

Instances of childhood trauma, contact with the child protection system, and other factors are far more prevalent in the Youth Training Centre than in the wider population.

These principles informed the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*, and should always inform our approach to youth justice policy.

A key component of the *Act* is the role of Training Centre Visitor—an independent statutory officer with powers to visit the Adelaide Youth Training Centre, inspect its facilities and advocate for the rights and welfare of its residents.

The current and inaugural Visitor is also our State's Guardian for Children and Young People, Ms Penny Wright.

Ms Wright, a former South Australian Senator, is well-respected for her work advocating for vulnerable young people.

In the 2017-18 Training Centre Visitor Annual Report, presented to the Minister for Human Services on 28 September 2018, the Visitor outlines Crown Law advice she received about the statutory basis for her role.

She raises two key issues:

#### Scope of Mandate

Firstly, the limitations of Section 14 of the *Act*, which outlines the Training Centre Visitor's functions. The Visitor reports that the advice interprets the definition of '*resident of a training centre*' in section 14 to refer only to those residents at times they are physically located within the Adelaide Youth Training Centre.

The Visitor raises concerns about the impact of such an interpretation on her ability to advocate for residents of the Youth Training Centre.

She expresses concern that children who are receiving mental health treatment in Boylan Ward at the Women's and Children's Hospital, or are appearing in the Youth Court, or are otherwise outside of the Centre's premises would *not* fall within the scope of her mandate.

Even in these locations, young people are still residents of the Youth Training Centre. They leave the Training Centre to attend these locations, and return to the Centre afterwards.

The possibility that the Visitor is unable to advocate on behalf of children in these settings is therefore of significant concern.

In her 2017-18 annual report, the Visitor describes the outcomes of consultation with Training Centre Residents, who told the Visitor they wanted a 'consistency of TCV Unit staff with whom they can build a relationship ...an advocate with whom they can build trust and confidence... accessibility when they need support (without delay), and... confidential simple self-referral opportunities'.

These important outcomes are undermined if the Visitor cannot advocate on a child's behalf, just because an incident occurs outside the walls of the Adelaide Youth Training Centre.

The Bill proposes a simple amendment to Section 14 of the Act, to clarify that the Training Centre Visitor's mandate applies to Training Centre Residents—whether or not they are within the walls of the Centre at the time of an incident.

#### Delegation

The second issue raised by the Visitor was that of delegation.

The Training Centre Visitor Unit consists of 2.5 FTE staff, plus the Visitor herself. The Visitor—like other statutory officers—ought to be able to rely on her staff to carry out some of her functions and support her in her important work.

However, the Visitor's 2017-18 Annual Report states that:

'Crown Law advice indicated that the Training Centre Visitor has no formal power under the Act to delegate powers and functions to staff to implement the TCV Program, including core requirements such as the capacity to conduct visits to, or inspect, the Training Centre'.

I note that Section 23 of the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* gives such a power of delegation to the Guardian for Children and Young People. That an equivalent power is missing for the Training Centre Visitor's role may simply be an oversight, and one that is easily remedied.

To that end, this Bill inserts a new section to allow the Visitor to delegate functions to others. Importantly, such delegations do not impede the Visitor's ability to undertake those functions personally, and can be revoked at any time.

#### 2018-19 Annual Report and Minister's Response

Disappointingly, the Minister for Human Services—as the Minister to whom the Youth Justice Administration Act is committed—did not act on the Visitor's recommendations.

A full year after first making them, the Visitor again restated her recommendations in her 2018-19 Annual Report.

On 31 October 2019, the Minister for Human Services was asked questions on these issues in the other place.

The Minister's answers make clear she does not intend to act on the Visitor's recommendations and believes them to be unnecessary.

I would suggest that these amendments are relatively straightforward but would go a long way to ensuring the safety of children who reside in the Adelaide Youth Training Centre. They would also reassure the Visitor and her staff that they have the necessary legal basis to carry out this important work.

The Training Centre Visitor's reports have shone a light on serious issues in the Adelaide Youth Training Centre, and provided a voice for children who are at real risk of otherwise being voiceless.

I believe it is imperative that the Parliament ensure the Visitor has the necessary legal basis upon which to provide that voice – and for that reason, I commend the Bill to the House.

#### Explanation of Clauses

##### Part 1—Preliminary

##### 1—Short title

##### 2—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal

Part 2—Amendment of Youth Justice Administration Act 2016

3—Insertion of section 11A

This clause inserts a new section 11A

11A—Delegation

Enables the Training Centre Visitor to delegate any powers, duties or functions to another person. This delegation must be in writing, and does not derogate from the power of the Visitor to act personally in any matter.

4—Amendment of section 14—Training Centre Visitor's functions

This clause inserts a new subsection (4), which provides that the Visitor may exercise their functions in respect of a resident of a training centre, even if the resident is physically outside of the training centre at which they are being detained or are to be detained.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

## **PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (CARPARKING REQUIREMENTS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 November 2019.)

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (10:33):** This bill seeks to amend the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016 to require (1) a minimum of one car parking space to be provided with all new dwellings, regardless of dwelling type or location; (2) a minimum of two car parking spaces to be provided with all new dwellings with two or more bedrooms; (3) that where such car parking spaces cannot be provided on the site of the development they be provided on an off-street car parking site within 100 metres of the dwelling; and (4) that where the above requirements cannot be met the development be classified as a restricted development under the PDI Act to ensure public notification and third-party appeal rights.

As members in this place know, the South Australian government is undertaking the most significant reform to its land use planning system in over 20 years. The centrepiece of this planning reform, pursuant to the former government's Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, is the creation of the Planning and Design Code, which seeks to combine 68 council development plans and four out-of-council areas into one statewide, electronically accessible planning code for all South Australians.

The proposal is to use blunt legislation to require minimum car parking for all dwellings, irrespective of dwelling type or location. This is both inflexible and unnecessary. Planning policies in current council development plans and in the Planning and Design Code already address car parking requirements. In most circumstances, car parking is required at a rate that at least meets the minimum rates proposed in the opposition's bill. In fact, in some instances the code proposes rates that are greater for larger dwellings.

Car parking in the code is proposed for a wide range of land uses, not just dwellings. Flexibility is necessary to provide for a variety of circumstances and to accommodate other broader planning outcomes—for example, transit oriented developments, where denser residential outcomes are proposed on transport corridors. In those instances, less rather than more car parking may be appropriate in order to reduce traffic congestion in communities.

Further, the proposal of a fallback position to provide car parking on other sites within 100 metres of a dwelling is considered to be unworkable. Planning laws cannot control the actions of private property owners in selling or disposing of alternative car parking sites if they are on separate titles. There are significant questions to be asked about the legality or otherwise of possible restrictions placed on land which may be designated as alternative car parking sites in the bill.

In addition, feedback from the development industry suggests the budget estimate for a car park in an apartment can add up to \$60,000 to the price of a new dwelling. Given the bill's proposal

to mandate two car parks for every two-bedroom dwelling, the question is whether this requirement will add up to \$120,000 to the price of every two-bedroom apartment in South Australia, smashing affordability in an already challenged housing market and harming the hip pocket of younger people who want to buy their first home or older people who want to downsize closer to town.

The proposal is both impractical and inflexible and it seeks to legislate, rather than codify via the Planning and Design Code, inflexible car parking requirements that fail to take into account diversity of development outcomes and the unique needs of the land use planning system. Not only is this proposal likely to kill the apartment market in Adelaide's CBD—which is something I know the former government was trying to improve—but it will also be seen as anti public transport, which again is something I thought the former government would want to be seen to support.

At the end of the day, the biggest harm in this proposal is that it seeks to create a very blunt, one-size-fits-all solution to what needs to be a very complex and nuanced land use planning system. The idea that we can mandate one single way of delivering car parks in any new dwelling is absurd, and that is why this bill needs to be opposed. More than that, there are actually some serious questions on the enforceability and legality of the ability to provide offsite car parks within 100 metres of the proposal.

In fact, I am advised there is no way to be able to place a contingent responsibility on a separate parcel of land in the planning system. The enforceability of putting in a planning application on one parcel of land and making it a requirement to place a car park on a second, separately titled parcel of land within 100 metres of that is seriously in question here. I will definitely be asking some questions through the committee stage of this bill.

This bill is contrary to the intent of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act to provide flexible and dynamic land use planning in South Australia and, accordingly, the government does not support the bill. However, I indicate that we will not be opposing the bill at the second reading and will be seeking to ask questions in committee to tease out what the mover of the bill is seeking to achieve.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (10:39):** I intend to quickly close the debate. I do not have to say much because most of what the minister has said is actually inaccurate. He has not actually read the bill because a lot of what he talked about was the inflexibility of the bill, but the bill makes it very clear: it is very flexible. There is a third provision in the bill to enable a second process to be undertaken when those commitments cannot be made in its design. The minister talks about flexibility being required in the code. That is the major criticism of the current situation: it is so flexible that it has actually created the current problem.

For those people who do not think we have a problem with road congestion in our suburbs, I would like to hear them because I hear it from everywhere: the east, the west, the north, everywhere. Allotments are being cut from one into two or into three and the streets are clogged up with cars because the flexibility that exists in the system and the flexibility that the minister wants to maintain have not worked.

He also talked about transport corridors, in terms of fewer cars being owned or used in those areas. That has not worked. All the things he said this morning have not worked to date. It is interesting to note that the minister makes a lot of his claims based on the current system working. Well, it has not worked and that is why we are here at the moment.

The bill does what the minister said; however, very importantly, it does provide flexibility. An example would be an apartment building in the city where there are services, public transport, etc. The bill provides for fewer car parks to be required. All it requires is a separate process to make sure that the integrity of the planning system is maintained.

What we have now is a lack of confidence in the planning system. At all the public meetings I have been to, including meetings the minister has arranged and gone to, people have complained about the integrity of our planning system. It does not deliver what it is supposed to, and this is why we have moved this bill: to make sure that it delivers certain outcomes for residents and that our suburbs are designed to maintain streetscapes and a level of amenity because, in the end, a person's home is probably the biggest investment they make and we need to protect it.

Clearly, the minister has also not heard what the development sector has said. The same criticism he made of me this morning the development sector has made of his current draft code. The development sector made the same criticism about what the current code—his code, as he admitted, his reforms—has done in terms of adding to the cost of apartments and houses.

If it is okay for his code to add cost to building to maintain the integrity of a system, I think it should be appropriate for this bill to do the same thing to maintain the integrity of the system and protect our residents. With those comments, I seek support of the bill.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Light, I open the committee and indicate that there are seven clauses and a title to be considered in this bill. Are there any questions?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I do not have any questions: it is my bill.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, member for Light, but if you want to take the opportunity now—

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I move:

That progress be reported.

Motion negatived.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** What methodology will be used to determine whether the commission should have regard to the act or the Planning and Design Code, and is it the member's view that one should have precedence over the other?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** In terms of the provisions the minister is referring to, it is quite clear that the last provision of the bill requires that when the applicant cannot meet the minimum requirements it would go to the commission and the commission would have regard to things such as those the minister has mentioned—where it is near a transport corridor, other matters such as services, and all those things the commission considers now. All it says is that the commission has to be satisfied that, if it is not going to meet those minimum requirements, these are the reasons why.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** What this bill seeks to do is to make anything where these provisions are not able to be complied with a restricted form of development, which comes with a far elongated process which will mean that all those proposals will need to become SCAP assessed. But I think my initial question still remains in that the commission has to have regard to the Planning and Design Code; that is the document that is supposed to provide the direction. But again I ask the question: does the member believe that the commission should give precedence to the act or the Planning and Design Code with regard to these provisions vis-a-vis any other provisions the code might seek to impose upon a dwelling?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I think it is quite clear. The legislative provisions would have precedence over policy decisions. The code is a policy matter. Secondly, as the minister mentioned, it goes to SCAP, and all it does in this case is give people third-party appeal rights and a say in the dealings which do not meet minimum requirements. If the minister is saying that nearby residents and people should not have a right of say, and not be notified and have no rights of appeal, that is his opinion. But that is what this bill intends to do.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** How did the member come up with the 100-metre limit for offsite parking?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** It was through an engagement process with a whole range of individual people and also organisations as to what is considered a reasonable distance people are prepared to walk or what would be considered to be in reasonable proximity to their home, and that figure was considered to be 100 metres. It could be 100 or 200, etc., but anything over 100 metres was considered to be less likely to be used and that is how we arrived at the figure.

It was done through consultation with the residents of Lightsview, residents from the Community Alliance and a whole range of residential groups in terms of what would be practical. These people think that this would be a good use of the off-location, off-street parking. It is designed to do two things: one, to provide car parking where it cannot be provided on site and therefore it provides flexibility; secondly, and more importantly, in the future, when the usage of cars is reduced, those consolidated car parks can be redeveloped for other users, so it provides for the future.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Has the member undertaken to get any advice on the enforceability of this proposal?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** My understanding is that the enforcement would come through in that the application itself would cover more than one title. Planning applications at the moment can cover one, two, three, four, five titles at the moment. There is nothing unique about that. They do not have to be contiguous. In fact, there is a whole range of policies in the North Adelaide area which cover that provision as well. So, yes, they can be. Also, if required, there are other mechanisms like land management agreements which can be utilised on some occasions.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** How would the member propose to control the car parks issue after approval? I want to paint a scenario. Somebody seeks to put in a planning application for a dwelling and they cannot provide the car parking on site as per this proposal. They then need to find the ability to provide offsite car parking on a different, separately titled piece of land. What mechanism would the member seek to use to force that planning application on that second and subsequent piece of land, and how would the member ensure that that land was not just sold off after that planning approval was given?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I thank the minister for his questions. It is unfortunate that he did not actually listen to the answer to the previous question because I did address that issue. In that case, the title would be part of the original application; it would be part of the original development approval. It would be no different from any other development approval. If it does not comply with the conditions, it would be forced to by a council or any other planning authority. It is no different from somebody getting an approval for one thing and then doing something else. There are enforcement proceedings that could take place. The fact that two titles are not necessarily joined together does not make it fatal.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** In your answer to the first question, member for Light, you said you had consulted with a list of organisations. Could you list the organisations you consulted with?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Yes, I can do that. I have a regular forum with a range of groups, which includes the Committee for Adelaide, the Planning Institute, the Local Government Association, the Property Council, the UDIA, the Environmental Defenders Office, some planning academics from the University of Adelaide, Community Alliance, SACOSS, Shelter SA and the Community Housing Council. They are some of the groups I have consulted with on a regular basis.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Do they all support the bill?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, probably not; not all do. Not all people support your bills either, but you still put them through.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Can you advise who supports the bill?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Certainly Community Alliance, which is an alliance of about 40 different resident associations, support it. A number of resident associations in your area support it, and they have been quite clear in their support for this.

**An honourable member:** Just one.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, it is not one; it is a number of organisations, thank you very much.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** Can I say that, as this debate is going on, I am receiving information to challenge what the member for Light just said, that he believes all the major stakeholders have been consulted. In fact, a number of stakeholders are saying that this has never been directly raised with them. Actually, one group that we did ask to provide comment, the Urban Development Institute, which represents developers of all different types and persuasions, has provided comment.

They essentially provided me with an estimate that the cost of building a car park for an apartment dwelling inside the CBD would cost up to \$60,000 per car park for new developments. Can the member explain what he believes adding the cost of \$120,000 to the cost of a two-bedroom apartment in South Australia would do to apartment housing construction inside the CBD?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I thank the minister for his question, but I indicated in earlier answers cases where this bill does not require every development to have that requirement for the car park. It is very clear. There is a specific exemption provision in the bill to enable that, so that in the cases where car parks are not required they will not be provided and it will cost nothing. Where they are required, they will be provided and they will cost what they cost.

In fact, the Urban Development Institute did not agree with the government's property tax bill, but the government still went ahead with it. The Urban Development Institute actually has concerns with the design code at the minute, but the minister is going ahead with it. The fact that one party does not support what I am doing is neither here nor there, but I did consult with them. In fact, I consulted probably more extensively than the minister's department has.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I am not sure that the member understands his own bill, because I am struggling to see here where this exemption is, except for clause 5 in relation to restricted development. Again, I think that the member quite clearly misunderstands the way in which the planning system works.

Under the new system there are three different forms of assessment pathways: one is a deem-to-satisfy pathway where somebody can tick every single box and get a very short and quick assessment pathway. For those people who fall outside of that, they can move to a performance-assessed pathway. This is one that will be undertaken by councils and one that will actually then engage and have consultation with the community.

However, restricted development is a form of development that is extremely hard to get up, and in fact is reserved for a category of development that is not envisaged, where you will have some very specialised or very out-of-the-box proposals that are seeking a pathway to which the planning system may not have an answer. An example is an idea that comes up that is different from what the land use envisages, but it might not necessarily be in conflict; it is just not something that is thought of or proposed in the zone in which the development application is assessed.

What the member is saying is that he thinks that every single apartment block in Adelaide now needs to follow a restricted development pathway. That is absolutely absurd. What it also does is that it extends the time frame needed to assess those applications from something like a few weeks up to a number of months, and also includes third party appeal rights. The way in which the planning system works is that it designates what types of development and what sorts of things would like to be seen within a zone.

What the member is saying is that in Adelaide, where every one would expect apartments to be built, the effect of this bill will be that every apartment block is now not considered an appropriate form of development within the development plan. That is a fundamental cognitive disconnect that the member quite clearly does not understand.

A restricted development pathway is not a viable alternative. It is one that will not only jack up the cost hugely for apartment blocks but also create huge cost and delay in getting apartment buildings off the ground. The former government provided stamp duty exemptions for off-the-plan apartments because they were trying to stimulate residential growth inside the CBD. Now what we see is this opposition now going 180° in the other direction, and the fact is that they now believe that

apartment buildings should not be envisaged inside the CBD of Adelaide unless people have to pay an extra \$120,000 to live in that house.

I also do not understand what this does to public transport, where inside the CBD you would expect that people would avail themselves of the public transport options that exist, especially considering that our CBD is the hub for public transport to get people out into the suburbs; the fact that there is the ability for people to live a more active lifestyle using e-scooters, or using bikes, or walking or using the free tram service, or any other number of ways to get around instead of owning a car.

However, that is not what the member is seeking to do with this bill. He is in fact attempting to go the other way. I ask the question again: what does the member think adding \$120,000 to the cost of a two-bedroom apartment in Adelaide will do to the apartment market in Adelaide?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I thank the minister for his question. The minister is quite obviously concerned about knocking this bill off. He actually wants to knock it off, but he is concerned about the impact of knocking it off, and that is why he is ignoring all the residential areas in this debate, which this bill mainly covers. I am actually quite happy to talk about this bill.

The minister accuses me of not understanding the whole process. Well, I think I do. It is interesting because his commission and his departmental officers made it very clear that, in this iteration of the planning laws, the restricted development is not to be equated with the old noncomplying development. The change of language was quite deliberate in this new act and these new regulations. The minister is now describing what was then referred to as a 'noncomplying development', and the minister is quite right. That was the old act; it was not in this proposal.

The restricted process, as explained to me by both the commission and departmental officers, is designed to establish a separate process. The same issues that the minister has raised are true for the noncomplying provision in the old act, so the minister is trying now to fuse the old act with the new act and somehow construct something that does not actually exist. The reality is that the bill says, 'These are the minimum requirements. If you do not meet these minimum requirements, this is the process you go through to justify your development.' It is as simple as that. He is trying to create a scenario that will not necessarily exist or, if it does exist, developers do it because they choose to trade one thing off against another, and that is a decision they make.

Regarding the nonsense of public transport, this is a government that has done very little about public transport except to sell it off. That is what he has done. In terms of improving transport, he has reduced buses and bus services, a whole range of things, so the minister's commitment to public transport is quite ludicrous. In his time as Minister for Transport all he has done is sell it off. So I am quite comfortable with this bill. The UDIA have put to me what the minister read out, and I understand that. The Property Council are the same. But I can assure you that there are a lot of residential groups, people in our suburban streets, who support this bill, and it has my support.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** I note that the member still did not answer the central question of what the increased cost of \$120,000 will do to the apartment market in Adelaide, so I will ask a question in a slightly different way. In asking this question, can I say that the Planning and Design Code provides for car parking as part of normal residential development.

Depending on whether it is a detached dwelling, semidetached dwelling, row housing, group housing or residential flat, it has different forms of car parking requirements. There is also a nuance to that where a dwelling is built within a few hundred metres of public transport, and it provides for lower rates of car parking on the understanding that people tend to buy houses near public transport routes so they can utilise that public transport and therefore lessen their reliance on private vehicles.

For large dwellings, the code also mandates increased requirements for car parking over and above what this policy seeks to achieve. Here, in my mind, is the central flaw in this bill; that is, it seeks to create the same car parking requirements for an apartment in the city owned by a young couple who do not want to own a car anymore. It adds cost to the purchase price of an apartment for something they do not want to use, as it does for a large suburban house where this proposal will see less car parking provided than a large suburban house would be required to provide under the code.

The reason we use a code is that we understand that car parking requirements are different. Living in the outer suburbs without good access to public transport is very different from living in the inner city where you do have good access to public transport. The code provides that nuance. So my question to the member is why does he believe that for every single dwelling—regardless of where they are, regardless of proximity to public transport and proximity to where people want to live and work—a one-size-fits-all approach is appropriate and why does it need to be put into legislation?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I am not sure if that was a statement or a question, but in terms—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Light, it can be either at the committee stage.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** So if it is a statement, I do not have to respond to it. I can choose not to respond to it.

**The CHAIR:** You can answer the question in whatever way you see fit.

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The reason I am seeking it is simple; and I am sure you are listening to your residents.

**An honourable member:** Didn't you hear him say why?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I just said—

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order in the house! The member for Light has the call.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Thank you, Mr Chair. It is quite clear: one just has to look around our suburban streets and the answer exists there—the congestion we have in our streets. It is quite simple. This is an issue that has been brought to my attention. A lot of MPs on my side have heard about this issue as well. If members on that side have not heard this from their residents, so be it, but I can tell you that people on this side have heard this story. It speaks for itself.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** I am interested in the driveways for these car parks. One of the big issues certainly in my electorate is that a driveway will go in and remove a car park from the street. So, with your proposal to mandate the number of car parks per dwelling, is there any restriction on the number of car parks that can be removed from the street?

So that is clear, street parking is very important. People like to be able to park in the street because, certainly in older suburbs, there are situations where there are already houses built without car parks—they were built over 100 or 150 years ago—so street parking is very important. What we often see is that a double car park or a double garage may be attached to a new development and, where you were able to park one or two vehicles, you can no longer park vehicles in the street. Does your proposal for the compulsory addition of off-street car parking have any restrictions on the number of street car parks that can be removed in order to provide driveways to access those car parks?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I am trying to understand the question.

**The Hon. S.K. Knoll:** Wider driveways mean less on-street parking. Have you thought about that?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** No, it does not. A driveway can be a single driveway that actually meets two car parks or two off-street car parks. In fact, part of the answer—

**Mr Odenwalder:** That's every driveway in Elizabeth.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** That's right. Two car parks on site do not require two driveways. In fact, the minister actually made the point a bit earlier. He said that the commission would have to have regard to the code and that is quite right. The new code says that it would encourage single driveways for more than one car park. The bill covers that.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** There is no protection for street car parking under your proposal. The other question I have is: do the car parks need to be exclusive to the property owner? Can they

be shared car parks? For example, could you have a car park that was seven cars in length and would require cars to be moved for cars that might be at the furthest distance from the car park to leave the car park that may belong to different owners on that subdivision? Is there anything in your bill that prevents that from happening?

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** And there is no provision in the bill that the moon will not hit the earth in 100 years' time either. The question is quite ludicrous and that is why I am not going to answer it. It is a ludicrous question because all it says, in terms of the actual requirement for car parks, is that if you have two bedrooms you require two car parks—simple as that. It happens every day. There are no restrictions.

The bill would protect on-street car parking, which is not protected at the moment. As you indicated yourself in your earlier question, where all these new driveways are being put into old, established areas, the bill is actually designed to overcome that to make sure there is off-street car parking. You are protecting on-street car parking for the whole community's use and community safety. It would also force people to design their homes in a way that meets the requirements, rather than what the code does.

What the minister did not say is that a lot of the stuff actually in the code is what is called performance required assessment, which means there is flexibility. That flexibility that we have in the current scheme has led to the problems we have today, including in the member for Unley's electorate, and it will continue if nothing is done about it.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** So, in the member's bill there is no restriction on these car parks being shared. The member said it was a ridiculous proposition, but I can tell you now that in Russell Street in Hyde Park and in Clarence Street in Hyde Park, there are a number of homes that share a car park and share a driveway.

This causes all sorts of angst between neighbours in having access to their rear gardens. For example, if it is a rental property that has a difficult tenant, there might be a situation where the tenant decides that they are entitled to use that driveway as a car park and they consequently restrict access to the rear garden for the neighbour who shares that driveway. This situation that evolved over 100 years ago demonstrates how the member for Light has not thought about the bill at all and having this mandated legislation on how to deal with car parking in areas that are being subdivided and developed, particularly in some of the older suburbs in Adelaide.

We have learnt through this interrogation in the committee process that there is no protection for on-street parking. An on-street car park can be replaced with a driveway at the drop of a hat under the member's bill. We have now learnt that there is no requirement for those car parks to be exclusive but that they can in actual fact be shared or common use car parks or they can be a driveway that has room for a car.

There are no specifications for the size of the car parks. Is it for a car park big enough for a small vehicle, or is it a car park for a larger four-wheel drive, for example? None of that detail is in the bill, yet this detail has a very restricted mandate that is not flexible and will not suit the requirements of those who are concerned about the congestion in the streets, the car parking in the streets and the density of development in my electorate. It is for that reason that the bill is flawed.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** I will respond to that because what the member said is actually just nonsense and incorrect. Not only that, though, if the member is so concerned about the issues he has raised in the bill, all the bill does is set minimum standards; all the other stuff is covered by the design code. All the issues that were raised are not addressed by the design code, so I would suggest that he has a word to his minister because all these so-called protections he is trying to put in for his residents are not met by the design code.

In fact, only to the extent that it sets minimum standards is where this bill intersects with the design code. All other provisions of the design code would prevail. To that extent, the member for Unley is trying to find a reason not to vote for this, but the reality is that this provision actually provides more protection for his residents than the design code alone. However, he will clearly support the design code by itself, which very clearly provides less protection for residents in his locality.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** What is interesting is that this actually does not really help to improve car parking rates in suburban Adelaide. In fact, a lot of those large block heritage homes in the member for Unley's electorate will actually see fewer car parking requirements under the bill, not more. Quite clearly, the member does not understand that what he is trying to do is help suburban Adelaide, which this bill does not.

All this bill does is hurt development inside the CBD of Adelaide and hurt development in and around high transport oriented development corridors in Adelaide. That is all it does. It does not help suburban Adelaide because it does not provide for a materially increased level of parking rates in suburban Adelaide. Logically, what the bill is seeking to do is to actually encourage more cars to be used on our roads. It is designed to encourage people to continue to use private vehicles in a wider range of circumstances.

The question I have is this: has the member undertaken any analysis into what the congestion impacts of this proposal are likely to be? The reason I ask that question is that when you create a nuanced policy, you need to do your homework and you need to do the research. When we design a planning and design code, it is done after broad consultation, not just some sort of regular catch-up meeting, where I understand these issues were not even raised.

You need to undertake some statistical analysis and some data analysis to understand the impacts these changes are going to have. It is why this process has taken as long as it has, and it is why we are undertaking the most comprehensive consultation process in relation to the code that has ever been undertaken. The desire of this change is to see more private vehicle use on our roads, and I would like to know what research or analysis the member has undertaken to understand what the impacts are going to be on our roads.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** The intention of this bill is quite clear. What the minister fails to mention to this house and to people in our suburban streets is the fact that this bill does not reduce the level of car parking provided. On the one hand, he argues that it is going to reduce the level of car parking, which actually the code does. On the other hand, he says it is going to increase car ownership. You cannot have it both ways, minister. It either will increase car ownership or it will not, and it will actually have less car parking. You want to on the one hand say it is going to provide fewer car parks, but do more car parks under his code actually lead to fewer cars? That is an interesting argument.

On the one hand, he says that this bill is restrictive and will reduce the level of onsite car parking, but that this bill, which in his view provides less car parking, actually produces more car usage. The logic in that just fails me. It is interesting he says that. Very importantly, all this does is it makes it very clear. It adds clarity to the process to make sure these are the requirements that are under the code. As the minister is aware, there is a requirement that these things are assessed under what they call performance assessment, and that there is discretion by every council.

That discretion, that rounding off, has led to the problems we have today. It is interesting that the member for Unley already acknowledges that a problem exists today, but he is not prepared to address it and deal with it, which would provide these residents with some protection. If this bill only does one thing it provides protection for residents in our suburban streets, to make sure that their streets are not continuously congested by cars that are not parked in the right location. It is as simple as that.

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** That is not what this bill does. Again, the fact that the member does not understand this is clearly why this bill needs to be voted down, and it needs to be voted down this morning. If the member sought merely to try to enshrine car parking rates within suburban Adelaide, why is this bill not contained only to those suburban areas of Adelaide? In fact, it does not even provide for a difference anywhere across the state. This is a blunt, one-size-fits-all tool.

If the member was actually seeking to resolve the problem that he believes is not being resolved as part of the code, why not nuance this bill to make it only in relation to suburban areas? It is because he simply does not understand the legislation he is putting in. All this does is punish

people who live close to public transport and punish people who want to live within the CBD. That is what it does.

He believes, in some corner of his mind, that it improves car parking opportunities in suburban Adelaide. Materially, it does not. But what is interesting is that it creates a huge conflict in the way that our planning system operates. The reason that it does that is that it creates, essentially, this blunt tool.

The planning system is supposed to operate to provide choice for people to live how they would like to live. Some people want to live on a beautiful rural living block out on the peri-urban fringe in my electorate, or the member for Heysen's electorate, or even the member for Hammond's electorate, and they want a large block to be able to live quietly and enjoy themselves—not in the middle of nowhere, but somewhere where it is quieter. There are people at the other end of the spectrum who want to live a bustling city lifestyle. Those people have a very different way of approaching the way that they live and the way that they move around.

People on the outskirts, in the outer suburbs, in rural living zones or on the peri-urban fringe know that they are going to use a car, because as soon as you are outside of metropolitan Adelaide, the provision of public transport is not really that great. Conversely, if you live in the centre of town, your access to a taxi, a tram, a train, a bus, a bike, a scooter or whatever else is vastly improved.

When people make choices about this, they weigh up the balance of those costs. If you are living in Adelaide, you could say, 'Okay, an apartment is not necessarily that cheap, but I don't need a car park and I don't need to have a car; therefore, I could save on that. I will live on a more expensive piece of land but I will be able to have the lifestyle I want.' Under this bill, those people get punished for no reason other than the member could not think of a more nuanced policy than the blunt bill we have here today.

There are those who choose to live further away. They may think, 'My land is cheaper and the building of my house will be cheaper, but I know that I am going to have a car or a couple of cars, because my young kids are about to get their driver's licence and I don't want to drive them to football training on a weeknight.' They know that they are trading the cost of that land versus needing to provide transport. The planning system needs to be able to account for both of those extremes and everything in between.

In and around Marion, for instance, there have been a lot of two-for-one and three-for-one developments, which I actually think have been of a reasonable quality—certainly, they are a lot better than what has happened at Campbelltown, which is an issue we have sought to fix. Residents around that area could say, 'I'm only 500 metres from the Oaklands train station, so I will have one car, but I go to work in Adelaide every day so I am just going to go to the Oaklands train station and catch the train into town. Therefore, I only need to have one car. I choose to live here, on a slightly smaller block, because it becomes affordable, but I am going to take advantage of the existing public transport options.'

Those people will be punished under this bill for no reason other than the member for Light could not think of a more nuanced bill than the one before us today. This also hurts housing affordability. I thought the member for Light was a champion of working-class people. This bill makes houses more expensive for people who would otherwise not want the expense of needing the land for an extra car park because they have alternative public transport options, which actually helps the rest of us who have to drive, because that means there are fewer cars on the roads. Those people will be punished by this bill.

This bill does not help the people the member for Light believes it is helping because the Planning and Design Code already provides for substantially the same car parking requirements this bill seeks to achieve. It does not actually have an upside; it only has downsides for people who can least afford it. That is why I think this bill is disgusting.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! Before I call the member for Light—and I will call him in a moment—I just remind members that the time for private members' business will expire at 11.30, so if we want

this particular bill dealt with we need to do it before then. I will just remind members of that. Member for Light.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Perhaps you need to remind the people on your right, sir. What the minister has just said is interesting because he has actually almost come to a position where he says my bill is not much different from the code. That is very interesting. He started off an hour ago—

**The Hon. S.K. KNOLL:** That is not what I said.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Let me finish. I did not interrupt him; let me finish. His words were that there was 'no material difference' between the code and what I am suggesting in terms of the provision of car parking. Then he says that it has 'no upside' because it does what the code is doing. That is interesting.

My bill, on the one hand, almost delivers what the code does. There are two differences. One is that it is a guaranteed figure. In the code, it is not guaranteed; it is performance assessed and subject to every individual council interpreting the rules as they see them. That has led us to the existing problem in a range of inner city suburbs and some parts of the City of Adelaide.

The second thing is the bill does not punish anybody because it provides a process where the car parking requirement can be reduced quite substantially if the case can be made. In some parts of the City of Adelaide, there are people who say there should be more car parking associated with development. The bill provides protection for those residential parts of the City of Adelaide against those people who complain about their streets and laneways being clogged up with cars today.

The minister talks about this whole big expensive process. Importantly, most of the developments in the City of Adelaide—these multilevel apartment blocks—would go to SCAP anyway because of their value. They would be assessed by SCAP, so there is no difference. All it says is that SCAP has to have regard to these requirements, etc. Any development that is \$10 million or above has to go to SCAP.

**Mr Brown:** Read the bill.

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO:** Read the bill—perhaps you should read the bill. Restricted development means it is assessed by SCAP. The commission and departmental officers explained to me that restricted development means that it goes to SCAP. That is what it means. It is not in the same terms or language of noncomplying, which the minister has misleadingly tried to convey in this chamber. The bill actually does what the code does: it adds clarity and certainty for people in our suburbs. I do not have a problem with protecting people in our suburbs but the minister clearly has.

**Ms COOK:** I want to speak on this. It is interesting that we hear members talking about dignity and improving the lives of people in our community and supporting vulnerable people. The minister started talking about affordable housing like he cares about vulnerable people, such as people who can be—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Hurtle Vale—

**Ms COOK:** Yes, I am talking to vulnerability and affordable housing.

**The CHAIR:** You are talking to clause 6?

**Ms COOK:** Yes, correct. If we really legitimately care about vulnerable people in our community, in respect to where they live and how they live their lives, then we should really be considering how these people could be confronted by people protesting at termination clinics—abortion clinics. We could have brought this debate on today and we could have really changed the lives of people in our community. Instead, what we saw, again—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Hurtle Vale, you are now not speaking to clause 6.

**Ms COOK:** Sorry, I will try to bring it back. The issue of housing affordability was raised and that speaks directly to quality of life. It speaks directly to how we as members—

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Point of order: it is not about speaking to the debate that has been in the chamber; it is actually about speaking to the clause of the bill.

**The CHAIR:** Just a moment, please, minister. Member for Hurtle Vale, there is a point of order, which means that you need to take your seat while I hear the point of order. Minister.

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** The member is not speaking to the clause. She is referring to what may have been debate earlier in debating other clauses. I ask you to bring her back to the substance of the debate, which of course is clause 6.

**The CHAIR:** It is clause 6 of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Carparking Requirements) Amendment Bill. The member for Hurtle Vale is well aware of that. I have asked her already to come back. She has indicated that she would. You now have the call, member for Hurtle Vale, in the dying moments.

**Ms COOK:** In respect of my electorate and car parks and the number of cars able to park at houses, what we see is regular subdivision happening. We have one property that previously only had one or two vehicles parking at it and suddenly we get three or four or five properties—

**The Hon. D.G. PISONI:** Point of order: the member appears to be speaking about clause 5, which has already been debated.

*Members interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Order! I am not going to accept that point of order because—and the member for Light knows this—I have given all members some latitude during this debate. Given that there are only seven clauses, I have given members some latitude. Member for Hurtle Vale and member for Light, you need to work out what you want to do here. We have only a couple of minutes left for private members' business. The member for Hurtle Vale has the call.

**Ms COOK:** This morning, I visited a property in my electorate that is on a corner block. It is a house that has been in disrepair for almost two decades because of issues with the owner and there have been many discussions about subdividing the property. The land is a quarter-acre block and there could potentially be four or five properties built on it. In terms of putting four or five properties on it, it means a house, where you could have one or two cars, could potentially have up to 10 cars parked on that property.

So that would directly affect the people in the neighbourhood. It would directly provide challenges in terms of its being on a corner as well. It is actually on quite a steep hill where the house is situated. What I could see is a lot of potential for accidents and safety risks for the people living in the suburb of Reynella East. This house has been in disrepair for 20 years. In fact, in the backyard it has a swimming pool that is full of black sludge, so I have been working really hard to try to get that resolved as well. There are levers that we can pull in planning that make a difference. There are levers that we can pull in legislation that make a difference. I was hoping we would pull one today that would make a huge difference to the safety of people.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Motions*

### **DOWN SYNDROME**

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (13:30):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) celebrates the lives and achievements of South Australians living with Down syndrome and the contribution they make in our local communities; and
- (b) recommits to ensuring South Australians living with Down syndrome can fully participate in society through strong, progressive legislative leadership.

It gives me great pride to move my motion today supporting people in our community who have Down syndrome. Many of us in our community would know people with Down syndrome, so today I move this motion.

Down syndrome is a genetic condition where the chromosome number is affected within the DNA of the embryo. It is a condition which can be detected very early on in a pregnancy. In fact, these days you can detect that condition within the first couple of months quite categorically. As we

know, people with Down syndrome, like all people in our community, are different. Each one of them is different and each one of them has a different capacity in terms of their ability to function and their level of independence in living with disability in our community.

People who are pregnant, families who are going through the journey of pregnancy, often will choose to have screening for Down syndrome as one of a number of genetic and other medical conditions that can be detected in pregnancy. As I said before, these days we can detect that diagnosis quite early. I wanted to raise the point within this that we need to have choice, we need to have support and we need to have proper counselling and love for the people who are going through this very difficult time.

I can talk from a very personal experience on a number of levels, just to bring this together. I was pregnant at the age of 43. It does not take a genetic counsellor to understand that the risk of having a baby with Down syndrome is much more likely; in fact, I think it is something like a one in 32 chance at an older age. There is also a range of other genetic conditions that can be diagnosed. At the age of 43, my husband and I had older children and we were financially stable and sound, and we felt that we would be able to support and love a child with Down syndrome no matter what. We knew there were other genetic conditions that are more life limiting.

We decided that we would screen only for a range of conditions and that if our child, our baby, had Down syndrome we would continue with pregnancy and monitor the medical status of the child throughout the pregnancy, knowing that babies with Down syndrome can have severe and significant life-limiting cardiac problems, severe and life-limiting other medical problems. My husband and I felt strong and that we could provide a loving home for a child with Down syndrome, so we stopped the screening once we were confident there were no other detectable conditions, we rode the journey and we did not know.

Our son does not have Down syndrome, but I have friends whose children do. Some of them also made that decision, that they were in a position where a baby, a child, with Down syndrome could be loved, supported, cared for, nurtured and thrive in their house. But I also have friends who decided they could not, and for them my heart aches for the decision they made based on what their family could provide.

I thank all the people involved in providing pregnancy support, love and care and pastoral care for people, understanding that not every baby or child develops the same and that there are different levels of capacity and ability to enjoy a productive life. That is why in a modern society, in here, in this place, we must do all we can to provide for safe and loving choices to be made.

I want to thank all the people in our community, like my friends, who love, care for and provide wonderful support for a child, an adult child—some little children, toddlers—with Down syndrome. I watch their love, I watch their patience, I watch the variation in behaviours, I watch the different levels of education that children can achieve and I watch the support workers who deliver care and love to those children, and I thank them.

As legislators, as people with the capacity to provide the best possible support in the community through legislation, through funding, we need to work together to ensure that these families do not have to screen for health counselling during pregnancy where they are not given all the options. I hear people say they do not hear all the options spelt out. They hear terror, doom and gloom or they hear sunshine and lollipops; it is not the case. It can be such a varied journey.

I hear about people with children with Down syndrome who have incredibly challenging behaviours. It takes some children 10 years to learn what our children who do not have a problem take only weeks to learn. In terms of education, the community and the NDIS, for example, we want to make sure that what is on offer is accessible, it works, it is flexible, it is agile and it allows for families to have choices.

I have just spoken, and over many weeks I have spoken, about the pregnancy advisory clinic and the service provided for counselling through pregnancy. I wish to acknowledge many people in the gallery today who have been involved in the counselling, support and love for these families who need to have safe and dignified choices. I thank them for what they do. I thank them equally, as I thank community organisations that provide care, support workers, love, compassion and

opportunities for many people living with Down syndrome in our community. They now have more options than they have ever had before.

They have the opportunity to complete school. I have never seen such happy faces as those of people with disabilities, such as Down syndrome, when they complete their SACE, their schooling and their traineeships. I thank them for that. We in this place need to make a commitment to ensure that we do everything we can, that choices are real across the full life trajectory, that choices are there and that choices are available. I commend the motion.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:40):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Delete paragraph (b) and insert in lieu thereof:

- (b) is committed to policy and legislative leadership that builds upon the vision that all South Australians living with disability have equal opportunities to fully participate in our community. This includes people living with Down syndrome

After paragraph (b) insert:

- (c) acknowledges the legislative leadership of the Marshall Liberal government who ensured the passage of the Disability Inclusion Act 2018 as the first piece of legislation passed through parliament under the new state government.

I note the mover of the motion has sought that we celebrate the lives and achievements of South Australians living with Down syndrome, and I fully endorse her comments in that regard. As is well known I think to most, Down syndrome is a genetic condition. It causes a level of intellectual and developmental challenges, and some of the health risks have been identified by the mover of the motion.

However, people in these circumstances are affected in very different ways. We have about a thousand South Australians who suffer from Down syndrome, and there are somewhere between 15 and 20 babies born a year with Down syndrome. It is important that we all recognise—and this motion does serve to do this—that people living with Down syndrome have the same ambitions and goals as each and every one of us who may not suffer from that condition but that to achieve those goals with Down syndrome is likely to require a much different level of support. Raising public awareness is important, and World Down Syndrome Day, celebrated each year on 21 March, is an important addition to the recognition of the month.

On 3 December (that is, yesterday), the International Day of People with Disability was celebrated with a range of other events across Adelaide, and I am advised that this Friday ParaQuad SA, Lifetime Support Authority and Brain Injury SA have organised the event Celebrate on the Square at Victoria Square between 11am and 3pm, and I urge any members who are available to support that.

What has actually happened is important to recognise. Since the passing of the Disability Inclusion Act 2018—part of our first 100 days commitment—we have continued to build on that commitment by developing and introducing a range of policy initiatives. The first was on 31 October this year, when the government gazetted the state's first disability inclusion plan, Inclusive SA. It is an important document. I urge members to read it. It sets a blueprint for how we might undertake a number of initiatives in this regard.

Obviously, it requires developing an event toolkit to promote accessible and inclusive practices. We need collaboration, we need to explore opportunities, and they are all matters that are underway. The inclusive playgrounds program has been launched, and the first Inclusive Play guidelines have been published. This is a really important initiative because in the design of our playgrounds we need to accommodate the needs of children.

The Disability Advocate, I am proud to say, has been Dr David Caudrey, and under our government his term as the Disability Advocate has been extended until June 2020. We think that in this new area of disability service delivery the extension will assist in ensuring that the issues arising from national reforms are identified quickly, and it is important that we action those.

Can I also refer to the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme. Following strong advocacy from our government, at the COAG Disability Reform Council on 9 October this year the

federal government agreed to fund the continuation of the state government's SA Transport Subsidy Scheme until 31 October 2021. That is signed up. The NDIA will commence this process from mid next year with respect to the continuation by ensuring that we, of course, in the meantime continue to use the taxi vouchers until individual plans are reviewed and adequate individual transport needs are addressed.

It is important to note that originally SATSS was extended until the end of the year whilst advocating for a long-term solution to ensure the most vulnerable are protected. Unfortunately, during this process the state Labor opposition were continuing to create alarm for people living with disability over transport issues, resulting in unnecessary stress. It must be noted that it was the previous Labor government that created the issue of agreeing to cash out SATSS to the NDIS without a plan in place, which has led to uncertainty for many people.

Under other initiatives that I think are really exciting, we had the announcement of a commitment to the City of Adelaide in March this year of \$1 million to build Quentin's playground, an inclusive play space, commemorating the legacy of disability advocate, actor and filmmaker, Quentin Kenihan. He was a really fun, young man.

Sadly, Quentin passed away, but he was a strong advocate and it is important that we recognise his contribution and ensure that we have play spaces that include sensory elements, water play and features that encourage shared play and that are suitable for children and parents in wheelchairs. Obviously, we are specifically acknowledging those who have health challenges that might accompany Down syndrome.

On Global Accessibility Awareness Day, on 16 May this year, the government launched a new online accessibility policy and online toolkit to assist all South Australian organisations to create more accessible digital platforms. I am proud to say that South Australia reached full-scheme transition to the National Disability Insurance Scheme (NDIS) in June this year. Obviously, we have committed \$749 million to the NDIS to support the delivery of quality services for South Australians, and we will continue to work with the commonwealth to maximise the opportunities for those who require it.

The National Disability Strategy 2010-2020 is about creating 'an inclusive Australian society that enables people with disability to fulfil their potential as equal citizens'. The state government is also working with the commonwealth and other states and territories to develop the new national disability strategy for 2020 and beyond once the current strategy expires. I also bring to the attention of the house the matter of the federal royal commission.

As a new government, we have committed \$5.5 million in the 2019-20 state budget to establish a dedicated central response unit to address and coordinate the South Australian government's response to the commonwealth Royal Commission into Violence, Abuse, Neglect and Exploitation of People with Disability. This is in addition to commitments made earlier in the year to provide \$3.2 million to set up a similar response unit solely focused on the Royal Commission into Aged Care Quality and Safety, a unit that has already undertaken significant work in coordinating the state's response.

This royal commission is obviously very broad. It may take some time to implement under the responsibility of the federal government, but I note that it had the support of both major parties leading up to the federal election. We have put money on the table to make sure that this is an effective assessment. Whilst that is an important investigation dealing with matters of abuse, neglect and the like, I would like to conclude on a happy note.

Of the thousand people who live in our community who have Down syndrome and the families who support them, who provide that extra support, we recognise you, we see you and we are committed to ensuring that you have the opportunities of others who do not face the same challenges as you do. This government has lined up the first piece of legislation to make sure that happens.

**Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (11:49):** I thank the Attorney-General for her contribution. I indicate that we will not be supporting the amendment. Principally, the private member's motion that I moved

was intended to be apolitical. It was intended to celebrate a group of people in our community who, for many, many years, have not had opportunities and celebration.

In fact, for many years people with Down syndrome were institutionalised, locked away, ignored and not seen. Now, because of the great work of many organisations and many wonderful families, people with Down syndrome are very much part of the community, as everybody is part of the community. They participate, they thrive and, in spite of the challenges, they are able to effectively undertake education, work and a whole range of things. On this side, we will not support amendments that introduce political argument into the motion.

I am sure that everybody in this place has been invited to and is attending or has attended Disability Day activities over this week and seen so much of the joy that is happening. It also brings to light many conversations. Firstly, I congratulate the previous minister for disability (member for Reynell, now shadow minister for multicultural affairs, women, sport and racing in this place) on leading that initial introduction of the Disability Inclusion Act. Had it not been for the ending of parliament, that would have come under the Labor government.

I acknowledge that it was definitely a priority as it came through under the incoming Marshall Liberal government. However, in the last month or so, since the release of the act and further discussions, I have had quite a number of people in my circle of people with disability who keep me abreast of things—and I have to say that circle is in the many hundreds who communicate regularly via various sources—say that they think it is weak. They actually do think it is weakened.

Over the break, I will be working to establish why they think it is weak and why it is not what they expected it to be. Only last night, I was approached by a wonderful advocate in the community, a woman living with disability, a very high-achieving legal woman, who swore and said it was p-weak. I respect her take on that. I do not have the lived experience of living with disability. I can only go on what other people say and I trust these people are disappointed.

We will not be supporting the amendment, but I respect and appreciate the genuine nature underneath that of the Attorney-General's passion and support for what is ostensibly a motion to celebrate and a motion to bring us together across all party lines to support people in our community with Down syndrome to make sure that they live the best life possible.

Amendment carried; motion as amended carried.

### **COASTLINE PROTECTION**

**Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:54):** I move:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the significant asset that our coastline represents to the South Australian community and economy;
- (b) acknowledges that preservation and protection of this precious natural resource will benefit generations to come; and
- (c) acknowledges the Liberal government's significant investment in the preservation of South Australia's coastline.

I take the opportunity in parliament today to speak about the importance of the 5,067 kilometres of both metropolitan and regional coastline in South Australia. Approximately 90 per cent of South Australians live on or near the coast. I spoke in parliament last week about the importance of surf lifesaving, and a large part of that is due to the fact that beaches are so very popular with people. That means that many people visit the beach and need to be kept safe. In fact, the beaches around South Australia are the most visited public land in South Australia.

In terms of my electorate of Morphett, the stretch of beach that sits in that electorate goes from the outlet of the Patawalonga near the Glenelg breakwater down south through Somerton Park, down to the John Miller Reserve at Somerton Park. This large continuous open space is the largest continuous open space in Morphett, with a coast park as well, which many people get to use on an ongoing basis, especially on weekends.

Of course, before European settlement the coast had many dunes along it. In fact, these dunes formed a natural barrier to not only the rivers and creeks that ran out to the sea but also the

ocean. That barrier meant that there was lots of marshland just behind the dunes. When the first European settlers came here on the *Buffalo* and set anchor in Holdfast Bay, the landing party then went up the Patawalonga. In fact, they had to go inland about a kilometre to find that dry land. That is why, on Proclamation Day at the Old Gum Tree, we have the ceremony where South Australia was first proclaimed.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** The government was first proclaimed.

**Mr PATTERSON:** The government was first proclaimed. Thank you, Attorney, for pointing that out.

**The Hon. V.A. Chapman:** Kangaroo Island was the first place that was settled.

**Mr PATTERSON:** I see. Yes, of course, Kangaroo Island was landed on and looked at. Unfortunately, it did not have enough fresh water to sustain a burgeoning city, such as Adelaide was to become. That point really does reflect on the fact that the Old Gum Tree is on the city side of Brighton Road. Today's development has it about a kilometre inland. I suppose that shows what the natural environment was like beforehand, because the Mount Lofty Ranges were a bit like a green island, so the rain falls down and makes its way back to the coast.

Coming back to the point around coastlines, the dunes and the marshes that were originally there formed quite a barrier towards the coast as well. In fact, while there has been a lot of development, there are still some remnant dunes along the Adelaide metropolitan coastline. Tennyson has dunes and there is also the Minda dunes near Somerton Park, between Repton Road and Gladstone Road in North Brighton.

The member for Gibson and I recently opened the coast park that brought those two sections of coast park together. The great thing about going for a walk along there is not only that the coast park has been put behind the primary dune, so it does not actually damage the dune, but also that it gives people the opportunity to see what a dune system looks like. We still have the secondary dunes there as well, which help reinforce the natural dune system that builds up sand over many, many years.

Along with protecting those dune systems, many volunteers have helped to revegetate the dunes over the years. They add another bulwark to the dunes to stop erosion from occurring. As I touched on, going back over a century development has occurred not only on the dunes but also quite close to the coast. This has meant that rock walls have now been put in place where dunes once were to provide that natural protection. We now have rock walls in place to protect not only the road infrastructure and coast park infrastructure but also housing.

The natural protection that dunes offer to replenish beaches after storms has gone, so these sandy beaches are now prone to the natural movements that take place, the northward littoral drift that occurs naturally at Gulf St Vincent, where the waves heading north cause the sand to build up on the northern beaches at North Haven and Semaphore, while at the same time eroding those southern and central coast beaches, starting at Kingston Park and working their way up through Seacliff, Brighton, Somerton Park, Glenelg and then on to West Beach and Henley Beach South. Essentially, you could think of the metropolitan coastline as being one long beach running 28 kilometres, from Kingston Park to Outer Harbor.

Unfortunately, the loss of this sand over time means that there is less sand on the beach to reduce the strength of incoming waves and absorb storm energy, which does occur, and this also increases erosion further. Because of this, you have this challenge where sand is being washed away. The beaches are an important public asset, the most visited public realm in South Australia, and so since 1973 there has been a need to see these beaches protected via sand replenishment. That has resulted in sand being moved back, reticulated through the system, from the northern beaches back to the southern beaches.

Even with this occurring, critical shortfalls have still occurred at certain beaches, such as West Beach. I know that the member for Colton has been really active in his advocacy to see the West Beach protected. There has also been a wider net sand loss through the beach system overall because of storms and also, to some extent, rising sea levels.

In fact, a report commissioned by the Danish Hydraulic Institute showed that the loss of sand at West Beach has been significant and that the actual loss was greater than first estimated. We need to look at a sustainable approach to managing our beaches that will involve, to some extent, recycling some of the sand where sand builds up, and also adding external sand to the system, which is really quite important.

I should say that this year the parliament passed the Landscape SA Act, which helps to prioritise coastal management as one of the seven priority focus areas for Green Adelaide, which does help ensure there will be a coordinated approach to managing our metropolitan coastline. It will involve partnerships with local government and non-government organisations. This act also looks at the effects of, and addressed the significance of, climate change to the management of our natural resources, and this was given express recognition in the objects of the Landscape SA Act.

Of course, to touch on climate change and the effects it has on rising sea levels, it really is a global problem. It is not something that we can think South Australia can address alone. Even at a national level as well, it is something that is bigger than just our country. We have had lots of debates around trying to reduce emissions from electricity generation, but there are so many other factors involved in what potentially could be driving climate change. Whether it be from the transport sector, the agricultural sector, deforestation or population growth, there are many factors at play here in South Australia.

It has been widely reported in the commentary that Australia produces 1.3 per cent of global greenhouse gas emissions. So, yes, while there is work that can be done by both the South Australian government and the Australian government, I think we need to realise that it is a global problem. Certainly, where the state government has to pay attention, and is paying attention, is in the form of adaption to what can happen. We have to be quite open with our constituencies around that as well. There is a lot of pressure on governments to act, and I think one area where we need to act is in adaption. That is certainly what we are doing as a government in terms of practical measures on the ground, and one of those is the coastal management that we are looking to do here.

In fact, in the 2019-20 state budget the government included a significant solution for our coasts by injecting \$48 million of new funds to be invested into our metropolitan coastline over the next four years. Part of this was beach replenishment: \$20 million is to be put towards additional sand, which will equate to approximately 500,000 cubic metres of newly sourced sand being added into the system. This would also be supplemented with \$28.4 million being put towards the completion of the sand recycling pipeline from Semaphore to West Beach.

I will just touch on the benefits of this pipeline. There is currently a pipeline between Glenelg and Kingston Park. I can certainly remember, before the pipeline was in place, that a lot of the sand replenishment would involve trucks carting sand from Glenelg Beach and making their way through many local streets. Heavy trucks would drive along Glenelg and leave big grooves in the sand. They would go along Kent Street, which is quite narrow, before going down Moseley Street and King George Avenue to the southern beaches.

That was quite noisy and dangerous, and during the winter months it was less than attractive on Glenelg Beach, which, as I have said before, is one of the most visited public spaces in South Australia. The replacement of these trucks occurred in November 2013; I acknowledge that the former government put that in place. Those pipelines allow for sand to be collected at the Glenelg pumping station, which runs on an electric motor and is very quiet. In fact, the pumping station is in front of the heavily used playground by the Glenelg Town Hall.

The pumping station has been set up as a viewing platform, with shade sails for sun protection. Many would not be aware that it is actually a pumping station. The sand is mixed with sea water to form a slurry—roughly 70 per cent sea water to 30 per cent sand—and this slurry makes it way through pipes that go along the coast. There are booster stations at John Miller Reserve in Somerton Park and Wattle Reserve in Hove, in order to make its way further south.

There are 11 discharge points, which means that sand can be injected onto beaches. It is quite targeted; that sand is washed around by natural wave action and helps to replenish those beaches. I think the extension of the sand pipeline from Semaphore to West Beach is going to be

fantastic, and the \$28.4 million investment there will be fantastic for local communities. I hope the member for Colton will contribute to this motion and go into that further.

In the time remaining, I will also spend some time discussing another activity that may not be so obvious, in terms of the coast: the blue carbon strategy that the minister is looking to progress. Principally, blue carbon is centred around underwater ecosystems, quite close to the tidal flats. I think 90 per cent of the blue carbon in South Australia is produced in seagrass meadows. There are also saltmarshes and mangroves. If managed well, these have the ability to capture carbon.

I think the minister has introduced a strategy around blue carbon and is trying to progress that. This will hopefully have great benefits in being able to absorb carbon, which can last for hundreds even thousands of years. That will be really important for us going forward, as will the effect of the regeneration of sea meadows has on local habitats and fisheries. In terms of local fish stocks, that is certainly going to be important.

They are some—not all—of the strategies being progressed by this government in order to protect the coast, which is so very important, not only to my constituents in Morphett but to all South Australians who love to use our beaches, now and for many years to come.

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:09):** I rise to perhaps somewhat reluctantly support this motion. I considered whether to propose an amendment, because the last dot point is a little self-congratulatory on behalf of the government. I am not entirely convinced that all the ways in which money is being spent by this government on the coast are appropriate.

Nonetheless, I acknowledge that there is significant investment and that at least some of the ways in which that money is being spent will be useful and good for the environment. Therefore, in the generosity of the nearly last day of parliament, I have decided not to vainly attempt to amend it. However, I would say two things: one is that we have to treat our coastline with enormous caution in the way that we actively manage it, and I will come back to that; the other is to note that our coast all the way around South Australia is under very serious threat.

It is under threat anyway because coastal processes can be reasonably aggressive and often incompatible with the way in which humans choose to arrange their developments, i.e. they love to build near the beach, as we all do, because we love to look at the sea, and that is not always compatible with the way in which coastlines move and evolve over time. It is absolutely an acute issue in the face of climate change. The looming threat from increased storms, as well as sea level rise, is something that we are going to deal with over a number of years and decades, I hope in a bipartisan way, because if we do not we will leave South Australia far poorer.

One element of the expenditure that I will acknowledge is positive, although I think everyone would agree completely inadequate, is the \$4 million for coast protection works in the regions. I acknowledge that. I am pleased that it is there. Obviously, it will not go far. It will be in partnership with local governments, but many coastal councils have raised with me the desperate need for a far greater fund, and so I am hopeful, as I said, that over the years and decades it is something that we will collectively give priority to.

To return to the first issue of the need to exercise caution in the way in which we actively manage our coasts, I think that we can be a little captured by an engineering approach, rather than an environmental approach. That became particularly acutely obvious to me when dealing with the Semaphore issue. I used to work in the department. I worked there for about seven years and have the highest respect for the people who work there and their expertise. I do not ever want to be one of those members of parliament, particularly in opposition, who choose to blame public servants. I have always chosen to speak truthfully and well of the earnest desire in the Public Service to do a very good job.

But I think the proposal to put a truck road through a dune that has never had a truck road through it and to have it there probably permanently—there was no proposal that I ever saw to remove it—was cavalier. For two years, the road would take trucks up to 20 weeks a year and during those weeks, during working days, there would be a truck every six minutes full of sand going up and down that road through the dunes. I think that was an example of the local environment and the

values of that local environment to the environment itself, not just to the people who enjoy it and care for it.

It was overriding what is a legitimate desire to protect and to preserve local environments that are important for supporting local biodiversity, local fauna and flora, as well as being extremely important to the community that had spent a lot of time planting in those dunes, weeding in those dunes and, of course, erecting those fabulous signs that warn of snakes. I know there are snakes there. I have never actually seen one. I have always regarded those signs as being more useful for deterring people from running through the dunes and causing chaos, but I believe that there are a few snakes there, and that is great. That is part of nature.

But the idea that you deal with the absence of sand on one beach by going to a small two-kilometre stretch and treating it effectively as a sand mine, with the amount of sand that was proposed to be moved in a two-year period, I think is not an environmentally sensitive approach. I was very pleased when, after a week of stand-off between the local community that was unhappy about the truck road being built and the contractors of the department who had been asked to build this road, the minister and the department found a way of managing that particular issue.

But there are more issues. We need to get sand onto West Beach. There is pretty serious damage that has been done to the southern Semaphore beach where there has long been sand mining as a result of the construction of the groyne at Point Malcolm. In the lee of that groyne—I think I am using the right nautical term—there is terrible damage that has been done to the dunes. In effect, the dunes have gone. You can now have the water come all the way up to the bike path and the grassed area which had been regarded as safe for people to use for recreation separate to the dunes. That now has been eroded as a result of the combination of the groyne and the sand mining that has been occurring.

That was one of the reasons we were so sceptical further north because we had seen it happen and that it was possible to do damage. Does that save West Beach? According to the environmental report, no, because the sand that would be moved down would wash off reasonably quickly. In fact, one of the contractors or possibly a member of the department said that it only needed to survive a couple of storms—that was all it was doing—while waiting for the external sand to come on. The proposition was that you wreck one beach in order to survive a couple of storms at another beach.

The idea of external sand coming in is a good one. It was done in the late 1990s and it is long overdue. I wish that the last government, my government, had done it and I think it is excellent that this government is going to do it. I do not quite understand why it is going to take so long to source the sand, and the proposition was to—

*Mr Cowdrey interjecting:*

**Dr CLOSE:** Well, it is sand. Does it take two years to find sand and dig it up? I do not think so. I think that there would be ways to expedite that if it were seen as a priority, and I hope that that will be happening. But I am also concerned about the sand pumping because surely one of the reasons that West Beach is deprived of sand is that the sand that used to come from further south is no longer coming because it is being pumped down again.

In our desire to have engineering solutions that are easy, are we creating more problems that then require more money to be spent? I would like to see a proper account of that, because certainly all the people in Semaphore who were protesting were extremely sympathetic to the need for Henley South, and West Beach in particular, to be looked after. So there is no sense that we only cared about our stretch of sand. The fact that an accommodation has been able to be found does suggest that we were right that it was an extremely blunt instrument that was being proposed to be used.

With those words, as I said, I support the motion. I particularly hope that, on the metropolitan coastline but also the full South Australian coastline, we can work on this more closely together on both sides of parliament to find solutions that are acceptable to all communities and that will manage the very significant changes that we will see to our coastline under every scenario for climate change.

**Mr COWDREY (Colton) (12:18):** I rise today to support the motion brought forward by the member for Morphett, as follows:

That this house—

- (a) recognises the significant asset that our coastline represents to the South Australian community and economy;
- (b) acknowledges that preservation and protection of this precious natural resource will benefit generations to come; and
- (c) acknowledges the Liberal government's significant investment in the preservation of South Australia's coastline.

Sir, as you are more than aware, this is an issue that I am significantly passionate about. Many who live in my local area rely in many ways on local beaches. They are the backbone of our local economy. They are the backbone of the social fabric that is the western suburbs—our surf clubs, our community hubs—and many of our sporting clubs are entirely located along the coastline. It is without a shadow of a doubt true to say that our suburbs come to life as soon as we start to hit summer. When the sun comes out, people start to come to the beach. We flock to those areas. That is very much at the core of what the western suburbs are all about.

The member for Morphett has very aptly described the commitment the government has made in regard to our metropolitan coastline, in particular the northern section of coastline running from Semaphore to West Beach. When we talk about the shift of sand down our metropolitan coastline, it is important to note that this is an entirely natural process. It is one that has happened for centuries and it is one that will continue to happen. It is not one that only happens in South Australia. Lateral drift happens along most coastlines that we are aware of. Different communities have decided to adapt and adjust to lateral drift by trying to ensure that beaches that have been utilised very well over the years are maintained for those local communities.

If we look at Queensland, there are significant issues around the Sunshine Coast area, in particular the Maroochy Surf Club and their beachfront, close to the Maroochy River, and also Kings Beach on the Sunshine Coast. If we look along the Gold Coast in particular, each and every year works are done to rectify lateral drift to ensure those beaches are appropriately maintained for generations to come. The solution to lateral drift is different depending on the community, the environment and what is deemed to be appropriate for different communities.

In some European countries, the solution has involved putting groynes down on the coast every 300 metres. It is not something that I imagine our community would be very fond of seeing. From a surf lifesaving perspective, it does not make our coastline very easy to use by any stretch of the imagination. I am not sure it is too appealing to look at. Within those groynes, with lateral drift we have a shift from one side to the other, so we end up with sand still building up and needing to be shifted, even when we look at a solution that involves groynes extending from our coastline every 300 metres.

South Australia traditionally has used a range of different technologies to deal with lateral drift over many, many years, when this was identified as an issue. We have used sand carting for a significant period of time in South Australia. We have, from time to time, done mass replenishments through the use of dredging equipment. However, in the last 10 years it was determined that we were having significant issues along our 28 kilometres of metropolitan coastline.

To that end, after the Glenelg Marina development had occurred, after the West Beach boat ramp was built, instead of having a 28-kilometre stretch of coastline, where sand shifted from the southern beaches to the northern beaches from Kingston Park down to Semaphore and Outer Harbor, we instead created a situation where there is a break in our metropolitan coastline—you could say two sections.

At that point in time, the former government put in a pipeline that ran from Glenelg to Kingston Park. That has been in place, as the member for Morphett rightfully acknowledged, for nearly six years now. In the transition from our southernmost beach, Kingston Park, which was just about entirely decimated by lateral drift over that period of time, we shifted sand through carting over a period of time to ensure that it was maintained to the extent that it could be. However, the introduction

of that pipeline has significantly—significantly—improved the beaches at Kingston Park, at South Brighton, ensuring that the equilibrium is maintained within that southern section of beaches.

Those opposite did not determine that the northern section of beaches was important enough to have a pipeline. So we saw West Beach, the southernmost section now not having sand get to it, decimated. Over the last number of years, year on year, more and more sand has disappeared from West Beach to the point where small storm activity, such as we had on the weekend, puts West Beach in jeopardy. I feel sorry for South Australians. I feel sorry for those members of my community who have had to wait so long to see a long-term solution to this issue put in place, I really do.

I am very proud and happy that the Marshall Liberal government has invested the money necessary to ensure that there will be a long-term solution. I am very happy that the increased short-term solution—increasing the level of sand, the amount of sand coming in via our current carting activities—has been significantly increased and started for this summer. I am glad that that will continue into next summer. I am glad that there will be a significant replenishment made into West Beach, because this is just not about West Beach: this is about the whole section of northern beaches running from Semaphore to West Beach.

We have the appropriate volume of sand getting back to West Beach. It started there. Henley Beach South, certainly around the end of Lexington Street, has been significantly impacted, and that impact will continue to move north but for a long-term solution to this issue. Henley Beach will be next, and Grange will be after that.

If this decision had not been made, we would be putting the whole of our northern section of beaches in jeopardy. I congratulate the Premier, and I congratulate the Minister for Environment and Water on putting the money on the table to ensure that this solution is now in place. I know that my community is incredibly happy to see this. More broadly with respect to our whole coastline, those who use our beaches, and those who use our beaches only occasionally, will have certainty that those beaches will be there in the appropriate form for years to come. I only lament that it has taken so long to have this decision taken.

For the last six years, 100,000 cubic metres has been put in the pipeline at Glenelg and shifted to Kingston Park. We know that that works. I know that the shadow minister for environment raised the issue of an engineering solution, and to that I say: what is the alternate? The position of those opposite was to maintain the status quo. It was to keep trucks on beaches, to keep trucks coming to Semaphore, shifting sand for all of eternity. Without a decision that was the future: trucks continuing to go onto Semaphore beach, to go down to West Beach and go down to Henley Beach South for the foreseeable future.

I do not think that is acceptable, my community does not think that is acceptable, and I am sure that the member for Port Adelaide's community does not think that is acceptable for the longer term. This is a good solution. I am very proud of the Marshall Liberal government for putting it in place, and I entirely support the member for Morphett's motion.

**Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:27):** I move to amend the motion as follows:

Insert:

- (d) acknowledges there is a significant divide between spend on regional coastline infrastructure and projects versus those located in the metropolitan area.

While I have moved my amendment to the motion, there is a whole host of things that I agree with in the original motion, and that is why I have not amended paragraphs (a), (b) or (c). I have moved to insert paragraph (d). Paragraph (a) of this motion could easily have read 'recognises the significant asset that our metropolitan coastline represents to the city people of South Australia' and paragraph (c) could have read 'acknowledges the Liberal government's significant investment in the preservation of metropolitan coastlines.'

I am very interested in future contributions to this motion, particularly from regional members. The member for Flinders, I would suggest, would have the most coastline anywhere in South Australia if you take it from the Western Australian border through to the electorate of the member for Giles. Of course, then you have the electorate of the member for MacKillop down to my electorate, the seat of Mount Gambier. I am trying to point out to the government the trap of falling into a

city-centric Liberal government, and I do so deliberately. Using this example of regional coastline, if you look at the map the coastline outlined is far superior in length and distance to the metropolitan coastlines mentioned by speakers today.

Of course, there has been a significant investment in the preservation of South Australia's metropolitan coastline. This year's budget allocated \$52 million to the overall coastline of South Australia, with \$48 million allocated for metropolitan coastlines, and I am not here arguing that that is not justified. We have to realise that the majority of people in South Australia live in metropolitan areas or peri-urban areas attached to Adelaide. But \$4 million allocated to the rest of South Australia's coastline covering the entirety of the South Australian coastline is nowhere near good enough.

An amount of \$28.4 million of that \$48 million, over half of that, is for just one project: a sand recycling pipeline from Semaphore to West Beach. Again, that is a project I would support. However, we have other avenues of funding. When the Royalties for Regions policy was developed by the Liberal Party, it was meant to set up a fund for the regions. The intent of the Royalties for Regions program was to take mining royalties, acknowledging that all mining activity occurs in regional South Australia, and quarantine 30 per cent for regions' infrastructure spend.

We heard the Minister for Mining say just last week that they have had record revenues from the mining sector—some \$300 million. As a rough rule of thumb, there would be \$90-odd million sitting in a regional investment fund (Royalties for Regions). We then found out when the Auditor-General's Report came up later that day that no such fund has actually been established. Coastal management is a critical environmental, social and economic need. Sand carting is now a fact of life to protect beaches and stabilise foreshores.

However, the vast sums of money spent on sand carting and building infrastructure in the metropolitan region do not sit well with me when I look at regional projects that are of equal importance and in such dire need of attention. The fact that this pool of money is coming out of the solid waste levy is another bone of contention with my councils. The levy increase announced in this year's state budget was \$110 per tonne on 1 July, followed by an increase to \$140 per tonne on 1 January next year. In the regions, the levy is based on 50 per cent of the metro rate and I think it is important to point that out.

Regional councils around the state are being impacted by this hike, as have metropolitan councils. If the returns for councils were equally divided depending on levy contributions, that may be a fair assessment. But if you do the maths you find that regional communities are once again subsidising metropolitan projects. Councils have had to scramble to find the extra money in budgets, and some of them have been forced to pass it along to ratepayers.

When this was announced, most were in the final stages of adopting financial plans and were forced to make changes to accommodate the extra fee. The impact on Wattle Range Council is \$20,000. They were only notified of the solid waste levy hike after they had adopted their budget. The Mount Gambier city council has taken another \$60,000 hit. For regional councils, these are significant costs and money that would otherwise be directed into projects for the good of local communities.

Coastal protection is of immense importance for our state, but so is maintenance of vital coastal infrastructure. There are more than 5,000 kilometres of coastline in South Australia and the Limestone Coast region, which encompasses my electorate of Mount Gambier, which currently has urgent need for fund allocation. We have the largest rock lobster fleet in the Southern Hemisphere with a major safety problem, which I have outlined a number of times in this house.

The Port MacDonnell harbour is essential infrastructure for not only Port MacDonnell but the Limestone Coast and the state's rock lobster fishing industry. Roger Cutting, President of the Port MacDonnell Professional Fisherman's Association, has written to minister Stephan Knoll outlining the problems the local fleet is currently having due to a long-term build-up of sand and seaweed in the harbour. He has called it a 'matter of extreme urgency'.

The levels are so high that professional and recreational fishermen are having trouble refuelling, mooring and moving in and out of the harbour, and they are reporting engine damage due

to weed ingestion. Roger goes on to say that in low tides boats simply cannot fill up with fuel. This is becoming a safety issue. The locals need to be able to use the harbour safely. He has received a response from the minister's office stating that it would take 12 months to get approval to find out where to best dispose of the dredging.

I speak not only for my electorate but for all regional electorates in South Australia. I refer to an article in *The Advertiser* from May, which outlines the dire condition of many of South Australia's regional jetties. There are 36 jetties and wharves across the state and, although they are owned by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, they are actually maintained by local councils under local lease arrangements.

Repair bills are starting to accumulate in excess of \$16 million, and these costs are far beyond the reach of coastal councils. Over the last two years, Kingston District Council spent 37 per cent of its annual expenditure on marine infrastructure. In November last year, the state government gave \$325,000 to eight South Australian councils to manage coastal risks and deal with erosion—seven of these councils were regional. Compare \$48 million with \$300,000 and it is not a fair assessment. With those words, I commend the amended motion to the house.

**Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:37):** I rise to support the amended motion. As someone from regional South Australia, I more than recognise the discrepancy in funding when it comes to supporting the regions compared with the metropolitan area. It is interesting to note that, of the \$52 million that has been made available, \$48 million is to be spent in the metropolitan area and \$4 million is open to the metropolitan area and the regional areas to bid for. We do not even have exclusive use of that \$4 million for 5,000 kilometres of coastline in regional South Australia.

I was incredibly fortunate, at the age of 10, to bowl up in Whyalla, so the sea and the coast became a part of my growing up. Clearly, the coast embodies incredibly significant environmental values, economic values and recreational values. I look at some of the improvements that have taken place over time in my community, a community with heavy industry that has a history of very significant pollution of the coastal environment.

Going back many years now, I have been involved in environmental issues in my community. I have been the chair of the Environmental Consultation Group now for more years than I care to remember. It brought together heavy industry, the community and the council to address environmental issues in a constructive way. One of the issues we faced was the loss of 20 square kilometres of seagrass beds in False Bay, near Whyalla, as a result of discharges into that bay from BHP and then OneSteel, predominantly in the form of ammonia, which encouraged epiphyte growth on seagrass beds.

It is good to see the progress that has occurred, with the massive reduction in ammonia discharge and the building of reed beds to partly address ammonia discharge, as well as a number of other activities that have been undertaken to reduce ammonia discharge, turbidity and heavy metals that were being discharged into the marine environment. As a result, there has been a somewhat patchy comeback in some of the seagrass beds that were lost.

The blue economy or blue carbon was mentioned, and seagrass beds obviously play an incredibly significant role in carbon capture and storage. People generally think that forests do the heavy lifting when it comes to carbon capture and storage but, on a per hectare basis, forests come significantly behind seagrass beds. If you look at the most prolific form of carbon capture and storage on the planet, it is actually tundra. We do not have any of that in Australia, but after tundra it is seagrass beds, mangroves and saltmarshes. These are incredibly important stores of greenhouse gases, so I would be a full-on supporter of anything that the government can do in terms of the marine environment and carbon capture and storage. I think that would be a very worthwhile initiative.

Clearly, I have the Northern Spencer Gulf in my electorate. I am fortunate enough to have part of the coastline, which is a low energy inverse estuary. It is an incredibly unique marine environment, and it has been recognised as such over many years. My coastline extends down to Cowell, where the economic advantage comes predominantly through oyster growers down at Cowell, as well as the charter industry, which has had a bit of a wrecking ball put through it without a thought-through plan or policy in place when it comes to support.

The coast is incredibly important. Obviously, GFG, as it now is, has an import/export facility at Whyalla with the inner harbour and the outer harbour. When pursuing and building on the hydrogen initiatives that the previous government commenced, one thing that the government needs to be mindful of is that the government actually owns a major export facility at Port Bonython, which Santos currently uses.

That facility is used nowhere near to capacity. The last figure I saw, which admittedly goes back a few years now, was about 30 per cent capacity at that particular jetty. If you were to replicate that, it would cost probably somewhere in the order of \$750 million or maybe more in today's dollars. It would be a very expensive undertaking, but at that export facility for hydrocarbon products at Port Bonython you have the capacity in an area with fantastic grid connection, industrial infrastructure and amazing renewable energy resources, to make Whyalla the centre of hydrogen and potentially ammonia production in this state.

It would take hardly anything to be able to export ammonia from the hydrocarbon facility already in place at Whyalla. It always amazes me that we talk about replicating infrastructure elsewhere in the state when we already have an area with a massive comparative advantage staring us in the face. I do not say that in a parochial way—although there is an element of that—but it is a purely objective assessment when you look at what is in place at Port Bonython and at Whyalla. When we talk about hydrogen, it is one of those places that would have to be high on the list.

Unfortunately, when we were in government, there was all that uncertainty surrounding Whyalla, so the two companies that put in bids for some of the funding for hydrogen facilities were at Crystal Brook and at Port Lincoln. We did not have a company interested at the time in Whyalla because of some of the issues going on, but they are becoming settled. Of course, it is not just the potential for export from Whyalla, you have a potential customer with GFG if they do forward their plans about what they want to do about being carbon neutral. Of course, hydrogen is potentially a replacement for coke and coal as a reducing agent when it comes to iron production.

So much for some of the economic aspects. Recreationally, over the years, growing up on the coast, when it comes to fishing, when it comes to diving, when it comes to swimming, when it just comes to hanging around on the coast, it has been a big part of my life. Growing up in Whyalla, we would often escape to the mangrove system that had a number of saltwater creeks where the fishing was great before it was a protected zone. As kids, we would escape for days at a time, get a campfire going, stay overnight, catch flathead, catch flounder, catch a range of other species. It was the way that we grew up.

The member for Flinders has a fantastic coastline. One of the most enjoyable things was taking my kids down to the Lincoln National Park, Coffin Bay National Park, Sheringa, Locks Well and Streaky Bay to go fishing and camping. It is a glorious part of the world. When you go to places like Europe and go to their beaches littered with bodies on sunny days, seeing what we have here in this state, both in my electorate and the member for Flinders' electorate—and I am sure electorates throughout our state—we are truly blessed.

We have to look after our marine environment, and there are some major challenges, climate change being one of them, with ocean acidification, ocean warming and sea level rise. That will provide profound challenges if we do not seriously mitigate at a state, national and global level. With those few words, I will take my seat.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (12:47):** It gives me great pleasure today to be able to come into the chamber and provide my support for the member for Morphett's original motion, recognising the very substantial role that our coastline plays in the lives of South Australians, socially, economically and first and foremost, of course, environmentally as well.

We have 5,067 kilometres of coastline in South Australia, and that is a figure that I regularly quote in this place. I quote it regularly because it is my way of recognising that it is such a vast part of our environment. It is diverse and it has the capacity to give us so much from an economic and recreational point of view. It attracts tourists to enjoy our state and it also provides an incredible area of habitat for our native flora and fauna.

Of that 5,067 kilometres of coastline, the vast majority is found in regional South Australia. I guess there are only around 100 kilometres, or maybe slightly less than that, that you could ever categorise as being part of the metropolitan coastline. When I became the shadow minister for environment in 2017, it was not difficult to do a scan across the horizon and realise that one of the areas that had had the least investment, the least care, the least interest and the least understanding from 16 years of Labor government was the state's fragile and precious coastline.

This area was crying out for policy innovation, financial investment and for the support of the state government of the day. It was not getting it from the Labor Party. In fact, it was an area of public policy that was left to languish. That surprised me, because the previous government was big on talking about climate change, big on the activism, big on the lists, icons and gestures, but not big on the practical outcomes on the ground.

One of the best ways to mitigate and adapt to the impacts of climate change—particularly in South Australia, because of that immense coastline—is to invest in the resilience and vibrancy of the coastline from an environmental point of view and also undertake environmental works to protect our economic assets, whether they be coastal communities, ports that play a role in our economic development or a range of other tourism and natural assets. We went to the state election pledging \$5.2 million towards coastal protection initiatives. That included a focus on replenishment at West Beach.

I acknowledge the vocal, consistent and creative advocacy from the member for Colton around that part of his electorate, which he knows is one of the most vulnerable areas off the metropolitan coastline. We also went to the election with a commitment to invest \$1 million in seagrass restoration projects to improve knowledge and understanding about how to restore seagrasses in our gulf.

Seagrass has historically been such an important part of the gulf, but of course it was substantially degraded as a consequence of the European colonisation of South Australia. I am pleased to report that our seagrass restoration trials in Gulf St Vincent are well underway and are starting to show some real progress. I hope we can learn from that to see more and more seagrass restoration projects continue into the future.

We announced an amount of money towards wetland restoration and creation in the state. We also, I think quite uniquely—government do not do enough of this—announced that we would set up a fund for research and development around coastal activity, looking at ways to create and hold sand on the beach in an innovative way and ensure that we were looking at balancing the conservation with the economic development and social side as well. We wanted to ensure that those beaches under most pressure are sustained in a cutting-edge way.

We have partnered with local councils and with research and academic institutions to make sure that the best science is present in South Australia when managing our metropolitan coastline. We have been rolling out the expanded grants schemes in recent weeks. It has been great to see a number of grants go to councils across the state for research and development projects. However, we really upped the ante in the 2019-20 state budget, providing \$52 million in funding towards a coastal protection initiative across the state.

This included, for the first time, a specific Regional Coast Protection Fund. We did this because under 16 years of Labor, there was no ring-fenced funding for coastal communities across this state. So, for the first time, we have a specific Regional Coast Protection Fund of \$1 million each year. Previously, under Labor, it was \$340,000-odd for the whole state per year; now we have this fund. We will be able to partner with local government and actually achieve outcomes on the ground across regional South Australia.

Is \$1 million enough? How long is a piece of string. We could always do with more money for these environmental programs. Deputy Speaker, I know you represent a coastal community. I represent a coastal community and the quadrupling of funding for regional coastal projects is a far greater benefit than was ever provided under 16 years of Labor. They had \$340,000, or thereabouts, a year. We have taken that to \$1,340,000 a year. That is a substantial effort and we will continue to support regional coastal communities.

Of course, we will also focus on the particular challenges facing West Beach and Henley Beach South—communities that are under threat of being washed into the gulf as a result of very significant and problematic erosion. A great concern for this government is the loss of that coastal environment and recreational space and of course also a loss of economic infrastructure as well. This is what my department and I have been working on, along with the member for Colton. This government is backing the preservation of our metropolitan coastline, recognising what it is worth and putting in place this sand pumping pipeline, as well as a major external sand replenishment project.

What amazed me were the comments from the deputy leader earlier this morning that she does not want an engineering solution. She wants a natural solution. Why did the previous Labor government do work, which I congratulated them on, and put in place the pipeline between Glenelg and Kingston Park, a very successful project, which now the deputy leader has had some sort of epiphany about and does not support anymore? She does not want an engineering solution for the northern and central beaches. She was happy to have it for the southern beaches. I represent those beaches.

I know my communities are grateful for the investment of the previous government in that pipeline. Why is that now the wrong solution under this government? When the current Leader of the Opposition took that position, he said they were not going to be an opposition that opposed for the sake of opposing. This morning, we saw another example of the deputy leader using her position as both a local member and the deputy leader of the South Australian Labor Party to oppose a really good project—a project that will build climate resilience into our metropolitan coastline. It will help us deal with the impacts of increasing storm events.

It will help us deal with rising sea levels and will build lasting resilience in Adelaide's coastline, coupled with a quadrupling of the funding available for regional coastal protection projects. This government is backing a climate-resilient coastline around South Australia, all 5,060 kilometres of it. It is precious. We need to look after it. We need it to be there for future generations and we recognise just how important it is environmentally, socially and economically.

**Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (12:57):** I also rise to thank the member for Morphett for bringing this motion to the house. I wholly support his motion recognising how important the assets of our coasts are. My electorate is very privileged to have an enormous number of assets in those beaches. From west to east, we start with Parsons Beach and Waitpinga Beach, which are great surf and fishing beaches. They are really dangerous beaches, though. Sadly, lives have been lost there. They need to be respected.

We see the beautiful Waitpinga Cliffs, as we work our way across the coastline. We get to Kings Head, which is an important feature on the coastline, as it turns a bit away from being totally exposed to the Southern Ocean. Kings Beach is a lovely, quiet little beach tucked in behind Kings Head. You need to walk there, as you cannot drive there. It is a beautiful part of the world. Then we move across to Petrel Cove. Petrel Cove Beach is another dangerous beach, but a fascinating place in the electorate. It is an amazing place of beauty in the electorate of Finniss. Then we have Rosetta Head, more commonly known as The Bluff. It is a very distinct feature in Victor Harbor and a beautiful part of our coastline.

We then move into the Encounter Bay area and Davenport Anchorage, where boats can come and anchor off Granite Island safely. We then have Policeman Point, Victor Harbor Beach, Hayborough Beach, Oliver's Reef, Dump Beach, Chiton Rocks, Boomer Beach, Knights Beach, Rocky Bay, Lady Bay and Horseshoe Bay in Port Elliot, which is a lovely part of the world. We then have Crockery Bay, Fisherman Bay, Basham Beach, Middleton Beach, Surfers Beach and Goolwa Beach. They are all lovely parts of the world. Five miles off the coastline from Goolwa Beach is where Baudin and Flinders met. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

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

*Petitions***COOBER PEDY WATER SUBSIDY**

**Mr HUGHES (Giles):** Presented a petition signed by 968 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to pay an interim water subsidy to Coober Pedy District Council whilst a permanent solution to the current inequitable situation is found.

*Parliamentary Procedure***PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

Marion, City of Annual Report 2018-19

Port Adelaide Enfield, City of Annual Report 2018-19

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

Community Road Safety Fund—Annual Report 2018-19

Correctional Services, Department for—Annual Report 2018-19

Fire and Emergency Services Commission, South Australian—Annual Report 2018-19

Parole Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2018-19

*Ministerial Statement***MINISTERIAL STATEMENT**

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:02):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

**The SPEAKER:** Leave is sought; is leave granted? Leave is not granted, Deputy Premier.

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** I table my ministerial statement with 49 copies.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Primary Industries and the member for West Torrens are called to order.

*Parliamentary Committees***NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:03):** I bring up the fourth report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into South Australian Livestock Industry.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, it is early in the day still. The member for Heysen.

**LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE**

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:04):** I bring up the 32<sup>nd</sup> report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

*Question Time***SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** My question is to the Premier. When did the Premier sign off on his decision to appoint an interagency government task force to examine the SA Health report from the ICAC commissioner?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** I believe that was yesterday.

**SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:05):** When yesterday?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:05):** I don't have the exact time. We are very pleased to establish—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —an interagency task force to look at this issue because we want to get on with it, as I have already outlined to the house. We take the ICAC commissioner's report on SA Health extraordinarily seriously and that's why we have acted very decisively to establish an interagency task force to look at this report and to report back to the government before the end of the year.

I have asked Jim McDowell, who is the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet, to chair the task force, but we will have representatives from other agencies who will be on that task force. We have mentioned some of those agencies, but of course the chair is at liberty to invite others to participate.

We want to fix SA Health. It was in an appalling state when we took over government. Many of the issues that were raised by the ICAC commissioner would be very familiar to the Leader of the Opposition, very familiar to the member for Kurna and very familiar to the entire Labor opposition. That is why we are not going to be sweeping these issues under the carpet, like the previous government did. We have tabled the report in full—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —as quickly as we possibly could and now we are going to be working through those issues. I am very happy that we are taking decisive action and we are getting on with fixing the mess that we inherited from those opposite.

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the Leader for the Opposition, I call to order the following members: the member for Lee; the member for Hurtle Vale, and I warn her; the member for Wright; the Minister for Innovation and Skills; the member for Waite; the member for Playford; and the member for Kurna.

**SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain to the house how he developed a response to the ICAC report when he had not read the ICAC report?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:07):** I don't know. I think it is much better when he reads the questions that are prepared for him by his office in the dream factory because when he goes on—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He just embarrasses himself, as per usual.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, members on my left! Member for West Torrens.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** That was debate, sir, and disruptive.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I will go through it again slowly, sir.

**The SPEAKER:** No, I am well aware of what you were saying. I will allow the Premier to provide some relevant preamble—I am not sure that first contribution was relevant—and ask him to come back to the substance of the question.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you, sir. I would like to address the substance of the question. The question from the leader was: how could we determine our entire response to the document so quickly? If he had been listening to my earlier—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Elizabeth and Leader of the Opposition! The member for Wright is warned.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I'm so scared.

**Mr Brown:** You're not fooling anyone.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The reality is we did not determine our response yesterday. We have established an interagency task force to determine our response. They will provide their advice to the government by the end of this year. This is the prudent and constructive way to work through a range of serious issues that were raised by the commissioner. We are taking these issues seriously.

*Ms Stinson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Badcoe!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I would like to highlight that many of these issues go back a very long way. In fact, the commissioner himself talked about instances back in 2013, 2014, 2015, 2016, 2017. We know who the minister for health was in 2017. It's the Leader of the Opposition. These are not new issues.

*Mr Patterson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Morphett!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** In fact, they have been around for far too long. In fact, in the commissioner's report he identified more than 1,000—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader of the Opposition!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —reports that had been made with relation to Health since he had become the commissioner in South Australia. It begs the question: how many of those 1,100 reports were made under the previous government? And what did the previous government do about those reports? What response did they make? Let me tell you, sir, when we came to government we found SA Health in a complete and utter state of hopelessness, and what did we do? We set about immediately—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —fixing the mess that we inherited from those opposite. Let me tell you, sir—

*Mr Picton interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —when we appointed KordaMentha to sort out the hitherto undisclosed mess within CALHN, did we get support from those opposite?

**Ms Hildyard:** 880 jobs cut.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Reynell!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No way! When we set about reforming the governance of the local health networks in South Australia, did we get any support from those opposite?

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, be seated.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No, not a bit.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, please be seated for one moment. Point of order.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Sir, our support or otherwise is debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I have the point of order. I ask for interjections on my left and my right to cease so that I can hear the Premier's answer. I have the question. It was very clearly about how the Premier developed a response. I believe at the moment he is answering in a manner which is germane to the question. However, I will be listening assiduously to make sure that he does not deviate. Premier.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Thank you very much, sir. Can I make the point that we have been working on a response to the mess that we inherited from those opposite since the very day that we came to government, and we have not been assisted in this task whatsoever by those opposite. When we wanted to appoint KordaMentha, we had nothing but complaint from those opposite. When we wanted to reform the local health networks, introducing five new local health networks in South Australia, a completely different governance arrangement in South Australia, with individual boards—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —to guide the continuous improvement within the 10 local health networks in South Australia, did we receive any support whatsoever? No. Those opposite have tried to stifle our improvement of South Australian health ever since we came onto the treasury benches.

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order, Premier. Please be seated for one moment. The point of order is for debate?

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** Debate, sir, obviously, yes.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, the Premier is beginning to deviate. Would he like to come back to the substance of the question? Three minutes in.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** Anyway, sir, I was just trying to provide the house with some evidence of the hard work that we have been doing since we came to power to improve the mess that we had inherited from those opposite. In no way, shape or form was the establishment of an interagency task force the end point. It was the starting point for a response to the document which has been provided by the commissioner. I find this document extraordinarily helpful. Yes, many of these issues—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —have been raised for a significant period of time, going back years and years and years, but it is good to have it in one document.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** I thank the commissioner for his report and I look forward to receiving advice from the interagency task force before the end of this year.

*Parliamentary Procedure*

### VISITORS

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member for Hammond, I welcome to parliament today members of Clapham Primary School: the Principal, Jodie; the Deputy Principal, Justine; and school captains, Raven and Leelu. Also today, we have cricket royalty: Mr Clive Lloyd CBE AO, 110 test matches for the West Indies, ICC Cricket Hall of Fame, average of 46.67, otherwise known as the Super Cat. Welcome to you, sir. I also welcome Ms Bertha Joseph, Andrew Sinclair and Caroline Rhodes. The member for Hammond.

*Question Time*

### REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

**Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:13):** My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Regional Growth Fund is delivering more jobs and a stronger economy in my electorate of Hammond and across South Australia?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:14):** Yes, I can. I thank the member for Hammond for his question. In my recent tour through his electorate, we saw some prospective projects that were going to be nominated for the Regional Growth Fund. As we all know, the commitment by the Marshall Liberal government is a \$150 million commitment over 10 years to put infrastructure projects in place to help regional South Australia grow.

We know that over 16 years they had been ignored, but not under this government, and no better than in round 1, where we have seen huge success with the projects that have been rolled out over there. Again, the regions have shone through. The innovation, the collaboration and the clustering have equated to community benefit right around our regions.

Round 2 has been announced with \$4.4 million of investment into 10 projects that will help our regions grow. It is creating jobs. It is creating economic activity. Round 2 will see about 160 new jobs created, but in the creation of those jobs it's about creating sustainability within an economy that is desperate for growth.

What I can say is that in the member for Hammond's electorate we have seen wine projects that have been supported, and it is about the collaboration of wine, distillation and breweries that have come together to grow a business, to grow tourism, but also to grow an industry that is now on the brink of making new records at every corner.

In terms of other world-class wine grape regions, the Barossa Valley has received funding through the Artisans group. Down at McLaren Vale, Chalk Hill has collaborated with the Never Never distillery and a local brewery to come together as another hub of tourism, excitement and attraction in that region. Down at Langhorne Creek, we have seen the Bremerton wine business now flourish to collaborate and grow to create huge opportunity, not only with food, tourism, wine and distillation but it is now a tourism hub that will attract people down to that really bit of a sleeper wine sector that has for long periods of time gone under the radar.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What we can say is that other projects have included the Barossa bikeway, which is to leverage value for cycling tourism and to link the \$80 million existing infrastructure linking Gawler to Angaston. We have also seen the Far North receive some money with the Royal Flying Doctor Service clinic at Marree, a faraway outback community needing improved health services, and the Regional Growth Fund is part of that.

We are also seeing the revitalisation of the foreshore at Port Augusta. For a long time the member for Stuart called out that Port Augusta was needing a bit of a facelift, and that is exactly what the Regional Growth Fund is about to do. Down in the South-East we have seen an upgrade to the largest cattle selling facility—\$385,000 allocated to improving loading and unloading infrastructure, which benefits a \$1.3 billion red meat industry.

The Regional Growth Fund is doing great things for regional South Australia. I have already spoken about the Goolwa Chart Room, and the member for Finniss is very, very excited about that project, as is the member for Kavel, because as I explained yesterday the Mount Barker water treatment storage facility will open up new economic activity.

The Regional Growth Fund is performing extremely well. We are seeing regional communities coming together for the benefit of those communities and those businesses. We all know that these regional building projects are made possible by the commitment of this government for the regions of South Australia because #RegionsMatter.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** We also have in the gallery today members of the Hallett Cove Probus Club, who are guests of the Minister for Environment and Water. Also, I forgot to point out that our cricketing guests are the guests of the member for Waite.

#### *Question Time*

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. How did the Premier establish a need for an interagency task force into SA Health without reading the ICAC report into SA Health?

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for West Torrens and the member for Hurtle Vale are warned. The Premier has the call.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:18):** I refer the honourable member to my previous answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.G. Pisoni:** You are a fool.

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Innovation and Skills, I am not a fool and you are warned.

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18):** My question is to the Premier. Did the Premier guess that there would be a need for an interagency task force without having read the report for a need for an interagency task force?

**The SPEAKER:** That question allows—okay, Premier. Leader.

#### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** My question is to the Premier. Did the cabinet sign off on the interagency task force?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19):** No.

**The SPEAKER:** I will allow one more.

### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19):** Who came up with the idea for an interagency task force?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:19):** I am happy to answer these questions. I think that it's a very logical response to—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** It was an immaculate conception.

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee is definitely warned for that interjection.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the report that we received. We are very happy with the fact that we have established this interagency task force.

**Ms Stinson:** Who came up with it?

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We think that it's a very sensible way to go. It's a very logical response to a very complex and important area for South Australia. On coming into government, we were confronted with a range of issues in relation to—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

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

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —SA Health. It seems very obvious that those opposite are—

*The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It seems very obvious to me that those opposite have no interest whatsoever in fixing the health system in South Australia. They handed it over to us in an appalling state.

**Mr Pederick:** They just trashed health.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Hammond!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There is nobody in this entire world who thinks that the health system that we inherited from those opposite was anywhere near what the people of South Australia expect, and we have worked very diligently every single day that we have been in.

I make it very clear, as you would be aware, sir—because you pay attention in question time—that this government has put in more than \$1 billion into the health budget since we came into government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There's a lot of work to be done. You cannot fix the system that we inherited in five minutes, but I am absolutely convinced that we are making extraordinarily good progress, and I think that this interagency task force will assist in that process. Again, I make the point that many of the issues—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It's a shame, sir, that those opposite don't take the extraordinarily important repair of the health system more seriously.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there is a point of order. If you could just be seated for one moment.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The Premier is imputing improper motive to the opposition, and it is debate.

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER:** Point of order, sir, on the point of order: it is the long-established practice of the house that that standing order requires a member, not a class or group of members, to take offence, and the person who has been here longer than anyone should have picked it up by now.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes. I don't need the speech as well.

*Mr Patterson interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Morphett is warned. Member for West Torrens, I ask that the interjections cease. I believe the Premier has concluded his answer.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** No. I would like to just continue talking about the important work of repairing the health system in South Australia. We have put more than \$1 billion in.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** There is a lot of sensitivity on the opposition benches because they all have to take collective responsibility for the failure in the health system that they passed over to us—none more so, though, on the opposition benches than the Leader of the Opposition. He, of course—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** The Leader of the Opposition complains that he only had five months to understand what was going on, and that wasn't long enough. It didn't take us five months to understand the full mess that we had inherited from those opposite. I don't hear anybody opposite, in fact, talking up the prospects of Transforming Health. That expression is no longer used in South Australia—

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

**The SPEAKER:** Minister for Police!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and, at every single opportunity, the Leader of the Opposition wants to back out and talk about that he was only the health minister for five months.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** What about taking responsibility? This is a huge embarrassment for the Leader of the Opposition. He knew—

*Mr Brown interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Playford will leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** He knew exactly and precisely what was going on in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, but he failed to inform the people of South Australia.

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

**The SPEAKER:** Point of order. Premier, be seated.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** The debate that the Premier is engaging in is causing lots of interruption to the house.

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for debate. I uphold the point of order. Premier, would you please conclude your answer.

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Premier has concluded his answer. The Leader of the Opposition, although I give him much lenience as the leader, will be leaving if this level of interjection continues today.

### RESERVOIRS

**Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:24):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on its commitment—

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**Ms LUETHEN:** —to open up the reservoirs?

**The SPEAKER:** Member for King, I am going to call the member for Light to order and warn him. I didn't catch that question because of interruptions. Can you please repeat it.

**Ms LUETHEN:** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on its commitment to open up the reservoirs?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:24):** I am always very pleased to update the member for King, the member for Newland and the member for Schubert, and a whole range of members on both sides of the house whose electorates will be hugely benefited by the Marshall Liberal government's commitment to open up a range of reservoirs across South Australia. We said that if we formed government we would go through this in a methodical and sensible way, appointing an across-government task force with representatives from the environment department—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —from SA Water, from SA Health and a range of other organisations to help us maximise this opportunity and do so in a sensible and safe way. We are moving forward with it. In April this year, the reserve around the Myponga Reservoir opened for recreation. That has been hugely successful with people going there to enjoy that quite different, quite unique natural environment and that is really stimulating the town of Myponga as well. It couldn't have gone any better.

The people who live in that western Fleurieu district have been asking, 'Can we get more at Myponga?' That is exactly what is happening this weekend, with Myponga opening for shoreline fishing from Saturday morning. That will be exciting for that community. We also have more happening. This weekend is a big weekend in the communities represented by the member for King and the member for Schubert with the opening of South Para Reservoir, a reservoir that sits up in the boundaries of the districts that they represent, out of Williamstown and Kersbrook, represented by the member for Newland.

The opening of this reservoir is an incredible opportunity for walking, for cycling and also for fishing, kayaking, paddleboarding, canoeing and getting people into the landscape that has been locked away, looking for linkages with Para Wirra Conservation Park, looking for linkages with Mount Crawford Forest and bringing that area to life. We know that towns like Williamstown and Kersbrook will benefit from this, as people flow into that part of the Hills just out of the north-eastern suburbs.

We are getting great feedback about what people are looking forward to, the positive experiences that they have already had at Myponga and how we are going to see this unfold at other

reservoirs across the state as well. On Saturday morning, I look forward to joining the Premier, the member for Schubert—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —and the member for Schubert's daughter as we experience this new area. The gates will be open and people will be able to go in. There will be a display from local rangers. Of course, there are more rangers working in that landscape as a consequence of our increase in the ranger workforce—a substantial increase. It was 93 when we came to office and now it is up to a figure much higher than that, heading up towards 130.

It's great news for our ranger workforce. Not only will there be rangers on site but there will be the opportunity for canoe tours, to meet with people from the fishing industry to talk to them about the opportunities, nature walks, cycling and walking. The potential with the opening of our reservoirs is immense. The conservation elements are great. We are looking at friends groups to help revegetate these landscapes. We are working alongside local business organisations and recreation groups to maximise the opportunity from our reservoirs opening.

These are public facilities; they are owned by the public. Yes, they have a role to play in our water security, but there is also plenty of opportunity to get people into the great outdoors in South Australia and enjoy our reservoirs, and that takes another step forward from this Saturday morning.

#### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:28):** My question is to the Premier. Why didn't the Premier just take the time to read the ICAC report before developing the government's response?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:28):** It's interesting: yesterday, the opposition were talking about why we didn't respond faster; today, they are talking about why we didn't respond slower.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** As I have already outlined to the house, our response wasn't yesterday.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We established a mechanism for informing the government towards our response to this document yesterday. We had ample time to read the document before we established our position to establish the interagency task force.

*Members interjecting:*

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

*The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** You can leave as well, member for Light. The Premier has the call. Come back for grieves.

*The honourable members for Badcoe and Light having withdrawn from the chamber:*

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We had ample time to read the report. It was only around 60 pages, plus appendices. I read the report and formed the opinion that the best way to inform the government to take action on the contents of the report was to establish an interagency task force—

**Mr Picton:** But you hadn't read it.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Kaurana!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —and that is exactly and precisely what I did.

### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29):** My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier explain why he told the house yesterday that he had not completed reading the report some hours after he had announced the interagency task force as a response to the report he told the parliament he had not read?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30):** They are really not understanding what is going on here. Our response—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Leader of the Opposition may not like what the Premier is saying, but that is not an excuse to carry on like this.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** It is a pity that those opposite do not take the extensive work that is now required to fix our health system in South Australia seriously. At every opportunity they want to talk about, 'What time was the report received? What time was the report read? When did you send your letter? Who is appointed?' rather than thinking about what is important here, and that is fixing the complete and utter shambles that we received from the previous government.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** When I look through the report, it is very clear that there is a series of very important issues that have been raised by the commissioner, issues to do with the culture within SA Health, issues to do with poor records management, issues to do with time and attendance recording—

**The Hon. S.C. Mullighan:** Why don't you want it properly investigated?

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Lee can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —the private practice opportunities for salaried specialists, procurement, clinical trials, special purpose funds. There is a range of issues raised in this report. I again make the comment that these are not issues which are entirely new to the government, and they are certainly not entirely new, or new in any way, shape or form, to those opposite, especially the Leader of the Opposition, who would have been fully aware of these when he was the minister for health here in South Australia.

But, unlike the previous government, who wanted to tell everybody that everything was fine, everything was dandy, everything was going very well within the Central Adelaide Local Health Network, we are taking responsibility for the massive transformation which is now required to get our health system to an acceptable level, and I believe that we are making incredible progress on this task.

What we received into the parliament yesterday, tabled by the Speaker, and I presume tabled by the President in another place, was a very useful report from the commissioner. We have formed the opinion to establish an interagency task force to look into every aspect of this report, look into the issues that were raised previously, going back several years, and then to make recommendations to the government. We will, of course, take that advice and then we will form our opinion.

But I want to be very clear: our response to the report wasn't the establishment of the committee; that will be used to inform our response. Secondly, I make the point that our task of fixing the mess that we inherited didn't start yesterday or today or next year: it started the very first day that we moved onto the treasury bench. Since that time, we have been working extraordinarily hard to improve outcomes for the people of South Australia: more than a billion dollars reinvested into the health system in South Australia and a completely different arrangement with regard to the

governance of health in South Australia, so taking it away from the central bureaucracy and moving that governance down to an expanded local health network arrangement.

There were five local health networks under the previous government, but there weren't boards in place to actually govern those local health networks. We have expanded that from five to 10 and, more importantly, we have put governance arrangements in place. They came into effect on 1 July this year. On 1 July this year, we made a major transformation of the governance of our local health networks and, ultimately, our health services in South Australia. We based that on best practice around the country. It is early days, but I am sure that we are on the right track.

### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34):** My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier set a time line for when he expects the interagency task force to complete its work about developing a response to the report, which he has said he had not read at the time of the establishment of that interagency task force?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:34):** Yes.

### JUSTICE SYSTEM

**Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:34):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General update the house on her justice agenda and the targets that have been met to date?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:35):** I thank the member for Heysen for his question. He is very active in law reform, and I appreciate both his advice and interest in this matter.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN:** For the benefit of members, however, there are six components to the justice agenda: protecting South Australians, strong penalties and effective solutions, a court system built to last, modern liquor and gambling laws, supporting consumers, and keeping the law and our policies current and relevant. As parliament wraps up for the year, I am proud that we have continued to implement our reform agenda to keep South Australians safe and modernise our laws, with the key achievement of the past year being further laws aimed at tackling the scourge of domestic violence.

Some of those reforms underway this year included allowing police bodycam videos to be admitted to court as evidence in domestic violence matters, giving authorities stronger powers to tackle repeated intervention order breaches and serious offenders, extending the domestic violence disclosure scheme until the end of June 2020 and supporting more victims of domestic violence to access legal support through the Women's Domestic Violence Court Assistance Program delivered by new providers, namely, the Legal Service Commission. Support has also increased for those who have experienced sexual abuse, with the state formally signing up to the National Redress Scheme and implementing other legislative changes earlier this year. Thank you, Premier.

As members are aware, the findings of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse were truly shocking, and we continue to make the necessary legal changes to better support those experiencing this trauma in South Australia by removing the statute of limitations for compensation claims. I am also very proud that the government has moved to strengthen the public's right to know, introducing laws to lift the veil of secrecy on those charged with sex offences in South Australia. We are also looking to update the state's freedom of information laws to strengthen transparency in government.

Other public safety initiatives coming into effect this year include new legislation to better protect emergency services workers; implementing tough antiterror measures, giving police additional powers in a terrorist incident; extending the public precinct and police powers in the West End; reducing the backlog of post-mortems and additional funding put towards a new CT scanner for Forensic Science SA; new offences to ensure that those who manage to promote websites featuring child exploitation material can be prosecuted; providing police the relevant powers to access

encrypted or password protected material in child exploitation cases; and funding South Australia's response units for both the royal commissions underway.

Furthermore, the government has moved to cut the red tape and implement laws in respect of consumer protection, passing laws to better protect both residents and park owners in residential parks, increasing accountability and introducing a licensing scheme for property managers, and there will be welcome news for consumers, for motorists shortly, as we work to address the cost of living concerns in this area. A lot of work has been dedicated to bringing South Australia's legislation in line with modern expectations and with the rest of the country, such as surrogacy laws making it easy for singles and couples, including same-sex couples, to have a child of their own.

Outside the justice agenda, a number of other priorities met during 2019 include the introduction of stronger trespassing laws to better protect our farmers and food producers, introducing labour hire laws to only capture industries with a high risk of exploitation and expanding the role of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal.

I would like to thank members and say to them that we have had a very busy year. We are going to have another busy year—be ready for it—with the introduction of legislation in the coming year.

*Matter of Privilege*

**MATTER OF PRIVILEGE**

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:39):** I rise on a matter of privilege. Yesterday, in question time the Leader of the Opposition asked the Premier a question, and I quote:

My question is to the Premier. Now that the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption has delivered his report on SA Health, will the Premier now provide him with the resources that he has requested to conduct a full investigation into the state's largest public sector agency?

The Premier responded at 14:04:

Yes, the Leader of the Opposition is right. This is the largest public sector agency, and we thank the commissioner for the report, which he delivered to the government last week, which is now being tabled in parliament and available for all to read. I myself am about two-thirds of the way through this report.

Today in question time, in his previous answer the Premier told the parliament that the government had ample time to read the report and that the intergovernment task force was released after the report had been considered.

I believe that the Premier has deliberately and intentionally misled the House of Assembly and that a prima facie case exists for the establishment of a privileges committee. I ask that you give consideration to my matter of privilege and rule if a motion to establish a privileges committee should be given precedence over other business in the House of Assembly.

**The SPEAKER:** I thank the member for West Torrens. I ask the member for West Torrens to provide me with all relevant information and I will consider the request in due course and come back to the house if necessary.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The leader is not assisting, as well as the Minister for Transport. The member for Florey rose to her feet first. I will go to her and then the member for Kaurana.

*Question Time*

**SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:40):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister advise how often Aboriginal cultural training is offered to members of the police force, other than the brief training provided to cadets, and how often and in what manner are serving police officers and SAPOL staff surveyed on their understanding and experience of racism?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:41):** I thank the member for her question. I note that it is an operational question, so I will follow that up with the police

commissioner and get back to her with an answer. I know there was an equal opportunity report done a couple of years ago, and out the back of that, discrimination was very much looked at and the commissioner took that on board.

A number of pieces of work were done around all forms of discrimination within the police force and a number of updates were run through the police force to make sure that police were very much aware. The entire force was aware of all the points that she raises. As to the specific detail that she refers to, I don't have that information, but I will seek an answer from the commissioner and get a response for the member.

### **SOUTH AUSTRALIA POLICE**

**Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:41):** Supplementary: in light of that response, minister, would you consider encouraging that same sort of collaborative work to be done with the equal opportunity commissioner, looking for or identifying the extent of any pockets of racist behaviour in the police force and measures to address them?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:42):** I thank the member for the question. The situation is that Equal Opportunity has a standing contract to undertake work for the South Australian police to monitor the implementation of recommendations that were made arising out of that initial investigation. You might recall a number of years ago—I think it was about 2016—that the police commissioner made a public statement acknowledging that there were clearly some systemic concerns in relation to culture and conduct in the police force and undertook to take certain steps to remedy that, including racial misconduct matters.

As a result of that, the equal opportunity commissioner has negotiated a continued contract to monitor that. She provides regular reports of that. There has been publication of a recent matter that was raised, where a former employee of the police left the force and has made complaints in support of her application for compensation that suggests that she was in some way treated badly, if I can put it as kindly as that, in the description that was made in the public arena in respect of her association with a person who was of Aboriginal descent. She has obviously made some public statements about that, but it forms the basis of legal proceedings seeking compensation.

That is a matter about which I propose to seek an update when I next meet with the equal opportunity commissioner, but she has given me regular reports. I think probably some of them are even available on her website, but I will check on that. She is tasked with the direct responsibility to ensure that the implementation, including training, and establishment of a cultural officer within the police force, and things of that nature, are not only happening but that there is marked recorded advance in relation to those recommendations. I will make some further inquiries as to what reports are available publicly, but I thank the member for her question.

### **SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr PICTON (Kurna) (14:44):** My question is to the Premier. How does the Premier explain his statement today that the task force proposal did not go to cabinet when his health minister told FIVEaa this morning that it did go to cabinet?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:44):** No, that's not correct. For starters, we don't go into—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —full detail about what was discussed at cabinet.

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

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** But the member is suggesting that there was a full discussion of the report and that was not the case.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

### SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:45):** My question is to the Attorney-General. Was there any limitation for the Minister for Health and Wellbeing from reading the ICAC report after being provided a copy of it on Friday from your office?

**The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:45):** I think I have tried to make it very clear in the ministerial statement as to what the situation has been in relation to that process and I don't think I can add anything further.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:45):** My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on the Climate Council's recent renewable energy report card for South Australia?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:46):** Thank you to the member for Newland for this very important question, from the doctor MP for Newland, who studies these things very closely.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We have some fantastic news. The Climate Council in its report last week undertook what it calls its report card of the states from its perspective with regard to environmental responsibility and environmental policy. I am very pleased to advise the house that South Australia has come in number one in the nation.

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

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Those opposite scoff. They clearly don't think that—

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Giles!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** —there's anything of importance in this announcement. They don't appreciate the fact that in the last 12 months we have overtaken one state and one territory—the ACT and Tasmania—to move to number one. The Marshall Liberal government is doing—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** Those opposite continue to scoff.

*The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The Minister for Transport is warned.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** They can explain their scorn for the Climate Council to the Climate Council if they want to, but the reality is that our government is achieving what the former government could not. The former government—

*Ms Cook interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Hurtle Vale is on two warnings.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** The former government had an all-or-nothing approach to environmental matters, particularly in the area of energy policy. They just wanted as much renewable energy as possible and they did not care about the impact on consumers. We saw blackout after blackout after blackout. We saw prices—

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

**The SPEAKER:** The point of order is for debate. As on previous occasions, I have allowed some compare and contrast to previous regimes to a point. Minister.

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** History notes it is clearly recorded that over the last several years our state experienced blackout after blackout after blackout and ever-increasing electricity prices. So what we have done with our energy policy is not take the all-or-nothing approach that was the hallmark of those in government over previous years and what we are doing is we are getting the mix right.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** We are encouraging renewable energy. We are encouraging grid-scale storage. We are encouraging household storage. We are encouraging demand response. We are encouraging interconnection with New South Wales. We know that we will have gas generation with us for years to come but less and less over time and more and more renewables.

Rather than just focusing on the ever increasing penetration of renewable energy generation, we are making sure that renewable energy works for consumers so that it is affordable so that it is reliable. We are seeing prices turn around. Those opposite hate it but the fact is electricity prices have turned the corner. Interestingly, the Climate Council of Australia recognises that our approach—the approach of getting the mix right and making renewable energy work for consumers, not just for the Labor Party's political ambitions to seem to be cleaner and greener than anybody else and throw consumers under the bus along the way, as they did—

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

**The SPEAKER:** I think the minister has finished his answer. Can you please wrap it up, minister?

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** No, sir.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN:** History shows that in previous years under the government of the day, consumers were thrown under the bus. That is a fact. We are making electricity more affordable, more reliable and cleaner for all South Australian electricity consumers.

**The SPEAKER:** Has the minister finished? The minister has finished his answer.

**The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS:** So the appropriate response to an opposition interjection is expulsion, but a minister can ignore your ruling.

**The SPEAKER:** Member for West Torrens, you will get up and you will leave in silence. If you do not, I will name you.

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

**The SPEAKER:** For 15 minutes, Mr Clerk. The member for Kaurana and then the member for Frome.

## SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT

**Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:50):** My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier believe it was acceptable that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing had the ICAC report since Friday last week but did not read it before announcing the task force response yesterday?

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50):** The task force response is a very important response and it means that we are getting on with exactly and precisely what we need to. I don't know whether those opposite want us to read it earlier or later, establish the task force before or after—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** They have not made their point clear. In fact, yesterday they were on one tack and today they are on another tack. The reality is—

*Dr Close interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —this is typical of what we have had from the Australian Labor Party for an extended period of time, which is petty pointscoreing rather than getting on with the fundamental guts issue of fixing health in South Australia. It is no wonder that the health system was in such a mess when those opposite were looking after it. By contrast, we have welcomed the report that was provided by the commissioner. There is plenty of information in there that would suggest there is a lot of work to do. As is very clear—

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** —in the report, many of these very substantial issues go back for a very long period of time. What we should be asking, of course, is: what did those opposite do to address some of these fundamental issues? We know what we have done. We have been very clear on that. We have immediately established—

*Mr Malinauskas interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order, leader!

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We have immediately appointed KordaMentha to look at the fundamental problem that existed right across SA Health, which was the Central Adelaide Local Health Network. Nobody in South Australia knew the magnitude of the problems that existed there.

*Ms Hildyard interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** The member for Reynell is on two warnings.

**The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL:** We were heading towards overbudget expenditure in excess of \$300 million. My understanding is that the remediation work done by KordaMentha, putting a lot of the systems in place that were missing—the financial systems that were missing—is now well underway. A lot of what we are talking about, and that the commissioner highlights, is around system failures, the lack of traceability, and information being made available.

I am the first to admit there is a huge amount of additional work to be done, but I am satisfied with the progress that is being made on this and I am very proud that we have acted decisively to establish the interagency task force. This is being chaired by none other than the Chief Executive of the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. They will have representatives on that committee from the Department of Treasury and Finance, the Department for Health and Wellbeing and, of course, the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment I think is also there. But it's not limited to that: the chief executive himself can invite others to participate on that task force.

This is an important task force and they have an important body of work to do. We have asked them to respond to the government. Are you ready to listen to this one, leader? Because you have asked the question three times and it would be embarrassing if you asked it a fourth time. We have asked the task force to respond by the end of the year, being this year, which I think is a very short period of time. But I think it's important that we get on with doing everything we possibly can to fix the health system in South Australia.

It's easy to kick the can down the road. We have seen the previous government do this on numerous occasions across virtually every single portfolio in government. We are not prepared to do that. It's a very important area of public policy and we plan to make improvements as soon as possible.

**Ms COOK:** Point of order.

**The SPEAKER:** Premier, there is a point of order. If you could be seated for one moment. For debate?

**Ms COOK:** For debate: 98.

**The SPEAKER:** Yes, consistent with my earlier rulings. The Premier has concluded his answer, so we are going to go to the members for Frome, Kurna and then Narungga.

#### **MUSIC EDUCATION STRATEGY**

**The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:54):** My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on any successful schools in the electorate of Frome that may have been able to achieve funding through the government's music strategy and, if there are any schools, what benefit will those students get?

**The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:54):** I am pleased to be able to talk about the government's music strategy. It is a significant announcement. I know that all members of the house are interested in it. I know that the member for Frome has spoken to me on a number of occasions both about his schools and about the need for music. I see the member for Florey sitting very close to the member for Frome.

She has raised this issue in the house on a number of occasions and cares deeply. All members care, but I think the member for Florey has very special care. Every time she sees a school performance, she raises it with me. The member for Frome knows that in the electorate of Frome and around regional South Australia there is a particular benefit that is achieved through the work that is undertaken as part of the new music strategy.

Of course, we have some excellent strategies in some of our schools. We have some good programs in some of our schools, but there are too many students in South Australia who need to have more music education throughout their schooling because in some areas there isn't that specialist level of knowledge, that specialist level of expertise, and that's particularly in rural and regional South Australia.

The music strategy talks about enhancing those existing systems and building capacity in general classes. It talks about upskilling non-specialist teachers and educators, which is particularly valuable in all regional electorates where there are many schools where there aren't those specialist teachers and, indeed, about providing curriculum and pedagogical resources, which will enhance music teaching in every school in the state.

Today, we are really pleased that the second round of one of the aspects of the music innovation strategy, the Music Innovation Fund, is being announced. This is a half a million dollar fund to look at particular programs where there are innovative and promising practices, partnerships and programs across the state. I am pleased to let the member for Frome know that one of the programs in particular will benefit some of his residents in Port Pirie.

I believe that one of the successful schools we are announcing today is the Port Pirie West Primary School, which is receiving \$12,000 towards the purchase of musical instruments so that they can have a new music education program that will support students from reception right through to year 6. Sometimes, these cash grants provide that immediate injection that enables a school to do so much more.

So, as we provide those extra resources to support teachers, even if they don't have that music background, with professional development so that they can use these instruments, this cash grant will enable that school to offer a much better program for their students. It doesn't just help those students who are interested in music. Students who engage in music programs benefit throughout the rest of their academic development as well. It helps students to look forward to school more.

Some of the other announcements today benefiting students in Frome and around the state are very exciting. The Australian Youth Orchestra is getting \$28,000 for their National Music Teacher Mentoring Program. The Song Room is a non-government organisation. We are actually going into partnership with them, their philanthropic fundraising, and the federal government to support their transformational learning through creativity program in Mount Gambier.

Also in the country, the Nuriootpa Primary School is getting \$10,000 for their instrumental program. Loxton High School is getting \$16,000 for digital technologies in music. In the city, Flinders Park Primary School is getting \$9,900 for their junior primary music program. I encourage all members of parliament to speak to their local schools about the great work they are doing and encourage them to apply for round 3.

Other round 2 successful recipients include Alberton Primary School, Aldinga Beach B-7, the Australian Society for Music Education, Bains Road Preschool, Christies North Kindergarten, Craighburn Primary, Elizabeth Park Primary, Enfield Primary, Flaxmill Preschool, Frances Primary, Gordon Education Centre, the Hackham West Children's Centre, the Hospital School, Kadina Memorial School, Kimba Area School, Le Fevre High, Magill Kindergarten, Mannum Community College, McLaren Vale Primary, Moana Kindergarten, O'Halloran Hill Kindergarten, and Peterborough Community Preschool, primary and high school. They also include Port Pirie West Primary School, Roxby Downs Area School, Seaford K-7, State Opera SA, Wandana Primary School and West Beach Primary School.

### WATER ALLOCATIONS

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister guarantee that he will oppose any plan to extend the deadline for the 450 gigalitres of environment water for South Australia when he is at the upcoming meeting of water ministers?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:59):** I thank the deputy leader for her important question about the upcoming ministerial council for the Murray-Darling Basin. South Australia will not be agreeing to any change to the deadline for the delivery of the 450 gigalitres of water, which is to be delivered by 2024.

### DESALINATION PLANT

**Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:59):** My question is again to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister guarantee that he won't allow the Desalination Plant to be used to substitute for any of the 450 gigalitres of environment water?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:59):** Again, I thank the deputy leader for her question. It is unlikely that the Desalination Plant would be suitable for an offset to Murray-Darling water from an environmental point of view.

We have said that of course we have that asset sitting down on the cliffs at Port Stanvac, and that asset can be used for the purpose of standing shoulder to shoulder with the drought-affected farmers across this nation, and that is an agreement that the state government has struck with our federal counterparts with agreement from ministerial council ministers. We will certainly not be looking to have the Desalination Plant used as an offset to Murray-Darling water under the 450. We said, though, at the ministerial council on 14 December 2018—

*Mr Boyer interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —that as a matter of goodwill we would undertake a study that would look at the complexities of using the Desalination Plant as a potential 450 project on a temporary or long-term basis. That statement, that commitment to the ministerial council, has been in the public domain for quite some time. We said that we would do that, but we also said that we would never do it in a way that would impact South Australia negatively, whether that is financially, socially or environmentally. I have said regularly that I was very, very cautious about using the Desalination Plant as an environmental offset, or a 450 gigalitre project. It is my feeling that that—

**Mr Malinauskas:** Why not rule it out?

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Of course it would be so easy to rule it out, but we have been going through a process. It would be completely inappropriate to rule it out because we have been going through a process—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Listen to them shouting—because when it comes to the River Murray it's all about the politics, isn't it? It's all about the noise. It's all about the politics, the games, the slogans, the 'I heart the Murray'. No, what we care about on this side of politics is sustaining that river for our irrigators—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —sustaining it for the communities at the Lower Lakes and the Coorong. Noise, noise, noise. They don't give two hoots about the Riverland. They don't give two hoots. They care about their cheap five-second sound bite on Channel 7 news. They care about the social media post.

**The SPEAKER:** There is a point of order, minister. One moment. I ask the—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

*Mr Szakacs interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Member for Cheltenham, be quiet. I ask for the interjections to cease, and the provocation and the rebuttal of the provocation as well. Member for Kurna, for debate?

**Mr PICTON:** Debate.

**The SPEAKER:** I uphold the point of order. The minister has the call. I would like to hear his answer.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Thank you, Deputy Speaker—Mr Speaker—

**Mr Picton:** The Speaker.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** As I have said many times, I do not need the member for Kurna's tutelage in any way in this place—in no way whatsoever. And with the member for West Torrens out of the chamber, Mr Speaker, we get the protégé coming in behind him, don't we?

**The SPEAKER:** Minister, do not reflect on the whereabouts of members.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** Anyway, back to the question, the very important question.

**The SPEAKER:** Come back to the question, or I will sit you down. I said, 'If you don't, I will sit you down.'

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** I would like to wrap up by emphasising what an important period it is for the Murray-Darling Basin.

*Members interjecting:*

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

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** We are making it very clear to other states that South Australia will not be trodden over on this. We have a desalination plant which can be used for the national effort. We will use it to help drought-stricken farmers, and that's what we are doing at the moment. We have no intention at this stage of seeing it used as a 450-gigalitre offset. We don't want to see that, but I cannot rule something out as being thoroughly investigated as a matter of goodwill, but prior to the ministerial council—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order! Members on my left, please.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —or at the ministerial council we will be in a position—

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Settle. It's almost over.

**The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS:** —to underline our plans for the Desalination Plant.

**ADELAIDE INTERNATIONAL TENNIS TOURNAMENT**

**Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:04):** My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister update the house on the Adelaide International 2020 coming this summer?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:04):** I thank the member for Narungga for his ace question—and what an exciting time it is for tennis in South Australia, what an exciting time for sport.

We know that those opposite called game, set and match on international tennis. They didn't want it here in South Australia anymore. Well, not on this side of the net. We weren't doing that. All we hear from those opposite are backhanded comments—not good backhands, bad backhands—and they will not admit that it's their fault that we are in this position. But we will return volley, and we have done so by bringing back the Adelaide International to South Australia, with ATP and WTA tennis right here in South Australia.

We are excited by that, and it's part of the Marshall Liberal government's strong plan, a strong plan that is delivering for South Australia more jobs, lower costs and better services, and I am so excited about what we are doing in sport and recreation. We are delivering not only at the top level but from the grassroots right through to the elite level. The growth we are seeing in tennis, I love it. Some might say, 'I 40-love it', but that would be going a little too far.

The member for Narungga knows that we are delivering in the communities as well. In fact, he loves what we are serving up, and it is just the first set as well. The Edithburgh Progress Association has received \$25,000 to resurface their courts, along with the Coobowie Tennis Club—another \$25,000. Again, more tennis is being played in his neck of the woods. Over in the member for Chaffey's electorate, \$135,000 to install new LED lighting at the Renmark Tintra Lawn Tennis Club. In the member for Colton's electorate, \$25,000 to the Seaside Tennis Club—that gets a smile on the Premier's face as well.

Even in the member for Lee's electorate, \$112,000 to upgrade the Grange Lawn Tennis Club and \$25,000 to the West Lakes Tennis Club. It doesn't end there. In the member for King's electorate, a much-needed \$369,000, a community that has been ignored for too long, but the member for King has delivered that for the Golden Grove Tennis Club.

*Members interjecting:*

**The SPEAKER:** Order!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** That is just a slice of the investment. I tell you what—you would agree that we are smashing it on and off the court here. In total, at last count \$1.38 million has been invested into grassroots tennis alone across the state, and we are just getting started. If I can, can you let me change ends because I want to talk about the Adelaide International. I will grab a drink on the way through, just a little bit of juice, and we will talk about what's happening there at Memorial Drive.

For anyone who went to Adelaide Oval over the course of the cricket, they would have seen the canopy going up, the roof going up over the centre court, and no-one is more excited than we are on this side of the house about the announcement of some of the world-class players who are coming to play here in Adelaide. They got dropped shot by shot today, and the racket has been intense. I can tell you: Ash Barty, of course; Novak Djokovic, how exciting is that; Simona Halep; Alex de Minaur; and Venus Williams as well. The list goes on but I could run myself out on a time violation, so we will focus again on the Adelaide International, on what a great event it's going to be on Sunday 12 to 18 January.

The Marshall Liberal government is so proud to be delivering for our economy as well. This event will bring nearly \$6 million into the economy to grow our visitor economy that already sits at \$7.6 billion. Whilst those opposite are still yet to return serve, the Marshall Liberal government has committed more than \$100 million to sport since coming into government, and I encourage everyone to get along to the tennis. Grab a ticket, get down there, it's going to be exciting. In the words of a famous South Australian tennis player, 'C'mon!'—this is going to be good.

*Grievance Debate***SA HEALTH, ICAC REPORT**

**Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (15:08):** Yesterday, we had a damning report from the ICAC commissioner tabled in this parliament. Since then, we have seen what a complete farce there has been from the government in responding to it, so much so that this is complete negligence by the government of our biggest spending portfolio, and one of the most important areas in public policy for our state is looking after the health care of the citizens of this state.

What did we have as a response from the government's response? Not to give the ICAC commissioner the funds he seeks, not to start a proper independent process and not to even read the report before standing up and announcing a bureaucratic task force to look into it. Frankly, a bureaucratic committee is not going to cut it. This is a negligent and weak response from a negligent and weak government. The fact that we have the admission from the minister and the admission from the Premier that their response was delivered before they had even read the report highlights what negligence we see from this government.

We had some backtracking today. Yesterday, we had the Premier say to the house that he was only two-thirds of the way through the report, 'I myself am about two-thirds of the way through this report.' That was after 2 o'clock, after they announced their response at 11.45. Yet today the Premier stood up in this house and said:

We had ample time to read the report. It was only around 60 pages, plus appendices. I read the report and formed the opinion that the best way to inform the government to take action on the contents of the report was to establish an interagency task force...

So which was it? Yesterday, 'I am only two-thirds of the way through this report,' or today, 'I properly read the report and considered it and then announced the task force 45 minutes after it was tabled.'

Then today we had a statement released by the Attorney-General, which I think could only be described as trying to clarify her comments yesterday, which says that basically her office gave the Minister for Health a copy of this report, not yesterday, not the day before, not the day before that, but on Friday last week, yet the minister told the council yesterday that he had only started reading the report hours after he announced the response to this report.

This is a joke. This is a hopeless government that cannot even take a couple of hours to read a relatively short report. Anybody who reads this report will see that urgent action is needed. Anybody who reads this report will see that the government's denial of the ICAC commissioner's request to properly investigate these matters is nothing other than negligent and nothing other than a blight upon this government.

What we have seen is a complete stuff-up of this response from this government. We do not even know if this went to cabinet or not because we had the health minister telling FIVEaa this morning in a train wreck of an interview—I encourage everybody to listen to it—that it did go to cabinet, yet the Premier stood up today and said that it was not approved by cabinet. So which is it?

We have a bureaucratic task force that has been asked to look into this that includes people from SA Health, the agency that is being criticised. How do we know that those people on the task force are not potentially involved in the critical issues that are being discussed in the report? That would have been something you would think about if you had actually read the report before you announced your response.

Yesterday, we had the minister standing up 45 minutes after the report was tabled announcing their response without reading it, with a bevy of public servants behind him, health executives, none of whom presumably had read the report either if the government is to be believed. There was one noticeable absence, though, and that was the Chief Executive of SA Health, Dr Chris McGowan. He is under independent investigation already. He was missing in action in responding to no doubt what will be the biggest thing that he should be dealing with in his portfolio. There was no response from him. Journalists asked for responses and there was no comment to journalists.

Now we have a disgraceful letter that he has written to the upper house committee which is inquiring into his statements and looking at his statements and which asked him to come back and

explain his statements. He agreed to come back on Monday of next week; he agreed to that earlier this week. He has now sent a letter saying that he will not be attending on Monday next week. What a joke and what a disgrace that this government is so unaccountable.

What a disgrace for the patients of South Australia, who have seen ramping double under this government's watch, who have seen beds cut, who have seen doctors and nurses cut while we see just a bureaucratic fiddle instead of a proper ICAC investigation.

### RIVERLAND AWARD WINNERS

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:13):** I rise to speak about some inspirational people in the Riverland. Representing the electorate of Chaffey, nothing brings greater warmth to my heart than people who are achieving, particularly the young ones.

Cameron Rankine and Aaron Schneider from Loxton Primary School were recently among the recipients for the Minister of Education's Children's Week Awards. Cameron and Aaron were recognised for their work as members of the Young Aboriginal STEM Thinkers in South Australia team for 2019, the STEM Aboriginal Student Congress and for the inspiration they provided to 800 Aboriginal student peers.

Cameron Dixon from Glossop High School received an honourable mention for his exemplary contribution to the school community through his understanding of technology and the media. Cameron has also been doing fantastic work in the agriculture sector with his drones. That was an important part of the school team who provided the live broadcast to the Riverland football grand final this year. I did go to Glossop middle campus to meet Cameron and to understand how good he is with a drone.

The Languages in Schools 2019-20 in-country immersion scholarship went to Rachel Lawson, a teacher at Waikerie Primary School. The scholarship forms part of the state government's Languages in Schools strategy. The scholarship will fund a trip to Colombia in January of 2020 and will allow Rachel to be fully immersed in the Colombian culture and share her learnings with students.

At the Riverland Wine Show, the famous Angove Family Winemakers won three awards: the best organic biodynamic wine in show for the 2019 Angove Rose; the best brandy—and we all love a good St Agnes brandy—the brandy for St Agnes, XO Brandy, received an award; and the best fortified red wine for the Angoves Grand Tawny. The Semmler family, both Jenny and Eric, are synonymous with the wine industry. Jenny also received the Riverland Wine Industry Award. Congratulations to them both.

The award acknowledges exceptional contribution to the Riverland wine industry. Jenny Semmler won the award for striving for excellence in her endeavours in the vineyard and in the winemaking industry. She also contributes away from her own business by serving on the Destination Riverland board, being a member of the Riverland Wine Marketing Group and a constant advocate for the Riverland wine industry.

Dr Raphael Torome won Australia's General Practice Supervisor of the Year at the Royal Australian College of General Practitioners awards. This was in addition to being awarded the South Australian General Practitioner Supervisor of the Year in July. What a great achievement. Dr Torome was nominated for this award because he is a supportive, knowledgeable and highly respected mentor, and nothing is too much trouble. He works endlessly to ensure best patient outcomes. He has been a GP in Barmera for almost 20 years. Congratulations to Dr Torome.

Hayley Pfieler received the SA Global Leadership of Future Food Safety Learning Scholarship at the APAC Food Safety Conference in Sydney. She was nominated by her employer, Renee Morelli, for the award. The award gives Hayley the opportunity to learn so much more through the courses that can be applied to her career. The food safety awards aim to honour individuals who make important contributions to food safety in Australia and across the ditch in New Zealand.

The Barmera Primary School won the Woolworths Junior Landcare Team Award for the 2019 South Australian Landcare awards. The group consists of Barmera Primary School students Tegan von Laue, Fletcher Dillon, Lucas Alder, Jaxson Fridd, Jessie Priest, Billy Kartinyeri and Trinity

Williams. The award recognises outstanding contribution that an individual or group under the age of 18 years makes in tackling environmental issues.

The Young Environmental Leaders Program conduct an annual environmental expo, which showcases the students' environmental work in a two-day event. Additionally, the young environmental leaders have been working with the Berri-Barmera Landcare and the Gerard Country Rangers to propagate and plant hundreds of native plants throughout the Riverland. These are great achievers in the Riverland. They are great young achievers who have done so much, not only for education but they have proved to be absolute icons in their community.

I also joined the member for Hammond down at the International Dark Sky Reserve at Cambrai. The Big Bend Lookout on the Murray River is now officially one of the best places in the world to see the night sky. The rating down there is 21.9, which is the highest level of darkness anywhere in the world. There are 15 recognised areas of darkness, and Cambrai on the River Murray is once again an iconic tourism destination.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

### **VISITORS**

**The SPEAKER:** Before I call the member, we also had today a guest of the member for Heysen in the chamber, Mr Peter Britten-Jones from the AAT. We welcome him to parliament.

#### *Grievance Debate*

### **YOUTH ADVISORY PANEL**

**The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (15:19):** Today, I would like to pay tribute to a group of young people in my electorate and in my community. Earlier this year, I established a youth advisory panel in my electorate to engage young people in community discussions and debates.

The purpose of the Youth Advisory Panel is to provide young people with the opportunity to speak directly and regularly with me about issues that are of concern to them. I was very keen to hear from young people about their views on a range of issues, not only what we might call youth matters but their perspective on a range of other issues that impact on the community. The panel provides a forum for young people in our community to speak their minds, and this will assist me as their local representative to have a better understanding of the issues in my community.

It is my belief that in our democracy we should give young people a voice in the political process to ensure that our decisions more accurately reflect community sentiment. Most of these young people are on the verge of voting, so I think it is very important for them to get involved and engage in the political process so they understand the issues and make informed decisions not only at election time but from time to time when other issues come up.

I invited all schools in the Light electorate, as well as those with a significant number of students living in the electorate but whose school is physically just outside my electorate, to nominate two students to be part of the panel. The response I received from the schools and the young people was outstanding. All seven colleges that I invited to be part of the panel accepted the invitation. My panel now includes 15 young people, plus teachers who accompany them to these various meetings.

In addition to representatives from the various schools, I was very keen to make sure that young people who were not at school but who would like to express an opinion were also invited, so I extended the panel to include representatives from the Playford Youth Advisory Committee, the Gawler Youth Advisory Committee and the Light Barossa Youth Advisory Committee, which are established by councils and represent a broader group of young people. I chose to do it this way because it is very important that the YAP is a very diverse group that reflects the diversity of opinions, views and backgrounds of young people in my community.

The YAP will meet four to six times a year and the agenda items will be determined by the young people themselves. We held our first meeting in mid-September. Since that first mid-September meeting, we agreed on some ground rules and a whole range of issues. We had a discussion about what sorts of issues we would like to put on the agenda and how often we would

meet. We had a meeting here in Parliament House where the group met with the Leader of the Opposition and the President of the upper house and had a tour of parliament.

I would like to acknowledge those representatives on my panel because they are doing a wonderful job. If time permits, I would like to mention a recent meeting, how important it was and the contributions that were made. The young people who are part of the panel are Ethan White, Rebekah Harris, Kobi Rigney-Foster and Jordan Searle from Xavier College; Curtis Worden and Tianna Ranford from Gawler and District College; Bridie McDougall and Nakai Bvunzawabaya from Trinity College Gawler; Robani Shukuru, Mwangaza Milunga and Claudetta Niyera from Mark Oliphant College; Gloria Kiwele and Mercedes Heydrich from St Columba College; Scott Larsen and Corey Lloyd from St Patrick's Technical College; Paige Gauci from Northern Adelaide Senior College; and Angus Millikan from the Gawler Youth Advisory Committee.

I am very proud to say that at our most recent meeting we addressed the issue of the mental health of young people, and the panel was really engaged in that. I would also like to acknowledge Dr Naomi Rutten, who gave an outstanding presentation about how young people develop and what we need to do to make sure they have the resilience to have good health. What really impressed me about the young people is that they want to have another meeting to discuss what they can take away from that meeting to do in their schools and in the community to make sure that young people in our community are resilient and have good mental health.

Time expired.

### CRICKET

**Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:24):** I would like to talk about a topic very dear to my heart and that is cricket. Whether it is the 11 wonderful players who wear the baggy green in a test match, to witnessing a century as a spectator, to cricket on Christmas Day in the family backyard, it is certainly a sport that brings a nation together.

Over the weekend, Adelaide hosted the second match of the Domain Test Series against Pakistan. Unfortunately, the weather was not so kind, but we still had a brilliant test match here in Adelaide going over four days and seeing Adelaide Oval host 91,879 fans, which is truly a fantastic effort by South Australia in supporting the Adelaide Oval test. It is an incredible number, showing that not even the wet can dampen the spirits of South Australian cricket tragics.

Picturesque world-renowned Adelaide Oval was once again bustling with spectators and the atmosphere was fantastic. Compare this with the test match a week ago in Brisbane, which was played a week earlier. Brisbane could barely put together 45,000 for the test match, despite the fact that the city is home to a much larger population than Adelaide. Indeed, if we want cricket to be alive in this country, we need to ensure that it is well supported right across Australia. Our international players, men and women, deserve to be playing in front of a large audience.

That is why it is so disappointing that, once again, we get to the end of the 2019 year and we are talking about whether Adelaide is going to host a test match next year. It is so important that Adelaide Oval does indeed host the test series next year. More importantly, it is because India is coming. India is a powerhouse in the game of cricket, but also a powerhouse in terms of communities that are in Adelaide of Indian descent. We know that they certainly come out and support the Indian team when they travel.

Adelaide Oval continues to draw crowds year in, year out, no matter what, even despite the beer prices. SA has long celebrated cricket and we have a great culture. I think we have one of the best pitches in the nation and that is why it is so important that as a government we continue to promote and want the Adelaide Oval test to remain. Just look at last weekend: hotels were booked and the bars and restaurants were packed. There was a huge focus on cricket. People were talking about it in the streets and, of course, I know that resonates into our communities as well.

Australia has an important relationship with India beyond the game of cricket, however. Cricket is a strong cultural connection between our two nations. India right now is seeing high economic growth and India is number four for South Australia in terms of our major export destinations for 2017-18. The high economic growth rate in the last two decades has led to increasing

demand for minerals from Australia. The mining sector is an important segment of the Indian economy and is very diverse, spanning most geographical regions.

India has also maintained its position as the largest buyer of Australian almonds and, of course, South Australia is a huge exporter of almonds as well. Prime Minister Morrison has accepted an invitation from Indian Prime Minister Modi to visit the country in January 2020. This will be a huge opportunity for Australia to further strengthen our cultural ties, our shared values and, really importantly, that economic stimulus and drive that is driven from exports between the two nations.

What better way to focus on bilateral trade from a South Australian perspective than through the prism of cricket and that will hopefully be through the Adelaide-India test match at Adelaide Oval in 2020, which will hopefully be under lights. It will be a great boost for tourism for our state in showcasing what is so fantastic here in Adelaide in South Australia to a huge cricket-loving market and a nation with a population of over one billion. I hope Cricket Australia sees sense and ensures that Adelaide Oval is awarded the India-Australia test match next year.

Sir, you will be very pleased to know that 2020 will see the launch of SA Parliament Friends of Cricket, which I am pleased to be a co-chair of, together with the Leader of the Opposition. We are looking to have our first charity event as a pollies versus media match at the Karen Rolton Oval early in the new year. The member for Florey was telling me the other day how she remembers opening the batting with former member of the upper house Angus Redford. It was Bedford and Redford opening up the batting for the South Australian team.

I have some great clubs in my community: the Coromandel Cricket Club, Belair Cricket Club, Coromandel Valley Ramblers Cricket Club and Unley Gunners Cricket Club. They compete in various competitions across suburban Adelaide in summer. They are fantastic clubs and I wish them all the best for the 2019-20 season.

### KANGAROO ISLAND

**The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:29):** Kangaroo Island, which I am very fortunate to represent in this place, has long been a Liberal voting part of South Australia. Indeed, this is the first time that a Labor member of parliament has represented the people of Kangaroo Island in either state or federal parliament. But things are changing on Kangaroo Island and there is a lot of disquiet about the way this Liberal government is treating the people of Kangaroo Island.

I have with me two petitions to present to the house, signed in protest, about this Marshall Liberal government's doubling of the registration fees on Kangaroo Island. When we look at people on the island who already struggle with higher freight costs and other costs of doing business and costs of living, because they are in a remote location in South Australia, this is another massive impost on them.

It is not a really big draw on a state budget that is probably worth \$23 billion but it is a lot of money for these people. So we have had 1,363 people on Kangaroo Island sign the physical petitions and 336 have signed the online petition, which we cannot present to the house because of the rules of the house. That is 1,600 people out of a population on Kangaroo Island of 4,500. We are talking about a third of the population of Kangaroo Island who have signed this petition, such is the level of angst and anger at the Marshall Liberal government's move to do this.

This will not only affect you if you own the vehicle that you get around in, but a lot of farmers on the island also own a few trucks, tractors, utes and things like that. The bills are going to be dramatically higher than they were when they were getting the 50 per cent reduction through the remote areas concession scheme. One of the freight companies over there says that their registration bill will go up by \$50,000 to \$60,000 a year. That will be passed on to every person on Kangaroo Island who has something that is not produced on Kangaroo Island and needs to be brought over to the island, so it is a huge impost. I want to thank all those people for their support of this petition.

As I have said before, this is not Labor versus Liberal. This is the Kangaroo Island community against a stupid idea. I really hope that the Marshall Liberal government will listen to the voices of the people who have signed this petition and will reverse those cuts in next year's budget. It went up by 25 per cent in this year's budget, and I think the people of the island would be happy to wear that and not have to get compensated for that and have that paid back because it would probably cost a

lot of money and it would be a lot of work for the bureaucracy to do, as long as the full 50 per cent concession is returned in next year's budget.

Again, I want to work with the government on this. We put these petitions out. They were out on the island for roughly five weeks. We started them at the Kingscote Show. I also want to thank those businesses on the island who have had them on their bars and front counters for people to sign. The other petition I have is signed by 943 people. It is about Flinders Chase National Park and the proposal to have accommodation built in very sensitive areas.

When we were in government, we were very much open to the idea of having accommodation in our national parks that fitted in with the environment and, in fact, we invested \$5 million to build the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail, which has been a massive success and has rated highly as one of the great walking trails in Australia. We put out a proposal to get high-end accommodation in there. When the then environment minister, Ian Hunter, and I were taken there, we were shown the locations of where this was going to be and it was near the trail.

Then somewhere between our being in government and our not being in government things changed and two of the sites are now in a place that was not originally proposed, which has angered a lot of people on Kangaroo Island. It has seen volunteers in the parks withdraw their services and go on strike. Again, I would ask the government to please reconsider and put this accommodation back on the track where it was originally proposed to be, because people are angry on Kangaroo Island.

#### **NARACOORTE WORLD HERITAGE FESTIVAL AND RUN**

**Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:34):** On Sunday 24 November, I was honoured to attend and take part in the inaugural Naracoorte World Heritage Festival and Run. This event was held to celebrate two very special anniversaries. Fifty years ago, in 1969 one of the world's 10 greatest fossil sites was discovered at the Naracoorte Caves. The caves themselves were discovered back in 1857, when the Reverend Julian Tension-Woods uncovered the first of thousands of tiny bone fragments deep inside a cave.

The key discovery, though, was in 1969 when palaeontologist Professor Rod Wells and his colleague Grant Gartrell were deep in the Victoria Caves, where they found an enormous chamber filled with the fossilised remains of tens of thousands of individual animals. This was the largest and most preserved discovery of so-called megafauna, the bones of giant marsupials, including the wombat-like diprotodon, the marsupial lion and the giant kangaroo, all of which used to roam the area more than 500,000 years ago.

In 1994, 25 years after the megafauna discovery, the Naracoorte Caves were added to the World Heritage List. This is an important recognition that identifies the caves as a place of cultural and physical significance to the planet and recognises the scientific value of fossil deposits. Importantly, the recognition guarantees the site will be held in trust for future generations, committing governments and local communities to protect the caves for everyone to enjoy.

The Naracoorte Caves are one of only two fossil sites in Australia and 11 worldwide that are listed for their World Heritage value. Today, the Naracoorte Caves site has grown to be a world-class location visited by more than 50,000 people every year. Of the 28 caves on the site, four are open to the public to explore and enjoy, boasting amazing displays of stalagmites and stalactites. There are a variety of tours to suit any level of fitness or ability, from the rooftop walk to adventure caving—a test for anyone who feels claustrophobic.

The inaugural Naracoorte World Heritage Festival and Run helped highlight and celebrate the anniversaries of the megafauna find and the World Heritage listing. There were among 300 entries, with participants able to take part in 22-kilometre, 14-kilometre or five-kilometre run courses. Trail runners came from as far away as Adelaide, and some were from interstate. The courses traversed the natural beauty of the area through pine forests and natural bushland, past farms and vineyards and over wombat holes and dry creek crossings, testing the abilities and fitness of many who participated.

The run was a really great occasion, and many families took part. I was privileged enough to take up the opportunity to run the five-kilometre run (it felt like more than five kilometres). I went with

my daughter and we ran together most of the way. She trailed me for the first four kilometres and left me for dead in the last kilometre, coming in second. What was most important was that I was not the only one to participate in the run, as there were many other families taking part.

It was much enjoyed and interesting. One of the best things about running is to run somewhere you have not seen or been before because it takes your mind away from whatever you are suffering from the run to enjoying whatever you can see along the track. We had to dodge a few native issues, such as wombat holes, and I heard that runners managed to avoid a couple of slippery Joe Blakes that were sliding through the bushes as well. In all, there was great participation. It is one of the first fun runs they have held, and I hope that there go on to be many more.

Support for the festival and run was enabled through \$20,000 from the Australian government's Building Better Regions Fund, while the Naracoorte Lucindale Council and the Business and Tourism Association contributed more than \$15,000 and \$5,000 respectively. The University of Adelaide and the Naracoorte Caves supported the festival and run with in-kind contributions. I would also like to express my thanks to all the people and local businesses who lent their support to and helped organise this event.

To the many stallholders who offered the best of our local food, wine and produce, thank you for again putting our region on the map. It was estimated that around a thousand people participated on the day, and one of the most popular events of the day was the Naracoorte Caves Music ensemble, who performed a specially composed piece inside the Blanche Cave. There was also an opportunity to hear from Professor Rod Wells and his colleague Grant Gartrell, who, as I said, discovered the megafauna remains inside the Victoria Caves 50 years ago.

Thank you also to the Department for Environment and Water for hosting the Naracoorte Caves run and for their ongoing role in the management of these fantastic natural assets. I look forward to the Naracoorte Caves fun run becoming a popular and important event on the tourism calendar. May the Naracoorte Caves continue to inspire, teach and amaze the many people who visit every year.

#### *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 28 November 2019.)

**Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:39):** I rise today to close debate on the report of the Select Committee on the Fire and Emergency Services (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill. It was tabled in this place on 4 April, so it has been some time coming to a conclusion, but I am pleased we have finally reached that day. I look forward to going into committee on the bill later this afternoon.

The committee made 10 recommendations regarding clause 23 of the bill, which proposed to extend powers to direct people to refrain from prescribed activities which may cause fires. While the report recommends that proposed powers be introduced, it also states that the bill should clarify that South Australia Police officers, as the chief authority for law enforcement in this state, have the power to issue directions.

Further to that, given the success of and stakeholder support for the Grain Harvesting Code of Practice, the committee further recommends the exercise of powers in section 82 take into account relevant industry-led codes of practice. The committee has investigated the possible implications of the powers to direct for people across South Australia based on a broad range of stakeholder submissions and is pleased with the outcomes.

On behalf of the committee, I would like to thank all those who took time to contribute to the inquiry. The committee received 39 submissions and held four public hearings. They took place in Adelaide, Port Lincoln, Balaklava and Keith. I would like to thank the other members of the

committee, who include the members for Finniss, Heysen, Mawson and Giles, and also committee staff Dr Josh Forkert and Dr Monika Stasiak.

I would also like to thank those who have made contributions on the report in this place, they being the members for Heysen, Finniss and Mount Gambier; the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services; the members for Elizabeth and Hammond; and also the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government.

With that, I commend the report and, as I said earlier, look forward to the committee stage of the bill.

Motion carried.

### *Bills*

## **FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

### *Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I want to thank the minister again for bringing this bill back to the house eventually. I note that there have been some changes along the way. I noted in my contribution to the select committee stage—which I think is the first time I have ever been involved in a select committee stage with a bill so, thank you, sir, for providing us with that opportunity—some of the deficiencies in the minister's approach to consultation. I was briefed very late in the day. Indeed, I was briefed after the forums in which I would normally come to some conclusions about how to proceed with the bill.

Nevertheless, we find ourselves here. I have been briefed by the minister's advisers. Almost a week ago, through the minister's office I requested a briefing from SAPOL. I have not received the courtesy of a response to the email let alone a briefing from SAPOL. We will get to some questions. We may not get there today but we will see. I just want to put that on the record so that my contributions later regarding SAPOL are based on the utterances of SAPOL on the public record and my anecdotal knowledge rather than a formal briefing provided by the minister. I have a question on clause 1.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Can I have a say on clause 1, too?

**The CHAIR:** You will get the opportunity. Perhaps if the member puts the question you can respond and answer the question at the same time.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Still on the theme of consultation, I think I will just ask at this point: can the minister confirm that before tabling the bill in the house he consulted? I will list some organisations for him to make it easier: the CFS Volunteers Association, the UFU, PASA and the SES Volunteers' Association. Also, can he confirm that he had the support of his entire party—that is, the party room and the cabinet—before bringing that bill to the house?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I will begin by making a few comments of clarity for the member for Elizabeth's benefit. I know that he has been in this place for a long time, but he is only new to the front bench, so he may not have been privy to a lot of the work that was done in the background for the 16 years that Labor were in government.

Unfortunately, and I will talk more about this in a second, a lot of this work was not covered as thoroughly as one might have expected in this situation. To add to my comments and just to clarify, this bill seeks to amend the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 to incorporate long overdue legislative changes, and I stress the words 'long overdue legislative changes' and again remind the member for Elizabeth of that fact. These issues, I remind this house, which the bill seeks to address include:

- employment and security of volunteers who are absent from work to respond to an emergency, which is an important point;

- breaches of permit conditions imposed by authorised by officers;
- various technical issues raised by the emergency services organisations relating to apparent anomalies or ambiguities within the act; and
- providing power to direct the cessation of hazardous practices that, due to weather conditions, may cause a fire if ignited to get out of control. Based upon the recommendations of the select committee, these powers will now be conferred upon SAPOL.

This bill as tabled will be amended to recognise that legislation was successfully passed on 5 June 2019 to recognise the volunteers' charter in the Fire and Emergency Services Act. We are proud as state as to have the CFS and SES charters now enshrined in the act to ensure that consultation processes are effective and provide confidence that the views of emergency volunteers are treated seriously, something that did not happen under 16 years of a South Australian Labor government.

We have also taken the opportunity to consider further feedback to ensure that we have the best possible legislation to provide protection to the communities of South Australia. These amendments will regulate the introduction of industry brigades to assist in protecting our communities, particularly in the state's South-East where our forest industries are an important part of our economy.

Through this amendment we will ensure harmonisation with Victoria, which has been operating under similar legislation for a number of years. This bushfire season has reminded us all of the bushfire threat. With this in mind, the government is keen to ensure that complete and effective powers are available to ensure that the risk of bushfire is minimised. So today we are amending the original proposal of the 2013 Holloway review.

Holloway suggested removing certain powers and standards that are prescribed in the Fire and Emergency Services Act. These standards relate to hazard reduction. These are all important powers, and we as a government are now not proposing their removal from the act. They will stay, and this government will expect that they are acted upon.

Again, the advice that I had previously received was that the previous management had looked to amend these. That work was not done. I was led to believe that a lot of this work had been done under the previous government, but it came to light that it has not been done, so I have just outlined the course of action we are taking. I will welcome further input and review to better streamline and coordinate these powers and functions.

However, at the moment we need to be able to assure the community that we are presenting the best possible legislation to protect our community from the threat of bushfire. The key objectives of this bill are to improve the ability of the emergency services to deliver key public safety outcomes at minimal cost to the government and community and to demonstrate the government's appreciation of the commitment of emergency service volunteers to the safety of our community.

In answering the member for Elizabeth's question, and I outlined some of it there, this all stemmed from the 2013 Holloway review. That was when Labor were in government. A number of recommendations came out of that review and one might have thought that Labor would have put forward those recommendations and acted on them, but they did not. The advice I received at the time we came into government was to put these amendments forward. I was informed that extensive consultation had happened under the previous government.

Again, I note that the member for Elizabeth was not in the cabinet, not on the front bench, so he may not have availed himself of that consultation. I am not sure at what depth or level the Labor Party were consulting with their backbenchers on that, but I was informed that extensive consultation had taken place on the back of this review and that Labor had not acted on that consultation and those recommendations. I am not sure why, and the member for Elizabeth may not be able to answer why. Was it incompetence? Was it not wanting to do it? Was it not having the intestinal fortitude? Were they just kicking the can down the road? Why did they not act on this?

I also outlined in my second reading explanation that we would work through this with Grain Producers SA, as a key stakeholder in this area. We are more than happy to do that and I could not have been clearer in my contribution to this house. To your credit, one way of doing that consultation was through a select committee, and you did a fine job, along with all the members who were involved with that. It was great to do that and to revisit that consultation with the community, not feeling that enough had been done from 2013 when it was originally put forward under the previous Labor government.

We are happy to admit that the perception out in the community was that the consultation work had not been done despite the information that I had received, so we went and did that. Again, I reiterate that point. I thank the member for his work and all members on both sides of this house. I did outline that we could potentially do some of this work through regulation but, to really be clear, the select committee did an outstanding job and really cemented down what I was probably thinking anyway. So it landed us in a really good place.

As such, we have amended the legislation and we are working very closely with Grain Producers SA. I note that they are very happy with where it lands. Probably an underlying theme from the work the select committee did right around the state—and a lot of people came out, and I thank them very much for that—the underlying consensus, especially when it comes to harvesting, was that 99.9 per cent of people arguably do the right thing.

There is one person out there who does not, and nearly every community actually nodded in agreement by saying, 'Yes, we know that person. What can we do?' As it stood, there was no power, so the person who was doing the wrong thing could snub their nose at anyone who questioned them on it. We wanted to put in place a system, if it is needed. I think I made it very clear in my initial contribution that I do not think it is needed. With the way that technology is moving and the way these communities are coming together and working together, it probably is not needed.

Making sure that we have that protection and the cover that is needed by having these powers as outlined will give everyone that reassurance. As I said, if a neighbouring landowner is doing the wrong thing and you want to go and question them on the activity they are doing, you can do that, but they can snub their nose at you. Now you can say, 'If you have done it, I will follow the process and do something about it.' That will mean that people who are doing the wrong thing will stop, so that in itself will be a really big win. If there is a situation where people are doing the wrong thing, again, the authorities can be called.

The big thing to note about this and the thing that really drove this forward is the situation where police could only act after someone had started a fire. After someone has started a fire and potentially damage has been done, someone can then be prosecuted, but there was no way you could actually stop the action before a potential disastrous situation unfolded. That is where we have landed with this.

Again, I thank all the stakeholders who were involved. I reiterate the point once more that from the information I was given, all this consultation had been done. I am not sure whether the member for Elizabeth can enlighten the committee any more about whether Labor actually did that consultation, whether in fact it was not done and whether or not he was included in that consultation, but that is where it stands.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I will need to clarify.

**The CHAIR:** Just before you do, member for Elizabeth, do you want the minister to address your initial question, which was around consultation?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I would like the minister to address that and perhaps I should be more specific. Since the end of the select committee process, the formulation of the bill and its tabling in this house, has the minister consulted with PASA, the CFSVA, the UFU or the SESVA and did his backbench get a chance to peruse the bill before it was tabled in this house? My time is limited, so the other part of my question is: was everybody on the backbench happy with it to go through? Did it pass unanimously through the party room?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Yes, it did pass the party room, otherwise we would not be here. As I outlined, consultation was done across a very long period of time. Again, I ask the member to

maybe go back and determine when this work was done and when, under the Labor government, they—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Down, down. Let me finish.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Point of order: my point of order is relevance. My question was very specific. The time frame was specific about the consultation.

**The CHAIR:** I am sure the minister is getting to answering that question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am. As I outlined and made abundantly clear, this is a body of work that has carried over since 2013—the Holloway review, which happened under the previous Labor government. The advice I was given was there was a big body of work done—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Hang on, hang on, zip it. A big body of work had been done is what I was informed. If you are telling me that the Labor government did not do any work on it, that would be news to me and I would be interested to hear that. But, with that, we moved the piece of legislation and consulted with a number of groups.

In my speech, and I will repeat it again for the member, I did outline that we were happy to consult with grain producers, who are one of the key stakeholders, around the specific context of the regulations. If I remember rightly, the VAs were sitting in the chamber as we moved this legislation. I know the VAs were here and present at the time of moving the legislation. You are right: some people were concerned about how it would actually roll out, so to be really clear the select committee was formed.

Mr Chair, you could maybe even answer this as well. The consultation for the select committee was thorough with anyone and everyone who wanted to have an input. Everyone was written to and given the opportunity to have an input and the select committee could not have been more robust or more thorough. Again, I commend to the house the work of that select committee. I think it has landed us in a really good place. Right throughout all that process, the invitations were there—

**Mr Odenwalder:** What happened next? What happened after the select committee?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** We have tabled the amendments in the parliament.

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Member for Elizabeth, you have asked your question. You are interjecting at the moment.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** They have been on the table for everyone to see.

**The CHAIR:** And, minister, you will direct your comments through me, please, and not respond to interjections. You were answering a question.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Thank you, Chair. As I outlined, we tabled the amendments in the parliament. They have been on the table for everyone to see. This is no great surprise. This happened 12 months ago. There has been significant consultation right the way through. They are sitting there for anyone to look at. Members of our house have had a look at it; everyone has had a look at it. Two weeks is not long enough for you?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I am not asking about that. I am asking specifically about PASA, I am asking about the CFSVA, I am asking about the SESVA and I am asking about the UFU. Have they been consulted on these amendments?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The UFU, on this amendment?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Yes, on these amendments.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Around volunteers?

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Again, it was laid on the table and it was very clear. Everyone was written to to be able to have a say and to be able to have their input. They were given ample opportunity.

**The CHAIR:** Do you want another question on clause 1?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** No, but I will just conclude some remarks, though. If you want me to phrase it as a question, I will, but I want to make it clear—

**The CHAIR:** No, you do not have to.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Excellent. That would have been difficult, I think, because what I am about to say is that, notwithstanding everything I said before about the consultation, or lack thereof, with the opposition—not the other people who were not consulted with—I do not intend to necessarily delay the bill through the lower house. Because of the lack of consultation, we do—what is the word?

**Mr Pederick:** Reserve your right.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Reserve our right; thank you, member for Hammond. I do reserve my right to examine certain amendments between the houses and continue consulting with these organisations, which I do speak to and I do consult with when I come in here and try to effect legislative change. But I do hope to approach the bill, believe it or not, minister, in a bipartisan way. I think some of the changes do make sense. I have read the Holloway review. I think there are some good changes to be made, but it is the nature in which those changes are made. This is the root of my question about the amendments—

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

**The CHAIR:** With all due respect to you both, it probably does not matter too much about that. What we are dealing with is the bill today.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Thank you, sir, for your protection. I was being nice. He interrupted me being nice.

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

**Mr ODENWALDER:** In any case, I was on bipartisanship. I was on the fact that this bill, with its amendments, may well make perfect sense and may be a perfectly good bill. Given the Holloway review and the other work that has been done over that time period, I am sure there are some good ideas in the bill. I do reserve the right, however, to make amendments following that consultation, as I said, but hopefully we will emerge from this process in this house with a bill that we can all support. However, I cannot guarantee the opposition's support at this stage.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Obviously, this is a pretty standard clause, but when is this intended to commence? Assuming this passes the house before prorogation, when is it intended that this will pass? If the consultation was right last year, a bill in a different form could have passed at least in the middle of last fire season. We are now well into this year's fire season. Considering how important the minister sees these changes, I wonder when he intends that the bill is proclaimed?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I thank the member for the question and note the 16 years of government and they did not get this done. I have mentioned that, and I am keen to chat with the member offline about what work was done in 2013 just to get clarification around that. What I will say is that the regulations need to be formulated around this. We have established a working group with the CFS and SAPOL to work through those regulations and make sure that they will be effective and efficient. We will work through that. I hope that we will have that all ratified before next harvest season.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 3, lines 16 to 18 [clause 4(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

Amendment No 2 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 4, lines 3 to 5[clause 4(5)]—Delete subclause (5)

**The CHAIR:** Did you want to speak to those amendments?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** No, I am happy to take questions if the shadow minister would like.

**The CHAIR:** Any questions on the amendments? Just so we are clear, if we pass the amendments we still get to consider clause 4 as amended, so it is up to you how you handle it.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** As I said, I do not intend to delay the committee in any particular way. My questions are genuine. The amendments to this clause interrelate to other amendments later on, so perhaps I will ask the minister at this point to explain why these provisions were inserted into the first bill. What was the need for them in the first bill, and why were these amendments removed from the bill? An explanation—and it might save us time later on depending on how fulsome the explanation is.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I thank you for the question. Just to clarify, I outlined this somewhat in the comments I made on clause 1, so hopefully there is a little bit more detail here for you, and I am happy to flesh it out as you see fit. The Holloway review recommended alignment of bushfire area management committees and council regions. The government supports greater alignment but also recognises the need for local committees to determine the necessity of this. Therefore, an amendment of using a legal instrument to push them together is deleted and instead CFS will work closely with councils and other stakeholders to best align boundaries of committees.

I think I outlined in my comments earlier that I was led to believe more work had been done in this space, but it had not, so as it stands I think leaving it as it is and continuing to work with those communities which, again, we always do. I stress the number of regional communities I have been to since coming into this portfolio: I think it is upwards of 77 CFS stations that I have visited and more than 100 brigades that I have met with, so we will keep engaging at that level, as one would expect, but that is the reason for that amendment, that change.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** At what point and following which consultation with which groups did it become clear in the minister's mind that these changes were not necessary or desirable?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** This did play out post the select committee. GPSA and the Nature Conservation Council were the key stakeholders that we engaged with around that, again identifying that the work had not been done and that staying with the status quo and continuing to work together would be the best outcome.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 5.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Clause 5 inserts a provision allowing the recording, possessing or using or moving of still images for the purposes of operations activities, including for training. Can you outline why and when the MFS would need to use these powers in some detail?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** A very good point, and I thank the member for this question. I am informed that as part of fire cause investigation and damage assessment MFS may be required to collect digital imagery to assist in investigations and determinations. Digital imagery may also be used to support incident controllers to gain rapid situational awareness to support decision-making processes. It will give them a heads-up. It has those sorts of capabilities.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Will there be guidelines around how these can be used and how they will be disseminated and stored, etc., and will these guidelines be publicly available?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am informed that that is an operational matter for each of the agencies and it will be determined through each of the agencies.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** What about if these images, whether they are still or moving, are images of people? Will there be guidelines around whether people can or cannot be in those images, whether they can or cannot be identified and how those particular images will be stored or disseminated?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Again, that will be an operational matter for each of the agencies.

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** You have had three questions, I think, member for Elizabeth.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Have I? I thought my third question was a reiteration of my second question.

**The CHAIR:** I will just check. My apologies. My record keeping has not been good. I have been reliably informed that you have only had two, so, member for Elizabeth, go for it.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** My obfuscation was unnecessary then, sir. It is really a reiteration in a sense. Has there been any work done on whether these guidelines might conflict with any public sector privacy principles?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Again, it is an operational matter and it is a matter for the chiefs to conform to any of those regulations that they are obliged to conform to.

Clause passed.

Clause 6 passed.

Clause 7.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** This amendment obviously refers to—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Elizabeth, clause 7 does not have an amendment attached to it.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I meant this clause as an amendment to the act. Sorry, I beg your pardon. This clause obviously refers to the powers of the MFS, in terms of safeguarding buildings: making it clear who can and cannot enter buildings at certain times. I think that, on the face of it, it looks like a pretty good change. My question, though, is: did these come at the instigation of the MFS or were they recommendations of the Holloway review, and why were they necessary?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am led to believe that it came from the MFS and the idea is to harmonise them so that there is continuity between the MFS and the CFS.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** My understanding is that currently the CFS do not have these powers; do they? This bill may give them to them, so in that sense there will be a harmonisation at the end of this process, but at the moment, no-one has these particular powers in terms of orders, do they?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** That is correct.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** So my initial question stands. The answer to my question cannot be that they want to harmonise with the CFS. My question is: what instigated this change, whether it is the MFS or the CFS later on?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** It may help if I can read the following. The definition of closure did not stipulate that persons were either required to leave or enter the building, although that was the intent of the closure order. The 48-hour period of closure meant that, if a closure order was implemented on a Friday afternoon, the closure order would be lifted some time on the Sunday, enabling re-entry to the premises even though the reason/danger for the closure order being implemented could still be present.

Changing the 48 hours to two full business days would ensure that an extension to the closure order would be sought from the Magistrates Court without the possibility of re-entry to the premises, where the danger may still be present, during Magistrates Court's opening hours. Subclause (7) allows the CO to lift the closure order if the danger has been alleviated and not have

to make the owner of the premises wait until a court appearance with a magistrate if the danger is rectified providing the order was not issued by the Magistrates Court in the first place.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Are there any legal or administrative mechanisms for owners or residents of buildings or any other premises to challenge these orders or the basis on which they are made? Can they be challenged within that time frame? Perhaps as an adjunct to that question, were there any instances which resulted in confusion that prompted these changes?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am informed that it was put forward to strengthen the legislation in the benefit of public safety, as I outlined. The 48-hour rule means that someone could re-enter their house on a Sunday, whereas if you have two business days, it just means that it gives operations a chance to make sure that the premise is safe for people to re-enter in the case of some devastation to their property.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I think I understand that change and I do not have any argument with it particularly. I just wonder if there is any legal or administrative mechanism for owners who disagree with the decision made by the chief officer or is the chief officer's decision beyond any challenge? I am not being tricky. I just want to know.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I cannot answer that. I would have to get legal advice to get clarification on what the pathways would be. I could suggest it would be through some legal avenue but I cannot give a definitive answer. But I am happy to get an answer and bring that back to you, yes.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** The second part of the question—

**The CHAIR:** I am cutting you some slack now but it may not continue.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I just want to know—and it is a supplementary to the previous answer—if there were any—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Yes, indeed, sometimes. Were there specific instances which resulted in confusion that prompted these changes or was it simply a policy change that was identified?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am not aware of any, no.

Clause passed.

Clause 8 passed.

Clause 9.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I move:

Amendment No 3 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 6, lines 9 to 38—This clause is opposed

Clause negatived.

Clause 10.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** This obviously is a reiteration of the MFS powers clause and my questions are the same. When and why would the CFS use these powers?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** You are asking when they will be used? The answer is that as part of the fire cause investigation and damage assessment the CFS may be required—are we talking about the digital imagery?

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Yes.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The CFS may be required to collect digital imagery to assist investigations and determinations. Digital imagery may also be used to support incident controllers gain rapid situation awareness to support decision-making processes.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I imagine that the guidelines, etc., around dissemination would be, as you discussed in your previous answer, down to the individual agency to assess. Can you guarantee, though, that images of people, in particular, but also other identifying matter like numberplates, for instance, and those sorts of things will not find their way into the public domain?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The short answer is yes, as with the previous answer I gave around the MFS. The point to this is that there are public sector protocols and each operation will make their own decision around that operationally. That will be their decision, but there will be protocols that they have to meet and that will be met.

Clause passed.

Clause 11 passed.

Clause 12.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I move:

Amendment No 4 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 8, lines 21 to 25 [clause 12, inserted section 69C(4)]—Delete subsection (4) and substitute:

- (4) If a prescribed person to whom a notice under this section has been given fails to comply with the notice, the Chief Officer may—
  - (a) establish an industry brigade for the designated area; and
  - (b) recover the costs of supplying and maintaining the plant, equipment, apparatus and devices specified in the notice from the prescribed person as a debt due to SACFS.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Just for some clarification, I understand the purpose of this is that it sends it from a negative to a positive. Instead of issuing a fine or an expiation for contravening the notice, the CFS can recover costs afterwards. That is my understanding of this. Can you just explain why that change was made? What is the difference?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Just to clarify again, the bulk of our forestry industry is obviously in the South-East. The intent with this was to harmonise the legislation, if you like, with the Victorian legislation, given that it is so close to the border and there is so much interaction across the border within this industry. That is what this does.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Still on the amendment, in the original iteration of the bill where would that money, as a fine or expiation, have gone under the previous model? Would it have gone to general revenue or would it have gone to the agency?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I cannot answer that question other than to say that that fine is no longer there.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Well, it is there still because we have not voted on the amendment yet. Where is it intended for that money to go? Does it go to general revenue or does it go to the agency?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Obviously, in those situations that is a negotiation with the Treasurer. My preference would be to see it go back to the agencies, but if you want to come with me when we talk to the Treasurer, I welcome you.

Amendment carried.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** This is all about industry brigades, obviously. This is a new provision, as I understand it. I am obviously not a country person. I have had some discussions with the member for Mount Gambier, and I understand this most directly affects his part of the world and, presumably, that of other members, too. For a suburban boy like me, can the minister outline the need for these industry groups?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** For the sake of the city slickers who maybe need to get out into the bush more often and get their shoes dirty—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** And I know that you would with your kids. I know your kids would love to go down to the South-East. They are great young fellows—

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** You should. Get them down to the South-East. You closed it. Get them down to the South-East; it is a fantastic place, a great part of the world. There are many, many people down there. You could go to the new sports club; we put a lot of money into that. We put a lot of money into their sports club. It is sensational. After years of your neglect, they are very happy to have the expansion there, too—a great community. I tell you what, the afternoon tea I had there at Kalangadoo sports—

**The CHAIR:** Minister, we are running out of time.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I do digress, but the member did ask. What I can say in answer to this question is that it enables the Chief Officer of the SACFS to require a prescribed person in a designated area, at their own expense, to form a suitable industry brigade for that area and apply to the SACFS for registration of that industry brigade.

It also requires the provision of such officers and members for the industry brigade as are determined by the SACFS and the provision and maintenance of the industry brigade with operational equipment for the prevention or suppression of fires, saving of life and protection of property at fires as determined by the SACFS. This will provide legislative power for the SACFS to require a prescribed person in a designated area to form and maintain an appropriately staffed and equipped fire brigade and penalty provisions for instances of noncompliance.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Can you outline the consultation that has been done—

**The CHAIR:** Member for Elizabeth, looking at the time, we are due to go to the Auditor-General's Report at 4.30, so we will come back to this, obviously.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

*Auditor-General's Report*

**AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT**

In committee.

(Continued from 28 November 2019.)

**The CHAIR:** We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Child Protection. I remind members that the committee is in normal session, and therefore any questions need to be asked by members on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19.

**Ms STINSON:** I refer to Part C, page 58, employee benefits expenses. This section reads that the DCP budgeted to expand its workforce with an additional 340 FTEs, to be recruited in 2018-19, but actually only recruited an additional 100 FTEs. Minister, is that data correct?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Yes, that is correct as at 30 June. However, I would like to point out that there have been 84.6 further staff members recruited since that time, and an extensive recruitment drive is underway and has continued. It is important that we get the right staff for the job, and it is more important to continue to do that rather than just fill vacancies to meet a target. There is considerable competition in the market with the expansion of the NDIS, and we are doing a lot of work on retaining and retraining their existing staff, which is also incredibly important.

**Ms STINSON:** So you are finding it difficult to recruit staff?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I did not say that it was difficult. I said that it was important to get it right. We have been extensively recruiting. Unlike the former Labor government that held open vacancies in order to cover the cost blowouts in their department, we have actively been recruiting for the entire almost two years that we have been in government, and I think we are making good progress.

In fact, right now we have the highest number of front-line child protection staff we have ever had, so we are doing very well. This government broadened the qualifications in order to expand our recruitment abilities. We have done everything possible to work to look after our staff, to recruit more staff, to retain those we have, and I think that the department is doing a good job. I would rather we took our time to get the right staff than fill the vacancies just to meet a target.

**Ms STINSON:** So 340 additional roles were budgeted in the last financial year. What has been the problem or the delay with recruiting that number of people within the 12 months for which those roles were budgeted?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Let me explain again. As you have stated, 100 staff were recruited in the last financial year, and since 30 June 2019 we have recruited a further 84.6. We are extensively recruiting throughout the state, and as a government we broadened the qualifications to allow expansion, which has occurred. We are recruiting.

As I said, there is competition with the NDIS, which is expanding and which is also looking for staff. If anyone is listening, we are looking for more staff. Please go online. We are recruiting in earnest. We would, as I said, prefer to get the right people. We prefer to also work on retaining the staff we have through staff training.

We had a our first leadership forum this year. We have had two. It is the first time it has happened in this department. We also had our first ever recognition of service and awards for recognition of good work as well this year, which has never been done before. So we are recognising our staff, retaining our staff better and actively working to recruit more.

**Ms STINSON:** Maybe the minister does not understand the question, so I will just go through it again. There were 340 roles that were budgeted for in the last financial year. Clearly, that money was meant to be spent in the last financial year to recruit those 340 FTEs. Obviously, that was not reached, and in the last financial year only 100 of those positions were hired. That leaves 240. My question is: what was the problem? Why were you not able to recruit the additional or the remaining 240 roles which you budgeted for and which were your target for last financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I would like to just point out that it is a relatively new department, so all the systems and processes and the human resources department were set up and continued to be managed. When there was the separation from the education department to child protection, there was a lot of work that needed to be done to separate the two and to set up the correct structures.

We have been working very hard as a department to recruit more staff, and we have been doing that for almost two years, as I have stated. I cannot explain it any better to you other than by saying that we are continuing to recruit, we are retaining the staff that we have through staff engagement and training and it is more important to get the right staff than just to fill vacancies for the sake of it.

**Ms STINSON:** Minister, you said in your previous answer that you are not facing difficulty recruiting enough staff. What is the reason that you are putting forward to the parliament for not being able to meet your target of recruiting 340 people in the last financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** What I am putting to the parliament is that under the former Labor government front-line positions and positions within the department were particularly held open to save money.

**Ms STINSON:** Point of order, sir: debate, reflecting on what the previous government did is in no way addressing the question.

**The CHAIR:** Member for Badcoe, we are not actually in question time; we are in committee. We are not as firm on the debate issue in committee as we would be in question time. Minister, you were getting to answer the question.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** As I said, we are not purposely holding open any vacancies, as was the former government's position, which was to cover the massive blowouts in their costs and their departmental budget. We are actively recruiting and, as I have said endlessly, there is no point filling spaces just to reach a goal. We want the right staff. I speak to children, and they express to

me the importance of having consistency of staff, whether it be their caseworkers in the department or whether it be their residential careworkers.

We are working on training, we are working on award recognition for good work to move to encourage other work processes to improve and we are actively recruiting. We have recruited 84 since 30 June. We are doing statewide recruiting. It is a competitive market with the expansion of the NDIS, and we are in earnest filling vacancies.

**Ms STINSON:** Have you got any idea why you have not been able to recruit those 250 workers you committed to recruit and did not in the last financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I do not know any other way to explain this to the member for Badcoe, who is clearly having a lot of trouble. It is a competitive market. There are other state government departments and non-government organisations—

*Ms Stinson interjecting:*

**The CHAIR:** Member for Badcoe, you asked your question. Minister.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** —who are competing for very similar types of workers. We are in a competitive market. We are not going to just fill a vacancy with anybody who applies. We want the right people. I have been out to many residential care facilities and offices, and staff have expressed to me that putting people through a training program is pointless if they are not going to last in the job.

This is a difficult area of work that is not for everybody. I would prefer that the department maintained their recruitment strategy, which is getting the right people. As I have already stated in the house, we now have more front-line child protection staff than ever before.

**Ms STINSON:** When does the minister expect that those 340 budgeted positions will be filled?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I thank the member for her question. Current vacancies sit at around 142, and we are actively recruiting. We will fill those vacancies as soon as possible. Some of those vacancies are not permanent vacancies; some are due to secondments. Some of our staff can often work in other government departments and some are on long service leave or maternity leave. The 142 that were under does not account for permanent vacancies and it also does not include agency staff who are used to fill temporary vacancies.

**Ms STINSON:** On the figures that you have provided, there should be an outstanding number from the 340 extra positions of 155.4. How can you explain that you are saying now that there are 142 vacancies? Can you also detail what vacancies there are on top of the 340 that you committed to fund under the last budget?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I would have to take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** Do you expect to recruit all the 340 roles by the end of this year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I refer the member to my previous answer. I have already covered that.

**Ms STINSON:** Just for clarity, your previous answer was that you would be taking the question on notice, so are you taking that question on notice?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** The question prior to the previous question then.

**Ms STINSON:** Do you expect to recruit all the 340 roles budgeted in the last budget by June 2020?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Let me explain it all to you again, which I think is about the fourth time now. It is important to get the right staff. There is no point in filling a vacancy to keep the opposition happy, if you think that is the way to go. Both children and staff have expressed to me it is more important to get the right people who are dedicated to working in child protection. You cannot just take on anyone, which was a mistake of the former government—high churn, high turnover, staff being burnt out, the wrong type of staff.

I am speaking directly with staff and children during my visits and they want continuity. They want staff who are going to stick around because we know that is important for good outcomes for children—that it is the same case worker, that there are the same residential care workers and there is consistency. I am not prepared to set a date or a time line. What I can tell you is that we are actively recruiting statewide and will continue to until we fill our vacancies.

**Ms STINSON:** How much money has been saved by not recruiting the full 340 FTEs that were budgeted for in 2018-19?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** Can you provide a breakdown of how many of those 340 positions were operational, professional or administrative?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take that on notice as well.

**Ms STINSON:** Thank you. Could you please also provide the classifications for each of those 340 roles?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Yes, we will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** Further, could we get a breakdown of what the remaining 240 unfilled roles were in terms of a breakdown of operational, professional or administrative roles and what the classification for each of those roles is?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** We can only work that out for the 142 vacancies as of now. They shift over time. Currently, as at the end of November, there are 142 vacancies, so the department can look up those vacancies, classifications and everything for you.

**Ms STINSON:** How many additional positions were budgeted for in 2019-20 and is the allocated number of additional staff, if indeed there are any in 2019-20, a carryover from last year's unfilled positions?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** That is not in this report.

**Ms STINSON:** With respect, it goes to the matter of staffing. The minister herself introduced facts in terms of how many recruitments there have been since the Auditor-General's Report was released on 30 June, so I think it is fair to ask about that.

**The CHAIR:** For my benefit, member for Badcoe, could you repeat your question, please.

**Ms STINSON:** How many additional positions were budgeted for in 2019-20 and are those positions, if there are indeed additional positions, a carryover from last year's unfilled positions?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take advice on whether that is a relevant question and, if so, we will bring back an answer.

**The CHAIR:** I think, given that the member for Badcoe has related it back to this Auditor-General's Report, the minister could answer it, but as she sees fit, obviously.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Those are really figures that are in the estimates. They are not in this report, so there are no figures here for me to refer to.

**Ms STINSON:** I am happy for the minister to take it on notice. I feel it is a relevant question that is allowable by the Chair, so I am happy for her to take it on notice.

**The CHAIR:** Yes, you have made your point. Perhaps if the minister is prepared to take it on notice—

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I am advised that that is an estimates question so I will not be taking that on notice.

**The CHAIR:** That is the minister's prerogative, member for Badcoe.

**Ms STINSON:** I refer to Part C, page 56 under the subheading of 'Commercial care placements and projected costs not always properly approved'. The report states:

As at 30 June 2019 there were 103 children in commercial care, an increase of 10 children from 30 June 2018.

It goes on to state that that is an expensive form of care and that controls are needed before this form of placement is approved. How many instances were there in 2018-19 of commercial care memorandums not being authorised until late?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** While the Auditor-General took a sample, we would have to take on notice to get those figures. However, what I can say is that several new processes and systems are under development to centrally manage placements and related costs, including a centralised register of all commercial care placements, automated reminders prior to the approval end date and a commercial care cost calculator with an electronic workflow solution.

The department continues to reiterate to staff the importance of receiving written approval prior to placing children in commercial care at the biannual business managers' forum. Longer term, the department is addressing the Auditor-General's commercial care finding through its much broader out-of-home care system reform agenda, which includes an overhaul of contracting approaches, which will reduce reliance on commercial care. The department will include commercial care in its internal audit program, which will provide assurance that these new approval processes are effective.

**Ms STINSON:** How late were those late memorandums?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I would have to take that on notice, but I would also just point out that this is not a new thing. Certainly, when I actually became the minister there were a lot of contracts that were out of date that were left by the former government, which I had to quickly sign. This is something we are working on. The department is aware of it and I have indicated some of the solutions that are underway.

**Ms STINSON:** Were there any late memorandums about placements that were ultimately not approved or rescinded?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I am advised, not that we are aware of.

**Ms STINSON:** Are you aware of any instances where no memorandum was submitted within the period that a child was in commercial care or another form of care?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** What was the total cost of payments that were made before each memorandum was approved?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** How many late memorandums have there been since 1 July 2019?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take that on notice as well. Clearly, I do not have that information here.

**Ms STINSON:** Of the late memorandums in the last financial year, how many of those late instances were extensions and how many were new placements in commercial care?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I will take that on notice also.

**Ms STINSON:** I refer to Part C, page 61, functional responsibility. Minister, how many children are in care right now and what is the latest information you hold about how many children are in care today?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** The latest published advice is 4,040 children in care.

**Ms STINSON:** What is the latest information that you hold about how many children are in care?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** The published and accurate data that has been audited is currently available online and that is 4,040 children.

**Ms STINSON:** To clarify, do you hold any information that is more recent than the 31 August published figures on the DCP website?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** What I can tell you is that delays in uploading our monthly data have occurred in recent months due to the high volume of statistical reporting required between August and November. In this period, a compilation of statistical information was required for the Report on Government Services, the performance framework reporting, the annual reporting, including the departmental annual Nyland royal commission reporting and the commonwealth royal commission reporting, as well as the development of new reporting pro formas, the C3MS data improvements and the development of new data sources.

The September report has recently been finalised and will be approved for upload in the coming days, whilst the October report has just been compiled and is undergoing a final departmental quality check.

**The CHAIR:** I thank the minister for that answer and remind the member for Badcoe that the question extended beyond 30 June.

**Ms STINSON:** I am grateful for the minister's additional advice; that was very helpful. What is your target for the number of children in care by the end of this financial year?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I thank the member for her question. Clearly, I do not have a target. What I can say is that we are doing a lot of work as a whole of government on early intervention and prevention to reduce the numbers of children coming into care. This is something that was neglected and is a new area.

I can advise the house that we have had some great success already in the north with the Anglicare pilot, the intensive family support services, directing families away from child protection and supporting them to maintain and stay safely at home. We have an Aboriginal family-specific pilot in the west that will be starting very soon, and in January we will be starting our family group conferencing, which is part of our latest budget; \$1.6 million was announced over two years, I believe. That will also build stability and capacity in families to prevent children from coming into care.

Some of the reasons that children are coming into care are a statewide issue, a whole of government and also a whole of community issue, so we cannot respond and I certainly do not have a target of children coming in. We are dealing with mental health issues, drug and alcohol abuse issues and domestic violence, so as a government we are doing extensive work around our domestic violence policies, our mental health plans and our support for families.

We are doing a lot of work in the early intervention space. Of course, my goal is to minimise the children coming into care; however, as the child protection department responsible for protecting children, when a court determines it is no longer safe for a child to be at home, we will remove that child. However many children there are, we will remove them from danger as required by the court, as is our role.

**Ms STINSON:** Do you have a target in terms of reducing the rate of increase in children coming into care?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** The rate of increase in children coming into care for the 2018-19 year was 7.9. That was lower than the average for the last five years which was 9.375. Of course, I would like to get that down but that takes time and we are working on it. It takes time to set up your early intervention and prevention policies and programs.

What we know from the early intervention research directorate is that what Labor was doing failed our children. In fact, they went as far as to say that children would have been better off left at home without any government intervention. So we are working hard, but we are not going to respond with knee-jerk reactions and policy on the run. We have evaluated programs that are being set up. They are starting now and we are making good progress.

**Ms STINSON:** In Part C, page 53, under the subheading Weaknesses in IT controls for C3MS, the Auditor-General identifies a range of IT and system weaknesses. How many complaints have been lodged of privacy breaches or unauthorised access to personal information relating to DCP?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** The management of the C3MS technical environment is contracted to a third party, NEC. The department has worked with NEC to put in place a monthly report that details which third-party staff have access to the C3MS system using privileged accounts. The department began receiving those reports from August 2019. The department will develop a comprehensive annual review of all C3MS user access accounts for currency and update access where required. This is on track for an end date of the end of December.

The department will also review its current procedure to incorporate this review of user accounts, including the process in place to remove access for terminated staff in a timely manner. The department is working with NEC to determine how audit logs can be maintained and reported. Once this is determined, a process will be developed and documented to ensure there is appropriate audit logging practices.

The department recognises that regular patching and upgrading applications helps provide an optimal operational/security model; however, the decision was made not to patch the PeopleSoft technology stack C3MS due to the risks associated with the C3MS ceasing to function if patched. The department acknowledges and accepts this as a potential risk, noting that a program to replace C3MS has begun and the patch management will be an integral part of this new system.

An external review has also been conducted by the department's cybersecurity practices. In response to this review, the department is currently formulating an information security strategy and work plan that will incorporate these components. The department has contracted a secondary security services partner, which will enhance the delivery of activities related to the review and strategy.

**Ms STINSON:** I am not sure that addressed the question. Just to be clear, I am not sure that NEC would be the ones making complaints about any privacy breaches or unauthorised access. How many complaints have been lodged, or, for that matter, how many notifications of violations have been received in relation to privacy breaches or any other unauthorised access of personal information?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** We will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** What has been the result of those complaints or notifications of violations? Were they upheld or rejected, and which authority decides on those?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** We will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** I refer to Part C, page 53, 'Significant events and transactions'. The Auditor-General in this line talks about the requirement for all residential carers to be psychometrically tested. Can you provide an update on whether all residential carers in DCP's employment have now been psychometrically tested and how many residential carers have been psychometrically tested in non-government organisations?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** Could you please just refer to where on page 53? I cannot find that yet?

**Ms STINSON:** To help, it is about a third of the way down, under 'Significant events and transactions'.

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I believe that, as of September 2019, all the DCP residential care workers were compliant and the NGOs have until April 2020 and they are on track.

**Ms STINSON:** Were there any DCP staff who were so-called red flagged? I understand it is not a pass/fail-type system, so how many DCP staff were red flagged after psychometric testing? How many staff were terminated as a result in either full or part because of their psychometric testing results?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** We have been asked this question before, not necessarily by you, but our advice is not to identify exact numbers so as not to identify the staff. There has been a very small percentage.

**Ms STINSON:** Can you provide a percentage at all?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** We will take that on notice.

**Ms STINSON:** I refer to Part C, page 57, under the subheading 'Ineffective review of payroll reports'. Have there been any instances of employees being paid incorrectly or leave balances being inaccurately recorded?

**The Hon. R. SANDERSON:** I note that since the 2017-18 interim audits, the department has implemented the automated online bona fide processes and documented related procedures consistent with my response to previous audit recommendations. That has now been completed.

**Ms STINSON:** Thank you to the minister and her staff.

**The CHAIR:** Yes. I, too, say thank you to everyone involved in the Auditor-General's examination. We now proceed to the examination of the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19 in relation to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. I remind members that the committee is in normal session and, as such, questions need to be asked by members on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2018-19.

**Mr HUGHES:** I refer to Part C: Agency Audit Reports, page 306, regarding PIRSA. In the section 'Significant events and transactions', it states that PIRSA incurred \$4.5 million of targeted voluntary separation packages for employees. On the following page, page 307, under 'Functional responsibility', it states that PIRSA's objective is to grow primary industries and drive regional development in South Australia. What impact do the targeted separation packages have on the department's capacity to meet its objectives?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** There were 50 PIRSA employees who accepted the TVSP packages and that make-up represented \$4.5 million. The number of employees who exited the agency primarily came out of corporate services. We saw 32 leave there. The agriculture, food and wine programs had come to a conclusion—fisheries, aquaculture (three), regions (three), biosecurity (one), SARDI and Rural Solutions (one).

**Mr HUGHES:** Were any of the people targeted directly involved in providing any assistance or advice to that element of primary industries affected by drought?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** No, not that I am aware of. I guess all people in the agencies all have a level of contact with industry and within those department regions—Biosecurity SA, SARDI, Rural Solutions. All of them are touched in some way by drought but, no, no-one directly.

**Mr HUGHES:** With the people who were targeted in agriculture and the food and wine divisions, was that all as a result of programs coming to an end, or were there other individuals who were targeted in relation to programs that had not come to an end and for one reason or another were regarded as being surplus to requirements?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** As I said in my first answer, in agriculture, food and wine there was one who moved to another department. Food SA or the food sector moved into DTTI, but, as I am advised, the remainder were people whose programs finished and then they moved along.

**Mr HUGHES:** Can you specify which programs had come to a conclusion?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I am advised there were a number of programs that came to an end. The South Australian Premium Food and Wine Credentials Grant Program, the Food and Wine Co-Innovation Cluster Program, the Advanced Food Manufacturing Grants Program and the economic sustainability program all concluded. That made up the movement of those nine people out of those programs.

**Mr HUGHES:** Was there any rebadging of programs or initiatives on the part of the government to pick up those areas that might well have been lost as a result of those programs coming to a conclusion, or was it felt that the work that had been undertaken was not valuable enough to continue with?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Not that I am aware of, no.

**Mr HUGHES:** I refer to page 312 of Part C: Agency Audit Reports, other expenses, which states there was a decrease in PIRSA's workers compensation liability resulting from a review by a

consulting actuary. Can you provide a bit of clarification around how those savings were actually achieved? I understand it was \$2.5 million in savings.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** It was a whole-of-government review and the workers compensation liability revaluation was \$2.453 million. There was a decrease in the workers compensation provision of \$5.647 million in 2018-19 following the review of the department's liability by the consultancy actuary. The significant decrease reflects the reassessment that the department has no open serious injury workers and claims assessed above 50 per cent compared with two in the previous year's valuation. I am also advised that the upward re-evaluation reflected in 2017-18 of \$2.453 million under 'other expenses' is offset by a downward re-evaluation in 2018-19 recognised in other income, which equated to \$3.194 million. That was the reason.

**Mr HUGHES:** So the savings did not come at the expense of injured workers in any way?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** No, it is just a book entry. As I said, the actuary was for the entire government, not just for PIRSA. It was not just a PIRSA-related incident; it was a whole of government approach.

**Mr HUGHES:** Given it was a whole-of-government approach, my next question is: what was the cost of the consultant fee? Are you aware of that? Given it was whole of government, I think that is reasonable. I refer to page 309, Legislative compliance. The Auditor-General has found that PIRSA has no central record of identified breaches of legislation to facilitate reporting to the executive. Can you provide a list of the types of breaches of legislation that we are talking about?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** This is about the central framework. This is not about PIRSA walking away from legislative compliance responsibilities. That pretty much gives you the understanding that assessing the legislative obligations embedded within PIRSA are governance and compliance requirements was acknowledged, but significant work has been undertaken on the framework of that legislation.

**Mr HUGHES:** You say that significant work has been undertaken. How far are we away from the conclusion of that particular work?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I am advised that the quarterly monitoring is in place for the executive.

*Mr Hughes interjecting:*

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Quarterly monitoring is in place for the executive of PIRSA.

**Mr HUGHES:** So essentially the deficiency that was identified has now been addressed?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** It was acknowledged that there was significant work to undertake. We think the department is about 90 per cent of the way there. It was a huge undertaking, but they are somewhere close. Ninety per cent of that work has been done, and we are almost there.

**Mr HUGHES:** When you say that you are almost there, when do you anticipate a conclusion? I take it that this is something you are quite serious about, which has been identified by the Auditor-General?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Obviously, I would think that work will be completed in the upcoming financial year. As I said, we have completed 90 per cent of that work in the Auditor's assessment. There is 10 per cent to go. It has been a very, very large undertaking, I know that, but I think the executive are well on their way to achieving what was asked of them, and if we are 90 per cent on our way, we are most of the way there. Maths tells us there is 10 per cent to go.

**Mr HUGHES:** Can you give me a flavour of the types of breaches we are talking about within PIRSA? What would be the most predominant category, say, from one to four? I just need a flavour about the type of breaches we are talking about, and the potential seriousness of those breaches.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** We do not categorise what area had the most breaches. It was about the Auditor's assessment overall in the department of where the compliance needed to be more robust as a department itself, not just about certain arms of the agency that had more work that needed to be done. It is an overall approach rather than individual parts of the agency.

**Mr HUGHES:** There have to be some parts of the department where compliance is probably far more important than other parts. Can you just give me a bit of a flavour about that, a bit of clarification about what areas we are talking about and the type of compliance issues we are talking about, given that there does seem to have been maybe insufficient reporting, or a lack of coherent reporting?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I think I have already explained to you that there is not any particular part of the department that is more important than another, or that has more of a focus on compliance. You have been around long enough to know that we have sections in the department that are driven by compliance and cost recovery, much like the rest of the department is, so there is no one area of significance.

**Mr HUGHES:** Getting back to the job losses within the department, we established earlier that 50 full-time equivalents received their targeted packages. For those additional people who for different reasons are no longer employed—I think an additional 20 full-time equivalents are no longer with the department—can you give me a breakdown of what areas those people were from and the sort of broad scope of reasons why they are no longer with the department? Given, I assume, it is natural attrition, is there any intent to fill those job losses in the future?

**The CHAIR:** Member for Giles, we are back on page 306, correct?

**Mr HUGHES:** Page 310, Statement of Comprehensive Income.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** You are comparing June of 2018 to June of 2019—from 890 back to 819?

**Mr HUGHES:** Yes.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** What I can tell you is that the decrease is mainly due to the saving measures in the 2018-19 year—23.6 FTEs—and then the completion of programs in the 2017-18 year resulting in a decrease of nine FTEs, including the Agribusiness Accelerator program, which I have already explained, and the international wine markets program. There was the removal of ministerial positions located in the offices of the former minister for regional development—that was obviously a restructure—and the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries in 2018-19, where three FTEs were making up the numbers. Also, with casual staff there was a reduction. The seasonal factors with the agency's activities resulted in a reduction of 14 casual staff.

**Mr BOYER:** I refer to page 306 and the net cost of providing services. What was the total cost of the fruit fly zero-tolerance policy?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** It is not in the report.

**The CHAIR:** Refer me to the page, member for Wright.

**Mr BOYER:** Page 306, net cost.

**The CHAIR:** 'Net cost of providing services.'

**Mr BOYER:** The amount spent on running this program would be included in that line item on page 306. If it is not, then the minister's agency has not given all the information they should to the Auditor-General.

**The CHAIR:** Your question relates to the net cost of providing services and refers back to the fruit fly program?

**Mr BOYER:** Yes.

**The CHAIR:** Minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Any of the additional costs to the zero tolerance program were born out of existing resources within the department, including the extra 14 staff that were employed at Yamba.

**Mr BOYER:** How much was that amount? How much was spent out of the existing resources? What was the cost of running the program?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I am advised that it was approximately \$1.1 million.

**Mr BOYER:** Is that the total cost of running the entire zero tolerance policy at Yamba from the commencement of the program, I think it was 4 January, all the way through to when you suspended it?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** The approximate \$1.1 million was part of bolstering the zero tolerance approach. Also, approximately \$1.9 million was spent on infrastructure upgrades.

**Mr BOYER:** That \$1.1 million plus the \$1.9 million is the total amount of money spent on the zero tolerance policy at Yamba from start to finish; is that correct?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Well, no. As I explained to you, if you were listening, a lot of that money was out of existing resources. We did what we could with those existing resources. That is when we had to go to Treasury to find the extra money as well as find money for the infrastructure upgrades.

**Mr BOYER:** Am I correct in saying that the amount of money spent out of existing resources to fund the program is included in the \$1.1 million and/or \$1.9 million; is that correct?

**The Hon. T.J. Whetstone:** Could you repeat that?

**Mr BOYER:** Am I right in saying that the amount of money you say was taken from existing resources, is that amount, whatever it is, included in the \$1.1 million or \$1.9 million figures you gave in your answer before?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Yes.

**Mr HUGHES:** I refer to page 316. Administered items starts on page 315. Page 316 states:

The Fisheries Research and Development Fund paid \$13.3 million to carry out research, exploration and experiments for the conservation and management of living resources found in waters.

Can I have a breakdown of how this funding was spent?

**The CHAIR:** The first paragraph on page 316, minister.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I am advised that the \$13.294 million were funds that were allocated to SARDI for those programs, but I am not able to tell you exactly what those programs were, other than SARDI's research and scientific studies into the water habitat.

**Mr HUGHES:** You will take that question on notice and come back with detail?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** Well, I can. What I am saying is that PIRSA allocates a significant amount of money to those programs. It was money that was agreed with industry through the licence negotiations discussions. Obviously, when PIRSA implements cost recovery with industry, there are agreements with industry on how their levies and licence fees are spent and those agreements with industry are moneys that are spent primarily undertaking stock assessments and the monitoring of those industries' needs. Again, that was an agreement with all the industries through cost recovery and levy fees that would give the agreed money spent within those certain sectors.

**Mr HUGHES:** Are you saying the amount of just over \$13 million is exclusively money raised from industry, or is there a state government contribution to that as well?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** When you say 'money raised from industry', it is an industry-led initiative. It is a PIRSA agreement with industry, as a led initiative.

**Mr HUGHES:** Was the snapper survey funded through that money?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** It is not in that year.

**Mr HUGHES:** Returning to Report 6, Part A: Executive Summary, page 43 states:

PIRSA paid \$23 million in SARMS grants, with the payments being made over time as approved projects are delivered.

Can you provide a breakdown of the \$23 million in SARMS grants paid out?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I can tell you that the implementation of the three IP projects are nearing completion. They are projects ranging from small farm turnaround propositions to the large irrigation trust. As at 25 November, 246 of the 255 projects were complete, and the remaining nine we are waiting on milestone reports to receive the remainder of their funding.

**Mr HUGHES:** I will not ask you for a breakdown of all those projects.

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** If you have a couple of hours.

**Mr HUGHES:** I think we have three minutes left, so I do not think I will go there. On the same report, Part A, page 44, PIRSA has entered into a \$24 million funding agreement for 16 projects. Amounts paid in 2018-19 were for \$440,000, as funds are not paid on approval but over time as project milestones are achieved. Can the minister, in the short time remaining, provide a breakdown of the \$24 million of funding agreements for 16 projects paid under the Regional Growth Fund?

**The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE:** I can whiz through them. The first round in 2018-19 is obviously what you are referring to. For the competitive round of \$5 million, we saw the Apple and Pear Growers Association, the Coorong District Council, Goolwa PipiCo., Mid Murray Council, Lot 100 Hills Distillery, Shield Intermodal, Royal Flying Doctor Service in the South-East, Outback Communities Authority, as well as the Ag Excellence Alliance projects all receive funding. They were the recipients of that funding.

If we are looking at the strategic projects, there was ongoing funding for the North West Indigenous Pastoral Project, the Mount Gambier Regional Community and Recreation Hub, the Coolanie Water Scheme Project on Eyre Peninsula, the Monarto Safari Park, the South Australian dog fence, Kingston District Council for their town centre upgrade, Thomas Foods International and Cummins Wanilla Streamcare Group for their drainage system.

**Mr HUGHES:** I thank the staff and the minister for their time.

**The CHAIR:** I thank everybody involved in that session as well.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

#### *Bills*

### **FIRE AND EMERGENCY SERVICES (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Committee Stage*

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 12.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** How many questions do I have left?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Two.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Well, that is more than I need. I think there will be more to interrogate about industry brigades between the houses. I have a lot of questions, but perhaps I will ask about the consultation generally. Was there consultation with mining interests, with the forestry owners conference and farming interests in the framing of this clause?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I thank the member, and again I do not want to go over old ground, but I reiterate the point that I was led to believe a lot of consultation happened from the 2013 Holloway review, and right the way through the process that was the information that was given to me. More consultation has taken place. Everyone was invited to be part of the select committee that toured the country regions in the state, and there was great input there. Everyone was invited to be a part of that, and every industry had a chance to have their say.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Does the designated area in proposed section 69B include farms?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am led to believe that early consultation as far as 69B is concerned was led by the CFS volunteers. I might clarify a couple of points. As you would understand, in the South East, with forestry and the assets down there, it is really important that the industry also plays a role in this as far as protecting that asset to make sure that it is looked after as

best as possible, to make sure that there are not substantial losses as well. So this is two organisations working together to get the best outcome for a local community, including the forestry industry.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Can it include farms? I am just reiterating the same question. I want to reassure the minister that as with my previous statements, I am not trying to be tricky here; I am trying to understand the bill so that I may further advise my party before it gets to the upper house.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I appreciate where you are going and it is not intended for farms. This is about industry brigades and the forestry industry specifically, as I outlined in my previous answer. So, no, it is not intended for farms.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 13 passed.

Clause 14.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** These provisions relate again to the CFS. Can the minister advise if these provisions are more or less a direct replica of those powers conferred on the MFS under section 38 and, if not, can he explain what the differences are?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Yes, I am informed, the same powers as the MFS.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** So it is a direct replica of those powers, is it?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Yes, as I am informed, that is correct.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Are there any geographical boundaries to these powers and indeed the powers enjoyed by the MFS under section 38? Do the geographical boundaries correspond to the general operational boundaries of the CFS and the Metropolitan Fire Service, or can those boundaries be blurred? I guess my question is: does the CFS have these powers broadly across the state?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** If I have your question right, the intent is that it matches with their designated area.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Well, the intent is, but is it spelled out? I am being a devil's advocate here, obviously, as it is unlikely to happen, but could the CFS chief officer exercise these powers in the metropolitan area?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** As outlined in proposed section 70A(2), 'This Division applies only to a building, vehicle or place in the country,' which means it would be the CFS because the CFS are in charge in the country.

Clause passed.

Clause 15.

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** We have two amendments: amendments Nos 5 and 6 on Schedule 1. Minister, would you like to move them individually or en bloc?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am happy to move them en bloc, sir. I move:

Amendment No 5 [PoEmerCorr-1]—

Page 14, line 39 [clause 15(1)]—Delete subclause (1)

Amendment No 6 [PoEmerCorr-1]—

Page 14, lines 41 and 42 [clause 15(2), inserted subparagraph (i1)]—Delete ', who will be appointed as the presiding member of the committee'

Amendments carried.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** My understanding of this is that amendments Nos 5 and 6 work together. That was not my question, sir: it was preamble. I guess my simple question is: can you explain this change, both the initial proposal and then its abandonment in these two amendments? I think there will be some amendments following this, so you can either have a fulsome answer now

or we will just ask questions of each amendment. I want to understand what the initial impetus was for this change in the bill and then the partial change back.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Without going over old ground, it is stuff that I have touched on, in that it is an element of the bill that we were going to look to change. I was led to believe from previous management that work had been done in this space. The work had not been done in this space, so we opted to stick with the status quo and go down that path, so that is why it is being removed.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** But what was the initial change? Assuming we are still debating the initial clause—

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** The clause was amended by amendments Nos 5 and 6.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** But we have not voted on the amendment yet?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** I put the question on the two amendments.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** But we have not voted on it yet. We are still debating that, aren't we?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** You had three questions.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** The amendments have been passed?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Amendments Nos 5 and 6 have, yes.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I beg your pardon, my mistake. We are whizzing through it then. I have no more questions on clause 15 then.

Clause as amended passed.

Clauses 16 to 20.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I will ask a general question now. I realise we are going over some of the same ground but I just want to be clear about this. All these things do is relate to the boundaries, the zones, and the conflict between this act that we are amending and the Emergency Management Act. There is a conflict in there. There was a change to resolve those conflicts and now those have been abandoned. Is that what we are doing?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I move:

Amendment No 7 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 15, lines 3 to 16—This clause is opposed

Amendment No 8 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 15, lines 17 and 18—This clause is opposed

Amendment No 9 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 15, lines 19 to 22—This clause is opposed

Amendment No 10 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 15, lines 23 to 26—This clause is opposed

Amendment No 11 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 15, lines 27 and 28—This clause is opposed

Fundamentally, I will see if this clears it up. There were some proposed changes but they have been removed because the work had not been done to facilitate them. We are going back to the status quo. To clarify, deleting the original amendment will ensure that the State Bushfire Co-ordination Committee has effective functions to prepare a state bushfire plan and review bushfire area management plans to ensure such plans and policies are consistent with the state bushfire management plan. It is going back to the status quo. As I said, the work was not done that I was led to believe had been done previously. By opposing these measures with amendments, we will go back to the status quo.

Clauses negated.

Clause 21.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Here we are talking about broadening out—and correct me if I am wrong—how the chief officer can publicise a total fire ban. It seems like a pretty reasonable measure on the face of it. What is the minister's understanding of the Australian Broadcasting Corporation's obligations to broadcast total fire ban and related information? What is the nature of their obligations? Do they have any obligations under any state act?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am informed that, no, they have no obligations as such, but they are an excellent broadcaster that always broadcasts the emergency warning message. I am on record—and I think you are on record as well—letting the public know that it is really important to make sure that they are getting your information from a number of different sources, not to rely on one. If they rely on the radio and something goes wrong with their radio, they do not have extra sources of information and it can put them in a vulnerable position. We are very strong in making sure people have a number of different ways to get their information, particularly bushfire information, so that if something does fail, they have a backup plan in place and they are getting their information from a number of sources. The ABC do a great job.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I agree, minister. I think the ABC do a fantastic job. They have some excellent journalists working very close to us. I will not name them. I will not do that. I wonder, arising from your answer, if they have been consulted and if you envision any change in their role going forward, or whether you would expect them to perform exactly the same role as they do now?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** No, my understanding is that they will continue to do the same role that they did. All those fine journalists you spoke about will keep doing their wonderful work and they will keep relaying the messages as they always have. That is the expectation.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** And were they consulted?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Not to my knowledge because there is no change.

Clause passed.

Clause 22.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Clause 22 maintains that each rural council 'must appoint at least 1 person as an authorised officer'. Were the LGA or any regional councils consulted, and what were the results of that consultation process, beyond the minister's previous answer about all the consultations since 2013?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I am informed that this is as was proposed under the previous government, so there has been no consultation on that front.

Clause passed.

Clause 23.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I move:

Amendment No 12 [PolEmerCorr-1]—

Page 16, lines 27 to 35 [clause 23(4)]—Delete subclause (4)

Amendment carried.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** Hang on, as a matter of process, do we get to debate the amendment?

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** I have just put it, but I am happy to take some questions on clause 23 as amended. The amendment has been passed, member for Elizabeth, but we can take questions on the amended clause.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I will ask, then, minister, in relation to the amendment and the clause it amends, before the select committee process the member for Flinders instigated why was consultation not properly conducted with the CFS Volunteers Association, the grain growers, notwithstanding all the praise we have given the grain growers since that point? Why was the

consultation not done with them and, perhaps most importantly, apart from with the opposition, with your own backbench?

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** Just to be clear again on a couple of points that I have already made but will make again for the sake of clarification, these were things that were instigated, that I was informed of coming into government, that had already been progressed under the previous government.

That was the information I was given from the 2013 Holloway review, so I was told that a lot of work had been done in the background. Again, I welcome your enlightening us on that. I am interested to know whether you are going to say that that work was not done, or it was done and we are not being informed of it. I am keen to hear the outcome of that. As far as that is concerned, that body of work had been done.

What I can say about this amendment is that it has been superseded by the outcomes of the parliamentary select committee, which has recommended these powers be vested in SAPOL. This leaves SACFS in the situation where it can, as an agency, direct a fire to be extinguished after it is lit under section 82(1) but cannot direct that the fire or an activity that may cause a fire to occur to be stopped. It has recommended that clause 23 is removed.

The other point I would like to make is from the information I was given under previous management that came through the CFS and SAFECOM. Again, I refer to the work they had done under the previous government on the back of the Holloway review. This goes to maybe a few of the questions you were asking before. Just to clarify, the CFSVA, the SESVA, the SES, the CFS, the UFU and the MFS are all part of the SAFECOM board. Those recommendations came through SAFECOM, which engages with the board that has all those stakeholders on there, so they are very much part of that conversation.

**Mr ODENWALDER:** I will take on face value what you have said about the volunteers associations, etc., but the second part of my question was about your own backbench. What we saw last time when this clause was initially put was your party room clearly being taken by surprise. The reason that this bill did not pass quite quickly through the house last time was no fault of the opposition; it was the fault of your own party. We can talk about democracy within your party, but surely there should have been some consultation before putting the bill before the house.

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** I thank the member for that question. Again, just to clarify the process we have gone through to get to this point—and it was outlined very clearly in my second reading speech—we were happy to negotiate with stakeholders like Grain Producers SA and to work that process through. Again, through the select committee it was done exceptionally well. People got more say than ever before. That did circumvent the consultation that I was told had taken place under the previous Labor government. We still do not know what happened there, and again I am happy to be enlightened on that. I know that they were not here; you were. You have been here for a long, long time, so you are part of what went on there. I am happy to hear what you had to say.

*Mr Odenwalder interjecting:*

**The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Duluk):** Order, member for Elizabeth!

**The Hon. C.L. WINGARD:** The point is that if you look at where the select committee has landed it has landed exactly where we brought this in with grain producers. We have worked through and found a better solution, and I am very happy to do that through the select committee process to now have SAPOL involved. The principle of what we were trying to do was to have the power to direct so that there would not be, as I outlined earlier in this conversation, a situation where someone doing the wrong thing would have no recourse, or no-one could actually stop them or have the power to stop them.

In the consultation process, which turned out to be the select committee, we have landed with the power to direct sitting with SAPOL, but the principle of what we were doing is where we have ended up. I think everyone is in agreement with that; in fact, I think there were two select committees. It was a bipartisan select committee, and everyone is happy with where it has landed, giving the result we all wanted.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

**STATUTES AMENDMENT (SOUTH EASTERN FREEWAY OFFENCES) BILL**

*Introduction and First Reading*

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until 5 December 2019 at 11:00.