

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 5 March 2020

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

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

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:01): Point of order, sir: standing order 38 states:

The Chair is taken on every day fixed for the meeting of the House at the time appointed. If there is no quorum* three minutes after that time, the Speaker adjourns the House...

After your prayers, sir, there were 13 people in the house.

The SPEAKER: I refer to standing order 38 and quote:

The Chair is taken on every day fixed for the meeting of the House at the time appointed. If there is no quorum...the Speaker adjourns the House to the next sitting day. A quorum consists of at least 17 Members including the Speaker. The names of the Members present are entered in the Journals.

I fully understand the standing order. I refer to Blackmore's *Practice of the House of Assembly 1885* at page 31, which states:

At the hour fixed the Speaker takes the Chair, his presence therein being announced to the House...As the Speaker takes his place the bell is again rung, and the three-minutes' glass turned. If at the expiration of that time a quorum be not present the House stands adjourned till the next sitting day.

I have been advised that we should ring the bells for a further three minutes per past practice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: To assist the Chair, sir, I understand the practice is that the Speaker will adjourn the house for 10 minutes and then ring the bells again if he believes there is not a quorum present.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

The SPEAKER: One moment, minister. I am going to ask for the bells to be rung for three minutes.

A quorum having been formed:

Parliamentary Committees

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: WORKPLACE FATIGUE AND BULLYING IN SA HEALTH

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:06): I move:

That the third report of the committee for the Fifty-Fourth Parliament entitled 'Workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services', be noted.

I am pleased to present the final report of the committee's inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services. Workplace fatigue and bullying in the healthcare sector have been the subject of extensive research and investigation in recent years, with many stories emerging of staff being subjected to unacceptable behaviour by their superiors and colleagues, and/or being required to work unreasonable hours.

The inquiry's terms of reference are outlined in the report. While I will not detail them all here today, the committee was focused on understanding the causes and also the impacts of workplace fatigue and bullying and finding practical evidence-based solutions to reduce both the incidence and the impacts of fatigue and bullying within the SA Health system.

The following definitions from Safe Work Australia applied to the inquiry, whereby bullying was defined as:

Workplace bullying is repeated and unreasonable behaviour directed towards a worker or a group of workers that creates a risk to health and safety.

Fatigue was defined as:

In a work context, fatigue is...mental and/or physical exhaustion that reduces [your] ability to perform [your] work safely and effectively.

In light of this, the committee accepted 66 written submissions from stakeholder organisations, as well as from individuals who shared their own personal experiences of workplace fatigue and bullying. We received a further 24 supplementary submissions, the majority of which were responses to a short questionnaire sent to all individual submission authors. In addition to this, the committee met with 48 witnesses, 13 of whom were current or past employees within SA Health and the remaining representing 19 Australia-based organisations.

While the committee sought submissions from a diverse range of stakeholder organisations and the general public more broadly, the majority of the evidence received focused on the SA public health system and, as a result, our report does likewise. Given the scope and complexity of the inquiry, the committee wanted to ensure that it consulted widely and fully understood all the key issues associated with workplace bullying and fatigue. It is for this reason that we developed a survey to assess the experiences of healthcare professionals with workplace fatigue and bullying. This resulted in a total of nearly 2,300 valid responses being received, and an overview of these results is available within the report.

The committee also undertook a site visit to a selection of SA Health sites, including Flinders Medical Centre, the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the SA Ambulance Service headquarters and Lyell McEwin Hospital. I would like to thank the member for Davenport for joining me at all four sites and also the Hon. Tung Ngo from the other place, who joined us at the Royal Adelaide Hospital.

It certainly gave us an opportunity to speak directly with SA Health staff about a range of important issues, including rostering practices at Flinders Hospital; the human resources procedures at the Royal Adelaide Hospital; the fatigue risk management in place at the Ambulance Service, which certainly, while in the end simple, actually made it very effective, and there were some good learnings we made from that visit; and also the incident reporting tools at the Lyell McEwin Hospital.

The evidence received by the committee clearly indicates that there are serious and widespread issues in the health industry, which have been protracted and are certainly ongoing and require urgent consideration and attention. The SASMOA junior doctors survey results showed that 70 per cent of junior doctors stated that bullying and harassment was a problem in their workplace. Dr Chris Moy, the President of the Australian Medical Association South Australia branch, gave evidence regarding major problems with regard to SA Health over a long period of time. He stated:

...firstly, a failure of leadership and accountability over many years...is best exemplified by the Royal Adelaide Hospital, which I think has had lost years of unstable leadership with CEOs changing every year while the NRAH was being built. This has led to particularly toxic culture being allowed to develop and that is what you are seeing now.

He then went on to speak about the traditional leadership structures, relating them to fish rotting at the head. When you think of that description, it certainly is a description of leadership that sounds very familiar to 2017 Oakden review into the Oakden aged-care facility, which stated, 'The fish rots from the head,' regarding failures of senior leadership. The Oakden review led to the ICAC commissioner, Bruce Lander, releasing his damning report into the matter, entitled 'Oakden: a shameful chapter in South Australia's history', in which Mr Lander stated:

...the evidence I have received makes it quite clear that, to a large extent, what was occurring at the Oakden Facility was unknown to ministers and chief executives.

To me that is astonishing. They ought to have known.

As I have said previously, the evidence the committee heard clearly indicates that bullying and fatigue issues in the SA Health system have been protracted and ongoing. You have to ask: is this just another case where previous health ministers, which includes the current Leader of the Opposition,

did not know about the serious bullying and fatigue issues but ought to have? That is why the Liberal members of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation established this inquiry into bullying and fatigue in the SA Health system through the committee's own motion on 16 October 2018: it was to shine a light on this very serious issue.

In reflecting on the evidence gathered throughout the inquiry, the committee has made 27 recommendations aimed at reducing the impact of workplace fatigue and bullying in SA hospitals and health services. The nature of these recommendations was informed by the evidence the committee received which, as noted previously, focused predominantly on issues within the SA public health system. That being said, a number of the recommendations are sufficiently broad as to apply to the health sector more broadly.

The committee found that the high-pressure nature of the work undertaken in hospitals and health services, coupled with the need to work long hours, shiftwork, overtime and on-call work, all as part of a 24/7 operation, creates an environment that places health professionals at greater risk of workplace fatigue and bullying. This is exacerbated by a poor workplace culture and a lack of contemporary management skills among many clinical leaders. The committee also received evidence of inadequate complaint resolution processes, leading to issues remaining unresolved and discouraging staff from reporting inappropriate behaviour.

Workplace fatigue and bullying can have detrimental impacts on the health and wellbeing of healthcare professionals. These impacts on both mental and physical health often stem from unsafe working practices, such as working excessive hours, having inadequate breaks and working irregular shift patterns. Further to this, both workplace fatigue and bullying can create a risk of emotional and physical burnout amongst staff.

The committee's recommendations aim to address areas where we see weaknesses in the way that workplace fatigue and bullying are currently being managed. The recommendations broadly fit within four key themes. Firstly, there is improvement to systems and processes. The report includes a series of recommendations focused on ensuring that SA Health takes a risk-based approach to preventing workplace fatigue and bullying and that it has sufficiently high-quality data to allow it to do so.

Secondly, there is complaint management and resolution. While preventative measures are a key focus of the recommendations in this report, the committee received evidence to suggest that existing SA Health complaint management and resolution processes have deficiencies that need to be resolved. Thirdly, there is having appropriate levels of accountability. The committee sees the advent of the new local health network governing boards as an opportune moment to improve accountability in addressing workplace fatigue and bullying so that each local health network can set themselves key performance indicators and try to actually attain them, knowing their own local conditions, and be held to account as well.

To this end, the committee has included a series of recommendations designed around the local health network boards, reporting against key performance indicators relating to workplace fatigue and bullying. The committee also sees SafeWork SA as playing a greater and more proactive role in ensuring that hospitals and health services are providing safe working environments for their staff and reducing the impacts of workplace fatigue and bullying.

The final group of recommendations relates to accreditation processes. During the inquiry, the committee wrote to both the ACSQHC and the Australian Council on Health Care Standards, which is an approved accrediting agency that undertakes accreditation against the NSQHS standards and is the main agency used by SA Health. We invited them to make a submission or to attend a witness hearing. Both organisations declined on the basis that they did not view workplace fatigue and bullying as being within the scope of their accreditation activities, given that there are no accreditation standards dealing directly with workplace fatigue and bullying. As such, they did not feel that they could contribute to the inquiry.

The view expressed in their response certainly did concern the committee, especially in terms of the potential impacts that workplace fatigue and bullying can have on patient outcomes. The committee is certainly concerned with the approach taken by the ACSQHC, given that the current

NSQHS standards, particularly the clinical governance standard, are arguably broad enough to encompass consideration of workplace fatigue and bullying-related matters.

The committee does acknowledge that it has no jurisdiction over these bodies; however, given the importance that the NSQHS accreditation standards have in ensuring patient safety, the committee sees this as being an opportune mechanism through which to drive meaningful change, not only in the SA Health system but also in other jurisdictions with serious bullying and fatigue issues. This would be done by requiring the hospitals and health services to treat workplace fatigue and bullying with the same level of seriousness as other risks to patient safety.

Hence one of the recommendations was that the Minister for Health and Wellbeing work with the commonwealth Minister for Health to facilitate the introduction of changes to the clinical governance section of the National Safety and Quality Health Service Standards. These changes should explicitly address workplace fatigue and bullying matters and be incorporated as part of the Australian Health Service Safety and Quality Accreditation Scheme, coordinated by the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care.

The primary aim of such changes is to ensure that medical professionals have a healthy and safe workplace, allowing them to provide patients and consumers with safe and high-quality care. Ultimately, workplace fatigue and bullying can lead to serious negative effects in the performance of staff, which can then impact on patient safety. It is for this reason alone that it is important that workplace fatigue and bullying in SA hospitals and health services are addressed as a matter of priority.

In the time remaining I would like to thank everyone who took the time to contribute to the work of the committee during the inquiry, including those who gave up their time to make submissions or appear before the committee at hearings. I would particularly like to thank the individuals who provided written submissions and appeared before the committee. Many of these individuals recounted their own very personal and often traumatic stories of fatigue and bullying to the committee, and the committee is extremely grateful to them for sharing these experiences. On many occasions we heard from witnesses who said that they have provided this information before and that nothing has happened. It is for their sake that it is so important that positive action occurs.

I would also like to thank members of the committee for their input and deliberations throughout the inquiry. Specifically, my thanks go to the member for Davenport, the member for Taylor and, from the other place, the Hon. John Dawkins, the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Tung Ngo. Finally, I would like to express my appreciation to the staff who supported the work of the committee during the inquiry, including parliamentary officers Mr Simon Macdonald, Ms Anthea Howard and Mr Phil Frensham, and research officer, Mr Eugene Braslavskiy. I commend this report to the house.

Mr GEE (Taylor) (11:20): I would like to add my contribution to the third report of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament by the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, entitled 'Inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services'. Firstly, I would like to thank the committee staff. Originally, we were assisted by Mr David Pegram and Ms Anthea Howard, followed by Mr Simon Macdonald and, finally, Mr Phil Frensham and the committee's research officer, Mr Eugene Braslavskiy.

I would like to acknowledge the members of the committee: the Hon. John Dawkins MLC; the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC; the Hon. Tung Ngo MLC; Mr Stephen Murray, member for Davenport; and the Presiding Member of the committee, Mr Stephen Patterson, the member for Morphett. I would also like to give thanks to the Hansard staff.

The inquiry commenced in October 2018, nearly 17 months ago, and it became clear fairly early on that it was going to take significantly longer than we had anticipated. I think it is important that I add my thanks to all the people who contributed to and participated in the inquiry. We received 66 submissions, 23 from organisations and 47 from individuals. We also received an additional 24 supplementary submissions. The committee heard from 48 individual witnesses. The terms of reference for the inquiry are as follows:

- (a) The factors contributing to workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian Hospitals and Health Services;

- (b) The impact of workplace fatigue and bullying on the health and wellbeing of health care professionals;
- (c) The impact of workplace fatigue and bullying on quality, safety and effective health services;
- (d) The extent to which current work practices comply with relevant legislation, codes and industrial agreements;
- (e) Opportunities, costs and impacts of measuring fatigue and using risk management tools, audit and compliance regimes, including those in other industries...to reduce the occurrence or impact of fatigue and bullying;
- (f) Measures to improve the management and monitoring of workplace fatigue and bullying;
- (g) The extent to which fatigue, including a comparison to other industry sector practices, is a factor that is taken into account during investigations into medical misadventure;
- (h) Any other relevant matters.

I will briefly talk about some of the evidence received by the committee during the inquiry. I feel as though really we were just scratching the surface. SA Health is a huge organisation that operates across a huge area 24 hours a day, seven days a week and comprises an enormous number of diverse and complex processes and procedures. We heard that much of the system is under considerable pressure most of the time and that fatigue is commonplace, even affecting employees at the beginning of their shifts, and even before work and during downtime and days off.

The report identifies that causes of fatigue include the type and nature of work. These are highlighted on page 19 of the report:

...high-pressure environment in which many staff work makes them vulnerable to workplace fatigue and bullying. Common frustrations such as job pressure and stress can result in creating an environment where bullying and fatigue are able to flourish.

Healthcare professionals have a level of responsibility for the health of their patients, which can predispose them to a higher risk of psychological distress. The impact can be particularly pronounced for first responders and emergency service workers. Heavy workloads can also result in aggression and dissatisfaction between staff. This was highlighted by Dr Chris Moy from the AMA by way of an example of what this looks like 'on a day-to-day basis in SA hospitals'. Dr Moy said:

This is Dr A of one ward ringing Dr B on another ward requesting him to assess a patient for possible admission to Dr B's ward to which Dr B says, [*expletive*] and puts the phone down, and that's the end of the discussion...That second consultant—consultant B, Dr B—is going to say [that] because he's got no beds, and he's been up for five days.

It is generally accepted that shiftwork is a significant contributing factor to fatigue, and shiftworkers, particularly those who work night shifts, are at a higher risk of fatigue.

The Australian College of Nursing also noted that in a profession where your job is to care for people in pain and suffering, there is a risk that this may be internalised and result in compassion fatigue, ultimately leading to professional burnout and job dissatisfaction. The Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation noted that 'challenging behaviours and violence is another safety issue that our members are regularly subjected to and is also a major contributing factor to work fatigue and bullying'. Also identified as a cause of fatigue was poor workplace culture.

Evidence received by the committee suggested that poor workplace culture is a key cause of fatigue and bullying in hospitals and health services. One of the key issues identified is the hierarchical nature of the workforce, which has allowed a culture to develop where junior staff do not feel like they are able to speak out about issues without prejudicing their career progression.

SASMOA noted in its submission that managers frequently receive no training in how to manage. There is no instruction, no mentoring and no framework for medical managers. There is no advice on what is and is not acceptable behaviour and there is no auditing of behaviour. In the last round of enterprise bargaining, SASMOA attempted to include a clause regarding the monitoring of medical managers' style and approach to address concerns about bullying; however, this was rejected by SA Health.

The committee also heard evidence to suggest that there is cultural pressure on staff to work long hours. In response to a question on whether it was a fair assessment that a large part of fatigue-

related issues is due to lack of veracity of timesheets, Bernadette Mulholland from the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association agreed that this would 'correlate with fatigue and bullying'.

Anita Filleti from Medical Insurance Group Australia (MIGA) also confirmed that MIGA receives reports from its members that there is a pressure to not report their full hours worked. This pressure was demonstrated in a number of examples provided by submission authors. One individual described a situation where they had to take carer's leave due to their child rapidly developing a life-threatening illness.

While on leave, they continued to receive revised rosters, had repeated requests from a colleague to make up time and their head of unit verbally expressed the view that it was appropriate for them to make up the time because it was not they who were sick. There is an entrenched culture of mistreating trainee medical officers throughout SA Health, which perpetuates the bullying and burnout of our young doctors. One of our young doctors said:

The only time I ever complained about excessively onerous rostering, I was told in writing, 'It doesn't matter what's in your EBA, this is what's expected of you by the director of physician training at the CALHN hospital.' I was so exhausted and demoralised by this stage that I didn't have the will or the strength to escalate the complaint so I just quit my job.

I am going to run out of time before I even get through a fraction of this report so, instead of going any further with this, I will just indicate that with an organisation of this size the behaviour is so entrenched that it is very difficult to point the finger of blame at anybody. I was disappointed that the Presiding Member pointed at previous health ministers and the Leader of the Opposition. I think the committee identified this as something that is solely the responsibility of the government—

The SPEAKER: Member for Taylor, with respect, your time has expired. Did you want to just wrap up, or are you done?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, I am trying to be fair and give him an opportunity to wind up.

Time expired.

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (11:31): I, too, rise to speak to the third report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation, entitled 'Inquiry into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services'. I will start by proffering my thanks, though I will not detail it as other speakers have done, first and foremost to those who gave evidence to the committee both on a personal and professional basis.

It was heartening to see the large number of professionals committed to doing what they could to elucidate or enlighten us as to better ways to address the two primary criteria of our inquiry, which were the measurement and management of both bullying and fatigue-related issues, which are particularly troubling. All members were united in their concern about some of the stories we heard from people relaying their stories of bullying and/or fatigue-related issues as well.

My thanks also go to other committee members for your shared commitment, notwithstanding our political and philosophical differences on many issues, to ensuring that our health system is run as well as possible and that we address these two issues in particular. I also want to thank the staff who were particularly helpful in enabling us to get through a considerable amount of work and helped us prepare a series of what I think are fairly cogent recommendations.

By way of background, I was extraordinarily keen to see an inquiry into bullying in particular. As the member for Davenport, my electorate includes the Flinders hospital and a large number of the people who work at Flinders hospital. The evidence provided to me on the doorsteps and in shopping centres in my electorate by a large number of people working in the health system was that they were systematically bullied—in this instance regarding the failures of the Transforming Health system, but that is not the point. The point is that if it is possible to bully people successfully with regard to one issue, then by definition it is possible to bully them about anything in particular.

I just want to touch briefly on what are for me some of the major takeaways. As the member for Morphet described, as an overview we have made 27 recommendations that are directed at

improving a number of things: systems and processes, complaint management systems, the need for accountability and, similarly, the need for enhanced accreditation. The size of the problem is enormous in our health system. You can measure it any way you like, but it has been a longstanding issue on both counts of bullying and fatigue-related issues.

I will not go into detail regarding the extent to which they are issues; they are detailed in a variety of tables and graphs in the report. Suffice to say, the health system experiences and exhibits significant issues in both those. What I do want to take the opportunity to do with the time available to me is cover off what, for me at least, are the major or pertinent recommendations.

I point the parliament to recommendations 2, 3, 4 and 5, which primarily deal with issues of accreditation. It is the committee's view that the health services should have a series of processes in place to enable accreditation of facilities to take account of their relative performance insofar as management of bullying and related issues is concerned, as well as having a working fatigue and related risk management system in place.

Recommendation 2 talks about accreditation at our hospitals, and likewise recommendations 3, 4 and 5 are, as I said, related. Our view is that professional boards and colleges, etc., should, as a matter of practice, be addressing these issues as part of the accreditation of a facility. If we are collectively serious about stamping these out and addressing these in our system, then the accreditation of our health services and health facilities should cover those off.

I will provide a quote. The member for Morphett has touched on it, but it is astounding, in my view, that the committee wrote to the Australian Commission on Safety and Quality in Health Care as well as the Australian Council on Healthcare Standards and invited them to make a submission and they declined because, in their view, they could provide nothing to us because accreditation does not take into account either of these two very important issues.

The second recommendation I want to point to is recommendation 12, which covers the use of timecards and/or hours reporting. To me, it is completely axiomatic that it be a legal requirement that timecards are not falsified. If timecards are not falsified, then we cannot have a situation where people are working longer hours than is indicated. The evidence to the committee, repeated evidence as well as anecdotal evidence I have heard in speaking to health employees, is that they are pressured; subordinate staff are pressured to falsify their timecards and show fewer hours worked on those timecards than are actually correct.

My very strong view is we should legally mandate that it is a major offence either to submit a false timecard or procure one. I point to the fact that operators of heavy machinery and our pilots are mandated, for very obvious reasons, to have place in appropriate fatigue management processes, in particular, yet in our health system it seems, at best, to be optional. That is unconscionable in my view.

Recommendations 19 and 20 relate to the HR systems and bullying and record keeping. The evidence we heard indicated that, quite frankly, the record keeping for bullying, in particular, and/or HR-related issues is woeful at best. There are no proper systems, and each of the local health networks are effectively silos: they have their own processes and they have their own 'systems'. There is no consistent methodology across them for measuring, tracking and managing the issue.

Without that consistency, and without a failsafe process to enable the management of the system all the way up to the top to know that all bullying accusations are recorded and managed properly, by definition it is not possible to properly address them. So I point people in the direction of that particular set of benchmarks. In my view, the primary suggestion emanating from the report and the overwhelming need, again in my view the number one issue, is the fact that there are no consistent KPIs or benchmarking for our health facilities to enable a drill down or assessment from the department, down to the LHN, down to the hospital department and the subdepartment. To the question of why that is important, it is important because we heard time and again evidence from people of silos or pockets of bullying with no reporting up and no visibility. No knowledge means no attempt made to address it.

Without that, it is not going to be possible to isolate problem areas in hospital departments, hospital networks, etc., and address them. In my personal view, every manager in the health

department should be assessed and made accountable for KPIs for the wellness of staff and, in particular, the susceptibility of staff to bullying. This is a relatively cheap and easy process to implement. It is the number one issue, in my view. If there is a will to do so, then it should be done. I cannot stress enough that, to me at least, that is the number one problem. If it is addressed properly, it will also enable a considerable uplift in staff morale.

In closing, I will recap our summary from page 106 of the report, which I think is also pertinent. The fact is that these issues have been raised as part of other reviews and reports. None of this is news. The reality is that we need to address these, and we need to address them quickly if we are serious about addressing these as serious issues. That said, I commend the report to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurua) (11:41): I rise to speak in relation to the inquiry of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation into workplace fatigue and bullying in South Australian hospitals and health services. Clearly, this is a very important subject. Clearly, bullying and workplace fatigue among our more than 30,000 people who work in SA Health have an impact not just upon those staff themselves but on the hundreds of thousands of patients who require services at our public hospitals and health services every year.

What is clear from this report is that bullying and fatigue issues are not going away. They are only increasing and becoming worse, and everything that needs to be done to stop that should be done. There is a very clear connection between the issues of fatigue, shortage of staff and bullying and harassment that takes place. It is clear from the report, it is clear from what we have heard from our health professionals and it is clear from what we have heard from different experts that more and more pressure placed upon our staff can equal some horrible results in terms of bullying and harassment and ultimately worse outcomes for patients and risks to their safety and the quality of their health care.

I think that when you look at the report you can see that sadly many of our staff are working far too much. Many of our staff are working without being compensated for the work they are doing. Many of our staff are being pushed to their limits, and that creates cultural problems and bullying and harassment problems across our staff. This is an issue across all the disciplines of health. There are issues that have been clearly articulated in terms of the medical workforce, but it is much broader than that, including nursing, allied health, paramedics and so on.

If you look at the report, you can see very clearly that through the survey work that was done for the report, which I think was a good approach for the committee to take in terms of getting some direct primary-source information to feed into their work, the number of hours worked over a typical seven-day period in some cases is quite dramatic. In a seven-day period, full-time equivalent hours would be 37½ hours.

But when you look across medical, nursing, midwifery, allied health, ambulance, as well as administration and facilities staff, many people are working more than 50, 60, 70 hours, sometimes over 78 hours. The highest levels are when you look at medical staff and ambulance staff, where many people are working over 78 hours in just one week—one seven-day period—which is clearly not sustainable and clearly not permitted under the proper enterprise bargaining and workplace laws. But that is happening and it is creating issues of fatigue.

You can also see in the report very clearly where the reporting is happening. You can see the top areas for people having witnessed harassment or bullying in the current workplace over the past 12 months. The top-line figures are in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network (NALHN) and the Women's and Children's Health Network, where 51 per cent of people in both those areas have witnessed harassment or bullying in their current workplace over the past 12 months.

Next in line is the Central Adelaide Local Health Network (CALHN), representing The QEH and the RAH, where 50 per cent of people have witnessed harassment or bullying; then the Southern Adelaide Local Health Network (SALHN), 49 per cent; Country Health, 49 per cent; and SA Ambulance, 48 per cent. Compare that to the public sector as a whole, which is 37 per cent, so it is significantly higher in Health.

For people who have been subjected to harassment or bullying in the current workplace—so this is not just someone saying, 'I have seen it happen to somebody else, but it's actually happened to me'—the top-line figures again are in the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network,

where 32 per cent of people have been subjected, and 31 per cent of people in the Women's and Children's Health Network. Coming down from there, it is 29 per cent of people in SA Ambulance Service, 28 per cent of people in both Country Health and SALHN, and 27 per cent of people in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network.

This is very important because, when you look at what is happening right now in our health services, you clearly have these people who are overworked you clearly have people who are pushed to their limit. They are clearly experiencing the effects of that in terms of harassment and workplace bullying in the system and what we are having is a process of cutting those staff, making the problem even worse. Some of the first places that were highlighted were some of those places which have reported the highest percentages of people who have witnessed bullying and harassment in terms of the Northern Adelaide, Women's and Children's, and Central Adelaide local health networks. They were the first people to put up their hands and say, 'We would like to cut our clinical staff.'

That is a process that is underway at the moment. There are hundreds of applications that the government is considering and, if those applications are accepted, they are not going to replace those people with more clinicians coming in. Those positions will be abolished. The work will have to be spread amongst the smaller number of people working there, and that is only going to increase the fatigue and the pressure. Ultimately, we see the result of that in a lot of the bullying and harassment that is taking place.

Many key medical, nursing and other professional groups participated in this inquiry, and I thank them for their work and their ability to stand up and say that bullying and harassment should not happen and that we should get to the root causes of why it is happening to stamp it out. In that vein, just last weekend, we had a summit from the Australian Medical Association, led by its new president, Chris Moy, who has made very clear that in his term he wants bullying and harassment to be one of the top priorities for the AMA in terms of stamping it out. I was delighted to be there, along with the member for Morphet and the health minister.

During that presentation at this summit, some other very startling statistics were presented on what is going on in our health system right now. This was part of the AMA Hospital Health Check Survey to review what is happening in terms of fatigue of staff and also in terms of bullying and harassment. You can see very clearly that there are many people who are pushed to their limits in the system. For instance, between 5.6 and 29.8 per cent of doctors at teaching hospitals said that they worked more than 15 hours a fortnight of unrostered overtime.

Between 15 per cent and 23 per cent of participants in different hospitals and health services had annual leave applications denied. When leave was approved, a lengthy approval process was experienced by as many as 40 per cent of doctors. Between 37.5 per cent and 56.9 per cent of doctors reported rarely or never taking sick leave when they should. Between 43.8 per cent and 69 per cent of doctors indicated concerns about making clinical errors due to fatigue. Very clearly, the connection is being drawn there by the medical staff themselves between their fatigue and the impact upon patients.

At one hospital, 70 per cent of respondents reported being concerned about their personal safety due to fatigue—for example, experiencing microsleeps driving home from work. Between 18.8 per cent and 38.9 per cent of surveyed participants said that they were unable to take mandated shift breaks. As Dr Moy articulated at the summit, good people go to these jobs, have an unrealistic workload when they get there, and it does not take very long for the pressure to build and for them to start acting in ways that they should not and they might otherwise not.

That is borne out in terms of bullying and harassment, where between 53.8 per cent and 61 per cent of surveyed participants in the three major teaching hospitals reported experiencing personal bullying or harassment from consultants, registrars or nurses. Patients and family members were identified as being responsible for bullying or harassment by between 13 and 22 per cent of participants.

There is a whole lot of data, going hospital by hospital through these figures, and you can see very clearly that the issues are in some of our major teaching hospitals. The government need to address this issue, they need to take action and they need to stop cutting the staff, which is making it worse.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (11:51): I thank other members for their contributions and for acknowledging what a serious issue bullying and fatigue is in our SA Health system. I thank the members for Taylor, Davenport and Kaurna. From those contributions, we heard about the serious issues that are in place in the SA Health system.

I should say from the outset that there was quite clear evidence that many SA Health employees are doing really great work. The overwhelming majority of them are dedicated professionals and they are working very hard to deliver quality results to the community. There are stories of their being fatigued but not wanting to take leave because they do not want to let down their fellow health professional because they know that load will just go onto them. The member for Kaurna commented that the government should do this, and that is what we have actually done. We went into this inquiry—

Mr Picton: You are cutting staff.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna will not interject out of his seat.

Mr PATTERSON: —in the very early days. He fails to acknowledge that this government has put in—

Mr Picton: You are cutting staff.

Mr PATTERSON: —\$1 billion over four years—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is called to order, as is the member for Davenport and the member for Kavel.

Mr PATTERSON: —back into the health system. We have reactivated the Repat. You talk about cutting staff—well, what about the Repat? Where is that? Cut. What about Noarlunga, where you are? Were you fighting for that? Cut. In fact, the member for Davenport and I—

Mr PICTON: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Member for Morphett, please be seated for one moment.

Mr PICTON: I believe standing orders say that members should direct their comments through the Chair.

The SPEAKER: That is true. I caution the member for Morphett and remind him he is not on the wing playing for Collingwood anymore—although it was great to see him when he was. Member for Morphett.

Mr PATTERSON: What I should say is that we are doing something about this as well in regard to the emergency department. The member for Davenport and I took this very seriously. We went to all four sites. We went to the Flinders hospital, and we saw their emergency department and the very real pressures they are under and what they need there. They have an ageing demographic in that area, so this government has committed funding to increase the capacity of that emergency department for the very reason to help those staff out—because they are fatigued. These issues have been ongoing for a long time.

Mr Murray interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Davenport! The member for Morphett has the call.

Mr PATTERSON: I would remind members that there is action being taken and it is very pleasing. I think it is as a direct result principally, although there may be other reasons as well, of the AMA's culture and bullying summits last week. Dr Chris Moy came and gave evidence to the committee around bullying and fatigue. It is a good thing that there is progress and that this is being taken seriously because we have shone a light on it.

As Dr Moy said, it is a line in the sand. He sees this as one of his biggest challenges, and it certainly is because it is about good people working in a system and making sure that the culture around them encourages them to be their best and, in turn, give very good and safe service to their patients, who are ultimately many South Australians, so that is very important. The member for

Davenport also spoke about the real importance of having KPIs and having transparency so that this can be compared.

If we look at what is going on in other jurisdictions, Western Australia has been doing a Hospital Health Check Survey since 2015 and, surprise, surprise, all the hospitals are suddenly taking action in this regard now that the light is being shone upon them to the point where it impacts them because junior doctors want to choose hospitals that rate very well in terms of the health check. So if this can be introduced into our South Australian system, where we have yearly reporting where you can drill down into different local health networks, that can only be good.

To finish on a positive note, in terms of other information that Dr Moy gave us, in regard to what has happened in other hospitals and how they can turn culture around, it does take time, but the first way to address it is to recognise it, which is what this committee has done, and then once it is recognised, it can be turned around. Royal Prince Alfred Hospital had similar issues to those we are now experiencing at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and they have been able to turn that around and eliminate the culture of bullying that was going on. The flow-on effect of course then becomes safer patient outcomes for the South Australian public. I thank members of the committee for their work on this report and I commend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: THOMAS FOODS FACILITY SUPPORTING ROADWORKS

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:57): I move:

That the 48th report of the committee, entitled Thomas Foods Facility Supporting Roadworks, be noted.

Witnesses presented to the Public Works Committee at a public hearing on 13 February regarding the proposed Thomas Foods Facility Supporting Roadworks project. In January 2018, the existing Thomas Foods International meat processing facility, located in Murray Bridge, was, as you know, Mr Speaker, extensively damaged by fire. Thomas Foods International has since committed to constructing a new meat processing facility to be located six kilometres north of Murray Bridge along Mannum Road.

The new meat processing facility is expected to employ up to 2,000 staff and plans to use higher productivity vehicles to serve the transport requirements for livestock and goods entering the site. The South Australian government worked with Thomas Foods to facilitate the state government's input and support for this new development. I particularly acknowledge the member for Hammond, who has been a strong and consistent advocate for this project and closely understands the needs of his community and the need to ensure that this project proceeds.

The proposed supporting roadworks project will deliver local road access to the new Thomas Foods facility. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure has identified requirements for a new access road and associated junction on Mannum Road for a safe connection to the existing Mannum Road. It is estimated that the total cost for the supporting roads project will be approximately \$14 million, with the project jointly funded by the Australian and South Australian governments in a fifty-fifty split. The proposed project will include the construction of a new local access road, approximately 2.2 kilometres in length, and a new junction, as I mentioned, at Mannum Road.

The proposed supporting roadworks are expected to support the several hundred million dollar investment in new infrastructure at the site. DPTI has advised that the new road will become a local road under the care, control and responsibility of the local council. The project will be delivered over two consecutive financial years, and construction of the facility and access road is expected to commence in the first half of 2020.

The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to this project and received assurances by DPTI officials that the appropriate consultation relating to this project has been undertaken. The committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects as described in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the scope of the proposed public works.

Motion carried.

Bills

**CRIMINAL LAW (LEGAL REPRESENTATION) (REIMBURSEMENT OF COMMISSION)
AMENDMENT BILL**

Introduction and First Reading

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

Second Reading

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

That this bill be now read a second time.

I am pleased to introduce the Criminal Law (Legal Representation) (Reimbursement of Commission) Amendment Bill 2020, a bill that amends the Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act 2001. The bill makes two changes to the process by which the Legal Services Commission, South Australia's primary legal aid provider, is reimbursed for the costs of expensive criminal trials. The changes are designed to ensure that the Legal Services Commission is subject to a consistent, reliable maximum cost when taking on a serious criminal case.

The Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act aims to ensure that all people have access to legal representation for the trial of a serious offence in South Australia. It was introduced in response to the 1992 High Court case of *Dietrich v The Queen*. The High Court held that if a person charged with a serious criminal offence is unable to gain legal representation, the trial should be adjourned or stayed until he or she can find such representation.

The Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act gives persons charged with a serious offence a right to legal representation from the Legal Services Commission. The costs of this assistance are split between the Legal Services Commission, the government and in some cases the accused person themselves. The Legal Services Commission has recently requested some alterations to the way that these costs are shared with the government.

If the costs of a serious criminal case exceed a set level, known as the funding cap, the Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act allows the Legal Services Commission to apply to the government for reimbursement of the excess costs. The funding cap is currently set at \$50,000 for a case with a single defendant and \$100,000 for a case with multiple defendants. It recently came to my attention that the Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act does not allow the costs of some preliminary criminal processes to count towards the Legal Services Commission's reimbursement claim. They are considered separate, non-reimbursable expenses.

The Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act only requires the Legal Services Commission to provide legal representation after the defendant is committed to the Supreme Court or District Court for trial. However, often the defendant meets the Legal Services Commission's standard criteria for legal assistance, and so they also receive legal assistance during the preliminary committal processes that occur in the Magistrates Court. Because these earlier costs cannot count towards a reimbursement claim, the Legal Services Commission will face uncertain costs if they take on the serious criminal case in the early stages of the criminal process. Above, all it is the government's position, which is reflected in this bill, that the Legal Services Commission should be able to be certain when they take on a serious criminal case that they will not have to spend more than the funding cap.

Clause 4 of the bill broadens the definition of 'legal assistance costs' to make it clear that all costs spent on a serious criminal case can be counted toward the total costs for the purposes of a reimbursement claim. The new definition of 'legal assistance costs' includes the cost of providing the assistance to which the defendant was legally entitled under the Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act as well as any other discretionary assistance that the Legal Services Commission provided to the defendant in relation to the same case. However, the total legal assistance costs will not include an appeal against the sentence or conviction or any other costs prescribed by regulations.

This new definition ensures that the reimbursement exercise reflects the true cost of the criminal case from the time the charges were laid to when they are finalised. The Legal Services Commission also currently faces uncertain costs when a single set of serious criminal charges needs to be heard across multiple trials. This may be required due to practical issues such as courtroom size, as a complex criminal matter may have multiple defendants, each with their own legal team. It may also be required due to evidentiary issues.

The Legal Services Commission has informed me that split trial situations subject them to an additional funding burden. The Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act applies the funding cap to each individual trial, even if the matter started as one set of charges. Therefore, the Legal Services Commission may take on a case expecting to spend just \$50,000 and end up needing to spend \$100,000 if two trials are required.

The bill allows the Legal Services Commission to treat separate but related trials as a single case for the purposes of the funding cap. Upon application to the Attorney-General by the Legal Services Commission, and if the Attorney-General is satisfied that it is appropriate in the circumstances, multiple related trials will be considered a single criminal case for the purposes of reimbursement, and the total legal assistance costs may be calculated accordingly. The funding cap will be applied once to the total costs of all related trials.

The bill ensures that the Legal Services Commission is subject to a consistent, predictable cost when taking on a serious criminal case. It seeks to ensure the Legal Services Commission can fulfil its role of providing legal assistance for serious criminal matters whilst also continuing to fund their other important work of providing community legal advice and education as well as representation in family law, domestic violence and mental health matters.

This is a necessary legislative change and it reflects the part of my justice agenda that is directed to ensuring that our justice policies and legislation reflect contemporary South Australian needs. I commend the bill to members and seek leave to insert the explanation of clauses into *Hansard* without my reading the same.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Criminal Law (Legal Representation) Act 2001*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause inserts and substitutes definitions for the purposes of the measure.

The definition of *assisted person* is substituted and is proposed to mean a person for whom legal assistance of a kind mandated under section 6(1) or (1a) of the Act is, or has been, provided.

The definition of *legal assistance costs* is substituted and is proposed to be expanded to include all costs of providing legal assistance to an assisted person in relation to the relevant trial (see section 5(2) of the LSC Act) regardless of whether the costs were incurred before or after the person became an assisted person. The proposed definition expressly includes the costs of providing—

- (a) legal assistance of a kind mandated under section 6(1) and (1a); and
- (b) all other legal assistance (other than prescribed legal assistance) which the person was eligible for and provided with under the LSC Act for matters related to and preliminary or ancillary to the trial, including (without limitation) committal proceedings under Part 5 Division 3 of the *Criminal Procedure Act 1921*.

For the purposes of the proposed definition of *legal assistance costs*, *prescribed legal assistance* is defined as—

- (a) legal assistance provided to a person for the purposes of an appeal against conviction or sentence; and

- (b) legal assistance of a kind prescribed by the regulations.

For the purposes of the definition of *associated proceedings* a new subsection (3) is proposed to be inserted to clarify that proceedings may be preliminary or ancillary to a trial whether or not the matter actually proceeds to trial.

5—Substitution of section 18

This clause substitutes a new section 18 in respect of the Commission's right to reimbursement in respect of the costs of providing legal assistance to persons who are assisted persons under the Act.

Proposed new section 18 retains the core elements of the existing section but has been revised to —

- (a) apply to criminal cases that may be comprised of multiple related trials (including multiple accused); and
- (b) include the costs of providing legal assistance for committal and other proceedings to be included in the tally of reimbursable costs for a criminal case subject to an approved case management plan.

For the purposes of proposed new section 18, trials are *related trials* if the charges the subject of each trial are founded on the same facts or form, or are a part of, a series of offences of the same or a similar character (whether or not relating to the same accused person).

Schedule 1—Transitional provisions etc

1—Application

The amendments will apply in respect of a criminal case commenced before or after the commencement of the measure. However, if, at the commencement of the amendments, the Legal Services Commission has already been reimbursed in respect of a criminal case (in whole or part), any further entitlement to reimbursement for the case is to be determined under the Act as in force before that commencement.

2—Case management plans

This clause saves existing approved case management plans which will be taken to be approved for the purposes of substituted section 18.

3—Expensive Criminal Cases Funding Agreement

This clause continues the existing *Expensive Criminal Cases Funding Agreement* for the purposes of the substituted section 18.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Piccolo.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (COMMENCEMENT OF CODE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 4 March 2020.)

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (12:09): I rise to make a contribution to the debate on this bill. I want to say from the outset that I am pleased the minister has seen the good sense in the crossbench bill before us today. This is a bill that originated from a proposal by the Hon. Mark Parnell in other place, and I commend Mr Parnell for his ongoing, sincere and informed interest in planning matters. As will be evident from my comments in the recent Address in Reply debate, I, too, am very concerned about the direction of the government's planning reforms. It is all too clear that the wheels have fallen off the reform agenda.

Of course, much has happened since this bill was first considered and passed in the other place during last year's session of parliament. For one thing, the minister's department has started to look shaky, with the departures of an increasing number of senior executives, including directors responsible for the delivery of the planning code, the ePlanning system and various other reforms. Like other members, in recent months I have been approached by members of the community with deeply held concerns, aghast at what the code proposes for their neighbourhoods. I have also noted that there is an increasing number of councils and peak bodies expressing outright hostility to the government's reforms.

So it is all too clear we need to go back to the drawing board. This is why, upon the conclusion of the second reading debate on the bill, I will be moving a contingency motion to allow the house to consider a motion to instruct the Committee of the Whole to consider amendments to the Planning,

Development and Infrastructure Act that go beyond the commencement of the code. I bring this matter up now because I believe the time has come to engage in a thorough parliamentary debate.

Merely delaying the commencement of the planning code will not resolve the widespread community anger and concern increasingly evident in recent months. We need to fix the traps and flaws left in the legislation when it was rushed through the last parliament. I make no judgement on the former minister's fervour for his legislation, but I do observe, in my experience, political shortcuts almost always inevitably lead to political headaches. But the government, which was then the opposition, and the opposition, which was then the government, should reflect on this. At the time, many of us, myself included, took the former minister's assurances the bill, as it then was, fulfilled the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform, which was an initiative with bipartisan support.

Perhaps, had the bill not been rushed through, the obvious flaws would have been picked up and remedied. Perhaps, if we had all spent more time interrogating the bill, sufficient issues would have been found and repaired. I do not apportion blame anywhere in particular, but I do say now is the time to fix, not just paper over, the cracks. On review of the expert panel's recommendations, it appears the legislation as it stands departs from some recommendations in a number of ways, which may seem minor but are in fact quite significant.

As I said in my Address in Reply remarks, I suspect if the recommendations of the panel had been more faithfully completed we may not have ended up in the current chaotic mess. Planning is an inherently contestable area of public policy. There is little to surprise in that statement, but we rarely examine the reasons why this might be so. I believe the explanation lies in understanding the psychology of how we interact with familiar places. It sounds obvious, but the places we live in, work at and visit can become as cherished on a special level—and loved, in some cases—as family members and close friends. We are all capable of becoming quite attached to the places where we are most happy.

So it is a credit to the expert panel that, after three years of intensive engagement involving more than 1,500 South Australians, the recommendations they made were so widely supported by councils, community groups, industry, professionals and across the political divide. Indeed, the reason for this was, I suspect, the panel really spent time listening to what people had to say. How quickly the goodwill from such a process has been squandered. I have spoken before of the dangers of political shortcuts and, indeed, I have been critical of some of the more recent shortcuts taken by this government.

Indeed, I expect we will be discussing one of the more obvious of these tomorrow, or later on today, when the government presents its GM crops bill for the second time after manoeuvres during the summer break—but I digress. My point is, as members of parliament, whether we are in government, opposition or on the crossbench, it is well past the time for us to all start lifting standards. The ill will the government's planning reforms now meet is a direct result of rushed process, untenable deadlines, the inflexibility of the approach and a lack of listening skills.

We have a problem, but if we work together as we can, we can get this important reform agenda back on track. By agreeing to my contingency motion, the house will be afforded the opportunity to move amendments that will go beyond the bandaid measure of merely delaying the implementation of the code. Indeed, I will afford any member, including the minister, the opportunity to come to the house with suggestions for how we can fix flaws in the legislation that relate to statutory instruments.

My own amendments, if passed, would restore a type of local council zoning plan, giving parliament a greater say in scrutinising planning instruments, and would replace the planning code with a simpler zoning menu and standards for good design. All these are consistent with the expert panel's recommendations and will address obvious departures from them that will put the planning reform agenda back on track. These changes, if adopted, would rebalance the role of councils and the State Planning Commission.

They will ensure that the focus of the new planning system is squarely on good design based on what the expert panel referred to as 'form-based zoning'. They would ensure that parliament has a truly effective role in scrutinising planning instruments made by the State Planning Commission.

Most importantly, they will mean communities will have the time to work with councils to understand and roll out the right zones and design policies in their own neighbourhoods, and not have these imposed on them from North Terrace.

I said in my Address in Reply remarks the government should pay heed to the groundswell of community anger on this issue. Allowing this debate, which would still enable the commencement date for the code to be deferred in a timely fashion, would be a good start. I would be more than happy, moreover, for the committee debate to then be adjourned to allow the government to take advice and to allow other members to have the benefit of any information the government may wish to provide prior to members determining a position and voting on my amendments.

Indeed, perhaps the government may come back after taking advice with its own amendments. I, for one, would welcome this and, if the amendments are based on genuinely listening to community concerns, I would be surprised if they did not have the wider support of others in the house and the other place. It would be a shame if the government, instead of embracing this opportunity, used its numbers to push this bill through just as it has tried to push through its planning reforms against widespread community hostility. With those remarks, I look forward to the conclusion of the second reading debate and the house's consideration of my contingent motion and, in committee stage, my amendments.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:15): I rise to speak on the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Commencement of Code) Amendment Bill 2019 and acknowledge and thank the minister for introducing it for our consideration so that we might, essentially, allow sufficient time for consultation to continue and consideration to be given to the development of the Planning and Design Code.

The member for Florey has already acknowledged the Hon. Mark Parnell as being the author of a similar bill in another place which has, although passed in late 2019, lapsed with the proroguing of parliament, and outlined the history of the demise of that as a result. I, too, wish to acknowledge the Hon. Mark Parnell and his consideration of this option in presenting it to the other place, because I also agree that the Hon. Mark Parnell has a significant area of expertise and skill in relation to planning law. It was obviously a significant aspect of his life prior to coming to parliament and, on a number of occasions, I have consulted with and, indeed, agreed with the Hon. Mark Parnell in his consideration of planning matters, not the least of which, I recall, was the debacle surrounding the Mount Barker development and the outrageous conduct of the previous government in relation to that.

Be that as it may, we are now dealing with a bill to remedy a time limit that was imposed under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, which requires the full introduction of the Planning and Design Code across the state by 1 July 2020. I must say, when I recall the former planning minister, the Hon. John Rau, indicating I think to this house as well as generally—but certainly to me—that it might take five years before all of the processes would be in place for that legislation to come into effect. I thought that was laughable and I could not believe that it would actually take that long, but there were issues relating to rules, regulations, design code, and another important document—some charter, I think, as I recall—but there were a number of processes that needed to be undertaken.

Four years later, we now find that we are coming to the end of that time and we need to hurry this up, and I can see why the former minister was quite realistic in setting out that time limit. Certainly, since the change of government, we have tried to ensure that this process continues. Obviously, while the original legislation took a very long time to go through this parliament, there was much scrutiny of it. There were literally hundreds of amendments to that legislation, and they were introduced by the former government, let alone all of the others. It just went on. It was really quite an arduous piece of legislative reform, which was excruciating.

I recall that this was the former member for Goyder Mr Steven Griffiths' life for some months, just negotiating the management of all the amendments. It was a very difficult legislative reform. There were arguments from all sides as to how it should progress. It did pass, but not necessarily in the form that some of us who were then in opposition would have wanted. Nevertheless, it passed. It was the will of the parliament. We have an obligation to get on with the implementation of what the law is in that regard.

However, what has become evident is that, apart from being the most significant reform of planning and development legislation since the original act came into being in 1993, it has elicited an extraordinary amount of response from the broader community. In particular, I think the most acute that I have seen, or had my attention drawn to, is the development of this Planning and Design Code. As a result of that, further time for the consideration and preparation of the code clearly needs to be given.

In a moment, I will come to the stakeholders and interested parties in my own electorate, but I say at the outset that I share the member for Florey's concern about the sheer volume of matters that have been brought to my attention and probably that of many in the parliament, whether they represent rural, peri-urban or metropolitan seats. Different aspects of concern are being raised predominantly relating to the region they are in, and mine is no exception. The expression of concern during the consultation versions of the code, which was released in October 2019, was that some further refinement was required and that councils had not had enough time to re-engineer the required business practices that the introduction of the code and its associated reforms require.

I do not know whether other members made any attempt to read the new draft code. To be frank, I found it difficult to navigate online how it was going to operate. I am not suggesting that this aspect is peculiar to planning codes, planning rules or other planning amendments we have had to look at over the years. They are all confusing to me. But, with perseverance and advice, particularly from Annabel Wilkins in my electorate office, who has worked diligently on this, I have a clear picture of exactly how these would apply within my own region of representation, and I am indebted to her for her hard work in that regard.

Trying to actually place it in some kind of understandable form for our representatives is important for them having a say. They need to have some understanding about what has happened. I see, like a sort of resurrection from the dead, the former member for Enfield has arrived, just after I have been complimenting the passing of his legislation, as wearying as that was at the time back in 2016.

The position is this: we do need extra time. Councils, industry and the community have asked for more time to understand, prepare and become business ready for the new planning system. I am advised that the commission has closely monitored those submissions to date, and in particular stakeholder readiness, and considers that further time is warranted to ensure the code is of sufficient quality and that stakeholders are adequately prepared for the change.

In addition to the personal challenge I have had as a local member, and I am sure others have had also, in understanding what this all means, preparing it in some form so that it is translatable and understandable for our constituency is important. Then, having been informed, they require sufficient time to respond. In addition to that, the planning commission has made the assessment that it is also necessary for us to accommodate a time frame for stakeholder readiness for this. So there is a twofold exercise that needs to be accommodated.

For the benefit of our members in attendance today and listening to this debate, the idea that it would be ready in five years after the bill passed is proving to be very true. The words of the former planning minister were quite accurate, probably just about to the day, that we needed the five years and, with the passage of this bill, that is what we will have to ensure those two imperatives are reasonably accommodated.

I think it is also important, from our government's point of view, that we recognise the significance of genuine consultation and providing time for the opportunity to listen, consider and act in those circumstances. Frankly, it would be completely counterproductive to the planning system and development across South Australia if we were to ignore that feedback from the community. Some of it has been directly from councils and councillors in our local government structure and those who work in the planning area and have experience in that regard. If we were to push ahead with those initial time lines, as we would be required to do in the absence of the passage of this bill, that would clearly be counterproductive, and we are not interested, as a new government, in allowing a situation like that to prevail.

Another aspect, I am advised, is that the bill will also facilitate some extra time for testing and potentially more enhancements to be made to the ePlanning system should they be required.

Having had some experience in the implementation of e-projects in the nearly two years that we have been in government, they usually are a challenge, not just because of the new technology coming into place to provide, usually, more efficient and cost-effective means by which business is done by a government, a court or a department, but also because we have to prepare those who use those services to become familiar with the new system and, most importantly, make sure that it is tested properly so that it works.

If I were to give an example, the ECMS proposal was to be implemented in our courts under the previous government. It piloted by late 2018 in the probate division of the Supreme Court. There were difficulties, I think it is fair to say, in the implementation of that part. I thought the Courts Administration Authority were wise in their staggered introduction. The introduction of probate for wills processes being through an ECMS was a good test area to start with, and it threw up some difficulties that came with it.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Point of order: is the minister actually speaking on this bill or some other related matter?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it is a related matter, then that is probably appropriate.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For the benefit of the member, might I just say that the member might have missed the fact that the importance of giving some extra time here is to also test and potentially deal with enhancements on the new ePlanning system, and that, as a result—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: It doesn't take 10 minutes to say that.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Light—

The Hon. A. Piccolo: You just said it in 30 seconds then.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Light, that is enough. You have raised your point of order. We are bringing the Attorney back to her speech. Other members will have the opportunity to contribute as well. Attorney.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just giving an example, sir, of the challenges that are met in introducing e-systems, and I was giving the example of the court. I just make the point that they come with some uncomfortable change, sometimes to the people who are using them. The example I have given was for some of the lawyers. Nevertheless, it also threw up, as the parliament is aware, circumstances where we were asked—which we have done at the request of the Chief Justice—to make some changes of law to accommodate things that were not clearly evident prior to starting. We need to get that side of it right.

I am advised that the phase 2 (rural areas) code will be delayed by three months to July 2020. The phase 3 (urban areas) code will be delayed three months until September 2020. Phase 3 remains in consultation—or I think consultation might just recently have closed, but in any event we want to be able to consider this further. This bill assists in mitigating the risks that the code will not be of sufficient quality and/or that end users will not be ready to engage with the code once it is operational. The State Planning Commission is responsible for the code development processes and is supported by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure.

I will conclude by saying that the department is responsible for the delivery of other aspects of reform, including the ePlanning platform. We have taken their advice, and we have seen the volume of submissions from the people of South Australia. We are a government who does want to constructively listen and we will consider those matters. We will have time then to action appropriate reforms with the passage of this bill.

Finally, can I say that I have not yet digested the foreshadowed amendment by the member for Florey, but obviously we will have a look at that. At first blush, it seems to be unnecessary to actually reopen the act to have a look at the other matters, which we took a painfully long time to debate back in 2016, but obviously we will have a look at that as this bill progresses.

*Parliamentary Procedure***VISITORS**

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge the former attorney-general and former member for Enfield, John Rau. Welcome to the chamber today.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And minister for planning, of course. Therein lies his interest.

*Bills***PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (COMMENCEMENT OF CODE)
AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Debate resumed.

Ms STINSON (Badcoe) (12:31): I rise to support the bill. Of course, I welcome this extension of time that I understand will be taken to look at the implementation of these changes and ensure that, as far as possible, they are put into place effectively and actually achieve what they are meant to achieve. In my community, I have been calling for a delay in the implementation of this for quite some months. I have been calling for it because I have been listening to people in my local community.

The feedback I have been getting from people is that this code is not ready for implementation yet. Certainly at a council level the changes have not been bedded in enough and the councillors, in particular, need more time to get across this. I know that because about a month or so ago the member for Light and I hosted a very productive forum with mayors from the southern suburbs—namely, the City of Mitcham, the City of West Torrens, the City of Marion and the City of Unley—and we spoke to them about their views on the code.

There was a diversity of views on the full breadth of the code, but one thing that shone through very strongly in the very strong feedback that we got from them was that they were not ready to implement this. Some of us on this side have been fighting hard to make sure that the many errors are ironed out in this code, that people's views are listened to properly and that councils and others are equipped to be able to implement this quite massive change to the planning system. We are, of course, delighted that there is now the flexibility to be able to do that, and that is why we are supporting this change.

I am very glad that the government has listened to Labor's calls on this, and the calls of others as well. Of course, Mr Parnell in the other place was the originator of this bill that has now been adopted by the government. We supported it in the upper house, and of course we are supporting it again here today, just because it is a good idea—it just makes sense. I did want to clarify, though, or raise, some comments that the Attorney-General made right at the beginning of her address, right before mine, in which I understood that she was thanking her colleague, minister Knoll, for extending the amount of time for consultation.

Certainly, while there have been calls for the consultation period to be extended, noting that it was quite a lengthy consultation period already, my understanding is that the consultation period was not lengthened at all and that it closed on 28 February. If the government has changed their view on that in some way, I would love to be enlightened about that, but as far as I understand all consultation was due on 28 February and is now being digested, I hope, by those who are charged with looking at this information. Hopefully, it will then be translated into the necessary changes.

I am certainly aware of scores and scores of errors in the proposed code—that 3,000-odd page document—pertaining to my area, and it has been very difficult for people to provide feedback on the code when there are so many errors in it. Typically, people will have raised these errors at a number of forums that the Planning Commission and DPTI have run. I welcome the fact that they have done that consultation, but then people have had no feedback about whether those changes are being made to the code and then have no document to reflect upon to see if the changes that they have been asking for, the errors that are in the code, have actually been adopted.

The difficult circumstance that my constituents are in is that they have been red flagging these errors, and the councils have as well. There are scores of errors in this document, things like character zones not reflected, things like streets not being in there. Most notably—and I will get onto this in more detail in a moment—there are things like zones that have been allocated that the locals think are completely contradictory and do not make any sense for the area. That leads them therefore to think, 'Hang on, maybe this is yet another error.'

It is very confusing for residents, most of whom do not have any planning qualifications, to look at this document, to be raising red flags or having to question whether something is an error or an actual intent of the government, and then they have received no document back. There has not been a second draft. Certainly, something that this side of the place has also been calling for is for a revised document to be produced, for people to be able to see that and have some confidence that the government has taken on board the self-admitted errors that are in this document, so that they can clearly see that they have been listened to and that errors have been amended, but that where things were not errors and were clearly the intention and the policy intent of the government that is made obvious to them.

I also wanted to focus for a moment on the following. I have done some fairly extensive community consultation since this process started. In October, I went out and spoke to people at a series of street corner meetings. Then in November I wrote to all householders in my electorate and invited them to a series of forums. I would like to place on the record my thanks to Michael Lennon, who attended those forums and was very gracious with his time, very generous, and answered the many questions of people in my area about this code. That was November, and a lot has happened since then.

People have certainly had more questions and where possible, people have been attending the public forums, but I think there is still a great deal of uncertainty, among my community at least, about what this code actually means. I might just let you know about a few of the pieces of feedback that I have received from my community. I surveyed my whole community and received many hundreds of survey responses on these cards. I might just let you know about a bit of the feedback that I have had.

There are certain geographical areas that were really prominent in the feedback that I received, and Kurralta Park is certainly one of them. There is a very strong view among people in Kurralta Park that their area is suffering the worst of the density and from some really poor planning and development decisions there. This one is from Steve in Glandore, and he says:

Since moving to Glandore in 1992 I'm concerned about the density of developments in Kurralta Park. Even in peak traffic times on Anzac Highway we have cars peeling off and driving through Glandore to Beckham Street. I believe due to the high density development in Kurralta Park fire brigades and ambos cannot access streets due to a number of cars parking in the streets.

This one is from Barb at Clarence Park, and she says:

I have watched the surrounding area slowly being ruined by lovely old houses pulled down and replaced by boring boxes. It is so sad.'

Another person from Kurralta Park talks about the density in the area, and the fact they cannot really drive down their street anymore, and I think quite accurately says, 'My story is being repeated over and over and over again in Kurralta Park.' That is certainly the feedback I have received. That one was from Ruth in Kurralta Park. Another person pleads with the government here, and says, 'What control do I have that a multistorey building will not be built next to my house?' That is from Joe at Keswick. Noel and Lyn from North Plympton have written:

Since 1991, 40 new houses have been built in Talbot Avenue at North Plympton, 750 metres long and the stormwater infrastructure is insufficient and cannot cope.

That is something I have also heard in our community, particularly in North Plympton. King from South Plympton writes:

I have far less in terms of quality of life since I came here in 1999. I feel powerless and would upgrade out of here if only I could afford it.

I think that is a very sad sentiment. I think we live in an absolutely brilliant area, and it is really sad when I get feedback from people saying that their quality of life is being affected by planning decisions

to the effect that they do not want to live in our area anymore, or they would not if they did not have to. I received this one from Despina in South Plympton, and she says:

I'm worried about the high density of houses in my area. Traffic has already increased and is making it difficult for me to go about my daily tasks.

Another one is from Greg, who lives in Kurralta Park, and says:

When fully developed the streets in Kurralta Park will lack charm and individuality. The monotony will be uninspiring. Four units per block is too dense when built side-by-side. There needs to be space in between blocks of townhouses. Alternate blocks should have lower density and higher-quality housing.

This one is from Jody from Ascot Park:

Over the last 20 years the area has gone from a quiet, green family area to being way over-developed with no greenery, no parking and too noisy with too many people living in each other's pockets. I'm thinking of moving because of this.

As I said, that absolutely breaks my heart. Amanda from South Plympton says:

Almost every house sold in my area in recent years has been demolished and replaced with two, four or even 16 units in one instance on the same block of land. There is a lack of parking and there has been a major loss of big trees.

This resident from South Plympton says:

I cannot get my rubbish collected. New infill means people park on the street and the rubbish truck cannot get to the bins.

That is something which has been raised with me before and which is of serious concern. The other major theme that has come through the many hundreds of these survey cards returned to me is a sentiment that is expressed here by Robert from Ashford, who says, 'Where are all the trees for our children's future?' This, of course, is an excellent point. The tenor of the responses I am getting, though, is not simply that people are saying, 'Not in my backyard. We don't want this. We're anti-development. We don't want anything built that we didn't come up with ourselves.' In fact, it is quite the opposite. Stephen from Plympton captures that in saying, 'Look, I'm not anti-development, but more thought and balance is required.'

That is the feedback that I am getting from my community, and what I have received over the last few months while I have been engaging in a pretty thorough exercise of consultation with my community is that people acknowledge that there does need to be development. We cannot keep expanding out into agricultural land, out into other areas without endlessly—sorry, did you have a contribution there?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

Ms STINSON: Well, maybe you might listen to my whole contribution rather than interrupt what I am saying, minister.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

Ms STINSON: I am reflecting on your consultation process.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe, you do not need to respond to interjections. I do not think there was an intentional interjection.

Ms STINSON: I think it was, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: If it was, then that was out of order as well. He has taken his seat. Please continue with your contribution.

Ms STINSON: Thank you, sir. As I was saying, the feedback I am getting from my community is that people understand that there does need to be some level of density, that we cannot simply keep building out into country areas, being further and further away from infrastructure, and even building into agricultural land. That is a sentiment that people expressed to me.

Also, a lot of people have expressed to me that they do understand what the former Labor government's intent was. It was that we would have greater density around transport routes, around railway lines, tramlines and major roads. However, that has to be balanced. There has to be development that does take into account the character and nature of the suburbs in which people live. We do not want to see beautiful suburbs like Glandore, Clarence Park, Black Forest, North Plympton and Kurralta Park giving up all their character and all the things that make those areas special for poor planning decisions.

The feedback that I am getting from my community is that we need to find that balance. This person said to me, 'I'm not anti-development, but more thought and balance is required.' That has certainly been the feedback that I have had from my community over recent months while I have been conducting quite comprehensive consultation with my community about the design code. I also just want to take some time to point out a particular issue that has come up in relation to the code. I am glad that the minister is in the chamber right now. I am hoping that he may listen to this because this is the nub of the submission that I have put in myself on behalf of my constituents to the code feedback process. I might just run through it.

I have been approached by hundreds of local people about the proposed zoning changes to Black Forest, Clarence Park and part of Everard Park. Residents are particularly concerned about the impact the change to a general neighbourhood zone would have on the character of their suburbs. Residents have expressed to me that they do not believe that it is a like-for-like transition as promised. Detailed below are some of the main concerns people have raised with me about the effect of the change to a general neighbourhood zone.

They are loss of vegetation, particularly larger trees that provide canopy; decreased off-street parking; decreased minimum window sill height, reducing privacy; congested streets; decreased minimum front setbacks for dwellings; decreased minimum block size; no side or rear setback; decreased minimum dwelling footprint; increased subdivisions; increased removal of trees in the public domain; no provision for the protection of character homes; increased maximum roof surface area; and no provision for the increased demand for services resulting from greater density.

The general neighbourhood zone, which is proposed for Black Forest, Clarence Park and a little part of Everard Park, is simply not consistent with new zones for neighbouring suburbs. There appears to be absolutely no rationale for why these three suburbs have been singled out for different treatment to the adjoining suburbs, which are remarkably similar locales.

Black Forest, Clarence Park and part of Everard Park are being treated unfairly. In my submission, I have also put forward emails from residents detailing their concerns about the impact of a general neighbourhood zone. Along with residents, as a local MP I would like to see these concerns taken seriously and the zoning changed to a suburban neighbourhood zone, which would be consistent with the surrounding suburbs. Residents believe that a suburban neighbourhood zone would provide the like-for-like transition they were promised by the planning authorities and indeed by the state government. I have also had scores of conversations with people about this unfair zoning at public forums and public events.

The question that goes through my mind about why these three suburbs have been treated differently from others is: is this simply another error? Is this actually a mistake? It would make a lot more sense for it to be a suburban neighbourhood zone consistent with all the other suburbs around it, but because of that process whereby a document has been put forward—some 3,000 pages riddled with errors, and no-one really knows which ones are the errors that are going to be corrected and which ones are actually serious policy intent—residents in my area are left not knowing whether this is just an oversight, whether in fact the government meant to make this a suburban neighbourhood zone or whether the policy intent is for it to be a general neighbourhood zone and for their suburbs to be treated differently and singled out for a greater level of development than the areas that surround them.

There has certainly been no explanation provided to my community so far about why Black Forest, Clarence Park and a little sliver of Everard Park would be treated differently to suburbs like Forestville, Glandore or the rest of Everard Park. I really would welcome the minister's feedback and response to the letter that I have written to him and to Michael Lennon about that, because it really

is a mystery to people in my community about whether this is actually intentional or whether this is one of the errors that is set to be changed in the next draft of the code that we see.

I, for one, certainly hope it is the latter. If not, I will of course be fighting as hard as I can for my community to make sure there are consistent results right across my community and that we have a strong planning system that actually means that people know what the rules are and can stick to them. That is all I wish to contribute.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:50): I rise to speak to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Commencement of Code) Amendment Bill. I was very interested by some of the member for Badcoe's contribution about people from her electorate actually complaining about the so-called sins of the current planning system. My understanding is that, as far as the Planning and Design Code goes, we are trying to reach some uniformity, and it is difficult. It is great to get that community feedback from constituents, but I note that they are actually talking about things that have happened in the past.

As I said, the whole idea of the code is to get some lines in the sand, so to speak, so there can be some uniformity. I remember when we debated the planning bill and what I call the birthday, when the planning bill was reborn in 2016. It was a very interesting debate. The former member for Enfield of blessed memory, the Hon. John Rau, was in charge. What intrigued me about that debate was that there were at least 300 amendments by the previous Labor government, who were in charge at the time.

I will acknowledge the former member for Goyder, as did the Deputy Premier, for the work he did. He basically lived this legislation. I remember the number of briefing papers he brought to the party room as things were moving. It was a movable feast, as the government of the day, the former Labor government, kept changing the rules as things went along. There were a whole range of other difficulties with that debate, and I will get to some of that a little bit later on.

I have had a little bit to do with this code, having formerly been on the Environment, Resources and Development Committee as the Chair, though I am not there at the moment. Phase 1 of the code (outback areas) has been in operation since 1 July 2019. Obviously, this took up most of the state. Phase 2 (regional South Australia), which obviously encompasses a lot of our country members' electorates, including mine of Hammond, was to be in operation in April 2020. However, this bill removes the commencement dates from the act at the government's discretion. We as the Marshall Liberal government have delayed the commencement of phase 2 to make sure that the public is ready to use the code when it does commence.

A few years ago, I took some constituents in to see some planners at one of my local councils. I said, 'Where are we going with this development? What's going on?' and within earshot of my constituents one of the planners said, 'Planning is a grey area.' I looked at them and thought to myself, 'That's not very helpful.' If you want to talk about grey areas, look at the debacle that happened at Mount Barker—I think it has been straightened out a bit as time goes on—where developers blatantly got in front of infrastructure. That was probably some of the impetus for the new planning legislation back in 2016.

In regard to metropolitan Adelaide, which will be phase 3 of the rollout of the Planning and Design Code, the Hon. Mark Parnell introduced the bill into the other place in late 2019, and it was then introduced into this house. The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act currently requires the full introduction of the Planning and Design Code across the state by 1 July 2020. The effect of the bill is to give the Minister for Planning the ability to postpone the effect of this bill, to postpone the introduction of the code for South Australia at the minister's direction. It is proposed that we will progress with this bill, looking for it to pass through all stages.

The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act is the most significant reform of planning and development legislation since the introduction of the Development Act 1993, which that act replaces. The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act includes the establishment of the code, which is intended to progressively replace council development plans by 1 July 2020, establishing a single set of planning policies for development assessment across South Australia. This is a good thing because we need to have the right guidelines, the right code in place, so that people can make decisions knowing that a development is either likely to get up or is not likely to get approved.

The code has had an extensive consultation program since early October 2019. That has been undertaken by the State Planning Commission, and I want to acknowledge the work of Michael Lennon in regard to that. He has presented it multiple times to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. Submissions from both local government and the broader community have indicated the scale of change brought about by the code and associated reform, which requires some further time for consideration and preparation.

In response to industry and community feedback, the state government is reintroducing this legislation to give stakeholders some time to implement the new Planning and Design Code. There has been some concern raised in both rural and metropolitan councils around the consultation versions of the code released in October last year. A lot of that feedback said it needed some further refinement and that councils had not had enough time to re-engineer the required business practices that introduction of the code and its associated reforms require.

However, the Marshall Liberal government, under the guidance of the Minister for Planning, is on track to deliver the new Planning and Design Code on time. We are also acting on advice from the State Planning Commission based on stakeholder and community feedback, and I think it is sensible that we do that. Councils, industry and the community have all asked for more time to understand, prepare and become business ready before the new planning system comes into place.

The commission has closely monitored these submissions, in particular stakeholder readiness, and considers that further time is warranted to ensure the code is of sufficient quality and that stakeholders are adequately prepared for the change. It would be counterproductive to the planning system and developments across South Australia if we were to ignore the feedback from councils and the community and push ahead with the initial time lines. With that, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

The SPEAKER: I direct that the written answer to a question be distributed and printed in *Hansard*.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Aboriginal Lands Trust—Annual Report 2018-19

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

Public Works Committee Inquiry into the North-South Corridor Darlington Upgrade Final Report—Response to Recommendations 2020

Question Time

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:02): My question is to the Minister for Education. What does the minister say to Springbank Secondary College families who have woken up this morning uncertain where their children will go to school in the future?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:02): I thank the member for the question, and it is an important question. It is really important to reiterate, as I have over the last year and a half actually, that the government has confidence and the education department has confidence in the teaching and learning that goes on at Springbank Secondary College. I think that—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the members opposite who have been talking down Springbank Secondary College over the last year should have a good, hard look at themselves.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: implying that the opposition has said anything about Springbank secondary school is debate.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I allowed a little bit of commentary into the question. I would expect the answer to be allowed also to be somewhat broad, but I caution the minister. With respect, when we start accusing—although it was as a collective, not an individual—if we start going down that path, I think we might bring down the standard of the debate. I will listen to the minister's answer. The Minister for Education has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I thank the member for the question, as I say. We have obviously a metropolitan zoned high school here, where 7 per cent of the families who have students in public high schools in the area are choosing to take the opportunity to send their children to the zoned high school that the public education system has on offer. I have spoken to a range of parents, both within that school and within that zone more broadly. I have certainly received representations from many over the two years that I have been the minister.

I imagine that the shadow minister received similar representations over the period when she was in office. Indeed, a range of measures has been put in place at Springbank (formerly Pasadena) to support that school in its efforts to build its numbers, to enhance its reputation and to ensure that the quality of the teaching and learning that we know goes on in those classrooms, and the support that is there for the students in those classrooms, is reflected in a confidence that the broader community might have.

What is unfortunately apparent is that that confidence in the community has not been to the fore. When we have 400 students out of those 850 choosing Unley High School rather than Springbank, when we have significant numbers of students and their families choosing other schools, it demonstrates that there is not the confidence in their local zone school that is offered to them by the public education system that we would hope for.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The fact of why that is, why that—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —reputational challenge exists, there would be no one answer to that. There would be a range of answers that have played out over a number of years. This isn't just an issue that has happened this year: there has been a decline in those numbers for a long period of time. There was indeed a bigger decline several years ago—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —and since then significant efforts have been put in to build morale, to improve culture and to ensure that the supports available at the school meet the needs of the student cohort, yet we are in a situation where again this year, despite having had a zone that is larger than it was last year for new year 8 entries—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am unclear as to the point that is being made there. Despite the fact—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe, you have been warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that the zone is larger than it was 12 months ago, and indeed what was previously—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —the Pasadena zone has been restored to the size that it was before the 2019 school year, we actually have fewer year 8 enrolments than we had the previous year when all the other schools effectively in the metropolitan area are experiencing significant capacity pressure. These are the challenges that we are grappling with, and the needs of the students at that school and in that community are our absolute priority in any decision that I may take.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I have the pleasure of welcoming today to parliament from the City of Mitcham council, I believe, the mayor, the CEO and elected members, as well as community members who are here today presenting a City of Mitcham Pledge of Gratitude with over 1,000 signatures. Welcome to parliament.

Question Time

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): My question is to the Minister for Education. Did the minister inform the school that there was a growth target to be reached before the \$10 million in infrastructure was to be spent that would have assisted in that growth target?

The SPEAKER: Again, there is a little bit of commentary there. I have allowed the question, but I am going to allow a broader answer because of that as there was some commentary.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:07): I understand that there were a number of expectations placed on the school in 2017 when the \$10 million funding commitment was made, and I understand that similar expectations were asked of a couple of the other schools—

Dr Close interjecting:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sorry?

Dr Close interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I ask the deputy leader not to interject, and I ask the minister not to respond to the interjections.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: My understanding is that there were a number of expectations placed upon this school and a couple of other schools, when the former government announced funding commitments, that the schools would be expected to meet prior to the expenditure of those funding commitments. I note that they weren't made public at the time, and I can find and provide further details to the member if she has forgotten the expectations she put on the school when she was the minister.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

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

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Minister for Education. Why the did the minister tell the media that he was considering closing Springbank Secondary College before he told parents or staff or even the principal?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:08): I make the point very clear: I spoke to the principal on Tuesday. I answered questions from a journalist yesterday that obviously informed the story in today's paper. When I spoke to the principal, I indicated that I was keen to meet with the school leadership and representative of the governing council, which I did this morning.

Obviously, some preparatory work has gone into preparing what option may be available to me as the minister, or indeed to us as the government, in how we can best meet the needs of students in the inner southern suburbs, how we can best meet the needs of those families, and so there has been some work done on this in recent weeks to frame up a proposal of what that would look like. But I do think that it is important to speak to schools and get the response of—

Ms Stinson: Yes, before you speak to journalists.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is interjecting. She is warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I think that it is important to do that. We are giving serious consideration to a school review. Obviously, in the things that were talked about this morning, that was one of the proposals that was put forward for consideration. It is fair to say that the principal and the chair of the governing council had a different view on what was best going forward, and I appreciated the opportunity to talk through that with them. I will obviously now be looking very seriously at the proposal that is in front of us in giving consideration to whether a review or whether business as usual is an option.

One of the positive things about the way the legislation is written in relation to school reviews is that it provides a legislative framework where the whole community's views can be taken into account: a three-month time frame, a process where there are views of the schools potentially impacted in a school review, the communities impacted, the local councils and indeed, as a result of the fact that our legislature remains as it was in relation to this, also the education union. All these stakeholders have a voice in the review, and the process is one that gives the community a voice too.

I recall, in relation to how these reviews work, the ones I am most familiar with are the ones where there were proposals to remove the junior primary schools in 2011-12 in my local area. There were a number of these reviews proposed at the same time. Some of them agreed with the proposition put forward and, indeed, those junior primary schools were closed. Some of them, certainly Stradbroke Junior Primary, disagreed with the proposal put forward, but nevertheless the government of the day made the decision having had that review—but they had the opportunity to explore the different arrangements that were in place.

I believe that in relation to one of those reviews back in 2011-12 there was a proposition put forward by the review panel that was different from the original proposition, and the then Labor government agreed with the review panel and did not proceed with the closure as suggested. The point I am making is that a school review process is actually a very good process in which to engage with the community to flush out and flesh out all potential arrangements that might be available. What we would be seeking if there was a review, one very simple and important thing, is how we best meet the needs of students in this school, students in this community. That is behind anything, any decision that is to be made.

There is no driving budget motive here. It is purely a focus on the educational needs of the students. We will ensure that in any determination that is made that is our driving factor and that the needs of those students in this school, in this community—indeed, the needs of students in the primary schools in the local area who are looking at where they are going to go to high school—are met.

DOMESTIC AND FAMILY VIOLENCE

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:12): My question is to the Attorney-General. Can the Attorney-General please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering better services for victims of domestic and family violence?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:13): I do so with pleasure, especially in response to the member for Elder, who is also our Assistant Minister for Domestic and Family Violence Prevention. It's an extremely important role, and I commend her for the work she has done to date. This week, we also turn our minds to specifically the issues that we acknowledge on International Women's Day.

Unfortunately, young women are almost five times more likely to experience sexual assault than young men. These statistics are simply shocking. This government, when elected in March 2018, brought to the table a number of initiatives, practical initiatives aimed at providing simple and effective preventative services for victims of domestic and family violence. Of these commitments, I commend the Minister for Human Services, the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC, and the team of the Office for Women, headed by Ms Fiona Mort, for their extensive work in rolling out what are some of the most comprehensive and focused policies for domestic violence reform in the country.

From the start, this government was active in this area. On 13 April 2018, members might recall that the government launched the first of many round tables with stakeholders. This was less than a month after being elected. A key outcome of those round tables, and seen nationally, was the importance of early intervention and the provision of services for victims. A crucial part of early intervention is providing a potential victim of domestic violence with all the tools and services they need to make an informed decision for themselves and their family.

The Liberal government's Domestic Violence Disclosure Scheme started accepting applications on 2 October 2018. The scheme, members might recall, aims to help people who may be at risk of domestic violence to find out if their current or former partner has a history of violence or any other relevant offences. Alarming, out of 23 convictions for homicide in 2017-18 in South Australia, 10 were related to domestic violence—a staggering statistic and one we all want to see rapidly decline.

When this service commenced, I maintained that, if it helped even one person become aware of their partner's violent offending, it would be a success. Far beyond that, in the first 14 months of operation, as at the end of last year 316 applications were received. This allowed Women's Safety Services and SAPOL to actively work with potentially at-risk persons to understand that violent offending may have been uncovered and to assist the person to leave the situation if they so wished.

Safety hubs and growing crisis accommodation beds were other key aspects of the government's domestic violence agenda. For regional South Australia, The Haven at Murray Bridge was launched on 5 August last year. This hub services the area and provides targeted information and referrals for women and their children to enable access to the local level of support they need. The second safety hub is located in the Riverland Domestic Violence Service, auspiced by Centacare Catholic Family Services.

The safety hub model includes the consolidation of administration staff, the co-location of a clinical specialist nurse from Country Health Connect and improving outreach joint service visits to clients. Safety hubs are the first government-led hubs in South Australia, with two more rolling out in 2020, and provide a crucial service to our regional areas. The 40 new domestic beds for crisis accommodation—the first eight now opened in North Adelaide—deliver a \$4 million government commitment.

Crisis beds will be placed in areas of greatest need, and for our government that means dealing with and providing these services to the regions that are much in need. Clients will receive those services of intensive outreach support. The commitments being delivered by the government in this space are extensive. Providing better services for those who are at risk has been a paramount consideration. It will also include the delivery of a personal protection app 24/7 for the women's crisis hotline, perpetrator information pilots and the continuation of the national implementation plan for the Fourth Action Plan to reduce violence. I commend these initiatives to the house.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Minister for Education. Will the minister rule out any further zone changes or school closures during his tenure?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:17): I thank the member for the question. I indicate that there are a couple of schools that are currently administratively closed. I think Mintabie is one. Tantanoola was administratively closed at the beginning of this year with zero students. I anticipate ordering reviews into those schools. There may possibly be another that has slipped my mind, but I don't think that that is the category that the deputy leader is concerned about.

There are zone changes certainly in the northern and southern suburbs. We are soon to begin consultation on what the zones will look like for the two new schools that are being built in Aldinga and Angle Vale. These two new schools, which are designed, as the member would be aware, for 1,675 students, are going to have a significant and positive impact on their local communities—growing communities where there is both housing growth at the moment and significant population stress on the existing high school infrastructure. So there will be high school zone changes in those areas informed by community consultation.

There may be, from time to time, small zone changes in primary school zones. The member would be aware that these things happen pretty regularly because when the primary school zonings were created—I think in the late seventies—they drew a line on the map and said, 'This is the closest one' and often that created unintended consequences for some of those zones. The member for Playford would recall requesting one in his area that we were able to support in late 2018. These sorts of changes happen in primary schools. They are usually small changes, so they may happen from time to time, but I don't anticipate anything substantial in that space.

The issues confronting Springbank that lead us to contemplate a school review are unique in the metropolitan Adelaide area in that this is a school that is, by factors, smaller than any others and certainly smaller in terms of the number of students in its zone who are coming to it. That is why we are giving consideration to this school. There are no other schools in the metropolitan area that fall into this category and I certainly don't anticipate having to weigh this difficult sort of question in my mind in relation to any other schools.

SCHOOL CLOSURES

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Will the minister rule out closing Valley View High School and Findon High School?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:19): I can certainly say that I have no intention of doing so. Yes, I will rule it out. I can't see that happening in this term of government. I would be surprised if it happened in any future term of government. The fact is that Valley View is in an area where the school population is growing. Traditionally, a number of students in that area have gone to Roma Mitchell, but it's a growing school. Roma Mitchell is facing significant capacity pressures at the moment. I would anticipate that the Valley View school population will continue to grow. It's starting off at a significantly higher level.

When the shadow minister was the minister, she put similar expectations on Valley View and Findon as she did on Springbank at the time. But I have every expectation that those schools will meet those expectations that the shadow minister put on them when they were promised their funding commitments. That is not to say that there is not more work that we can do in every one of our schools. We are eager to see all of them improve and enhance the offerings to their students. They are assets in our community and we want our community to have confidence in those schools.

But this is a unique circumstance, and despite the confidence that we have in the teaching and learning at Springbank it is quite apparent that the local community does not share that same confidence. What we need in our public schooling system is a provision for all South Australians where they feel confident, proud and excited about their local public school. If they choose to go to a non-government school, for whatever reason, then that is a choice they are entitled to make, but it shouldn't be because they don't have confidence in their local public school.

Ms Stinson: You're the one who is diminishing the confidence in the school by telling everybody you're going to close it down.

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe can leave for 50 minutes under 137A because she has been on two warnings. I have given her a fair go. She keeps interjecting. Member for Morphett, do you have something to say about that? No? Good.

The honourable member for Badcoe having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I make the point, as I did earlier, that for the entire time that I have been in the ministry for education I have taken every opportunity to talk up what's happening at Springbank. The shadow minister was with me when we launched the school's new name and when we spoke to some of the students about how much they are enjoying their experience. Throughout last year, I spent a lot of time in the media and at public events talking about the great offerings that were there. Not all members of parliament took the same view in their public pronouncements about Springbank.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Minister for Education. How much of the \$10 million that was assigned to Springbank to facilitate infrastructure and to facilitate increased enrolment has been spent already?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:23): Out of an abundance of caution, I will take that on notice.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna, member for Hammond!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: To be clear, there has been a range of maintenance works that has taken place at Springbank.

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The member has asked a question and I am endeavouring to answer it. There has been a range of maintenance works that—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: A range of maintenance works have taken place at Springbank over the last year and a half, and there has been some infrastructure work that has been done there. Whether or not that's out of that \$10 million or out of a different funding pool I will clarify. My understanding is that it's in the order of \$1 million that has been spent. Nevertheless, despite having provided a reasonable amount of information, I will take the question on notice so that I can provide even more information to the shadow minister because I believe the shadow minister is interested.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering better services via people-focused public transport?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: the question contained debate.

The SPEAKER: 'People-focused public transport'?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: And also 'better services'.

The SPEAKER: Given the nature of how today has gone, I have allowed the deputy leader, in her earlier question, what I think is commentary. I am trying to be consistent here, so I'm going to allow the question; but it's a fair point of order and I have noted it, and I will be listening very carefully to future questions and future answers. Minister.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:24): There can be no doubt that our focus is very much on people when it comes to delivering public transport services.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is shouting, and if he shouts at that level it's going to be very hard to keep him here.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I didn't realise the question came with a trigger warning, Mr Speaker, but we move on. Since coming to government, we have taken a whole series of steps to improve transport and public transport here in South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

Mr Picton: Cut grassroots.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In fact, within the first couple of months of coming to government I announced on behalf of our government increased train services here—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in South Australia, increasing the frequency of services from morning peak through to the end of the day at night, an increase in services to a 30-minute minimum. And, again, for all day on weekends—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —a fantastic step forward for our public transport system. When the Light-City bus contract was transferred across back to Torrens Transit, the opportunity that we took through that to be able to improve bus services in Adelaide was very warmly welcomed. Increasing frequency, for instance—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Be seated for one moment. The member for Kaurana and the member for Lee, you are warned for a second and final time.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Tell us about your better services and cuts.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned. I am trying to hear the minister's answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And whether that be increased services heading to your electorate, Mr Speaker, down Magill Road, whether that be getting more buses getting people to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital or right across those inner northern parts of our network, we were able to provide improved service capacity so that we can get more people onto public transport and fewer people driving—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —their cars in to work. But what we have done is actually undertake to ask our customers what they want. It's how you know that you're people-focused; it's asking passengers what you want.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition is on two warnings, as is the member for Playford.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And what our customers said to us is that half of them don't believe that they are currently getting value for money. Half of our customers don't believe they are getting value for money, and we on this side of the house don't think that's good enough. We think that there are heaps of ways that we can improve the service to get more bums on seats. What they told us—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —was that they wanted the increased reliability, they wanted increased frequency of service, and they wanted a less crowded service. So we are responding by providing 12 new extra trains as part of the Gawler line electrification, as well as extending the train line out to Flinders University for the Flinders Link.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Whether that be getting a new bus contract that actually provides new Euro 6 diesel engines—in fact, I did get a message only last week from a satisfied public transport user who sent me a message saying that he had just caught the brand-new bus with the new USB ports (and he sent me a photo of him using them) saying he absolutely loves the new ride that our new buses are providing. But there is more that we need to do.

What is interesting here is that when our bus contracts were first outsourced some 20 years ago now what we saw over the next decade was a 15 per cent increase in patronage against a 30-plus per cent decrease in the cost of running the service. That is a fantastic outcome. In fact, over the first financial year of the Marshall Liberal government, the 2018-19 financial year, we were able to see a 1.1 million passenger increase over our first full year in office—bums on seats and the best measure for how we want to deliver better public transport services.

We genuinely believe that the outsourcing of our trains and trams will lead to better services, and that's not just us saying that: that is Infrastructure Australia, a body those opposite were crowing about earlier in the week. They don't want to hear that their 2015 report says 'franchising is an opportunity to deliver service improvements and reduce costs'. That sounds precisely like the public transport system we want to deliver and what we are getting on with right at the moment.

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

The SPEAKER: The member for Mawson is called to order. The leader has a question.

PUBLIC TRANSPORT PRIVATISATION

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): Being to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure: in the minister's customer service satisfaction inquiry, how many times did they ask whether or not people supported privatisation and what was the response?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29): What the survey showed is that people cared—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —not about who is providing the service; they cared about what the level of service was: 'Is the service clean? Is it secure? Does it arrive on time? Does it arrive in a frequency that gets me where I want to go and the time I want to get there?'

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Cheltenham is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The two things that I find interesting are that I am being asked questions at the moment about a customer service survey that this government undertook. Prior to that survey, there was no customer service information asked for. It is pretty easy to let down your customers when you don't even bother to ask them a question in the first place. We had the guts to actually ask the hard questions because we want to know the answers. Instead of just sticking your head in the sand because you don't want to know what your customers actually want, we are undertaking a people-focused—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister, be seated for one moment. The member for Kaurna, it is your turn to leave today for the remainder of question time for being on two warnings and continuing to interject. I ask the minister to try not to provoke members of the opposition.

The honourable member for Kaurna having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The second thing here is that our bus services have been outsourced for 20 years. We are in the process at the moment of finalising the new contracts in relation to the bus network, which will come into place on 1 July, including with our tram network. What is interesting is that in 2005 those contracts came up.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Were those services brought back into public hands or were they re-outsourced? They were outsourced. In 2011, were those contracts brought back in-house? No. The former government had every opportunity to be able to practise what they now preach and actually bring services back in-house, but they didn't do that.

At the next election, there is going to be a massive contrast between members who want to put our state and our taxpayers at huge financial risk and a government that has actually delivered better services that customers have wanted to use. That will be the contrast, and we are up for the fight—in fact, we are eager for the fight. The customers don't care who is providing the service; they just care how good it is. That is precisely what we are getting on with delivering.

I think that South Australians are the ones who are going to benefit from increased service frequency, from having a system that is more efficient, meaning that we can actually reinvest in services and also answer those questions and deliver on the information that our customers have told us about improving reliability, improving frequency and improving the number of services to ensure that they are less crowded. These are things that we are listening to and what we are getting on with that the moment.

The SPEAKER: If all the noise continues, the member for Morphett and the member for Reynell are going to be leaving.

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Education. Did the minister inform the school leadership at Springbank Secondary College that he was considering initiating a process for closing the school prior to telling a journalist that he was doing so?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order: that question contained argument and is out of order under standing order 97.

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the question, but I am going to ask for the noise to reduce. I am going to allow the question, so I would like to hear the question again, and then I am going to give the minister an opportunity to answer.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for West Torrens. If I do, I will get back to you. Can I have the question again?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:33): I am happy to answer the question.

The SPEAKER: You have the question.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I spoke to the school principal on Tuesday. I answered a journalist's questions on Wednesday.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left, I have allowed the question.

Mr Malinauskas: What about the answer?

The SPEAKER: Yes, well, you might not like the answer, but that's irrelevant.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:33): My question is to the Premier. What new shovel-ready projects has the state government submitted to the federal government for consideration as part of the proposed economic stimulus package?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:33): Yesterday, we had word from the Prime Minister, the Hon. Scott Morrison, as well as receiving information from minister Alan Tudge in the federal parliament, that they were considering and are considering measures to help stimulate our economy while we deal with the effects of coronavirus here in South Australia.

We are seeing very clearly unfold now what is going to be a difficult economic situation that we need to work our way through. As a government, we are very keen to provide a strong response. Those discussions started early afternoon and went through to later in the afternoon. Here we stand at 2 o'clock the next day. We have already made significant progress in relation to that.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In fact, I had a meeting with my department this morning about the kinds of projects that we can put forward to this. It is something that we are going to very rapidly progress as a government. I want to say this: we are going to work with the federal government to make sure that we can help our economy weather this storm, but it is also true to say that we are actually providing extremely strong stimulus right as we speak—\$12.9 billion of infrastructure projects that we've got on the table in the next four years.

We know with these infrastructure projects that a lot of the more complex ones need longer lead times. It's why, for instance, we have done our homework to get the Joy Baluch Bridge and Port Wakefield duplication off the ground, already out there and working in the field. The Regency Road to Pym Street section of the north-south corridor, Golden Grove Road to Paradise park-and-ride—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee can leave for 45 minutes under 137A.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Mr Speaker, in your electorate, the Newton-Graves intersection, which I understand is extremely near to being completed, is also helping to do that. We have projects going on all over the state as part of our record \$12.9 billion infrastructure program. I have been working extremely—

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

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister, if you could resume your seat for one moment. Point of order?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The point of order is debate, sir. The question was: which shovel-ready projects has the state government submitted to the commonwealth as part of their stimulus? The minister is talking about a forward estimates \$12.9 billion worth of infrastructure.

The SPEAKER: I have the bit about shovel-ready projects, but I will listen carefully to the minister's answer to ensure he sticks to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: When we talk about stimulus, infrastructure in capital spending is a key way that governments can help to stimulate the economy. The way that you stimulate the economy more than it otherwise would have been stimulated is to put more money into infrastructure projects. It's why over these four years of the forward estimates we will see \$12.9 billion spent. That is a billion dollars more than anything those opposite could manage in their time in government and any four-year period.

That is stimulus. That is stimulus of some one billion dollars over and above what has happened previously. As part of that extra one billion dollar stimulus, a lot of those projects are actually projects that the Minister for Education and I are working on to help stimulate South Australia's economy by building the schools necessary to deliver the services that our kids need and want. It also has the added benefit of providing job stimulus in our economy.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: I allowed the minister to go on for another minute. This is debate again, sir. We asked what shovel-ready projects the government has submitted to the Treasurer's new stimulus package.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order; I don't uphold it at this stage.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The projects that the Minister for Education and I are working on are shovel ready, and they are precisely why I am talking about them in this context.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We are getting on with delivering our record \$12.9 billion infrastructure program. It is very clear now that there is going to be work done. There is already work being done to make sure that everything that we can bring forward is brought forward and that we work with the federal government to make sure that we can help ride through what is now going to be a difficult time. These economic headwinds are upon us, but as a government we are reacting and reacting extremely quickly to deal with—

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

The SPEAKER: I am not going to allow frivolous or vexatious points of order. I do have the point of order about debate, and I assure the member for West Torrens that I am ready to act if the minister steps out of line. Would he like to conclude his answer? Is he done?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Mr Speaker, I am just providing information to the house. If members opposite don't like it, then they can ask some different questions. I think that South Australians realise that \$12.9 billion is a fantastic investment in jobs here in South Australia.

SCHOOL FUNDING

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:38): My question is to the Minister for Education. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering better services for South Australian students, parents and families?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:38): I am very pleased get this question from the member for Heysen—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elizabeth is warned twice.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —as a local member, as a parent, as somebody who is passionate about schools, indeed public schools, in his area and a passionate advocate for his schools.

The Marshall Liberal government has worked hard over the last two years to realise our ambition of supporting every student right across this state to fulfil their potential. As others have said, we are working very hard every day to improve what we can do. A range of particular initiatives is helping us in this, but the focus and the model we are pursuing is a school improvement model that is looking to meet the needs of every school in South Australia. We are working with those schools on their improvement plan, particularly focusing on where we can help them with extra support from the department and where those schools can focus their efforts more effectively.

One area that I haven't spoken about so much in this house is the substantial investment that the government has made and the education department has made in improving high-quality world-class professional development opportunities for teachers and leaders. Indeed, I was in the member for Narungga's electorate just last week and we spoke to a principal at one of the small country primary schools in his area who was absolutely beaming and glowing about the opportunity she had had to do a course on instructional leadership, delivered by Harvard University and supported through the education department.

Focusing on giving our schools and our students everything they need to deliver world-class whole-school approaches to improving their literacy and their numeracy is critical. Through the work that we are doing and the professional development opportunities that are available, we are really targeting what is going to be evidence based and what will work in supporting schools to meet the needs of all their students.

Our schools have been supported through this by increased funding. The agreement that we came to with the federal government not just saw the federal government putting in billions of dollars extra into South Australian schools but required the state Liberal government to put in an extra \$700 million into our public school system over the next decade in order to unlock those federal funds. Those resources are being spent wisely and well as we chase down excellence in all our schools across South Australia.

We are, of course, particularly interested in the teaching profession and in leadership. I am very pleased to be able to report to the house that 80 per cent of the education department's teaching workforce have indeed voted to accept a 2.35 per cent per year pay rise and 3.35 per cent for leaders, principals and preschool directors. That is enabling us to have the certainty and the security as we go further.

I know members across this house are very excited about the enhancements that are being achieved through improved internet services in our schools. I can update the house that 76 per cent of our schools, or 411 of our schools, have now been connected, meaning that 164,259 students in the last 18 months have gone from having their schools with the slowest internet connection speeds in the country on the mainland to the fastest, and that is very exciting.

I pay credit to the former minister for instituting a trial of the year 1 phonics check, which I think is transformational in ensuring that early years literacy programs can be rolled out. In our first year in office, as was our longstanding commitment, we rolled that out to all government schools across South Australia. It identified some of the challenges and headwinds that we confront, with 43 per cent of our students meeting the target, meeting the expected achievement level, but within a year that had improved to 52 per cent. We are heading in the right direction and we are heading there at pace.

Our teachers, our principals, our leaders, our SSOs and all the staff in our schools are working hard to support our students, and this government stands with them to ensure they can deliver the services our families, students and parents expect from our school system.

WOMEN OFFENDERS WORKING GROUP

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services, and I refer to his recent answer to a question from the member for Elder on the establishment of the Women Offenders Working Group. Why is it considered appropriate that no-one with lived experience of incarceration be on this advisory panel and will the minister consider such an appointment? With the leave of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: Women with lived experience of custody are, dare I say it, experts in the area and they have access to networks that this advisory group couldn't have and don't have. It has been put to me by a constituent and a key stakeholder group that it could be considered counterproductive to convene a panel of so-called experts and not include the voices of women with lived experience.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:43): I thank the member for the question and do refer to my answer I gave the other day. It is an outstanding working group. The people we have on it have a wealth of experience. You are right: lived experience does count as well, but so does experience in other fields and other factors. We have people who have worked within this industry, people who have had plenty of time associating with people in this industry and people who have worked to actually help people when they have transitioned out of incarceration and into the workforce. I am very happy and very confident with the people we have on the group. I am happy to take the member's point on board, but the people we have on the group are outstanding.

TAFE SA

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:44): My question is for the minister for higher education and skills. Can the minister confirm that regional TAFE manager positions will be relocated back to Adelaide and local positions in Mount Gambier downgraded?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:44): I thank the member for the question. I will seek to get an answer for the member from the Chief Executive of TAFE SA and bring it back to the house.

KANGAROO ISLAND BUSHFIRE RESPONSE

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:45): My question is to the Premier. Since the bushfire emergency started on Kangaroo Island on 20 December, how many trips has the Premier made to Kangaroo Island that have lasted longer than five hours on the ground?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:45): I don't have that information with me.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Light is warned.

KANGAROO ISLAND BUSHFIRE RESPONSE

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:45): My question again is to the Premier. I asked the Premier that same question on 19 February and I got that same answer. What reason does the Premier have not to be up-front with the people of Kangaroo Island?

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson—

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier! That is clearly an assertion of fact, and it's not on. I am moving to the member for Narungga. I will come back to you.

HEALTH SERVICES

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (14:45): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering better health services for South Australians?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:46): I thank the member for Narungga for his question. When I was in the member for Narungga's electorate just last week, we were passing the Kadina hospital and talking about a number of these issues. While I'm on that opportunity, I will pay tribute to Dr John Flett, who passed away in the last couple of weeks, who was integral to building that hospital and supporting health services on Yorke Peninsula. Dr Flett was South Australia's nominee for Australian of the Year two years running in the 2000s, and I think

it is appropriate at this time to mark his passing and the extraordinary contribution he made to health services in South Australia, particularly on Yorke Peninsula.

The Marshall Liberal government was elected with a commitment to deliver better health services for the people of South Australia. We have always made clear that there is not going to be a quick fix for the health system that we encountered upon coming to office. The disastrous mismanagement in so many areas will take time to fix, but we have worked every day. The Minister for Health in particular has worked diligently every day to address the challenges facing that system.

In relation to the Repat, we stopped the sell-off of the site. Fifty beds have been secured on the site that were to be washed away. A new 78-bed dementia-care facility will be built as part of the Oakden response statewide model of care, co-located with an 18-bed acute ward, and \$110 million has been committed to reactivate the Repat. We have restored 24/7 cardiac services at The QEH. We have invested \$4 million to upgrade the cardiac cath labs and begun the stage 3 redevelopment.

At Modbury, we have returned 72-hour surgery. We have established an extended emergency care unit. We will deliver a four-bed HDU, and we are delivering a \$92 million capital upgrade for the hospital. At Noarlunga, we have delivered the 12-bed acute medical unit. We are investing a further \$86 million in a very important project in the Southern Health Expansion Plan, a series of service moves that will boost health services in southern Adelaide by increasing emergency treatment spaces at Flinders Medical Centre by an additional 30 spaces, creating a new state-of-the-art 12-bed acute facility for people with dementia and complex care needs at the Repat, enhancing acute capacity in Noarlunga Hospital and increasing medical cover in the ED.

About 4,100 South Australians were waiting for a colonoscopy beyond recommended clinical time frames in August 2018. We committed \$45 million to cutting overdue elective surgery and colonoscopies given this extraordinary waiting list balloon that we were confronting. It was completely unacceptable. In the past five months, the number of people referred for colonoscopy for the first time and who were on the overdue waiting list has dropped from that 4,100 to 1,970 as of 15 August 2019 and to 1,017 as of 31 January this year, a 75 per cent reduction from the government starting this support.

We have halved the number of South Australians overdue for elective surgery since the election in March 2018, and since we activated stand-by beds in the Central Adelaide Local Health Network last October transfer of care figures for ambulances has decreased. This is so important at the moment because these improvements have put us in a better position to respond to the challenges of COVID-19. By cutting the overdue elective surgery and colonoscopy lists, by having beds ready on stand-by, our hospitals have the capacity to deal with a potential surge from COVID-19 if that proves to be the case.

We have seen today that the Royal Adelaide Hospital has opened a clinic, something it might not have been able to do if it was operating at full capacity. The Marshall Liberal government is delivering better health services for the people of South Australia and in doing so is making sure that the state is prepared as best it can be for COVID-19. We will continue to work every day to support improved services for all South Australians.

KANGAROO ISLAND BUSHFIRE RESPONSE

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier not responded to any of the questions about the Kangaroo Island bushfires that he took on notice in this place on 19 February?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:50): I think there is a longstanding practice in this house to have 30 days to respond to questions on notice. If I could be very clear about this, we take this responsibility very seriously, unlike those opposite when they were in government where we are still waiting on questions that were taken on notice more than a decade ago.

The SPEAKER: The Premier will please resume his seat.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: No point of order? Okay.

The SPEAKER: Has the Premier finished?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will move to the member for Frome; he has been patiently waiting. I will come back to the member for Mawson.

BLYTH PLAINS ROAD

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister please advise of the progress of the shoulder sealing of the Blyth Plains Road? With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I have been communicating with the minister since July 2018. This road is used by many tourists and also heavy vehicles, including many hay trucks and, very importantly, the regional school bus services. I congratulate the minister on having a site inspection there in June 2019. I am just wondering about the progress of this road.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:51): I thank the member for Frome for this question and note his very, very keen interest in this. In fact, I've got photos on my phone of the visit that we made in June 2019 of Red Pass Corner. What we saw that day was pretty scary—essentially, two trucks coming at each other in opposite directions on a road that was so narrow that I am not 100 per cent sure how the side mirrors of those trucks didn't smash on the way through. It's an extremely dangerous part of our road network.

In last year's budget, we committed in the member for Frome's electorate to upgrade Blyth Plains Road; in fact, that work has now been undertaken. It was undertaken late last year, and the safety barriers on those roadworks are set to be done next month. It's a road that takes some 1,400 vehicles a day at a cost of \$1.261 million of taxpayers' hard-earned money. It is essentially a 12-kilometre section of road that had the sealed shoulders there, and those safety barriers are due to go in. We know that when we seal road shoulders we can reduce death and serious injury by up to 40 per cent.

That is a phenomenal statistic, and the reason is that the number one way that people die on our roads, especially country roads, is by what we call single vehicle run-off, where a single vehicle, not in contact with anything else, drives off the side of the road. Whether that be fatigue, whether that be drugs and alcohol, whether that be inattention, whether that be a kangaroo jumping in front of the car, somebody driving off the side of a road crashing into a fixed object is what kills people more than anything else.

It has happened all too often, especially in the member for Frome's electorate, and we can talk about the Horrocks Highway at a different time. It is why investing in shoulder sealing is so important, and it is why we were so proud as part of last year's budget to see an increase, a doubling in the amount of money—in fact over-doubling—from \$11 million under the former government to \$26 million that we are spending sealing shoulders across our road network.

I did have the great opportunity to visit the member's electorate just last week to address the Legatus meeting and group of councils to talk through a whole series of issues, but I had the opportunity afterwards to drive again the stretch of road from Blyth to Halbury, a 28-kilometre stretch of road, and it was just as bad as the time the member for Frome and I went to visit.

However, the exciting thing is that next month we are going to get on and seal that road, seal the shoulders on that road, to save the 600 vehicles a day that drive over that road, to help them stay alive using the Blyth Plains Road—\$3.5 million as part of the safety package under our Rural Roads program to help improve road safety on that dangerous stretch of road.

What I look forward to, once this road is done—and, again, next month it will start and progress over the course as we head into winter—is that when people do experience inattention, when they are inattentive on the road, when they see a fixed object in front of them, the opportunity for them to be able to swerve onto the shoulder, rather than swerve onto the gravel, and then go on to hit a fixed object means that we are going to keep more South Australians alive.

This is a program that our government is extremely passionate about because it reinvests in South Australia's country roads, which have been so long neglected under the former government.

This is part of \$1.3 billion of taxpayers' hard-earned money that we are spending to fix some 1,000 kilometres out of the 10,000 kilometres of road that we own, that we are fixing for country South Australians to keep them alive, to help our heavy vehicles work more productively and to make our regions just that much more liveable.

KANGAROO ISLAND BUSHFIRE RESPONSE

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (14:55): My question is to the Premier. Why has the Premier not responded to any of the 16 letters I have written to him about the Kangaroo Island bushfires, dating back to day 4 of the crisis, on 23 December?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:55): I can update the house because I have now received advice that I have visited Kangaroo Island eight times since 20 December, and three of those times have been for more than five hours. Of course, I am not the only person from the government who has visited Kangaroo Island during that time. In fact, I think that the cabinet has visited on multiple occasions—some people on a very regular occurrence.

The entire Liberal party room was over there earlier this year, and we saw firsthand the devastation that was caused by the fires which, I understand from the member for Mawson, started on 13 December. Of course, they escalated thereafter and, on 3 January, wreaked havoc across the western end of Kangaroo Island. We are very well aware of the issues over there. We are making regular visits. I do note that His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le, Governor of South Australia, is actually on Kangaroo Island as we speak.

There have been multiple visits from very senior members across Australia, including the Governor-General, the Prime Minister, cabinet ministers and senior members of the military who were looking at what happened with the deployment of the ADF.

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

The SPEAKER: Premier, just resume your seat for one moment; there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: This is now debate. The Premier, for over a minute, has been talking about visiting Kangaroo Island. The question was about answering correspondence.

The SPEAKER: I think the question was about correspondence concerning Kangaroo Island. I have the point of order. It's a valid point of order; however, what I am looking out for is whether there is some content in the answer that does come to the substance of the question. I appreciate the point of order, and I will listen carefully to it. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you, sir. I apologise if I was not answering the question directly, but it related to the earlier question from the member for Mawson. I was providing that update to the house. If I did it at the wrong point in proceedings, then I apologise to you, sir, and to the house. With regard to this question from the member for Mawson that related to correspondence I didn't realise it was 16 letters. Last time I asked it was 12 letters, and my understanding from my office is that they are preparing an answer for the member for Mawson now.

As I have previously pointed out to the house, the very first letter that came in seemed to have a bit of a whinge about the fact that the deputy leader hadn't smiled at him as he was walking down the street.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: He doesn't understand that that was exactly the day that the deputy leader visited her own property on Kangaroo Island and saw the devastation firsthand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: So rather than the member for Mawson out grandstanding on Kangaroo Island and not recognising—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the loss that's been suffered on this side of the house—

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

The SPEAKER: Premier, resume your seat. The point of order is for debate?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Personal reflection on members, so I ask the Premier to withdraw and apologise.

The SPEAKER: If someone has taken offence, then the person who takes offence should rise in their place and do so. I uphold the point of order on the basis that I believe that the Premier was deviating from the question.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries, happy birthday—and you are called to order.

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

The SPEAKER: It's okay, member for Mawson. Would the Premier like to conclude his answer? I ask you to please not provoke the opposition so late in the day.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has finished his answer. Member for Mawson.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Mr Speaker, I would like an apology and a withdrawal from the Premier. I have done nothing over the last 76 days except work very, very hard for people in my electorate who have gone through very, very tough times—

The SPEAKER: A point of order.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —and to accuse me of grandstanding is nothing short of scandalous and disgraceful.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. With respect, I didn't hear the Premier single out the member for Mawson specifically.

The Hon. L.W.K. Bignell: What sort of Speaker are you? You're meant to be running this place.

Members

MEMBER FOR MAWSON, NAMING

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, you are now named.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I move that the apology be accepted.

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, before we do that, I was trying to sort this out but, now that I have named you, you do have the right to be heard in explanation or apology, per standing order 139, if you wish to do so.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I have done nothing but work extremely hard for people who are going through an extremely tough time on Kangaroo Island, and for the Premier of this state, who has shown absolutely no empathy for those people, to come in here and accuse me of grandstanding—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right!

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —when he hasn't even had the decency to respond to a letter that I wrote to him 72 days ago, I don't think it's me that needs to be doing the apology, sir.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I understand that this is a difficult time. We are dealing with, I suppose, heightened emotion.

The SPEAKER: Are you moving a motion to accept the apology of the member or not accept the member?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:01): I move:

That the member's apology not be accepted.

The SPEAKER: The mover is in every case limited to 10 minutes, including right of reply and stating the reasons for the acceptance, if you wish to do so.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I understand that this is a time of heightened emotions. As somebody whose community has lived through three significant bushfires, I know firsthand what situations like this do. I have, as have all members in this house, huge empathy for what is going on on Kangaroo Island. I know what the member for Mawson would be going through, in the sense that he would be dealing day to day with issues of people coming to him in vulnerable circumstances. I have had discussions with the member for Morialta, the members for Heysen and Kavel, the member for MacKillop and the member for Narungga about the devastation in their electorates.

Unfortunately, in order to be able to accept an apology, an apology needs to be given. As the Manager of Government Business, I was desperately listening to the words of the member for Mawson hoping that there was an apology in there, but it is extremely difficult to accept an apology when one is not given, and it is with great reluctance that we on this side of the house do not accept this apology. Unfortunately, the words of the member for Mawson do not give us any room to be able to do anything other than what we are doing.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:02): I speak in opposition to the government's motion. I know it is disorderly to talk about interjections, but the Premier interjected across the chamber that he wanted to sort this out and have the member for Mawson remain in the chamber. Then the Manager of Government Business moved a motion in direct contradiction to what the Premier had expressed to us through banter across the chamber.

It is very disappointing that the government would use its numbers to try to expel the member for Mawson or any member when they are simply outraged in response to what I think any reasonable member would think is a remark that perhaps would be better left unsaid. The idea that any member in this house acts with anything but integrity when it comes to defending and fighting for their electorate, the idea that any member in this house would attempt to grandstand over a tragedy or a natural disaster I think, sir, is not an accurate reflection of who we are as a chamber.

I think we all rise above it when South Australia is on its knees. When South Australia needs our assistance, we all come together not as Labor, not as Liberal, not as Independent: we come together as South Australians and patriots. It is very—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Playford! Members, order!

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries, be quiet.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, the house taking a decision to remove a member does not serve the people of the constituency that that member serves. The member and the Premier both wanted the explanation to be accepted. The Premier told us just now in the chamber that he was going to sort this out so that the member could remain. Then his Manager of Government Business does the opposite.

I ask the government not to use their majority to remove a Labor member of parliament who was provoked and responded. I think it is fair to say that perhaps both members would want to make sure that they reflect on the fact that this house is here to serve everyone, which is what I think the member for Mawson is attempting to do and I think the Premier is attempting to do. But there is, of course, the juncture that we have here, where we have a member who is about to be withdrawn from the house.

There are important matters before the house. We are about to go to His Excellency's residence to deliver our Address in Reply. The member's constituency would be denied that right and honour, so I ask the house and I ask government members to reflect on this and not use your majority to deny people a voice in this house. Do not do it. It is not the appropriate way to use your majority. When I was manager of government business, to my memory I never once moved that a member be expelled. I always moved that the explanation be accepted. That is my memory, and I stand corrected if I have that wrong.

I take the idea of the government and the executive using their numbers to expel someone from the minority to be an abuse of power of this parliament. I ask members in the government to understand the step that they are about to take to deny a member their right to be in this chamber. I think it is unfair and unwarranted, and I ask the government members to accept the explanation of the member. Sir, the opposition says that this is no reflection on your ruling.

If the motion moved by the Manager of Government Business is defeated, the opposition will not claim that to be a de facto vote of confidence in the Speaker. There is now no reason why the government cannot either withdraw the motion or vote with the opposition to defeat it so that the member for Mawson can remain in the chamber and represent his constituents—because that is why we are sent here.

He is entitled to be angry. It is okay to be angry, it is okay to be disappointed and it is okay to sometimes get emotional when you have seen your community subjected to what he has seen it subjected to through a natural disaster. Let's have a bit of forgiveness, let's have a bit of mercy and let's move on and do the people's business.

The SPEAKER: Would the minister like a right of reply? He does have some time.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Mr Speaker, I would like to flag a couple of options.

The SPEAKER: Are you withdrawing the motion?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: No. Mr Speaker, there are two opportunities I think here. One is the government could take the opportunity now to move to suspend standing orders to allow the member for Mawson to make a personal explanation; whether or not that is something that can be done and explored within the next eight minutes, I think that is something that we should do. There is also potentially the opportunity for the member for Mawson to rise on a point of order to be able to make an explanation. The government desperately does not want to do this but, unless an apology is offered, it is impossible for us to accept one.

Again, I think that the good functioning of this house is one that we are seeking to achieve. It is made all the more difficult because a number of the conventions of the parliament are not being upheld, which has led to the week we have had. This house can only operate when all its members adhere to the respect and the authority of the Speaker. To talk over the Speaker, to shout at the Speaker, is not something that can stand because, without accepting the authority of the Speaker, this place would turn into chaos.

I accept the member for West Torrens's utterings in this place when he says that he does want a parliament that functions properly. Certainly, in my Address in Reply speech I gave the same commitments to have this house work properly. But, without all members of this place respecting the authority of the Speaker, it is extremely difficult for us to be able to move forward.

Again, I note that this issue on Kangaroo Island is extremely difficult. These bushfires have devastated communities and devastated large swathes of South Australia. In fact, sitting next to me is a minister who is personally impacted. When dealing around the cabinet table with bushfires, having firsthand accounts from the Attorney-General about the devastation and impact really does help us to get that personal understanding. I think the great courage she has shown throughout this is a testament to us all, dealing with the macro, dealing with that which must be done by government whilst experiencing personal loss and loss of friends.

It is also something that we as government members, when heading across to Kangaroo Island, as we have all done, have all sought do—that is, to talk with local people, to understand the issues and, for instance, the opportunity to speak to Pierre Gregor, the head of tourism down there,

about the impact. We have to remember the impact of not just bushfire-affected areas but the areas around there. It is why we took the opportunity to be briefed by him about what the priorities are to help things get back up and running and why I know that members took the opportunity, for instance, to go to Parndana the night they were there to talk to locals and why I know various ministers have been across.

The Minister for Environment has made numerous visits because a lot of the issues his department is dealing with have meant that he has needed to be across there. I know that the Minister for Correctional Services and Emergency Services, too, has been there and thanked our emergency services workers for the phenomenal effort they have undertaken. I know that all members of our party room have taken those opportunities to be able to get out there. We will be regular visitors.

I implore that whatever procedural opportunity there is for us to be able to deal with this situation in an amicable way to be brought forward so that we can deal with this and show some goodwill in this house late on a Thursday afternoon.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the apology not be accepted. It has been moved.

Motion negatived.

The SPEAKER: Would the member for Mawson like to rise to make a personal explanation? Would you like to seek leave to make any personal explanation?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No. The comments I have made stand, sir.

The SPEAKER: Thank you for clarifying that. We can move on to the last four minutes. I call the member for Hammond.

Question Time

MOBILE BLACK SPOT PROGRAM

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development—and I would like to wish him a happy birthday. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering better services by funding mobile blackspot towers?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:14): Yes, I can. I thank the member for Hammond for that very important question. I know that he has had concerns, where regional South Australia stands, with the lack of digital connection around South Australia. Sadly, with the promotion of rounds 1 and 2 of the commonwealth Mobile Black Spot program, South Australia missed any opportunity to have the regions connected with the rest of the world. Those people who live in the regions were denied the access.

What I can say is that the Marshall government has seen fit to invest \$10 million into the state government's blackspot program in collaboration with both rounds 4 and 5 of the commonwealth government's Mobile Black Spot Program. That gives us the ability to connect regional South Australia or start the process of connecting regional South Australia to the rest of the world.

I can say that it has been a great outcome. Round 4 has seen \$5.3 million invested by the state government to leverage commonwealth government funding—\$19.4 million. That is providing better services and making the regions more competitive by having that digital connection. The Marshall Liberal government has seen fit to support the regions that a previous administration always ignored. For far too long there was a lack of support out in the regions. Not only were they ignored but they were not even given the courtesy of connection, particularly with mobile blackspot towers.

What I will say is that the result has been a responsible collaboration and has seen those 29 new base stations to fix those priority sites. There are nearly 500 blackspots in South Australia. As a government, responsibly we are getting the wheels in motion to make that connection possible. What I can say to the member for Hammond is that Ettrick, Marama, Mypolonga and Nildottie are just a few of those vital digital connection spots that he, as a good local member, has been promoting.

The state government, in conjunction with the commonwealth government, has been working with telcos to secure funding. It gives us the opportunity to put the regions of South Australia back on the map with that connection. For far too long many of those farmers in regional communities have had to drive to the top of the hill and stand on the roof of the tractor—no longer. We are dealing with those blackspots.

What I can also say is that we will have the first sites. They were delivered in February. All tower stations are expected to be operational by the third quarter of this year. That is a great outcome for regional South Australia. We are currently working on round 5 to actually enhance more digital connection to make sure that all regional South Australia has the opportunity to be in the line, in the priority list for that digital connection.

The blackspot towers give us that competitive advantage. If you are a regional community member looking to contact your markets, looking to contact the school or the hospital for safety reasons, we are doing everything that we can to work with the commonwealth and the telcos so that you can actually have that advantage.

Just recently, many regional MPs in this place have put priority lists to me. On both sides of the house, we know that there is the need for that blackspot tower promotion to be moved forward. As a government, responsibly the Marshall Liberal government are doing everything they can to enhance services, to make South Australia, particular the regions of South Australia, a better place to live and a better place to do business, because we know #RegionsMatter.

Grievance Debate

SPRINGBANK SECONDARY COLLEGE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:18): Unsurprisingly, I want to talk about the absolute shambles of the treatment of the public education system in this state by this government. Let's turn first to what has just happened to Springbank, although it is not the only example. We know that Springbank Secondary College, when it was called Pasadena High School, was in declining enrolment but was dearly loved by the people who sent their children there and by the students who were there.

Given the declining enrolment, given the numerous rumours that had gone around about whether the school would be closed or whether it would be amalgamated, we decided on this side when we were in government, when I was the minister, that we would go through a proper process: 'Would you like to close and amalgamate with Unley?'—a voluntarily amalgamation process. The vote occurred and that school community said, 'No, we prefer it like this. We are happy to see growth, but we are very happy with the quality of the schooling that we are getting here.'

At that point, I could have done what the minister has just said he is going to do via the paper and gone through a ministerial review process, and within three months—gone. Instead, I listened to what that school community asked for and I said, 'Let's give them the money and the space to turn this school into a growth school.'

That took \$10 million from Building Better Schools, which would not have been assigned under the normal criteria for most of the schools. Valley View, Findon and Pasadena had additional money in order to be able to turn around. As the minister tried to allude to, I said that there had to be a business plan. There had to be a plan for how that was going to be used to grow, but crucial to that was the \$10 million—absolutely crucial.

What has happened in the last couple of years? They have rebranded, they have a new name, they have a new uniform and they have seen a growth in enrolments. What they have not yet seen is the expenditure of that \$10 million. What they have not yet seen is that money that was given to help them become the school of choice be spent in order to become that school of choice.

What they have seen instead is that they have been forced to use some of the money for maintenance. They have done work on what facilities they would like and they have cleared the ground in order to have a new facility, which was proudly talked about in one of their recent newsletters, then suddenly the minister decides, 'The school isn't growing fast enough. I'm not happy with this.'

How did he tell them? Did he go and have a conversation? No. He had a conversation with a journalist and made sure it was in the paper. Now he is saying to the school, 'By the way, at the end of the year you're probably going to be gone.' What does that do to the confidence of that school? In here he says, 'There will be a process. It means that we can consult with the community.' What that tells the community is that this school is done. How do you grow enrolments in an environment where you have taken the \$10 million away, you are not putting those facilities in and you are not listening to the people who are already at that school? What does that say?

One of the reasons people valued that school and wanted to see it grow was that it is not as big as some of the others. For some students, that is ideal. I remember while I was waiting to receive the vote from the school community that I received postcards from students at that school saying why it was special to them. A lot of the students in the disability unit told me what a difference that school made to them.

Are they going to break their hearts and try to persuade this minister? Are they going to write those cards and say what matters to them, or are they going to have to just give up and accept that this minister could not care less? If he did, even if he were concerned about the growth of the school, before the money has been spent to help it grow, he would have talked to them and he would have listened to them.

The idea that the person you talk to first is the journalist and you are going to give the story exclusively to that journalist—no call came through for a comment from the opposition, so that is when you know it is an exclusive: 'Just put this out. Just tell that school community when they open up the paper in the morning. Tell them.'

We have Adelaide High School, where suburbs in Labor electorates were cut out of the Adelaide High School zone overnight. Some of those poor kids in primary school who thought they were going to go with their friends to Adelaide High were told, 'No, you're going to Springbank.' Well, now where are they going to go? Are they going to be crammed into Unley? Are they going to be crammed into Hamilton? What kind of planning is this?

Public education needs the backing of the minister and the government. It needs the backing for the parents, for the students and for the staff, and that requires respect to be shown. This minister has treated this school disgracefully.

SOUTHERN ADELAIDE INFRASTRUCTURE INVESTMENTS

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:23): I rise today to talk with pride of the Marshall government's investment in the southern regions of Adelaide. I am particularly compelled to do so because we have delivered for the residents not only of Aldinga, Normanville, Willunga, McLaren Vale and Yankalilla but also a place dear to my heart, my birthplace of Kangaroo Island. One would think, having listened to the member for Mawson, that he had somehow or other been delivering on these commitments, but this is what we have done. This is the Liberals' plan and this is what we have actually been delivering.

One of the great failures of the previous government, which the member for Mawson was in as a cabinet member, was the lack of adequate planning and preparing for new schools, particularly in the areas where schools are already at capacity and areas of significant population growth.

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kurna!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Our government has been committed to building a new Aldinga birth to year 12 school—

Mr Picton: No, we were. You just followed our commitment.

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: You did nothing for 16 years; you had your turn. This school will be constructed on a 14-hectare piece of land along Quinliven and Port roads in Aldinga. Coupled with that, to support the families in Aldinga, Sellicks Beach and surrounding areas, was the federal government's announcement of \$2.26 million to do a major rebuild and add two extra soccer pitches

at the Aldinga Sports Complex. I thank them for the complement of that as well. The new school will be ready to start at the beginning of the 2022 school year and will accommodate 1,675 students, which includes 100 special school students and a 75-place children's centre. This is what is needed in the region and this is what this government is delivering.

I also want to mention the \$92 million project for the duplication of the Victor Harbor Road between Main South Road and McLaren Vale because I think it is very important for the southern region. But particularly for the people of Kangaroo Island, they will now have a direct extra \$50,000 per year to contribute towards their roads and the upgrades that are necessary. Sure, the member for Mawson has raised and complained about the loss of concessions for the benefit of those few, but everybody needs to be able to use the roads on Kangaroo Island. Everyone is the beneficiary of this, whether you are a schoolchild travelling on a bus or whether you are being taken to the Western Districts Footy Club. Everyone needs to be able to use these roads and it has really been an important initiative.

Also very important for Kangaroo Island is the huge \$305 million commitment to the Main South Road duplication, which the previous government again failed to deliver. These are important infrastructure projects. There is a \$6 million investment connecting the parks.

Mr Picton: You're failing to deliver it now.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurna is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Of course, an environmental feature is connecting the parks that run along the southern coastline of Fleurieu Peninsula, as well as the works to upgrade the Deep Creek Conservation Park and the Heysen Trail from Cape Jervis to Deep Creek.

One matter that is dear to my heart is the opening of the state's reservoirs, which has been announced, with Myponga being the first, and during the recent summer shoreline fishing has also been brought in. So now people can walk, run and cycle around the bushland tracks with water views, enjoying picnics and lookouts and with viewing platforms. This is coupled with the wonderful local businesses, such as Smiling Samoyed Brewery and the Myponga General Store.

The member for Mawson has recently brought to the chamber's attention the plight, through his eyes, of the people of Kangaroo Island. I have a personal commitment to Kangaroo Island and I obviously still have family there. I am related to half of them over there, so I make this point: this is a very difficult time for the people of Kangaroo Island. Whilst I share the sentiment of the member for Mawson, in that he is concerned for their wellbeing and welfare, I say it is really important that the member presents to the government specific areas of concern.

For example, just last week I had a farmer crying on the phone saying that he had been asked by the local accountant to get his tax return in. Of course, his house was burnt to dust and all his records are ash, so of course it is insensitive. Rather than complain about it, in this case our government contacted the Small Business Commissioner and said, 'Can you get in touch with the accountants and financial advisers and actually help them to advise the Taxation Office that a number of people on Kangaroo Island clearly won't be able to comply with the usual arrangements for lodging their tax returns, their fringe benefits tax returns or anything of that nature. Please, can you help us in that regard.'

That is what is real about providing support for the people of Kangaroo Island, not screaming abuse at you, Mr Speaker, in this chamber or making allegations against people that are very unfair in these circumstances.

INTERNATIONAL WOMEN'S DAY

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:29): Sunday 8 March is International Women's Day. It is a global day celebrating the social, economic, cultural and political achievements of women. The day also marks a call to action for accelerating women's equality. The theme this year is 'I am Generation Equality: Realising Women's Rights'. In Australia, we can be relatively pleased with our efforts over the years to achieve equality for women, often against remarkable odds.

South Australia can in fact be particularly proud of its part as a world leader in women's rights. While suffragette protests for the right to vote raged in London, Philadelphia and Boston in

the later years of the 19th century, South Australia went a step further in granting women's suffrage. The Adult Suffrage Bill was passed on 18 December 1894, awarding South Australian women the right to vote in general elections and to stand for parliament, the first time anywhere in Australia.

Indeed, we have come a long way since the passing of this bill, and we celebrated the 125th anniversary of that in this place in 2019. Women like Catherine Helen Spence, Mary Lee and Elizabeth Webb Nicholls paved the way here in South Australia as leaders of the suffrage campaign. Women like Adelaide-born Muriel Matters, who campaigned by flying over London in an airship inscribed 'Votes for Women' and throwing handbills over parliament, played a significant role abroad.

I have been fortunate to have the opportunity to serve both in the Australian federal parliament as a senator and in the state parliament in South Australia as the member for Torrens. Today, in our South Australian parliament, 19 out of 69 seats are held by women. Women hold 10 out of 27 of the Labor seats, while only six out of 34 Liberal seats are held by women. I know where I would rather stand.

Ms Bedford: And 33 per cent of the crossbench.

Ms WORTLEY: What was it?

Mr Bell: 33 per cent.

Ms WORTLEY: And 33 per cent on the crossbench. The efforts of women to achieve equality, of course, go well beyond the walls of our parliament. Many women who have strived for a career have historically been forced to balance that career with the needs of family, until recent times, often for years without any consideration of the difficulties presented. International Women's Day recognises and honours not just the achievements of the ground breakers, the women whose names we know and whom we admire, but all women. There are many more women who do not make the headlines and have not had the chance to move us with inspirational speeches or actions.

These are the women who have had to fight hard for everything they have achieved in what until very recently have often been unfair workplaces: women who still have to juggle a career with raising a family, who drop the kids at school before heading to work and who often have to take work home so they can pick them up; women who, after a full working day, sit with their children overseeing their homework; and women who take their children to sports practice, who are there week in and week out on the sidelines, cheering them on and taking up voluntary positions of team manager, coach, secretary of the club, event organiser or on the fundraising committee.

They are there staffing the canteen, cooking on the barbecue stall and taking team uniforms home to wash. These are the many women I see at my local sports and community clubs in my electorate of Torrens taking up these roles at Gaza Football Club, MetroStars and Adelaide City FC, the North Adelaide Rockets Basketball Club, Windsor calisthenics, NECAP, the Neighbourhood Watch meetings and Hillcrest Scouts, and many more at our local schools on governing councils or volunteering for school excursions.

International Women's Day also recognises women like my mother, Janice, and my mother-in-law, Pamela, who each raised six children, walked the path and faced the struggles that women of their generation faced when equality issues were not enshrined in law. It acknowledges these women and others who have in their own way each made a valuable contribution towards achieving equality and fairness, whether through standing up for their rights in the workplace, at home or in learning institutions.

It acknowledges those who have taught or are teaching and raising their children to respect and value contributions equally, regardless of gender, and that some things are worth standing up for. It acknowledges the efforts of those women who fought the fight, helping to make Australia a better, fairer place for all. The emerging global consensus is that, despite progress, real change has been agonisingly slow for the majority of women and girls in the world. It is disappointing that today not a single country can claim to have achieved gender equality. Multiple obstacles remain unchanged in law and culture, and International Women's Day is a day that we can focus, too, on these. This year we celebrate achievements of women who have overcome the barriers while we work towards addressing inequalities that continue to exist today.

The SPEAKER: I do have discretion to extend these contributions if I need to, and I will remember past examples.

ADELAIDE ELECTORATE

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:34): It has been almost two years since I was re-elected for my third term as the state member for Adelaide. During this time, there have been many major and local projects announced within the Adelaide electorate, and the Marshall Liberal government has a strong plan to do so much more.

At the last election, we promised to erect a noise barrier along Hawker Street and Park Terrace at Ovingham, and I am pleased that plans for the Ovingham wall are almost complete. It was important for the project designers to look at the impact of such a big wall, including traffic and line-of-sight requirements, as well as pedestrian safety. The department is also trying to save as many trees as possible. Once these considerations have been incorporated and the plans finalised, it is expected that the wall will be completed by the end of the year.

The government is also progressing work on the Gawler electrification project, which borders my electorate on the western side along Devonport Terrace. I have conveyed residents' initial concerns about the number of trees and bushes that were to be pruned or removed to both the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the minister. I am pleased that the government listened and not only reduced the number of trees affected but significantly increased the funding offered to the Prospect council for the revegetation of the rail corridor to now more than \$200,000. The department recently held two street-corner meetings to discuss the revegetation plans with locals and to receive further feedback.

Another rail project has also been announced at Torrens Road, Ovingham, with \$231 million being provided by the state and federal Liberal governments to remove the level crossing. With an average of 23,000 vehicles passing through this level crossing every day, a grade separation will improve traffic flow and road safety for drivers, cyclists and pedestrians.

Torrens Road crosses both the interstate rail line and the Gawler passenger rail line, and the boom gates at this intersection are down for approximately 22 per cent of the time during peak periods, adding considerably to traffic times for motorists. A planning study is currently underway and, while this project is on the border of my electorate, it affects thousands of people, including my constituents, and I am pleased that the state and federal governments are working together to address this congestion problem.

The Marshall Liberal government is investing \$42.5 million over two years to refurbish older South Australian Housing Authority stocks, for example, redesigning outdoor laundries to now be internal thereby making it safer for tenants. As a result of working with agencies and changes to the tenancy management program, the mix of residents has improved to the extent that antisocial behaviour has decreased significantly and residents are now much happier.

In addition, a purpose-built four-storey apartment specifically designed for universal access for aged and those with disabilities, including those who are at risk of homelessness, has recently been constructed on Churchill Road and tenants have begun moving in. The apartment includes security features, stepless entry, provision for handrails in bathrooms and larger spaces to allow for mobility devices. It also has a lift, a communal area and a garden area to promote social interaction and reduce isolation.

There are 20 apartments in this complex located in the heart of the community so that people have easy access to public transport and amenities connecting them with the wider community. I am pleased that the state government has also provided funding for other projects in my electorate, including \$600,000 to the City of Prospect through the Open Space grant program for the redevelopment of the George Whittle Reserve on Churchill Road for a fantastic skate park widely used by bike riders, skaters and scooter riders of all ages and abilities.

The state government is also investing \$13.3 million through the Planning and Development Fund to help fund local projects to help make Adelaide greener, to preserve open space and to build local community infrastructure. One of these projects in partnership with the City of Prospect was the

redevelopment of the Charles Cane Reserve, also on Churchill Road, which received \$508,562. This funding enabled:

- the installation of structured recreational play, including all-inclusive play equipment, nature play and fitness equipment;
- new furniture and structures, including seating, picnic settings, bins, drinking fountains and shelters; and
- landscaping, fencing and footpaths.

This is another great local project where the state government and local council have worked together cooperatively for the benefit of the whole community.

WRIGHT ELECTORATE SCHOOLS

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:40): Now that the new school year is well underway, I thought it would be an opportune time to reflect upon some changes in the leadership teams of a number of schools in and around the seat of Wright. Some very long-serving school principals chose the end of the 2019 school year to retire or to move on to new roles in the education sector, and I would like to use this opportunity today to thank them for their many years of service and to welcome their successors and wish them all the best in their new appointments.

Being a school principal is a really tough job. I think, objectively, it is harder than it used to be, and it was never easy. With the prevalence of social media, and all the complications that it is bringing not just to the classroom but also to the schoolyard, principals are now routinely called upon and responsible for dealing with the fallout of online bullying that occurs overnight and on weekends; I have seen the complexity of those issues firsthand.

Last year, I was contacted by a parent whose child had been bullied online, and that bullying then escalated to the transmission of some very nasty messages via a website that protected the identity of the person who was sending those messages. The child of my constituent was terrified, and with very good reason. The school had pulled out all the stops to identify the perpetrator, but they were unable to prove who had sent the messages. Fortunately, with SAPOL's involvement, a phone was seized and, although it could not be determined who had actually recorded the message, it could be determined who had emailed that message to my constituent's child.

The resolution of this matter took months, and it is just one example of the kinds of issues now facing principals every single day. So with that in mind, and before I offer personal thanks to those departing and good fortune to those who are stepping into their shoes, I just want to say I think on behalf of everyone in this place that we do acknowledge your service to our community, and we also acknowledge the increasingly complex world in which you are regularly called upon to be an arbiter.

First of all, I would like to acknowledge the very long tenure of Mr Mike Millard, the outgoing principal of Pedare Christian College. Mike gave more than 10 years of service to Pedare and oversaw a period of real growth for the college, including the co-location of the junior school with the senior school and the delivery of new state-of-the-art facilities for the next generation of Pedare students. I had the pleasure just last Thursday of attending the commissioning ceremony of Mike's successor, Mr James Tamblyn, who joins Pedare from St Peter's College. I wish James all the best in his new role.

St Francis Xavier Regional Catholic School in Wynn Vale has also had a leadership change. Ms Leonie DeGaris, who has been at the helm of SFX for a number of years, has moved to a new role in Catholic Education head office and has been succeeded by Mr Jason Mittiga, previously of St Catherine's School, in Stirling. I would like to wish Ms DeGaris all the best in her new role and thank her for her years of service at St Francis Xavier and also for her personal support. A shout-out must go, too, to Mr Todd La Forgia, who very ably acted in the principal's role until Mr Mittiga was appointed.

I have already had the pleasure of meeting Mr Mittiga on a couple of occasions, and I think he is an excellent choice as principal. He was already a resident of the north-eastern suburbs before

being appointed, and he has thrown himself into the role with the kind of hands-on approach that I think the staff, parents and students at St Francis Xavier will respond to very well.

Gleeson College also had a change at the top, with Principal Andrew Baker being tapped on the shoulder for a role with head office for a year. Stepping in is Mr Joe Corbo, previously deputy principal, who will be overseeing the completion of the new Senior Learning Centre. It is a very exciting time for the college, and the residents of the north-east are currently the beneficiaries of some very healthy competition between the three co-located high schools, all of which have undergone significant infrastructure upgrades in the last few years, including the previous Labor government's \$2½ million STEM lab, which is now complete at Golden Grove High School.

Last but by no means least, I would like to pay tribute to the outgoing principal of Kings Baptist Grammar School, Mr Russell Eley, who gave an incredible 23 years of service to the Kings' community and just last year stepped away from the school he has shaped for almost a quarter of a century. Mr Eley's successor is Mr Don Grimmett, a former teacher at King's, who most recently served as the principal of Investigator College for 17 years. I wish Russell all the best for the next chapter in his life and welcome Mr Grimmett back to the north-east.

MEDICAL CANNABIS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:44): I rise to clarify a few points for those who have been following a debate that we were meant to have in this house last Wednesday around medical cannabis. A number of people phoned our office wondering why that debate did not occur. Quite simply, the debate did not occur because government business takes precedence over private members' motions.

However, I want to assure all those people who have been following these developments and are passionate about medical cannabis that I will be working with the government to increase the supply of medical cannabis and the awareness of health professionals regarding the prescription and benefits of medical cannabis. For those who are suffering through pain, have a child with epilepsy or cancer-related appetite suppression, this development will continue.

On 6 May, I will be hosting the first regional forum for medical cannabis. It will be conducted by LeafCann, which is a Western Australian company that is investing in South Australia in Adelaide. They are coming to Mount Gambier to host two sessions: one for our health professionals, police, members of our legal fraternity, council CEOs, mayors and elected members and then a second forum for the wider community. They will occur on 6 May.

To highlight the interest in this area, I put a post up yesterday talking about this forum, and in 24 hours we have had 7,100 views and 194 comments—overwhelmingly positive comments talking about their personal circumstances or general support for this decision. I have also had another member of parliament ask whether it would be okay if they held the same type of forum around the same time, which I think is fantastic. Whilst we have LeafCann over here, I see great synergies in working together.

In terms of an industry, medical cannabis is tipped to be a billion dollar industry by 2025. That is an industry that I would like regional South Australia to be engaged with fully. Of course, my preference would be Mount Gambier. I think we need to look at the manufacturing and processing of medical cannabis. Before some people get a little bit caught up in themselves, we need to realise that medical cannabis has either no THC or minute amounts of THC, which is the active ingredient that provides the high or the effect that most people would relate to cannabis.

In fact, if I had my way, I would rename the product so that the word 'cannabis' or 'marijuana' did not actually appear anywhere because we are talking about different strains that have low THC but certainly high cannabinoid qualities that form an oil.

Quickly touching on why I am so passionate about this, the member for Waite and I invited a number of parents to come and talk to the Minister for Health, the Hon. Stephen Wade, about their experience with medical cannabis oil and the effect that it has had on their child who has severe epilepsy. Out of the 12 or 13 parents, there was not a dry eye in the house when they talked about the effect that this oil has on the quality of life for their child: 100-plus seizures a day going down to one or two or no seizures.

We face a significant problem and that is the cost. Some parents are paying up to \$2,000 a month for the oil because it is so expensive. Supply is an issue and awareness is an issue. I think that this is an industry that we need to get behind, and regional South Australia can really benefit.

Mr PEDERICK: Mr Speaker, I draw your attention to the state of the house.

A quorum having been formed:

Address in Reply

ADDRESS IN REPLY

The SPEAKER: I inform the house that Her Excellency the Governor's Deputy will be prepared to receive the house for the purpose of presenting the Address in Reply at 4pm today. I ask the mover and the seconder of the address, and other members, to accompany me to proceed to Government House for the purpose of presenting the address.

Sitting suspended from 15:54 to 16:33.

The SPEAKER: There not being a quorum, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

The SPEAKER: Honourable members, I inform the house that, accompanied by the mover and seconder of the Address in Reply to the Governor's opening speech, and by other members, I proceeded to Government House and there presented to Her Excellency the Governor's Deputy the address adopted by the house on 3 March 2020, to which Her Excellency was pleased to make the following reply:

Thank you for the Address In Reply to the speech with which His Excellency the Governor opened the Second Session of the Fifty-Fourth Parliament. I am confident that you will give your best consideration to all matters placed before you. I pray that your deliberations will add meaning and value to the lives of our South Australian community.

Her Excellency Professor Brenda Wilson AM

Governor's Deputy of South Australia

Bills

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION (INVESTIGATION POWERS) NO 2 AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 February 2020.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (16:36): I move:

That this order of the day be discharged.

Motion carried; bill withdrawn.

PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE (COMMENCEMENT OF CODE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:36): I want to continue my remarks in regard to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure (Commencement of Code) Amendment Bill 2019. I was going through some of the things that the bill will facilitate. The bill will also facilitate more time for testing and potentially more enhancements to be made to the ePlanning system should they be required. It is also likely that the implementation of the phase 2 code, which is the rural or regional code, will be delayed by three months to July 2020, while the phase 3 code, which is the urban code, will be delayed three months until September 2020.

This is truly a generational reform of the planning system. The Marshall Liberal government is listening to stakeholders to ensure we get it right and deliver for all South Australians. Phase 3 has remained on consultation until the end of February. The planning reform program, including development of the code, is governed by a comprehensive project schedule. The passing of the bill will allow additional time to test the quality of the code and provide additional time for training and preparation of activities for use of the ePlanning platform that supports the delivery of the code.

The bill therefore assists in mitigating the risk that the code will not be of sufficient quality and/or that end users will not be ready to engage with the code once it is operational. The State Planning Commission is responsible for the code development process and is supported by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure. The department is responsible for delivery of other aspects of the reform, including the ePlanning platform.

As I indicated, I had a bit of experience of this in my time on the Environment, Resources and Development Committee. I commend Michael Lennon, the commissioner, for the work he has done in getting this code on track. I commend his work in getting out to communities across the state. This generational change is a huge thing. It all started back in 2016 when we passed a whole new planning bill in this house.

What was interesting about that was that once this bill was introduced, the government of the day, which was the former Labor government under the auspices of the former member for Enfield, had 300 of their own amendments to their own legislation, which made it very confusing. I have already commended the former member for Goyder Steven Griffiths. He is a very good man who worked tirelessly to keep his fellow Liberal colleagues informed and updated about what was happening to keep ahead of all the changes that we were happening over time.

One of the things that really irked me in the conversation, the discussion and the debate around the bill was that we were 50 clauses into the committee stage when the minister of the day, the former member for Enfield, came up with this idea of environment and food protection areas. I mentioned it and took the debate up to him during the question and answer time in the committee process. We were a bit limited because you obviously get three questions for every clause. It did seem unhelpful, to say the least, that this happened while we were in the committee stage and that it had not been augmented as part of the original bill. Mind you, when you see 300 of the former Labor government's amendments coming through, you do not wonder that much.

Some people may think that as a farmer I would be concerned about or in support of these environment and food protection areas. The issue for me, and I have said it in this place before, is that it creates real inequality across the board. Apart from also encompassing the Barossa protection zone and the McLaren Vale protection zone, this environment and food protection area has essentially incorporated land from Kapunda, in the Minister for Energy and Mining's electorate, through to Goolwa, in the member for Finnis' electorate, right through the Barossa, in the electorate of the Minister for Planning (member for Schubert) and right through to the coast. That is a vast swathe of country where different development rules were endorsed for open country.

Where you see this really play out is in my electorate of Hammond, where the Rural City of Murray Bridge council is covered by this environment and food protection area but the Coorong District Council is not. I am not saying Coorong should be involved (it is my home council), but it does impose other restrictions on development. Yes, we absolutely do have to have balanced development, and that is why we are working hard to make sure that we get this codification process right and giving it more time, and I think the minister is doing exactly the right thing in giving this more time.

It is pretty interesting when one side of the river in my electorate is impacted by this environment and food protection area, and there are very strict controls on whether people can put a second house on a farm, for example—it is not even straightforward under the other legislative processes anyway—and there are different rules for the other side of the river in Coorong District Council. So there are two different sets of rules in Wellington East and Wellington because they are on opposite sides of the River Murray. I am really concerned about what has happened here because we already have development controls in place for people putting in developments.

There are already controls in place in local government. Generally, the rule is that if you want to subdivide a farmhouse—this is pretty well across the state and rural areas—you have to subdivide 40 hectares, or 100 acres in the old language, unless you go through a negotiation process. You can go through that negotiation process in quite a few council areas and have less land to be subdivided off the farmhouse. The simple fact is that the way agriculture is in this state and in this nation, as I said before, if you do not get big you have to get out.

People end up with farmhouses they do not need, and there is an opportunity to subdivide them off and bring other people, other families, into the district. What has happened over time is that districts have been gutted because of the way it is with economies of scale, with people having to expand just to make operations work. It takes people out of communities, and it is very tough to try to turn it around. If I had the full answer on how to turn it around, I probably would not even be here. We need to be far more sensible about these things.

I remember I asked the former member for Enfield, the former minister, at the time, what he was doing with this environment and food protection area. It took a few goes—and I am more than happy for someone to check the *Hansard*—but I finally got him to admit that this was equivalent to the protections involved in the Barossa protection area and the McLaren Vale protection area that are enhanced under other legislation. You would think it almost nullified that legislation.

It is a real concern for me when we go over the top. During my time on the Environment, Resources and Development Committee we had an issue where we wanted a second home on horticulture blocks in, I think, the Adelaide Plains Council area. We managed to get a win for the reality of these small blocks that need the option of more people. Horticulture is more intense and you need more people on the property to assist with sowing, tending and harvesting of the crops. Yes, I absolutely agree that you do not want to have a blatant excuse for a semi-subdivision, but you do need to deal with reality, and I think we could have done it without this Environment and Food Protection Area.

Another issue I had with the former member for Enfield was his hatred—and I will say it: his genuine hatred—of lifestyle blocks. They are useful for a range of reasons. In regard to lifestyle blocks, I had an issue in Hammond where the owner of Swanport Harvest did his own development plan amendment, spent thousands and thousands of dollars and was just blocked out. Thankfully, when we got in we fixed it, and I thank the Minister for Planning (member for Schubert) for that. When we got in, we could see what had to be done because the simple fact was that you could not have houses abutting the South Eastern Freeway. I begged and pleaded with the former member for Enfield. He was never going to go there, but we have had success and those first blocks are up for sale.

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely. It is a great outcome, and it is a great outcome for reality. That is what we need to see in any planning system as we move forward. Yes, it will have its challenges, but we will get there in the end.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:49): I would like to thank all members for their contribution to this matter, and I look forward to a lively committee stage. I would like to say a few things at this juncture, if I am able. First off, I want to use this opportunity to thank everyone who has been involved in this process more generally. This is a mammoth task. The complete reimagining of any sort of bureaucratic structure is difficult at the best of times, and when we are talking about planning it is never going to be easy. I think the dedication with which departmental staff have undertaken this task has been impressive, to say the least. Executive director, Sally Smith; Anita Allen and everyone else have done a phenomenal job.

What I like is the fact that the planning department's attitude when issues are presented is to look at ways to solve them. Such a progressive and proactive attitude to try to deal with issues is fantastic. I have a number of community groups that say they are very pro-development and I have development groups that say that they are not. At the end of the day, I think that they do a fantastic job taking and creating a structure and then trying to apply it in a systematic, consistent and objective fashion. I want to put on the record my most sincere thanks.

I also want to thank almost every council in South Australia for their involvement with this process. Many have come on board and it is a mammoth task for them as well. Essentially, a lot of council planners have had to let go of development plans they have lovingly tended to over decades and accept that we are moving to a statewide system, but it is something that is fundamental to helping us progress forward with a system that is going to reduce red tape. It is not about saying yes more often; it is about saying yes more quickly or no more quickly, and I think that is what this system will achieve.

It has been a difficult couple of months, as we move through what has been five months worth of consultation. It has been an extremely long and comprehensive consultation process. I know that there are people—and I am receiving letters now—saying, 'Well, I didn't know about it.' We use every available means to us to try to engage people and we have certainly worked with councils to try to do the same, but I think five months worth of consultation is a long period of time and one which reasonable observers would suggest is a long period of time.

In regard to planning, the old saying that a lie gets halfway around the world before the truth can get its pants on in the morning I think is very apt. The number of mistruths that I have heard and been presented with, as I have done forums myself around various electorates, has been quite staggering. In fact, in this chamber today there were statements that were made that just have no basis in fact. But it is always going to happen in planning. I accept that it is always going to happen in planning because it is a contentious issue.

At the end of the day, what a planning system is seeking to do is to take the very many and varied desires and wishes of disparate community members and different parts of the development industry or conservation industry and create a framework in which they can all exist. It is, at its heart, about creating a balance whereby we can have a planning system that delivers what the community wants. But there is no homogenous view about what the community wants.

In fact, ask 100 people what they think is good development and good planning and you will get 100 different answers. It is what makes creating a planning system all the more challenging, but that is precisely what we are trying to do: create some greater clarity about where we need to conserve, but create greater clarity also about where we need to develop. That fundamental tension—conservation versus development—is at the heart of why planning systems need to work objectively and have consistent and repeatable results.

Something that I think has been lost in this debate more generally has been housing affordability. What I have found quite frustrating is that in one breath members of the community would say, 'I don't like the development at the end of my street,' but then in the next breath lament the young people who have been leaving our state in droves.

If we want to keep young people here, we have to provide affordable options, options that they consider to be of value in places that they want to live. We have an enviable lifestyle here—a cost of living that compares extremely favourably versus other states—but if parents of grown-up children do not want to see them leave and pursue opportunities elsewhere, we need to make sure that we are providing them with options to exist in their local communities, to have stratified opportunities within areas so that we can see more affordable housing opportunities sit amongst more established and more expensive allotments.

That key is lost. In a debate where councils, for instance, at the moment are suggesting that our improvements to the design standards do not go far enough versus conservation groups who would like to see development opportunities reduced, housing affordability loses in all those options. Very key to what we are trying to achieve here is to help first-home buyers, young families, young couples and individuals get into the housing market. They want housing choice.

They do not want to live at the fringes of our state; in fact, consumers are demanding greater opportunities for infill. That is why the planning system needs to respond to the desires of the people it seeks to serve. If we do not provide those opportunities, we will lose those people, and I think that is an outcome that the planning system can ill afford. In the end, what this code is trying to do is to respond to what customers want. It may seem quite basic, but there are huge changes that are happening in the way people want to live.

We see an ageing demographic. We see more single-person households. We see a huge shift away from people wanting greenfields fringe development to infill development. We see people wanting to have smaller block sizes because they would like to tend a little cottage garden as opposed to having to mow a couple of acres in the backyard. The planning system needs to provide those opportunities. At the end of the day, we are also dealing with the tension between established residents and potential new residents, and that tension will always exist.

Again, that is precisely why the planning system seeks to make the decisions that it does, but it has to account for all those different choices that consumers want to make. I do not want a planning system that says to a specific cohort within our community—the people who have lesser means, young people trying to get into the market or people who genuinely just want to live on a smaller, easier to maintain block—that they should not have a place within our planning system. They definitely should because they live here, they exist here, they are citizens of this state and they have every right to be able to have the housing choices that they want.

At the end of the day, if a builder is building a type of development that a consumer does not want to buy, they will not sell too many blocks. In fact, to my mind, a lot of what developers are doing is responding to the consumer demands around them. Through these tensions between trying to improve design quality, whilst also maintaining affordability, whilst also maintaining character and ambience, whilst also maintaining access to public transport, shops and all those services that are required to exist within a community, I think we have put together a code that seeks to deliver on all those different and competing outcomes.

So I beg, I ask, for tolerance and understanding as we go through the next stages of this process. A lot of the time, I see instances where people think that there is sinister intent. In my time as planning minister, I have seen no examples of people with any sinister intent, merely businesses trying to get on and grow jobs in our state; bureaucrats, council and state government planners who are seeking to interpret otherwise subjective and complex rule sets; and community groups and organisations who genuinely and passionately want to protect the best of what is our state. Everybody needs to coexist in that environment.

Turning to this bill specifically, all we are seeking to do here is to allow time to get this right. In fact, whether it be community organisations, whether it be heritage organisations, whether it be councils, whether it be the development sector themselves or whether it actually be the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, everybody was saying that we needed to have a delay to the rollout of the code. I am a little bit stubborn from time to time and it took me a little while to come around to this realisation, but we are here and I think that the code will be all the better for it.

Really, what we are seeking to do with this delay is not to extend first-stage consultation, because I think that we cannot begin to make some of the decisions and changes that the consultation has asked us to until the consultation is closed. Having us continue to have public consultation open merely slows us from resolving those issues that the community would like us to resolve.

Providing the time between gazettal and when the system goes live I think is important for us to be able to allow councils time to get ready for implementation with the ePlanning system, allow time for builders to be able to modify their designs to ensure they are compliant with the new code, to ensure that community groups can go through and understand and engage with the ePlanning solutions so that they, too, can understand in a live environment what the system is going to look like.

The other thing that I would say just to wrap up is that when the code goes live, it is not the end of the story. In fact, I am certain that the first code amendment starts the day after the code goes live. This is a living document that is going to continue to evolve. It always has and always will, and so the opportunity for us to continue to make the code more perfect exists on an ongoing, continuous improvement basis. With those thoughts, I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:01): I move:

That it be an instruction to the Committee of the Whole House on the bill that it have power to consider amendments that relate to the form, content and procedures for making, amending and revoking statutory instruments, including consultation upon and parliamentary scrutiny and disallowance of statutory instruments, and to establish new statutory instruments and repeal or replace existing statutory instruments and make any other related amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (17:02): I rise to oppose the contingent motion on the basis that, if we seek to make this small amendment bill that seeks to deal with a discrete issue into a broad rewrite of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, then it means that the only course of action that I will have, knowing how long it will take to get a broad bill through both houses of parliament, is to actually go back to the original time frame that is stipulated in the act.

There would be any number of people who would like to relitigate the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, of that I have no doubt, but we are now over 3½ years through that act having been legislated, and we are close to seeing what was at that time the parliament's wish to be implemented. If we go down this path, the only choice that I will have is to go back to the original time frames in the code, which would mean that there is very little time between gazettal and go live for people to be able to understand.

It will create a suboptimal outcome. More than that, after all the calls from members in this chamber and in the community to see more time given to the code, that opportunity will be taken away. While I accept that people would like the opportunity to relitigate and to change things about how the PDI Act works, this cannot be that opportunity without fundamentally stopping the reason that this bill has been restored to the *Notice Paper* in the first place.

Ms BEDFORD: Point of order: I am not sure, was I was able to speak to the motion when I made it or do I speak—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We can come to that now, member for Florey.

Ms BEDFORD: I thought it was being put.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Take your seat, please. You have moved the motion. We need to have that seconded. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you. Member for Florey, you did have the opportunity to speak before. If there are any other members who wish to speak, the member for Florey can then close the debate.

Ms BEDFORD: I was not given the opportunity to speak, sir, because the motion was not put, which was what I was waiting for before I sprang to my feet to speak in support of my motion. Motion interruptus, I am afraid.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, well, one way or the other we will get you the opportunity to speak, member for Florey.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: My understanding, member for Florey, was that you were simply going to stand and put the motion.

Ms BEDFORD: The minister spoke to me before I got to my feet and he understood I was going to speak to the motion, but I have not had the chance to do that.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I suggest a suspension of standing orders to allow the member for Florey to make her opening remarks. I also point out, sir, that you did not recognise her. You recognised the minister and I think that is what has caused the confusion. I am not making a reflection on you, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, I think I did recognise the minister, in fact.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think the member wanted to make some opening remarks. The minister could respond and then she could close debate, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, so the member for Florey stood, she spoke and then sat down.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, waiting for the Clerk to read out the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, the Clerk does not need to read the motion.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, then, sir, I think there has been some confusion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Here are our options: member for Florey, you can seek leave to make your second reading contribution now.

Ms BEDFORD: I have already made a second reading contribution, though, sir.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On the motion.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, on the motion, and then, member for Florey, you will also have the opportunity to wrap up debate, so could you seek leave now, please. My apologies for any confusion, member for Florey and other members of the house.

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (17:06): I seek leave to speak to the contingent notice of motion I have moved.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: This motion, if passed, will afford the Committee of the Whole House an opportunity to consider a range of amendments to the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act that go beyond merely the timing of the Planning and Design Code.

After making my own second reading contribution, I listened carefully to those of other members. I particularly noted the comments of the member for Hammond who alluded to the 300 or so amendments to the then government's bill. I noted also the comments of the Attorney-General, who wondered if it was at all necessary to return to the act and remedy the problems. Of course, I have noted the comments of the minister himself. I say to you all, if it is as it seems that the legislative framework is flawed, then we must make changes. I have no political barrow to push. Rather, it is obvious that problems were missed and they are now all too obvious.

It is undeniably clear that there are problems. That is not my opinion; it is the opinion of councils, many planning professionals and like experts in many parts of industry and notably thousands of South Australians who have signed a petition expressing concerns about the progress of planning reform. Councils like the City of Salisbury in my own electorate were among the first to point out how the draft code had errors. Councils like the Copper Coast Council, the Fleurieu council, the City of Prospect, the City of Marion, and the City of Norwood Payneham and St Peters did as well.

On occasion, the language to describe the situation has been very blunt. One councillor has described the code as a 'horror story', another as 'laughable', with a further saying it was a 'joke'. In one of the more eloquent remarks I see the code described as 'dumbed down into something you can drive a truck through'. If that were not enough to merit a wider debate, then the 12,000 people to date who have signed a petition calling for the code to be deferred and for there to be a thorough review of the legislative framework undertaken should be considered. Thankfully, even if the government closes down debate today by using its numbers to defeat this motion, the new legislative requirements for petitions will ensure further debate ensues. I commend my contingent notice of motion to the house.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (17:08): I would like to speak in support of the motion. I will do so briefly because all this motion actually does is open up the opportunity. It does not mean we will actually be endorsing any other suggestions, but I think it is worthy of discussion, given the concerns in the community raised by a number of residents, residents' groups, local government, the HIA, the Master Builders Association.

Apart from the minister, everybody else in this community seems to have some concerns about this Planning and Design Code. A few minutes ago, he said the first thing which I think was truthful. He is quite stubborn and is being stubborn. By his own admission, five months ago he started

hearing people who were asking for this code to be delayed in its implementation, yet three months ago his colleagues in the upper house spoke against this very bill which he is now seeking to restore.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How humiliating.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, exactly. And a Greens bill at that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: This is a Greens bill you are moving.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: It's a Greens bill; that's right. This is essentially a procedural motion. It is not a substantive motion in the sense that it actually changes anything, but it gives us the opportunity as a committee to revisit some ideas and some thoughts on this, and there is no harm in that. What might come out of this is probably some tweaking of the actual act, which may improve it and address some of the issues raised in the community. For those reasons the opposition will be supporting this procedural motion.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes 21
 Noes 21
 Majority 0

AYES

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

NOES

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

The SPEAKER: There being 21 ayes and 21 noes, I have a casting vote and I cast with the noes, so the noes have it.

Motion thus negatived.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The CHAIR: We have three clauses and one amendment.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: My question to the minister on clause 1, which is the short title, is: could the minister please explain what this amendment seeks to do in relation to the actual finished product of the code between the date it is finalised and the date it goes live?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It is the subject of a subsequent clause and I do not want to ruin the suspense but, in terms of the short title, essentially what we are trying to achieve here is that the time frame at the moment would be that in April people can look at phase 2 of the code, have April,

May and June to grapple with it and then for it to go live in July; then for phase 3, for people to see it in July and go live sometime in September.

The CHAIR: I have just realised the member for Light and the member for Florey have both been in this position as Chair of Committees.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: But you are doing a much better job than I did.

The CHAIR: I would not say that, member for Light. You might get four questions.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: It is Thursday afternoon. Member for Light, you have the call.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Your rulings in the next few minutes will actually judge whether or not that was a true statement I made. Just to clarify, at the regional Legatus meeting last Friday the minister indicated, as he just said, that phase 2 of the introduction of the Planning and Design Code would have two elements: the actual gazettal date and also the date it goes live, and there will be some time in between those. April is the gazettal date and 1 July is the actual live date. What is happening in that regard for phase 3 of the code?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: To reiterate my previous answer—but he does not get an extra question because this is still his second question—with phase 3, people will see it in July and it will go live sometime in September. That is the current thinking.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Just to clarify, you are saying it will be gazetted in July and go live sometime in September?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I refer to my previous two answers.

The CHAIR: So I understand that—

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: He could have just said yes; it would be easier.

The CHAIR: Yes, well, anyway, that is it. You have had two questions on clause 1, member for Light. Any further questions?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: To clarify, if I could, when people talk about the finished product of the code, is that the finished product that is actually gazetted? When you go out to consultation and there is language used by the department and other people saying when the code is finalised, by the code being finalised is it that product which is actually then gazetted?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Not necessarily. It is not envisaged that we have a further proper public consultation period. That is not to say that there will not be discussions with people about various aspects, especially in regard to their submissions. Some work is still going on behind the scenes, but there will be an opportunity for people to see the code, to be able to grapple with it and to understand it before the go-live date, and I expect that period to be somewhere between two and three months.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Just to clarify the answer he has just provided, he said there would be no further consultation. He has said that on a number of occasions in this chamber over the last few days, that the consultation period will not be extended. Now that consultation has, in his opinion, concluded, there is a whole range of submissions. I think there are hundreds of submissions, putting aside the petitions. Am I right in understanding from these comments that when either phase 2 or phase 3 is gazetted and then goes live some months later, the minister will entertain no other changes to the code in that period?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That is not what I said. There is a particular meaning about public consultation. You open it up exactly as the period we have just had five months of, where you open up and people have the ability to make public submissions. Quite clearly we do not go into a little box now and hide from everybody. There is still the ability to have direct discussion; it is just that the formal consultation period has closed.

In terms of opportunities post gazettal pre go-live, a number of options are being explored. There is an opportunity post gazettal pre go-live to deal with any technical errors that are made. In the old act, there was section 29, and there is the same head power under the new act to correct errors of a technical nature. That opportunity will certainly exist. But can I reiterate that this code is a live document. It is not set in stone. It is a living, breathing document and, as soon as it does go live, all the opportunities that exist within the act to undertake code amendments will kick in and this document will continue to evolve from there.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The next question I have is about one of the things that the minister stated, that between the gazettal notice and when the code goes live there is an opportunity for training. Can that be elaborated upon: what sort of training is envisaged by the department and for whom?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: At the moment, there is training being codesigned with the LGA in relation to councils and assessment managers and assessing authorities within the council sphere. Obviously the ePlanning solution is one that we are going to need to help people work through and understand and also in relation to the code itself. We have also had requests from the development industry to have training undertaken, and certainly we have committed to them that we will undertake what training they believe to be necessary, and then there is certainly an opportunity for community groups or whoever to be able to, if they want, have some training provided. We are more than happy to do that.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I wish to clarify that further because this is an issue that has come up time and time again in my discussions with various groups, and I need to clarify it because there has been some shifting sand in what we have been saying in this time. What I am trying to clarify is that last time (and I can be corrected because one of the officers who was present at the briefing I think is present here today) I understood that the training would be delivered in digital form—I think those are the right words, 'digital form'—and that, secondly, the training would be over some period of time. I would like to clarify the delivery mode of the training to the various stakeholders and, secondly, the time period allowed for that training.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: We will certainly include digital training opportunities as well as other opportunities, but again—

The Hon. A. Piccolo interjecting:

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Non-digital and face to face or paper-based—certainly not on the back of toilet paper at the moment. That is precisely why this amendment bill is here, to provide us with a greater opportunity to do that based on the feedback that all sectors have given us about wanting more time to grapple with the code before it goes live.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: The second part of my question was about the actual time frame, which has not been answered.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I refer to my previous two answers. It is being codesigned at the moment, and once it has finished being codesigned those time frames will be well known.

The CHAIR: Are you seeking clarification on that, member for Light?

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: Yes, a supplementary almost.

The CHAIR: I will call it seeking clarification.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I am seeking clarification because the minister was quite certain in response to a question on notice that the training provided would be both digitally and face to face and would be at least somewhere between four and six weeks between the gazettal and the code going live. If that is the case, what has changed that he cannot tell me now?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: It seems as if he already has the answer, so I do not know why I have to answer the question. I refer the member to the answer I gave in the question on notice.

The CHAIR: I will call a halt there.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: That does raise another question, but I will not go there.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I seek leave to move my amendment in an amended form.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Piccolo-1]—

Page 2, after line 17—Insert:

(3a) Schedule 8, clause 9—after subclause (7) insert:

(7a) However, the Minister cannot revoke a Development Plan under subclause (7) unless the Minister has given the LGA and any council affected by the revocation—

(a) notice of the proposed revocation; and

(b) a copy of the amendments to the Planning and Design Code proposed to take effect on the date on which the revocation is to operate from,

and given consideration to any submission made by the LGA or an affected council within a period (of at least 2 months) specified by the Minister.

In the last line, I have replaced 'at least 1 month' with 'at least 2 months'. Given the answers provided by the minister, it does not actually alter but just provides some warranty to those stakeholders.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The government opposed the original motion because it would have the practical effect of delaying the code not for one month but for something like eight to 12 weeks. In the amended form, it will delay the code by a further 12 to 16 weeks because, when we undertake consultation, we need to provide a report on what the consultation and engagement heard, and then we need to consider those things.

There is a balance here between wanting to get this right and also of wanting to create some certainty in the industry. As I think was noted by the Master Builders Association in the paper today or yesterday, creating a further three to four months' worth of uncertainty is ill advised. Moreover, I am not 100 per cent sure about the rationale for why only councils and the LGA are consulted. If we are going to undertake public consultation, why are we not giving the community the opportunity?

Regardless, this amendment is not needed because there will be opportunities for there to be some back and forth with the department, so it does not need to happen through a statutory consultation period; it naturally happens anyway. Within the department we have people who are assigned to each council to act as liaison, essentially, and deal with the issues that arise. I think that the existing consultation mechanisms are appropriate, so the government will oppose the motion.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO: I have to disagree with what the minister has just said. The reason I moved this amendment is that, in his own words today, the minister said that phase 3 of the code would be gazetted sometime in July and would actually go live sometime in September. So that is July, August and September. If the minister is actually consistent in what he is saying, my amendment is entirely consistent with his declared intentions. All it does is provide all stakeholders with a safeguard that the minister will be held to his word.

Once it is gazetted, this actually gives effective notice of two months. I am at a loss to know why the minister is opposing it. On the one hand he says that he is going to do this, and on the other hand he is opposing a statutory obligation. Perhaps the minister wants the capacity to actually change his mind.

The committee divided on the amendment:

Ayes	21
Noes	21
Majority	0

AYES

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

NOES

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

The CHAIR: There being 21 ayes and 21 noes, the vote on the floor is tied. I have a casting vote. I vote with the government, so the noes have it.

Amendment thus negatived; clause passed.

Members interjecting:

The CHAIR: I remind members that, even though it is Thursday afternoon, they should not reflect on a vote of the house.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (17:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

At 17:42 the house adjourned until Tuesday 24 March 2020 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***SERVICE SA**

In reply to **Ms BEDFORD (Florey)** (18 February 2020).

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning): I have been advised:

The statistics provided in the press release demonstrate the change in customer behaviour as a growing number of customers transition to digital services.

As at end of January 2020, only 3 per cent of the total transactions across all channels were completed through Service SA's call centre. This compares with 30 per cent of transactions being undertaken at a Service SA centre, 58 per cent through digital channels, and 9 per cent through service agents such as Australia Post.

Whilst transactions undertaken at Service SA centres have decreased over the last five years and transactions through digital channels have increased, transactions through the call centre have remained constant.