

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Thursday, 4 June 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 Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: INTERSECTION UPGRADES

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:01): I move:

That the 59th report of the committee, entitled Portrush Road and Magill Road Intersection Upgrade, and Grand Junction Road, Hampstead Road and Briens Road Intersection Upgrade, be noted.

The Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection is located approximately four kilometres from the Adelaide central business district, and the intersection at Grand Junction Road, Hampstead Road and Briens Road is located approximately nine kilometres from the CBD. Both are very significant intersections with heavy carriage of vital traffic.

The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure advises that both intersections are currently operating at capacity during peak periods, with signal phasing and traffic lanes fully utilised, creating congestion and causing safety risks, which are well known to members in this place. The Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection is part of the National Land Transport Network and forms part of the outer ring route, which is an identified major traffic route and freight route in the state. Both Portrush and Magill Roads are also identified as high frequency public transport corridors.

Right turn movement with Grand Junction Road to Hampstead Road is identified as a key freight movement, and the existing single right lane causes problems due to the slow acceleration of heavy vehicles. DPTI has advised of the need for additional capacity on all approaches to the intersection, and the need to provide additional capacity for the movement by duplicating the existing right turn lane.

The proposed upgrades to both intersections are expected to improve travel times and also improve safety outcomes for all road users. It is anticipated that the upgrades will also improve network reliability and support economic activity. The budget for the Portrush Road, Magill Road intersection upgrade and Grand Junction Road, Hampstead Road, Briens Road intersection upgrade is \$98 million and \$19 million respectively. Funding contributions have been made equally by the state and the commonwealth.

Construction for both road intersection upgrades is expected to be completed by late 2021. The committee examined written and oral evidence in relation to the project, and received assurances that the appropriate consultation in relation to these projects had been undertaken, and the committee is satisfied that the proposal has been subject to the appropriate agency consultation and meets the criteria for the examination of projects sets out in the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. Based on the evidence considered, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee recommends to parliament the scope of the proposed public works.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (11:04): I rise to speak on the motion moved by the honourable member for Kavel. It is fair to say that the opposition is supportive of the Grand Junction Road, Hampstead Road and Briens Road intersection upgrade. However, the Portrush Road and Magill Road intersection seems to have been maladministrated. It seems to be, in my opinion, an ill-conceived, ill thought-out, expensive and intrusive piece of infrastructure.

In taking evidence during the Public Works Committee, we heard evidence from constituents of the Premier who live in and around that intersection, who informed me that the department had behaved in a manner that I thought was intimidating and, quite frankly, not in the best traditions of

the way we conduct compulsory acquisitions. I do say, with some sympathy to the minister, compulsory acquisitions are difficult. I have addressed very, very angry crowds about compulsory acquisition and government upgrades of major intersections. It is difficult. I accept that. I hear the Attorney-General mumbling under her breath in her usual unhelpful way.

The maladministration that I believe has occurred here by someone, I think, very close to this project has been that the government has used its resources, I believe, to treat local constituents in that area appallingly. Yet the question we have to ask ourselves as a parliament is: is this the best use of \$90 million worth of taxpayers' money?

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: Ninety-eight.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is \$98 million worth of taxpayers' money. I was taking out the DPTI fees for your consideration. I am just talking about what we are actually spending on the road, not what we fund to keep your department's FTEs funded.

The important thing here is the question: was this project head of DPTI's priority list? Was this an intersection upgrade that DPTI were pushing hard for, or was it simply a matter that there was a change of MP running for the seat of Sturt, from a very high-profile, well-known, established, long-serving and, dare I say, popular Liberal MP in Chris Pyne, close friend of the Government Whip—I understand they are very close, very tight—being replaced with a Liberal Party staffer who no-one had ever heard of other than in the Premier's office?

Could it be that the government was expending taxpayers' money simply to get a Liberal hack elected to the commonwealth parliament? Maybe. We will not know until we are in office and we will do an audit of this to find out whether or not this intersection was pushed up the list by a government decision or whether it really was something on the priority list that DPTI had in place. We will find that out at the change of government. We will not know that now because the minister will not, of course, let us know. But we do know that this is a very proud announcement by the minister. He has been championing this intersection, as has the Premier. The Premier and the minister are big supporters of upgrading this intersection.

Interestingly, when you look at the maps of the intersection that is being upgraded, you notice that the government have chosen an alignment that is interesting, to say the least. The alignment they have chosen is not to disturb an SA Power Networks asset, a service station and a car park. However, the government were quite happy to choose an alignment that compulsorily acquired private freehold residential property, people's homes, rather than potentially not acquiring anyone's home. It is an interesting choice the minister has made. I do not know what considerations were taken about why this was done. A bit of the evidence we received from the department was—

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Transport!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Some of the evidence we received from DPTI was the prohibitive cost of moving the SA Power Networks substation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right! I removed the member for Hammond yesterday. Do not make me do it again today.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Transport, you will have your time to shine. The member for West Torrens has the call.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It seems that the minister is agitated about something, something else focusing his mind. I do not know whether it is because I have mentioned the word 'maladministration' many times. Perhaps he is focused on other matters.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Just get on with it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: For the defence, the Attorney-General pipes up, sir.

The SPEAKER: Yes, the Deputy Premier has a point of order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Point of order: I think the member has had fun. Let's just get on with it.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I would like that to occur. I would ask you to cease provoking, if you can, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you very much for your protection, sir. It was a strange alignment, where you heard members of the government ridiculing the opposition for perhaps even suggesting that, rather than compulsorily acquiring people's homes and closing businesses, we consider whether or not there is scope to have that substation removed. Was there capacity in the system? We could not get that answer from the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure—whether or not that substation was essential—but I am sure the minister inquired as to whether or not the substation was essential or whether there was capacity in the system to have it removed altogether, and why leaving a car parking place for a chemist's shop is more important than taking people's homes.

I am sure the government think they know what they are doing. I am sure that the Premier and the minister think that this is popular in the eastern suburbs, but we shall see—we shall see. The opposition's view is that this money has been poorly allocated to a project that perhaps was not necessary. Even more concerning, the alignment of the proposed works is overly disruptive and intrudes on a very beautiful part of Adelaide.

Perhaps a different alignment could have given us a very different outcome, but we have a very junior and inexperienced minister in place and I think perhaps he rushed this decision. Perhaps he did not read everything he was meant to read; perhaps he did not do his due diligence. Perhaps he did not ask the appropriate questions of the agency. Curiosity is always a very important instinct to have as a minister. Perhaps this minister lacks those key fundamentals when he is inquiring of the agency about how this alignment should occur. I also wonder whether or not the minister has taken the time to go and speak to any of the constituents who have had their homes compulsorily acquired, whether he has actually spoken to constituents of the Premier who have had caveats placed on their titles by the department.

I have also received correspondence that the Premier himself has refused to meet with some constituents who are affected by this intersection, which I also find concerning. I know the Premier is busy, especially during a pandemic, but politicians are never too busy to serve their constituents or to meet with local communities. I would have thought that perhaps the Premier could meet with this local community and speak with them about their concerns about this and that more could be done to try to save some of those jobs that are being acquired through the alignment of this road.

I think this is a poorly planned, poorly executed, poorly designed intersection that will create more angst than good in the eastern suburbs, and I think the blame for that lies squarely with the minister.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the minister, during the member for West Torrens' last contribution I believe I heard the minister say, sotto voce, 'bloody oath'. I am going to make a ruling that that is not unparliamentary, but if I hear it in malice I might change my ruling. Minister for Transport.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:14): Thank you, Mr Speaker. As always, we defer to your superior judgement. There was a lot of assertion and innuendo in the member for West Torrens' speech, and it is interesting that, when asked point-blank about whether or not Labor support this project, they are unable to give you an answer. What they prefer to do is try to sniff the political winds on an issue as opposed to getting on and supporting what is a stimulus-delivering, traffic-improving project.

The evidence for why this intersection has been picked as part of the government's record \$12.9 billion infrastructure program is that we need to deliver the best traffic outcome and traffic improvement to the greatest number of people that is possible. On coming into government, having

made an election commitment, we put together a Keep Metro Traffic Moving report, a report looking at a whole series of ways that we can help to improve traffic across Adelaide.

One measure used to identify where the most congestion occurs is the percentage of travel time delay, which is a relationship between the average time during peak and the minimum time. If you drive across a road at midnight and nobody else is around, that is the baseline measure. The average of the peak time taken and the delay between those two is where we know that we have the greatest amount of congestion. The number one road on that list is Portrush Road.

The number one road, at 26.5 per cent average increased time delay from minimum to peak average, is Portrush Road—the most congested road in South Australia. So heaven forbid that we would pick that as a road, and a key intersection on that road, to fix the intersection. Also on that list of the top dozen most congested roads in South Australia is Magill Road, coming in with a 15 per cent delay. So the opportunity to fix an intersection that deals with two of the top dozen most congested roads in Adelaide would seem to me to be a pretty reasonable choice.

Apart from that fact, as the member for West Torrens well knows—because it is in the Public Works Committee report that was tabled—it shows that for the \$98 million of taxpayer spend on this project there are \$600 million to \$900 million worth of benefits over the next 20 years that will be delivered, \$600 million to \$900 million worth of benefits because of this investment—again a BCR that is phenomenal in how much improvement it is going to make to our traffic network.

If you go to any business in South Australia and say, 'I can give you \$6 back for every dollar you invest,' they would say, 'Where do I sign up?' The question about the alignment of this road is not one the department took lightly at all. In terms of creating an alignment, you want to pick one side of the road or the other side of the road to have to acquire because you do not want to have to acquire both, two lots of land acquisition but also two lots worth of service relocation. Looking at this intersection, the choice was extremely clear.

Whilst members opposite might be flippant about how much cost and time it would take to move a significant substation, experts within the department are not and, as a minister who listens to those experts, I am not. Had we wanted to see tens of millions of dollars worth of extra cost, and potentially years worth of delays, then we could have chosen another alignment, but to do so would have put taxpayers at risk and energy users at risk.

We would have had to find somewhere else within the vicinity that was an appropriate location to put a new substation, built the substation and transferred everything across to be able to shut down the existing substation. That is not an easy task, especially when dealing with SAPN and having to fit that within their own schedule. So of course it became much easier to take the other side of the road. Yes, that meant the difficult decision to move a childcare centre, which I note shut down in February well ahead of the middle of the year time frame that was put on the table.

Again, we think the \$600 million to \$900 million worth of benefits at stake here for South Australians is a good use of taxpayers' money. The 50,000 to 55,000 motorists a day who go down Portrush Road will know the difference that this intersection upgrade will make. As a government, whether it is this intersection or whether it is other intersections around Adelaide that we are upgrading—the Hampstead Road, Briens Road and Grand Junction Road intersection; the Fullarton Road and Cross Road intersection; two grade separations; as well as five other intersections around Adelaide—we are spending money to fix up our road network.

We know that this is what works, we know that this is what delivers benefits to South Australians and we know that we need to continue to invest to create jobs but also to build the infrastructure that this state needs. The \$12.9 billion on the table over the next four years shows that we are serious. There are always short-run issues in delivering infrastructure projects when land acquisition is involved, and we certainly do appreciate that it is difficult.

What we have instituted since coming to government is—instead of running a completely sequential project delivery framework whereby you do all the design, then the land acquisition, then the early works and then get into major construction—that we have sought to deliver these projects more quickly by running a number of these processes in parallel. This has meant that we have been able to give more information to locals about the way that they will potentially be affected much earlier in the process.

As soon as this information was announced, the first amount of information went out to a potentially affected residence. Then, in October last year, we were able to go out with further information, well before the designs were completely finalised, so that we could give local residents more time than they have had previously to be able to make decisions about what is best for them and their families. Essentially, we have given a 12 to 15-month heads up that something is coming down the pipeline, we have then given nine months to be able to work through what is otherwise a difficult process and we have used every tool that we have within the confines of the Land Acquisition Act to be able to provide help and support to residents.

I do know and I do appreciate that there are some people who do simply do not want to see this upgraded, but what we do and the decisions we make as a government are based on what is best for all of South Australia. It is what we can do to help improve the lives of more people, rather than necessarily give in to sectional interest. I also resent the imputation in the member for West Torrens' remarks, suggesting that somehow all the infrastructure investment, and the difficulty and pain that is gone through, should be confined to one side of the city or the other and that it necessarily should only be people in the western suburbs who have to bear the brunt of land acquisition and disruption.

We have a grid network. We need to provide traffic improvement across that network, and that is precisely what this government has chosen to do. According to road congestion statistics, this is the number one priority in terms of helping to fix congestion on our road network. It is a project of our conception and our funding, and it will be of our delivery. It is one that I know all South Australians can be proud of, knowing that we did what is otherwise tough and difficult so that we can deliver a better network for South Australians and so that they can spend more time at home, rather than sitting at a set of traffic lights being frustrated.

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:23): The Public Works Committee considered this project extremely carefully. At no time in those hearings were improper motives ever attributed to the minister or any other member, and the matters that are now being ventilated by the member for West Torrens ought rightly to have been put before the committee. It speaks volumes about the reason why those matters are now being ventilated here: that is, the member for West Torrens comes as the prince of acquisition in his time in government to criticise, opportunistically, the minister for a project that has a very, very substantial basis.

The minister outlined the BCR for the project and he outlined the congestion and the traffic impact, not only on those motorists seeking to pass through this intersection but also on commercial vehicles at this intersection—both these intersections. These are vital parts of our city's transport network. Acquisition of private land is very difficult. It involves a number of important considerations. Substantial protections are available at law, and those people whose properties are being acquired ought, and rightly should, take advantage of all the protections that exist at law. However, that process is being conducted according to law and carefully, to ensure that proper value is paid for those properties.

Mr Speaker, allow me to reflect briefly again on the number of vehicle movements at these intersections. DPTI has advised that an annual average daily traffic movement of approximately 60,200 vehicles passes through Portrush Road and Magill Road. Then, of course, there are 58,400 vehicles passing through the Grand Junction Road, Hampstead Road and Briens Road intersection. It is hard to contemplate further intersections in Adelaide that have such substantial pressure on them at the moment.

What, of course, comes to mind as well is that the former government had many years to resolve this issue. Instead, they come now, late in the piece, without properly ventilating these matters in the Public Works Committee, and they ask that we somehow question, at the final moment, matters that have not been raised earlier. I think that is the height of mischief-making—

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: He has done worse.

Mr CREGAN: —he has done worse—and is not informed by a proper focus on ensuring that public money is spent to resolve substantial transport issues. It is dangerous ground in this place, it is very dangerous ground, to turn to matters of maladministration without having a proper basis to

do so. If there is a proper basis to make suggestions of that type, they should be put in a different forum, as the member well knows.

It is clear to me, as Chair of the committee, that these matters are raised not to ensure that there is a laser-like focus on the matters that section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act asks us to focus on, but instead to ask us to direct our focus on matters of pure politics. These are not matters of merit and not matters that we should rightly be focused on when considering the discharge of our obligations within the committee and equally when considering how a substantial amount of public money is to be spent.

None of that is to say that anybody in the government does not have substantial sympathy and appreciation for the extraordinary stressors and anxiety faced by those people whose land will be acquired. There is no doubt that that is a difficult process, but we are all each also committed to ensuring that those people receive all the rights and benefits that are accorded to them under statute.

Motion carried.

Motions

DEVELOPMENT (PUBLIC HEALTH EMERGENCY) VARIATION REGULATIONS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (11:28): I move:

That regulations made under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, entitled Development (Public Health Emergency) Variation Regulations, made on 9 April 2020 and laid on the table of this house on 28 April 2020, be disallowed.

The regulations were made by the Governor and published in the *Government Gazette* on 9 April. I am moving disallowance because the powers these regulations grant the minister are unnecessary, disproportionate and represent a significant threat to the proper operation of the state planning system. I think we have all been willing to give the government a fair amount of leeway in its response to the coronavirus-related public health emergency, but that does not mean the government necessarily always gets it right, and in this case I and many others believe that the government has it quite wrong.

Members will be aware of the ongoing disquiet that has characterised the rollout of planning reforms under the government's Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, which was carried in the Fifty-Third Parliament before the last election. It is apparent the wheels have fallen off the government's planning reform agenda in a major way. Recently, this house considered a bill to delay implementation of the signature measure in the planning reform agenda, the state Planning and Design Code, after concerns were raised by councils, the development industry, planning professionals and members of the public.

At that time, I sought the house's support to move alternative amendments, but the government declined to take up this opportunity. As I said then, merely delaying the commencement of the code would not be enough to assuage the widespread community concern, frustration and now even anger evident in the past six months. It is all too clear that we need to go back to the drawing board.

The Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act as passed deviates from some of the recommendations of the Expert Panel on Planning Reform in several ways, which, while appearing minor, are in fact significant. I note recently that the former chair of the expert panel, Mr Brian Hayes QC, has expressed concern about the manner in which the code is being delivered. It is possible that tensions are playing a role in what appears to be ongoing disfunction in the minister's department, as reported by the media. Perhaps staff are trying to resolve inherent contradictions in the legislative framework.

When I last spoke, the minister's department had already experienced several high-profile departures from the planning reform team and, as of a few weeks or so ago, I have heard and seen more reports emerge which suggest an unhealthy culture within the department; no wonder, when the staff there continue to be put under pressure to resolve issues on the run which were inherently problematic while flaws in the legislation are left unaddressed by the parliament.

I have put this history on record because it is important context to understand why the regulations before us must be disallowed. These regulations purportedly relate to the COVID-19 emergency and it is true that some of the variation provisions in these regulations are directly relevant and, therefore, appropriate. For example, new regulation 3A authorises councils to fulfil obligations to move for the public to inspect planning documents by publication of them on their website instead of attending the council office personally.

Obviously, this is an appropriate measure while social distancing remains the advice of our public health authorities. Similarly, the ability not to hold public meetings set out in the changes to regulation 12 of the Development Regulations also seems to be an appropriate measure; however, the remainder of the regulations are inappropriate and should not be supported by this parliament. Under the name of COVID-19, the minister has been granted what are essentially unlimited powers to take development applications of any sort away from councils and have them approved centrally.

I see no circumstance in which this is justified by health advice, nor is it obvious why it would be justified as a stimulus measure. It is true the former government made regulations, now expired or revoked, to allow speedier development approvals in the context of the need for stimulus, but none of the former regulations were unlimited in the scope of development to which they apply, as these regulations are. They were confined in one way or another by quantitative standards, decision criteria or other safeguards against abuse. Even with these limitations, they were still controversial.

The current scheme of the Development Act, under which these new regulations are made, and of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, which will in due course replace it, already provide a legitimate role for significant development to be assessed centrally; however, it should be done by regulation, not by ministerial decree. That means if there are fundamental objections, parliament—this chamber or the other place—can move a motion to disallow that measure.

The government may argue in opposing this motion that disallowance will force councils to return to holding public hearings and offer public inspection of planning documents, but there is a simple way to address this: remake the regulations with the objectionable parts removed. I have spoken with representatives of the Local Government Association and it is clear from their advice this solution would be satisfactory. Equally, it is clear any measures which involve further centralisation of planning powers is always a concern to local councils, as it should also be for this parliament.

We have seen attempts by the government to excise councils from key planning decisions under the cover of COVID-19, just as we have seen the government use COVID-19 to loosen shop trading hours against the clear will of this parliament. These development regulations are in the same vein: they cut out councils and, more importantly, they cut out parliament from having any say.

I have spoken before about the dangers of political shortcuts when it comes to proper democratic process. When you take a political shortcut, you will inevitably have a political headache one day. The recent GM crops legislation swept off the table in this house in April under a compromise deal no-one really seems to like is the most notorious example of political game playing in the term of this parliament and is the reason I have put forward a private member's bill to stop ministers from remaking regulations which have been disallowed sooner than six months from that date.

In my view and in that of many concerned South Australians outside this chamber, the regulations which this motion would disallow are another example of overreach and another example of political shortcuts and planning reforms being rammed through without the consent of the community we all come to this place to represent. I commend the motion to the house.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (11:34): I rise to oppose this motion. I am a little bit surprised and shocked by the speech that has just been given, especially as it relates to discourse in relation to how the department is operating and how it is going through what is the most comprehensive set of reforms to planning since the Development Act in 1993, a mammoth task which has been undertaken with the highest degree of professionalism and the highest degree of commitment towards the principal cause of improving the planning system for all parties.

To somehow use this disallowance motion speech to call that into question, I think is downright offensive, especially as it comes off the back of the speech by the member for West Torrens, who also tried to somehow suggest that elements of my department are committing maladministration whilst undertaking land acquisition. Both are without basis, both are without fact and both were given here in this chamber where recourse is not available to the parties who are being slurred, and I think that is something that we need to reflect on. I am happy to stand up here and take account of all the decisions that I make and that this government makes in my portfolio areas but, when it comes to public servants doing a bloody hard job in the best way that they know how and doing it with the highest degrees of integrity, I will not allow those slurs to stand.

There was reference made to the Labor government's expert planning reform panel and what it thinks about how the planning reforms are progressing. Interestingly, late last year, as debates on heritage were raised, especially in relation to contributory items transitioning across to the new system—a decision that was actually taken back in 2016 and one that members opposite all voted for—I asked that same expert panel to look at how we were transitioning heritage to the new system and they fundamentally agreed with the government's approach.

They fundamentally agreed and confirmed that the government's approach is correct, that it is in keeping with what the expert panel handed down back in 2014, and, moreover, that it is actually going to help strengthen and improve the legislative underpinning of heritage in South Australia. I have sent a copy of that report I think to all members, and they might avail themselves of an opportunity to read that and actually understand that it supports the processes and the outcomes the government has reached.

Interestingly, though, there has been some mention of the expanded call-in powers that we put in place under the earlier iterations of the COVID-19 bill. Those call-in powers and the broad-ranging nature of those call-in powers were voted on by this chamber back in 2016 when the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act was put through this chamber. Those broad-ranging call-in powers given to the minister, voted on by members opposite, supported by members opposite, are essentially the powers that we sought to bring forward as part of the COVID-19 bill.

The reason we did that is that we did not want to have a situation where construction workers were having to sit idle because planning applications were being held up in council chambers. We wanted to make sure that if the need arose, especially in situations where we were facing a stage of the pandemic where it could have been that entire planning departments within councils needed to self-isolate because they had potentially contracted coronavirus, we would have a contingency in place for that situation so that we did not see construction jobs stop dead in various parts of our city, as we know that keeping people in work at this time is even more important than it is pre and post COVID.

We also have not used the power because to date we have not had a situation requiring us to. Because of the strong performance and strong health response that this government has put in place, we have not had the need to use those call-in powers, but they sit there as a fallback, as a reserve option, in case we need to do what we need to do to keep people in jobs in South Australia to help stimulate our economy, and that is something we do not resile from.

Also, what we have had announced today is a significant housing construction support package announced by the federal government, including \$25,000 grants for new construction. This is a phenomenally important measure that will help to stimulate potentially thousands of new houses to be built right at a time when confidence in the housing construction industry is at its lowest. From our discussions with the federal government, there are very strict time frames about people's ability to get that \$25,000 grant because the federal government wants to make sure, and we want to make sure, that those jobs are in there at the time that they need to happen.

Those time frames will be stymied if development applications for those new builds get stuck in council chambers. If it is a situation where that delay goes on for too long, we could see a situation where people are denied those grants because of red tape and bureaucracy. Having these reserve powers, which I remind the chamber we have not used yet, make sure that those applications are processed in a timely way so that people can get access to the very money that the federal government knows, and the state government knows, they need to be able to stimulate jobs during this time. Again, that is something we do not resile from.

We are not doing anything underhand here. All we are doing is seeking to bring forward powers which will exist under the phase 3 rollout of PDI which is going to happen later this year—powers this chamber voted for. All we are doing is seeking to bring them forward to give us the flexibility to be able to respond in real time to this coronavirus. The government most strongly opposes this disallowance motion because, if it were to pass this chamber today, it would cause significant issues, not for the state government but for the very councils that others think they are championing by forcing them to have to go back to public notification processes that are not compatible in a COVIDSafe environment. I think that that is dangerous and I think that that is unhelpful, and it is why this government will be opposing this disallowance motion.

I appreciate that on heritage matters people do not always agree. In fact, I would settle for most people agreeing maybe once or twice. But what we have are disparate groups within the community who believe in a different set of outcomes for what Adelaide should look like and how Adelaide should be developed—fundamentally and potentially diametrically opposed outcomes. It is the job of the planning system to try to balance all those views into a system that is coherent, repeatable, transparent and one that people can have confidence in regarding open decision-making.

That is an impossible task to deliver with people who have disparate sets of views. They will look at the same development and think, 'This is brilliant and beautiful and delivers good outcomes,' and a different group of people will say, 'This is awful.' We have to put in a planning system that can help to cater for all those needs, so I am not surprised in the slightest that there are people who do not like the Planning and Design Code and what it looks like it will become because they disagree with those outcomes. But in a democracy that is inevitable. I know that the Speaker has had to deal with this in his own electorate, and this government has sought to remedy and deal with some of the most egregious examples.

This is a difficult time, this is a difficult area, but what we will deliver at the end of this process in essentially delivering on a process that was started under the former government are—and the member for Enfield whose name does not get mentioned that often by members opposite these days—

Mr Brown: Former member for Enfield.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sorry, you are correct, member for Playford. It is the former member for Enfield.

An honourable member: QC.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: SC—longer consultation time frames for people, a Community Engagement Charter that means that people have more say in decision-making, quicker time frames for assessing development applications so that we can get to a yes or a no more quickly, as well as a consistent system that helps to reduce bureaucracy and red tape and that, for the first time, delivers a statewide e-planning solution that means that laypeople will be able to click a button on a piece of land and know exactly what they can and cannot do on that piece of land. These are all brilliant reforms, ones that this government supported in opposition and one that this government will deliver to the benefit of people in South Australia.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:44): I rise simply to observe that the regulations were the subject of the Legislative Review Committee's report No. 6, which was received in the house yesterday. The committee resolved no action. I might observe more particularly that the regulations in this case are wholly conventional, amending the act pursuant to section 73B of the act; regulation 5, does that. The Henry VIII provision in the act is applied. The powers that are conferred are by no means unlimited, and they apply explicitly and expressly until no longer than the designated date, and they are applying in circumstances that are obvious to all members of the house. I would add that, in my view, the motion is unmeritorious and I wholeheartedly endorse the contribution of the minister in that regard.

Ms BEDFORD (Floreay) (11:46): The remarks I have cited in my contribution today are in the media; they are in the public area. Support, of course, for the difficult role of the staff is not withdrawn or besmirched in any way. My concerns reflect on the regulations, not the staff who have

been required to produce them. Were councils going to stop dead in their tracks because of COVID? Are they delaying anything in particular? None of this has been shown to be the case.

As the minister said, he has not used the powers which he has asked for. Reflecting on the concerns raised with me and raising them is part of my job in this place, and I will not be forced into silence by the minister or his remarks. Dissent is an important part of any democracy, and I do not understand why I have been attacked in such a fashion here in the chamber this morning. Did you, minister, consult with the LGA? Our centralising power is a concern of theirs, and I think you should be aware of that, if you have not actually consulted with them and found that out for yourself.

The minister mentions heritage issues, and they are of course an important part of Adelaide. Once something has been razed, it is gone and it is gone for good, so it is important that we do hasten slowly perhaps rather than go full throttle. The people—14,000 of them I believe it is—who have signed a petition that has been received in another place are naturally very concerned and wary of centralised power. As I said, the minister has not used the power—he has admitted that himself—and it could therefore be seen that these powers are unnecessary in the first place. So I commend the motion to the house.

Motion negatived.

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: GOLDEN GROVE HIGH SCHOOL REDEVELOPMENT

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (11:48): I move:

That the 60th report of the committee, entitled Golden Grove High School Redevelopment Project, be noted.

Golden Grove High School is located on Adey Place, Golden Grove, within the district council of Tea Tree Gully, approximately 20 kilometres north-east of the GPO. Mr Speaker, you will know that the high school is a public secondary school located with Pedare Christian College and Gleeson College, which are private schools on a shared campus. The Department for Education has advised that the three schools share a number of common facilities and resources.

Golden Grove High School also shares facilities with the Tea Tree Gully council, which manages the Golden Grove Recreation Centre, also located on the site. Golden Grove High School and Gleeson College share a specialist arts centre, with facilities for drama and dance, known as the Dame Roma Mitchell Centre.

Golden Grove High School was allocated total funding of \$15.549 million as part of the Department for Education's capital works program. Initial funding of \$10 million was announced in October 2017, and this funding was confirmed in March 2018, with further funding announced in February 2019. The redevelopment project will include demolition and new works to accommodate 1,900 students at the Golden Grove High School site.

Mr Speaker, as you will know, the redevelopment project will include the construction of new buildings to accommodate years 7 and 8. There will also be construction of new performance and senior school buildings, replacing the existing dance and drama studios, which will be demolished, as well as the replacement of a year 12 study centre and a locker shed, which I understand is also being demolished. There is also anticipated to be an increase in the outdoor area for two practical outdoor learning spaces. Construction for the redevelopment project is expected to be completed in November 2021.

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

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:51): I have resisted speaking to each of these reports on the developments in schools, and I will probably continue to resist after I make this contribution. Naturally, as someone who cares about education, as we all do,

it is a delight to see any money being spent on schools in South Australia. It is also, of course, of particular pleasure for me, having been involved in the previous government's decision to allocate nearly \$700 million to upgrades (known as the Building Better Schools project), to see sequentially that money being rolled out, the designs being announced and the works shortly to commence, and I note there has been an addition of about \$185 million to that amount to further facilitate development.

I cannot, however, let my pleasure in seeing those developments roll out obscure from myself or from the people of South Australia some of the consequences of the decisions that this government has made. One decision, to move the 12 year olds, the year 7s, from primary schools into secondary schools, does have a significant capital works cost associated with it. The true cost of that has been taken up largely by the money that had been previously allocated by the last government for much-needed developments across the school system through Building Better Schools.

It has also meant that there has been a delay for any primary schools that were allocated funds under Building Better Schools because those schools will not be able to proceed with their developments until after the high schools have been done in order to meet the 2022 deadline for moving year 7s. It is a source of continual frustration to me and many others that we are unable to ascertain how much of the \$692 million allocated under the previous government has been allocated to the move of year 7.

For some reason, it is beyond the wit and wisdom of the department to be able to determine how much money is being spent on infrastructure to accommodate children who are already accommodated in schools down the road. It is further a source of irritation and annoyance that the costing for the changes has meant that there are projects in high schools that either will not happen at all, because they are having to accommodate year 7s, or will occur in a diminished and substandard way as a result of having to accommodate year 7s.

This is obscured because the previous government created such a large fund for capital works that it is not always immediately apparent to school communities what they are missing out on because they are having to accommodate year 7s in what is largely an unfunded scheme. In the case of Golden Grove, in particular, it is good that the government chose to allocate an additional \$5 million to that project.

It is good that they accepted that within the \$10 million envelope they would not be able to accommodate anything more than moving the year 7s. On the other hand, it is also still clear that what the Golden Grove community had wanted will not come to full fruition because, even with the \$15 million, they are having to spend a significant proportion on accommodating the move for year 7s in a school that was already very full.

With the demographic growth in the area, the expectation was that there would need to be room for more students from 8 to 12, let alone taking on an entire other cohort. Contrast this with the experience of schools in other electorates. Contrast this, for example, with the allocation made by this government to Brighton Secondary School, which had already received some \$30 million under the previous government for a very good concert and performance space.

Although the government estimated there will only be a net additional 100 students as a result of the move to year 7, because they are tightening up so significantly the way the zone operates around Brighton, they are getting \$14 million to spend on Brighton Secondary School. What is the justification when it is essentially the same amount going to Golden Grove accommodating far more new students, both from the 8 to 12 cohort and also the addition of the year 7s, and with a much greater need to catch up with schools like Brighton that have terrific facilities that all high schools should have? What is the justification for that allocation?

Let's also look at Glenunga International High School. Glenunga is going to grow to be a very large school, in the sense of the number of students it is accommodating. It has been allocated \$29 million, in stark contrast to the \$15 million being allocated to Golden Grove. What is the basis for distinguishing between those two? They are both schools that are on very constrained sites. They are both schools that are going to need to have more than one storey as part of their development

to accommodate additional students, yet they have half the amount at Golden Grove as the amount allocated to Glenunga.

Lest anyone misunderstand me, every dollar spent in a public high school in South Australia is welcome. I am pleased that Brighton Secondary School is getting more money and I am pleased that Glenunga International High School is getting more money, but I am mystified about the way in which those decisions are being made when you contrast them with the very serious and present need of a school like Golden Grove. Golden Grove is sitting, as was mentioned in the member's introduction to this report, on a co-located site.

Golden Grove is at the front of saying, 'As a public school, we know that we have a Catholic school and an independent school next to us and we want to put our best foot forward to make the public option one that parents can comfortably and happily embrace.' To show that school that they get the short end of the funding, in comparison with a school like Glenunga or a school like Brighton—already highly successful public schools and highly sought after—sends a message to that community that this government is not as interested in making sure that that public school has everything it needs for its students to be successful.

Have a look at Adelaide High School. If memory serves, Adelaide High School received somewhere between \$20 million and \$30 million under the previous government, not while I was minister but a little earlier than that. I was involved in opening up the new facility that predecessors had approved. It is a very well-furnished school. Not only does it look good but people are desperate to get into that school and desperately want their children to attend.

It was required to fit in year 7s, despite being full and despite already being a very large school. It was given more money only to accommodate just enough to let year 7s in, not enough to continue the zones, the borders on the map that parents had understood would mean that their children would be able to go to school. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Bills

SINGLE-USE AND OTHER PLASTIC PRODUCTS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2020.)

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (12:01): I rise to speak briefly on the Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Bill. In doing so, I note that the shadow minister, the member for Port Adelaide, has already foreshadowed that we will be seeking to introduce some amendments that address the issues of reporting and review.

We all know just how big a role plastic has in our daily lives, and I often highlight to family and friends my concern at the amount of packaging there is for products that we purchase. May I also add how difficult it is for people in our community who have difficulty with finger and hand movements to unwrap this packaging. We only have to open our fridges and our pantries to see the amount of single-use plastic we accumulate and then dispose of on a weekly basis, and we can then multiply that by the population in South Australia.

It has an enormous impact on our environment. Sadly, we see so much of this going into our waste streams, making its way through our watercourses and into the ocean, which really is a tragedy. In my electorate of Torrens, many of my residents are diligent about sorting their waste, including plastics, into the right bins. When speaking with students in my local schools, it really is heartening to see the great way they contribute to the whole debate about our environment and climate change.

As we know, there are single-use disposable plastic products that can be replaced with other forms of products, and one of these examples, of course, is straws. However, in doing so we need to address the exceptional circumstances where these products are necessary. Only this week I spoke with a friend whose daughter lives with cerebral palsy, and I know that metal straws and paper

straws are not suitable alternatives for her, so we need to make sure that consideration is given to people with exceptional circumstances.

The early days of encouraging consumers to consider the environmental impact of product go back to the alternative for single-use plastic products with the refund on plastic bottles, where consumers can get a return deposit. Under the Dunstan Labor government, the Beverage Container Act 1975 was introduced principally to reduce littering and to encourage recycling.

There have been a number of significant changes to the container deposit scheme since its inception, largely relating to the types of beverage containers covered, which now includes plastic bottles, and there has also been an increase in the refund amount. This led to more South Australians participating, resulting in less litter in our streets and of course less being sent to landfill. For 35 years, South Australia was the only state with container deposit legislation.

I recently visited Adelaide Botanic High School and was impressed to see their water fountain system, where students are able to fill a water bottle with water from the fountain, and as they do it clocks up another bottle that has not been used and gone into landfill; it is about the number of bottles they keep out of the system. In 2009, the Rann Labor government introduced the phasing out of lightweight plastic shopping bags, and many of us here today give out shopping bags to our residents—of course, they are fabric shopping bags that can be used many, many times.

So the Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Bill before us today is a further step towards reducing the impact of waste on our environment, and I am pleased to be able to stand here today to support it.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (12:05): It gives me great pleasure to be able to close the debate on the Single-use and Other Plastic Products (Waste Avoidance) Bill 2020. I would like to take the time to thank all members for their contributions to the second reading of the bill and to thank them for their thoughtful ideas and input, the anecdotes they provided from their own personal experiences and particularly the stories and advocacy they had received and heard from the electorates that they have the privilege of representing.

There is absolutely no doubt in my mind—and it came forth in the anecdotes in speeches from both sides of this house—that the South Australian public is both proud of our heritage, in terms of waste management and resource recovery, and very excited about the future. I have absolutely no doubt that the South Australian community wants us to maintain that heritage and continue to push the boundaries when it comes to world-leading waste management and resource recovery. Single-use plastic legislation forms a key part of what the South Australian community expects of their government and of their political leaders and local representatives in this place. It is heartening to see a broad level of support for this legislation across all sides of politics in South Australia.

South Australia is a global leader. We are a global leader in waste management and resource recovery, and we are right to be immensely proud of the way that our state continues to implement best practice policies, procedures, programs and initiatives in the area of waste management and resource recovery. We can take that heritage back to 1977, when South Australia was the first mover in this country when we implemented the world-leading container deposit legislation. We were so advanced at the time that it has taken other jurisdictions decades to catch up, and they are only just getting there now. In fact, I believe Victoria only announced a few weeks ago that they were moving down the path of a container deposit legislation scheme, and it will be a couple of years yet before they catch up.

I was greatly interested to read on the BBC website and to hear from colleagues in Scotland that Scotland is going to go down this path in the coming months as well. They have actually been inspired by the work of the government of South Australia in this area. A delegation from Scotland visited a couple of years ago and were really inspired by what South Australia has done over several decades. They obviously took that back to Scotland and have now made the announcement that the Scottish government will be implementing a container deposit scheme, inspired by South Australia. Obviously, I was very pleased about that.

I had the opportunity to speak to Roseanna Cunningham, the Scottish environment minister, when I was over there in August 2019. Interestingly, she was actually educated in Australia and went

over and became Scotland's environment minister, and I came from Scotland to be South Australia's environment minister—so a little bit of quirkiness there.

The bill marks another historic moment for our state. It is another way that we are demonstrating South Australia's leadership in waste management and resource recovery. We know other jurisdictions are looking at us as an example, and they will follow us. It might take them some time, but they will follow us in taking action regarding single-use plastics. I hope it does not take them that long but, unfortunately, based on the historic pattern, sometimes it does take them too long to catch up.

Feedback from the South Australian community during consultation has been exceptionally clear: South Australians are committed to the environment and they want action on single-use plastic products. That has been the message we have had face to face from community members; it is a message we have had from many businesses, hearing that their customers are seeking alternative products to single-use plastics, and that is coming at point of sale from cafes, restaurants and events organisations. Albeit they have been through a tough time in the era of COVID-19, the message I am getting from retailers, catering organisations, cafes and restaurants, is that they most certainly want to see progress on this to give themselves certainty and to provide a level of comfort and confidence amongst their customer base.

I reiterate to the house that this bill only seeks to restrict and prohibit the products listed in clause 6(1), as well as oxo-degradable plastic products. Before adding other items to the list of prohibited plastic products via regulation, the consultation process outlined in clause 6(2) must be undertaken. Members have referred to the benefits of plastic through their speeches in the second reading part of this debate. Those benefits include in relation to the packaging of food. I am aware of these benefits, and they are important considerations that will be taken into account in considering other products that may be added to the list of prohibited plastic products in the future.

We know that plastic is a good thing in many ways. It has led to the modernisation of our nation and many other nations. It has led to greater hygiene and has seen the preservation of food. Plastic is not in itself a bad thing, and we should not get caught up in that, but when dealt with in inappropriate ways, when discarded into the environment, when used in a way that sees it become overabundant and unnecessary, plastic is not good in that regard.

It is important to draw that line between plastic as something that is an incredible invention of the 20th century and plastic that is a great environmental problem. We acknowledge the great benefits of plastic, the modernisation it has led to, but of course acknowledge the environmental problems that it has also led to. This legislation has been introduced into parliament by the Marshall Liberal government because we see those environmental impacts and want South Australia to continue that leadership in dealing with them.

As members would be aware, there is a need for further parliamentary scrutiny of all regulations, and this will be applied through the Legislative Review Committee as well as the availability of motions of disallowance should the community or members representing the community have a concern that something that is being proposed to be banned down the track will be inappropriate for a particular reason.

During consultation on the draft bill, submissions were received from national business associations and companies representing a diverse range of business interests that were supportive of the government's action on single-use plastic products. They emphasised the importance of allowing sufficient time to adjust to the new arrangements, reduce existing stocks and transition to alternative products. These concerns will be addressed through setting a date when the operation of the legislation will come into operation, and will be assisted by communication and awareness campaigns led by my portfolio.

In relation to local manufacturers who may be impacted by this legislation, I am advised that the response has again been exceptionally positive. Although some South Australian companies may be affected by the ban more than others, most offer a diverse range of product lines and are not solely reliant on the selling of products that are likely to be prohibited by this legislation.

The majority of businesses in South Australia that supply these types of products source them from various producers and manufacturers, and many are imported from overseas. It is

expected that suppliers will quickly adapt to the changing market to meet the growing demand for equal friendly alternatives, and we are seeing that already in cafes, restaurants and events-based organisations and in households all across the state. People are adapting. There is a consumer push to see that adaptation, and this in itself is driving a greater availability and, of course, lower costs because of market demands around the availability of these products.

There is also a great opportunity for South Australia to position itself as the place where these products are made. That will create jobs in South Australia and will lead to a situation where, when the other states do catch up and when demand increases in those states, South Australia can really put its hand up and say, 'Hey, we're over here. We're already in this space. Not only do we have the legislation backing us up in South Australia with runs on the board there but we also have the manufacturers of these alternative products based here in South Australia.'

We are seeing those manufacturers develop their capacity. I think of BioBag in Richmond. I have had the pleasure of being able to visit that organisation. They are doing great work, providing those plastic barrier bags, which can be used in households for lining kitchen caddies or in supermarkets as barrier bags and various other places. I think the opportunity for an organisation like BioBag with this sort of legislation is really substantial.

We are seeing organisations manufacturing alternatives to straws in South Australia as well. I have had the pleasure of dealing with an organisation called Mister Rye, which is looking at using a rye product from South Australian farms, treating the leftover part of the grain harvest to turn them into straws. It has been great that the couple involved in this company live down in my electorate in Seacliff. They are actually here on an entrepreneurial visa and are developing this alternative plastic product as part of their time in South Australia through that visa.

We can actually see examples of this legislation and the foreshadowing of this legislation over the last few months driving innovation and entrepreneurialism in the start-up sector as well. We know that some South Australian businesses are already transitioning substantially away from single-use plastic products, and suppliers are adapting to these consumer and business preferences. We have seen that feedback referenced in the 'Turning the tide' discussion paper and the consultation undertaken through the process of the draft bill.

We also have an important family-owned packaging business in our state. It is showing significant support for a legislative approach to single-use plastics as well. It already produces other types of products that are able to be recycled and composted. We hope, again, by sending this market signal, organisations like that can grab hold of the opportunity and expand and grow their base not just in South Australia but further afield as well.

Although sales associated with the ban on prohibited plastic products will cease, legislation such as this provides businesses that opportunity to know that there is a pathway, that government is really aligning itself with an environment that is freer of single-use plastics and that community sentiment and expectations are backing that up as a foundation. This emergence of a wide range of alternative products to single-use plastics really is testimony to how the market can respond, and absolutely the business sector should watch this.

They should scrutinise what government is doing. I think the business sector does have the confidence, but I would say quite clearly to the business sector that we want to work alongside you to minimise impacts and to create opportunities through this legislation rather than negatives. As mentioned by the member for Ramsay in her contribution to this debate, there are existing South Australian manufacturers of a whole range of products. I have come across these people and these organisations, and members on the other side of the house have certainly done so as well.

Interestingly, Business SA conducted a survey amongst its members on single-use plastics to inform feedback in the 'Turning the tide' discussion paper, of which the manufacturing sector was the most represented respondent. The results showed strong support for measures to reduce single-use plastics, including through legislation and regulation.

As referred to in my introductory speech to this legislation, there are a number of national initiatives underway in this area, and significant efforts are being made to improve the recyclability and recycled content of plastic packaging, while also phasing out unnecessary and problematic

single-use plastics. Again, it is great that South Australia is able to lead the way nationally and really show what a state that has its house in order with regard to this type of regulation and legislation can look like.

The government is very clearly committed to inclusiveness around this area, and this is why a broad exemption has been proposed to allow continued access to single-use plastic drinking straws for members of our community who rely on them. The government has listened to feedback from representatives of people living with disabilities and people with lived experience through the Single-use Plastic Stakeholder Taskforce, and we have decided not to prescribe specific outlets for the sale or supply of single-use plastic drinking straws, instead opting for a broader availability of these products to ensure that they remain easily accessible for those who need them.

I agree that we need to ensure there is no onus on people to have to provide proof in order to access the products they need to consume food and beverages safely. The government has made specific reference to that in the explanatory information that was made available publicly on the introduction of the bill to explain the proposed exemption. I look forward to refining the exemption and the development of regulations and encouraging contributions from stakeholders and interested persons, particularly those with lived experience.

It has been really good to be able to sit down with those people as part of the task force that we have established to help shape this draft legislation and to hear from those groups about the particular challenges they think that this legislation could have caused if not drafted in the right way. It is fair to say that they have given this legislation a ringing endorsement through that task force. We have had really solid feedback that they believe there is inclusiveness within this legislation and that the possibility that it could unintentionally not be seen as inclusive has been dealt with by the way that the legislation has been drafted.

We would be very keen to ensure that is continued through the regulations and we will be feeding back to those people, capturing their views again and relying on them for insight and advice as to how those regulations are shaped going forward. I note the deputy leader's comments about enforcement and agree that a credible option of enforcement is required to support implementation of the legislation. This is not unusual or uncommon.

There has been the same enforcement in place for container deposit legislation and the products that sit under that, and also the single-use plastic bag legislation, which was implemented by the previous government back in 2009. The same sort of compliance regime needs to be in place, although I do suspect that after a fairly short period of time South Australians, as they have done in the past, will embrace this legislation, will be proud of it and will simply get on with doing the right thing.

It is the government's clear intention that the regulatory approach will focus on education and communication about prohibited products and that efforts will be first made to support businesses in their transition to alternative products. However, as outlined in the bill, expiations and penalties can be applied and certainly will be, with my encouragement, if required.

The EPA, as the state's independent environmental regulator, will be able to take action where the authority considers it appropriate, for example, where systemic or ongoing noncompliance occurs, obviously using the tools of education and awareness raising in the first instance but of course moving to a compliance regime should there be wilful noncompliance identified. Success of this legislation will be a shift in consumer behaviour and a transition to other products not necessarily in the number of expiations issued or the number of penalties applied.

I would like to reiterate that the government will be undertaking communication activities in the lead-up to and during implementation of the legislation to support businesses in understanding their obligations and to help them to transition to alternative products. My portfolio agency, Green Industries SA—and I am immensely proud of the work that it has done in developing this legislation and consulting on it—have the experience in this regard as an agency. Back when it was then Zero Waste they implemented communications activities to support the ban in lightweight single-use plastic shopping bags with very substantial success.

The Single-use Plastic Stakeholder Taskforce, which comprises business, industry, retail, disability, local government and conservation representatives, is helping to inform these

communications activities from their respective experiences, and obviously then they will be able to push those through. They are particularly activated networks as well. The task force is also being informed by the experience of trialling plastic-free precincts across the state, which has been a great success to date trying to create particular areas where there is energy and enthusiasm around the phasing out of single-use plastics and the discovery and implementation of alternative products.

The initial group of single-use plastic free precincts—or plastic-free precincts in shorthand—are Jetty Road, Brighton; The Parade, Norwood; the Central Markets; and all the surf lifesaving clubs across the state. There are more of those plastic-free precincts being rolled out, but those four initial precincts have gone really well. We have learnt from it, they have learnt from it and there has been a real level of progress in terms of those business communities and NGO communities learning what works for them and sharing those stories with their communities and other players in their industries.

It is intended that our communications activities will provide practical guidance for businesses and industry sectors which are impacted by the legislation. Communications with businesses will make it clear that it will not be an offence under the legislation to sell or supply single-use plastic drinking straws to members of the community who require them due to disability or medical need, and that no proof is required to enable this transaction.

The government will recommend that businesses supply alternatives to single-use plastic drinking straws for their customers generally but also maintain a small stock of plastic straws to enable people to access those if needed on request. Assistance with signage to communicate this will also be provided. As referenced, too, by the deputy leader, there is a significant amount of greenwashing of products in relation to environmental claims that create confusion amongst the community. This bill seeks to address the products that are not genuinely compostable and will break down into microplastics causing as many problems, if not more, than they seek to avoid.

This greenwashing is a great concern of mine and I see it in supermarkets. The deputy leader was right to raise it, and it is something we want to deal with. I actually had a message from the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, presumably taken in a Barossa supermarket, where he was confused about a product called 'greener' so and so, when it was actually just a product name for plastic bags made of oxo-degradable plastics, and certainly would not be beneficial for the environment.

There are too many people just walking up to supermarket shelves and grabbing particular products—although we cannot blame people for doing this while they are doing their shopping—thinking that, because it had a big sign on it saying 'greener' so and so, or 'greener' whatever, that it was a product that could be put in the green bin or would break down very quickly through a normal waste management process. We know that is not the case, and we do need to get on top of these oxo-degradable plastics.

The definition of oxo-degradable plastic in the legislation is broad enough to capture the different names used for these products: for example, 'oxo-biodegradable' and 'degradable', where additives have been included to accelerate their breakdown into smaller pieces of plastic but are not—as too many people think—able to be composted.

In relation to greenwashing claims, there is also a role for consumer affair authorities in holding companies to account for their claims. This legislation does not seek to address all misleading environmental claims that could be pursued under Australian Consumer Law. To support enforcement of this part of the legislation, the bill contains a provision that enables the EPA to seek certification from manufacturers and producers as to whether or not their products contain oxo-degradable plastic. A form to guide this requirement is to be developed by the EPA and will be made public should businesses wish to proactively seek this information.

As mentioned earlier, communication activities will help businesses and suppliers understand the requirements of the legislation and to find appropriate alternative products, including the replacement of any oxo-degradable plastic products. A big part of this will clearly be education, and raising awareness amongst retailers and consumers, about what oxo-degradable is and why it is not as good as the packaging might suggest. If businesses are seeking products that are able to be legitimately composted, the government strongly recommends these products have the

appropriate certification to Australian standards. If not, they should be seeking appropriate re-usable and recyclable alternatives.

As outlined in my introductory speech, and in a number of remarks made in the public domain through the media, I will be considering the impacts of coronavirus and social distancing measures on businesses in determining a commencement date for this legislation, acknowledging that during this era of coronavirus being present in our country, and existing as a threat to our state, that it is necessary to pay attention to that in deciding when this legislation will commence. It is my very dear hope that this will occur towards the end of 2020. I have made that statement publicly and that remains my hope.

I really do hope that the amount of single-use plastic, which we know has gone up in this difficult season, will hopefully start to drop down quite dramatically again. We do not want to get into a situation where the war on single-use plastic, which we were making some really good progress on in South Australia, is undone unintentionally as a consequence of the difficulties that have emerged since the beginning of 2020.

I note the deputy leader's amendments that have been placed on file. While I am not in a position to outline the government's response to these, at this point I am happy to enter the committee stage up until the first of those amendments in about clause 12, I believe. This bill, along with the progressive policy initiatives being implemented within this state, and having been implemented over many decades in this state, keeps South Australia in a leadership position at the forefront of waste management resource recovery and litter management and, importantly and critically, in circular economy development in South Australia.

We do not want this just to be a big stick approach that says you should not be using single-use plastics. This government believes we need to significantly reduce the presence of single-use plastics in our state. We believe that will have really substantial conservation benefits in our outdoor areas, in our parks, along our coastline, in our marine environments, and we think this is something that South Australians will grab hold of, they will be proud of, they will promote and they will do well in achieving.

The word 'historic' might be a little bit overused in this place, but I think it is a special moment to see this legislation begin its journey towards the other place and hopefully through both houses of parliament in the coming weeks. This is good legislation—it will do good things and it will set South Australia in a position of continued leadership—and we should all be proud of the heritage that we have in waste management and resource recovery. I commend the bill to the house.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1 passed.

Clause 2.

Dr CLOSE: My question acknowledges that the minister has partially addressed this in his close of second reading speech, but I would like to understand better what triggers he will use to decide to commence the act, to have the act come into operation. I appreciate, and I think we all support, the challenge of the COVID crisis. Is it actually an end to the emergency period, or are there other triggers that will be used?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, deputy leader, for that question. It is a really sensible question because it is something that there is an uncertainty about; there is no doubt about that. I think it probably goes a little beyond the emergency period. We always anticipated having a period of time between the legislation passing and commencement so that we could undertake substantial education and communication activities, notwithstanding this legislation being well discussed publicly for some time now.

I mentioned in my closing remarks that we have a very successful task force with lots of representation from industry, and we have conservation groups advocates from the disability sector and the like on it. I will certainly be going to them and working through this, consulting with them and

seeking a level of confidence that they think this is ready to be commenced. I have to say that my threshold is not going to be ridiculously high.

I think the South Australian public are ready for this legislation. I think they want it. You should not pay too much attention to social media, but when we put this bill in, right in the midst of COVID and potentially a worrying time for South Australia, I thought, 'Is this the right time?' However, the social media sentiment was very much 'get on with it', so I think South Australians are ready for this. My view is that we should be looking towards the end of the year for this, probably the last quarter of 2020, but I will be seeking advice and endorsement, to some extent, from the task force that we have established and will go from there.

Dr CLOSE: I would invite the minister to clarify which elements will be prohibited from immediate commencement and which ones will be deferred for a longer period of time.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There will be a number of tranches in this. Our hope is that the legislation has durability into the future and can continue to be updated through the regulation side of things. But the first tranche, which we expect to commence when the legislation is commenced, would be straws, drink stirrers and plastic cutlery, which make up a very significant proportion of the single-use plastic discarded waste stream, particularly the straws and the plastic cutlery. Drink stirrers are a little bit less present these days. Then, 12 months later, we will move into that expanded polystyrene product range: the clamshell takeaway containers and the like and the oxo-degradable products as well. That will be 12 months after the legislation.

I really hope that over time the parliament will identify other products to phase out through regulation, but also that the community will push for certain items as well, and it will become obvious over time when other things will need to be phased out. There are a couple of things that we need to get a handle on: barrier bags—we know there are alternatives there—and we also need to work out the future of coffee cups and how they are dealt with.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Dr CLOSE: There is a reference to the oxo-degradable plastic, and of course it is then scattered through the bill, but I thought I would ask my question at this point. What other products are there that have the same consequences of being degradable, are often being sold as degradable, but in fact are not compostable? Is all of that kind of product encapsulated under the title of oxo-degradable or are there other materials that have a similar issue but are not known as oxo-degradable?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This is a relatively tricky area, but we have drafted the legislation so that it will capture all the products that have those additives within them that will accelerate the breaking up—probably breaking up is a better word for me to use—of these items. Often the main sorts of items are the plastic bags. The definition and the way this is interpreted in the legislation, it captures oxo-degradable but also degradable and oxo-biodegradable. It is these items that have the additive within them that sees that fragmenting of the plastic product. We think we have probably been able to capture all of that.

Our focus really will be, in terms of compliance and educational awareness among the retailers and the consumer as well—because we want to knock off interest in these products and raise community awareness around greenwashing—around the plastic bags, the bin liners, the sandwich bags, the things that people are accidentally lining their kitchen caddies with and dropping into the green bin, thinking that that will just break down through the industrial composting process at Jeffries or Peats and the like, but actually that will not be the case. Hopefully that answers the deputy leader's query.

Dr CLOSE: Thank you. Are there products that are sold as degradable that do not have an accelerant in them but nonetheless are sold as degradable and eventually break down but are not compostable? Is there another category of product?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Yes, there could be another strand of product here that does not have the additives but could be referenced as degradable. At this point, we would direct the

compliance through Australian Consumer Law because it becomes difficult for us to focus in on. It is one of those things: how long is a piece of string? That word can be used quite loosely and we know where the problem is here. The government is going to have a particular focus on where we think the problem is, but no doubt there could be other things that crop up from time to time and the Australian Consumer Law legislation and pathway could be used there.

Clause passed.

Clauses 4 and 5 passed.

Clause 6.

Dr CLOSE: The list that has been presented here is obviously one that has a high degree of support and endorsement from the task force and also the wider community. What other items were considered for inclusion and not supported to be on this initial list?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Thank you, deputy leader. As you have identified, that list in clause 6—Prohibited plastic products, goes through those sort of headline items that we have talked a lot about publicly. This is really where the task force focused most of its efforts because these had been identified through consultation as being those items that are used a lot, are around, that people understand are a problem, and that come up in the KESAB surveys and the like.

The other items which were really considered in a broad sense, and which I think we should be looking at in the medium to longer term, are coffee cups. The great challenge with coffee cups is that you get some that are compostable, you get some that are recyclable and you get some that are neither, and we have to do a bit of work around what we think is the standard that South Australians should be after.

The compostable cups are only compostable if they go through the industrial composting process through the green kerbside bin, the recyclable ones sometimes have to be put through a particular process that separates the plastic lining from them, and then there are others in the mix that are neither and can only really end up in the municipal waste bin. We do need to get a handle on coffee cups. It probably needs a further bit of work around it and probably a bit of research as well.

With the thicker plastic bags, as you would be aware, the previous government really successfully saw a massive reduction in the presence of lightweight plastic bags in South Australia. Creeping in over time have been those thicker plastic bags, which are very readily available at the point of sale in supermarkets but also in the more boutique stores, so I think we probably do need to look at that in the medium term.

I am very keen to look at barrier bags, the items you put your fruit and veg in at the markets or in the fruit and veg aisle in the supermarket. The alternative is there, the price point is coming down and we know there are manufacturers in South Australia, so we could be very well placed to move on those in the medium term. We then need to look at broader categories of takeaway plastics and takeaway containers, whether beverage containers or food containers. All those things were discussed in broad terms by the task force, but we expect to focus in on them in the future.

Dr CLOSE: What process will be used, presumably by Green Industries, to work through how to assess what will come up next? I appreciate the list has already been given of what is likely to be considered next, but what process will be undertaken, particularly to address the coffee cup and barrier bag issues, which are both areas which people might have expected to see on this list?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: You are right to say that there is likely to be a desire from some parts of the community to see this legislation go further. I think we probably have the initial list right for the time being to get us a vehicle to move forward with this legislation, but I do not think it is any secret from the sentiment that I am suggesting that certainly while I am the minister I will be seeking us to prosecute a few more items and try to look for opportunities. There would obviously be nothing to stop members of this place or the other place from in the future bringing forward regulations to add other items.

The task force will continue. It may not meet quite as often, but certainly through this period of implementation, in fact, it may meet just as often, to be honest. Through the communications and

the implementation and working at the compliance and the acceptance of the legislation, the task force will continue to be in existence. I foresee it continuing for the foreseeable future. As a consequence, there will be an avenue through that task force for other items to be looked at.

I guess the next tranche of items has the possibility of perhaps being a little bit more disruptive to business. I think business is up for the challenge in many ways, but the coffee cups one, because of the confusion out there and the need to come to a landing around what constitutes an acceptable coffee cup product in South Australia where people do not get confused as to which bin they put it in, I think will need a fair bit more work and consultation with industry. It probably needs a bit more consultation with the community as well. With thicker plastic bags and barrier bags, there is also a little bit of business impact there, probably no more so than the plastic cutlery or the straws, though, and there probably needs to be a bit more consultation on an expanded version of takeaway containers as well.

I see this as an evolving process. The task force will stay in place. Whether I am the minister or it is someone else down the track, there will be an element required of ministerial leadership and discretion as to what to push forward. Certainly, there would be an opportunity for people simply to propose products to the minister or to Green Industries SA down the track.

But I guess my message is that there is certainly a willingness from me at a ministerial level, and I think there is an administrative willingness within the bureaucracy just to keep on progressing this journey. The evidence of that is the way we have set up the legislation to make it quite easy to add things over time without needing to go through the whole legislative process but, instead, bring those in to the parliament via regulation.

Clause passed.

Clause 7.

Dr CLOSE: I have a question here about the impact on South Australian businesses. I appreciate that the businesses would not be able to sell into the South Australian market but would be able to continue to sell interstate if they make these products. What is the estimate of the impact on any business, and obviously Detmold is one, for them to lose the South Australian market?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I do not have a specific cost estimate on what financial impact this would have. We have worked closely alongside the major packaging businesses in this state, the Detpak products being the most significant. They have a fairly significant recyclable arm to their organisation and they also have some compostable products as well, I think. The move amongst all the packaging manufacturers that we have spoken to has been quite rapidly towards products which would be likely to meet the requirements of this legislation.

I think the direction the wind has been blowing on this has been present for the last few years. Many of these businesses are innovative and entrepreneurial and have seen that they do need to evolve. I think it is impossible to please everyone all of the time with this but I think we have a fairly good level of support from business, certainly from Business SA as the state's Chamber of Commerce providing an endorsement of this legislation. I cannot put a figure on potential financial losses. I think that is probably quite hard to quantify, particularly when businesses are developing these alternatives and pushing them into the market probably in front of the products that might not be acceptable under this legislation.

Dr CLOSE: Did any of these companies get in touch with either Green Industries or the ministerial office to raise any concerns about impact on their business?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There were no organisations which got in touch specifically to oppose the legislation. I think they were probably quite nervous, too, given the community support for it. Most of their overtures were around the time in terms of transition time, ensuring that there were appropriate transition periods in place. I met with Detmold and that conversation was really quite positive.

There was some correspondence, which the deputy leader may have received, from an organisation called Dairy Luv in the last couple of weeks, which was probably based on a bit of a false premise that this would somehow block their product. There is no intention in the legislation at

this stage to do anything of the sort, and anything in the future would be by regulation which would obviously be disallowable. We are open to having conversations with any business that feels they are particularly impacted, but there has not been that significant level of concern raised, and all these groups have been fairly well represented, I would suggest, through the task force process.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Ministerial Statement

HEAVY VEHICLE INSPECTION SCHEME

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:02): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Following an inquest into a fatal accident in January 2014, the Coroner recommended that all heavy vehicles should be subject to a periodic and frequent inspection regime. The government initiated a pilot heavy vehicle inspection program in January 2017 to identify, monitor and mitigate unroadworthiness as a causative factor in crashes on South Australian roads, which required an inspection on change of ownership of a heavy vehicle, otherwise known as stage 1. Stage 1 of the HVIS has improved the roadworthiness of heavy vehicles and is providing valuable information to inform targeted, on-road compliance activities aimed at vehicles more likely to be noncompliant.

In 2017, work commenced on a process to implement an annual heavy vehicle inspection program (stage 2) and a tender was released seeking proposals for a vendor-led delivery model. The procurement set out requirements for regional service delivery to ensure regional operators were not disproportionately impacted by the imposition of fees or accessibility when compared to those in the metropolitan area.

The viability of the stage 2 scheme was dependent on volumes, which have reduced over the course of the procurement due to some vehicles being exempted and the increasing number that have moved to the National Heavy Vehicle Accreditation Scheme. Following an exhaustive process to identify a provider for stage 2 of the scheme, the procurement has been concluded without a recommendation to award a contract.

Given the greater number of vehicles captured by stage 2, in comparison to stage 1, it was estimated that an additional cost of over \$10½ million per annum would fall on South Australian heavy vehicle owners for annual vehicle inspections alone. In addition to the cost of inspections, the nonproductive time and cost of travel to and from inspections for heavy vehicle owners—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —were considered excessive and could result in a loss of productivity, competitiveness and hurt local jobs in the South Australian industry. The requirements for an inspection for change of ownership are still in place, with further details available at the Heavy Vehicle Inspection website. Change of ownership inspection services will now be provided at existing Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure metropolitan and regional locations.

To continue to improve road safety and heavy vehicle roadworthiness compliance, the state government will investigate additional options in consultation with the National Heavy Vehicle Regulator and SAPOL and in response to the review of the roadworthiness regulations nationally by the National Transport Commission.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, be quiet.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following paper was laid on the table:

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

Rules made under the following Acts—
Water Industry—Standard for Dual Reticulation Infrastructure

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

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

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:06): I bring up the fifth report of the committee, entitled Inquiry into Use of Off-Road Vehicles in South Australia.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (14:06): I bring up the 88th report of the committee, entitled Adelaide High School Redevelopment.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

INTEGRITY CARE SA

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:07): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier satisfied that every worker at Integrity Care, the agency caring for Ms Ann Marie Smith at the time of her death nearly two months ago, has the appropriate screening and clearance to care for vulnerable South Australians?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:08): In relation to this question, which she touched on yesterday, I repeat the situation is this: the investigation, criminal investigation by the police, is underway in relation to the circumstances surrounding the death of Ann Marie Smith.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Kaurna and the member for Playford are called to order.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The agency in relation to the employment—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Defer all you like. We are asking about the screening.

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —of course is the NDIA and the commission.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The services provided to Ms Smith were through a federal agency, and you are familiar with the current circumstances surrounding that. I am advised—I have had a briefing from the police in relation to their investigation, and I can't add anything further in

relation to who or what they are investigating, but I can say that Integrity Care is part of that investigation and I can't make any further comment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, there's a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir: the question did not ask about the police investigation into Ann Marie Smith.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The question—

The SPEAKER: Yes, I have the point of order; I don't need the speech. I have written down the question. I have the point of order. In fairness to the Deputy Premier, there have probably been over five members who have been interjecting during the first minute of the Deputy Premier's answer. The question did contain—

Mr Brown: She was all over the place.

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford, you can leave for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: What I will do is listen to the Deputy Premier's answer. I assure the member for West Torrens that if the Deputy Premier, after some relevant background information she is giving, steps out of line, I will bring her back into line. The Deputy Premier will try. The Deputy Premier has the call.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I have concluded.

The SPEAKER: You have concluded your answer? I am going to give the member for Hurtle Vale another question. The member for Hurtle Vale has the call.

INTEGRITY CARE SA

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. What steps has the Premier taken to ensure that every worker at Integrity Care has the appropriate screening clearance to care for vulnerable South Australians?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:10): Again, can I point out to the member that I have had a briefing on this matter by the police, who are looking at this matter and all of the circumstances surrounding it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I don't need the interjections, members, please.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the member wants to make some inquiry in relation to any of the entities that are under investigation—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —then I could only encourage her to refer that matter to the police commissioner, if he sees fit to provide that information. I have received a briefing, and I am not in a position to make any further comment other than the fact that Integrity Care is part of that investigation.

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I can't make any further comment on it.

INTEGRITY CARE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:11): Supplementary question: is the government not concerned that there are potentially employees of Integrity Care currently looking after vulnerable South Australians without any clearance?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:11): What I am concerned about is that the Leader of the Opposition is declining to accept the advice of the police on this matter. They are the ones—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If the Leader of the Opposition is of the view that making any further statement in relation to the investigation, which includes Integrity Care, is—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: We're not asking about the investigation.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that I not make any further inquiry about what the police are doing in relation to this matter, then he needs to address that to the police commissioner. I can't and won't make any other statement in relation to it.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think that the Leader of the Opposition as a former police minister would understand the significance of having a briefing and receiving advice.

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will not in any way contravene or interfere with that investigation, including their investigation in relation to Integrity Care.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am going to give the leader one more and then I am moving to the member for Heysen.

INTEGRITY CARE SA

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:12): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier's government received any advice from the police commissioner or anyone from SAPOL that they are under no circumstances to check if Integrity Care are employing people without the appropriate clearance?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:12): Again, I can't be certain of any others, but I think the parliament has already been informed—

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

The SPEAKER: Member for Mawson, we've got the question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that I received a briefing in relation to this matter that the police commissioner had received advice in relation to the statement that was going to be at that stage made by the police on the day of 15 May. I can't be any clearer: I will not in any way cut across the investigation of the police in relation to that matter—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —including Integrity Care. I simply won't contravene that request. If the member as a citizen wants to make some other approach to the police commissioner, he can do so, but I cannot make any further statement on this matter.

The SPEAKER: I am going to switch to the member for Heysen and I will come back to the member for Hurtle Vale. The member for Heysen has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader, be quiet. Member for Heysen.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, you are on two warnings.

TOURISM

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting tourism businesses to get back up and running?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:14): That is an excellent question. We are doing a lot of work to support the tourism sector; it is a vitally important sector here in South Australia. One thing which I would like to update the house on is how well South Australia did in 2019; in fact, we have just seen some figures which showed more than an 8 per cent increase in tourism in South Australia during 2019, and a 4 per cent increase in the number of people employed, up to 41,000 people.

We said when we put out our sector plan for the visitor economy, which was sitting when we published that plan at \$7.6 billion, that we wanted to get to \$12.8 billion by 2030. As of the end of December, we were already at \$8.1 billion, so making great progress with an 8 per cent increase in 2019.

Can I say, 2020 hasn't been so kind to the tourism sector in South Australia. We know that devastating bushfires, which began on 20 December last year and burned in South Australia in various places, in particular on Kangaroo Island and in the Adelaide Hills, had a devastating effect on our tourism sector and also the way consumers perceived Australia from international markets. Nevertheless, we were very quick to get out with a #BookThemOut campaign to support those operators to drive dollars back to those areas as quickly as possible. You can imagine how devastating it was then only a few weeks later to be in the midst of this global coronavirus pandemic. It has been a major hit to this sector.

We moved very quickly in this sector to put \$5.7 million on the table to help those communities survive this period of time and come out the other side stronger than before. We put money into regional tourism associations. We put money into different events to try to help them cope with some of their cancellation costs.

We also put money into the small business sector of the tourism industry, and in particular provided them with access to grants, access to financial advice and also advice on how they could digitise their business. In fact, with our early calls in terms of those financial seminars and digital economy seminars, they were oversubscribed and had to be extended.

In addition to that, of course, we have given all small businesses in South Australia access to the \$10,000 grant in South Australia, which is now closed off but has been enormously popular. More than \$13 million has already been paid out and many tens of millions of dollars are still to come on that. That has really provided many small businesses who are dependent on cash coming in to pay last month's bills an absolute lifeline, as has the federal government's JobKeeper program.

There are still some very tough months ahead. One of the things that we did early was to make sure that we could open up for intrastate travel as quickly as possible—we were the first state in Australia to do that—and also to make sure that what we could do would be to open up for caravanning and camping. I know that there have been some fantastic bookings for this long weekend.

We have also now launched a \$1.5 million Welcome Back strategy, the campaign which I know is going to drive intrastate travel. We are looking forward to better times ahead, but certainly the start of 2020 has been a tough time, but it's very much being supported by this government trying to enable people to get back on their feet and come out the other side stronger than before.

INTEGRITY CARE SA

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:18): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier ensure appropriate steps are taken to suspend Integrity Care's operations until such time as they are able to meet the screening requirements of the bilateral agreement—

An honourable member interjecting:

Ms COOK: I will get to leave; I am coming to that. Can I finish the question?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms COOK: I will start again, sorry, I have lost my place. Will the Premier ensure appropriate steps are taken to suspend Integrity Care's operations until such time as they are able to meet the screening requirements of the bilateral agreement he signed with the commonwealth for the NDIS? With your leave and that of the house I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms COOK: The agreement, signed by the Premier on 29 June 2018, states:

Consistent with the NDIS Quality and Safeguarding Framework, South Australia is responsible for the authorisation and consent arrangements for regulated restrictive practices in South Australia required by South Australian legislation and for the operational aspects of worker screening.

The SPEAKER: That does give the government enormous scope to answer, and I am going to afford the courtesy of that scope to the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:19): Whilst I do not accept the connections the member's question has made between certain claims—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —can I say this—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —I am, and I know the government is, quite confident in understanding that, if there are connections between the issues that have been raised, the government is continuing to support and ensure that the current police investigation has all information available and we will, of course, await their outcome in relation to that. I know the member has made a number of presumptions in relation to that question. I am not even going to comment on the accuracy of it because—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Badcoe is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —whilst it might be an easy way to try to remove a lot of red herrings in relation to these matters, I am not going to be drawn into that.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: That is a matter for the police. I have every confidence that the police—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —are looking at the question of whether there has been compliance with the law in relation to screening tests, or any other process. That is a matter which is under their investigation.

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You better hope that's right, Vickie.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned for a second final time, and if this continues he will be departing the chamber today.

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining is also called to order. The member for Hurtle Vale.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:21): My question is for the Attorney-General. Is the Attorney-General telling the house that the police are currently investigating the screening unit of the Department of Human Services, and, if not, why won't she answer questions about that unit's current operation?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:21): Again, the police investigation includes Integrity Care. If the member wants to have information about the process of what happens by the department generally in relation to the operation of the screening unit, the Hon. Michelle Lensink gave a very comprehensive and long answer as to how the process occurs, as to what information is populated in it, as to what reforms are at a national level in relation to it—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and to the expected operation and commencement of those new reforms in February next year. That gives a very detailed outline as to how the unit operates generally, but I will not and cannot answer any questions in relation to Integrity Care—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —who, I repeat, are part of the current police investigation.

The SPEAKER: I will give the member for Hurtle Vale one more and then we are moving to the member for Morphett.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:22): My question is to the Attorney-General. Why will the Attorney-General not answer questions in relation to state government screening for carers other than Ann Marie Smith?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:22): I thought I had, and I won't try to repeat what the Hon. Michelle Lensink has said in relation to the general process that occurs outside of the Smith case. I have made that clear. There was a very comprehensive outline by the minister yesterday to the parliament as to how the process works, how the information is populated and transferred in it under the current law relating to screening tests generally.

She is very much in charge of the day-to-day operation of that, but I make the point that the applicability of our law in relation to screening tests is a matter in respect of Integrity Care which is under investigation. Our government will continue to support whatever inquiries the police are making

and, indeed, the other inquiries that are occurring via the judicial inquiry at the national level and the task force inquiry here, and we will, of course, in relation to the future coronial inquiry. But at the moment I cannot offer any other information as to whether there has been compliance or any other matter. That is a matter for police investigation.

SKILLS TRAINING

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (14:24): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills.

Members interjecting:

Mr PATTERSON: Just be courteous. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is delivering on its skills and training policy?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:25): I thank the member for Morphett for his question. I know he likes to be part of a winning team, being a former Collingwood player, and of course the South Australian government is a winning team. We are nation-leading when it comes to skills training here in South Australia. The latest NCVET figures for September 2019 show that there was a 20 per cent increase in the number of commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships in South Australia compared to a national increase of just 1.7 per cent.

Not only that, this has happened because of a partnership that we have, that we signed, with the Morrison government back in September a year earlier, unlike the people's republic of Victoria, who refused to sign that partnership with the Morrison government. They went backwards in the same period by 3 per cent, minus 3 per cent growth in commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships.

Of course, we have put money where our mouth is. We went to the election with a policy to create more apprenticeships and traineeships here in South Australia. Those opposite: no apprenticeship policy, no training policy. Our first two budgets, we spent \$50 million more than the last two budgets of those opposite in skills training. We have hit targets. We have delivered more apprenticeships and traineeship commencements since the establishment of Skilling South Australia.

The Marshall government of course welcomes Prime Minister Morrison's announcement last week for the JobMaker plan, where we will have a much stronger focus on apprenticeships and traineeships. How good is it to hear a Prime Minister elevate apprenticeships and traineeships here in Australia? We have all been in politics for a very long time. When was the last time we have seen a Prime Minister take responsibilities for skills training? I haven't seen it. I didn't see it when I was employing apprentices myself. I didn't even see it when I was an apprentice.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I was an apprentice. What that tells us is that the federal government knows what we have known, what we have implemented, since we have been in government, and that is you need to work with industry to find out what they need to skill their industry. That's why we re-established industry skills councils. Remember those? You abolished them about 10 years ago. Industry skills councils: we are getting our information about where those skills are needed directly from industry. We are delivering bespoke programs through our Skilling South Australia program: \$20 million spent so far, delivering over 100 different bespoke programs.

Gone are the days of one size fits all. We saw that happening over the last 16 years: one size fits all, fewer apprentices. That's the outcome that they achieved opposite. We have been working with industry, working with even the individual businesses, so that we can understand what their barriers are and what we can do to help them take on apprentices and trainees, because we recognise that there is a cost to the employer for doing so, and so we have been supporting them in doing that.

Of course, there are massive growth industries here in South Australia. Defence, we've got right in front of that by announcing and delivering our Diploma of Applied Technologies, a brand-new apprenticeship for those moving into the engineering space in the defence sector. It is a three-year

apprenticeship. It will take off the first year of a degree in engineering if you decide to do that after you have finished your apprenticeship or you can stay working with those qualifications in the defence sector. It is a very exciting time for skills training in Australia.

HUMAN SERVICES SCREENING UNIT

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (14:28): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier order an immediate audit of all workers providing care for the around 4,000 vulnerable South Australians to ensure that they have appropriate screening, as he is required to do under the bilateral agreement for the NDIS signed on 29 June 2018?

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: It's the same question.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:28): It does have a familiar ring about it, that's true.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Again, the—

Mr Picton interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Kaurana is warned.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: The joining of the dots by the member in the question claiming certain links with things is not accepted. However, I just want to assure the member and the house that the government is doing everything it can in relation to, firstly, assisting the police in relation to their inquiry, which includes circumstances relating to the agency, as I have referred to. Our government departments are working hard to support the police investigation and a number of other inquiries—I won't repeat them, you know what they are—and we will continue to do that. But in relation to the—

The Hon. Z.L. Bettison interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Ramsay!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —service and what we're doing to assist the police, and what we're doing in relation to the assistance that we have provided, which we have committed to do, I am simply not at liberty to provide that detail to the member. I will not compromise that circumstance. The Premier provided to the parliament—I think, two days ago, or it may have been yesterday—his indication that our government didn't, upon coming into government, go through and audit all of the previous government's processes and who they had contracted and who they had utilised for services in the disability area. I suppose to some degree we relied on the previous government and the agencies that supported it to properly support those with disability in our community.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: But the indications of this recent case do raise the question about how can somebody be in an agency for five years, as it was under the previous government—we inherited it and nobody seemed to notice. That is a real question, but we are doing something about it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and we will continue to do something about it, and we will make sure—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You signed the bilateral.

The SPEAKER: Order! I did not sign the bilateral.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —and I want to reassure the house of this: that we will make sure, initially through the task force, with all of the expertise in relation to that—and of course hopefully this will also be further informed once the police have concluded their investigation, which may or may not result in matters that they pursue, but we will on this side of the house, continue to be vigilant in relation to this area. There is no question about that from the government's point of view, and although—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader! Members on my left!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —the member continues apparently to be frustrated about not having particular details as to the operation of government, which is in the support of the police investigation—

Ms Stinson: You should be frustrated you don't have the details.

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe is on two warnings.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —I can't do anything about that at this point.

DISABILITY SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My supplementary question is to the Premier. Is there any agency within the state government that is currently ensuring that every worker in the sector has the appropriate clearances?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (14:32): Again, I think it's just a repeat in a more simplified form of what's already been asked, so I make the point that the government are continuing to undertake their responsibility, including in supporting the police inquiry. In relation to the statutory obligations that of course we continue to have in relation to guardianship and the like, they are ongoing, continuing obligations and we will continue to do what is required of us.

Mr Malinauskas: Well, no-one's checking, so we haven't learnt the lesson.

The SPEAKER: Order, leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In addition to that, we will not receive the demands of the opposition—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that in some way we should act—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that would prejudice the investigation that is otherwise being undertaken.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Hurtle Vale is on two warnings, as is the member for Badcoe. We are switching to the member for King, and then I will come back to the member for Elizabeth, who is kindly waiting.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:33): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is better supporting children and young people in residential care and facilitating the skills and training and development of staff?

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

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

The SPEAKER: Not to the extent that I am going to rule it out.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:33): I thank the member for King for her ongoing interest in child protection in my portfolio. Whilst this government has a strong focus on increasing family-based care through both—

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Badcoe!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —kinship care and foster care, we still have over 500 children in non-family based care. For some of these children, we are hopeful of reunification with their families and for some we are hopeful of family-based placements, but for some residential care is the most appropriate form of care for these children. For these children, it's important to endeavour to provide the best care possible. My department and I have been researching, visiting and consulting on therapeutic residential care models interstate and throughout the world.

I am pleased to announce to the house that we have selected the Sanctuary model of therapeutic residential care. Children and young people living in residential care will benefit from this new therapeutic model of care, which is trauma informed. It will transform the existing non-family based care model in line with the Marshall Liberal government's strategy for children and young people: 'Every effort for every child'.

We are investing more than \$600,000 to roll out the Sanctuary model across all Department for Child Protection residential care homes. Extensive training and development will be provided as part of the rollout over the next three years by the MacKillop Family Services. The Sanctuary model respects the relationships operational staff have with children and young people and enhances the staff experience as well as the experience of children. It is an evidence-based model that has proven results interstate and will aim to provide better outcomes for children and young people in care.

The Sanctuary model also maintains a strong focus on organisational culture, encouraging a commitment across the department to understand and support the principles of the model. To achieve this, we will be asking staff from different areas of the department to become champions of the model and undertake further training. We selected the Sanctuary model, as it responds in a holistic manner to the needs of children and young people who have a history of trauma.

It best responds to the needs of residential care staff by supporting them to deliver consistent care that is therapeutic, culturally appropriate and responsive to the complex needs of children and young people who have experienced trauma. It respects the relationship operational staff have with children and young people and is designed to enhance the staff experience as well as the experience of the children and young people. It also acknowledges the unique experiences of Aboriginal people and supports culturally responsive and culturally safe practice and care.

Maintaining a skilled and robust workforce is fundamental to promoting a high-quality residential care system for children and young people, and the training program provided through this model will enable staff to build the capacity of children and young people to form positive relationships with others. I thank all of our staff, especially those working on the front line in residential care, who go above and beyond every day to care for and support our most vulnerable children and young people.

The implementation of the Sanctuary model of therapeutic residential care is all part of the Marshall Liberal government's whole-of-government approach to supporting vulnerable families, protecting children in care and investing in their futures. We are always looking for more foster carers, so I encourage those who may have thought about foster care before to take the steps to find out more. To find out more you can go to fostercare.sa.gov.au or call 1300 2 FOSTER.

SMITH, MS A.M.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Police. Will the minister advise the house when he first heard of the death of Ann Marie Smith? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ODENWALDER: When the minister was asked yesterday when the minister was informed by SAPOL of the death of Ann Marie Smith, he responded, and I quote, 'I am just checking my notes here because I have been given a number of briefings,' before stating, and again I quote, 'My first formal identification from SAPOL was, I apologise, 15 May.'

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:38): 15 May.

SMITH, MS A.M.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:38): My question again then is to the Minister for Police. Had the minister been advised informally prior to 15 May of the death of Ann Marie Smith? With your leave again, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr ODENWALDER: The Attorney-General yesterday told the house that the Minister for Police had received notice prior to the police announcement on what was to be a major crime investigation into the death of Ann Marie Smith.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:38): No.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Well, Vickie, what did you tell us yesterday?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my right! I am just reminding the member for West Torrens that he is on two warnings.

SMITH, MS A.M.

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (14:39): My question is again to the Minister for Police. Who did the Minister for Police inform once he had been advised of the death of Ann Marie Smith?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:39): The Premier's office.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the government match the commitment made by the opposition leader yesterday, pledging \$91 million to connect to SA Water mains the approximate 4,700 households of the City of Tea Tree Gully's community wastewater system, which includes approximately 120 homes in the electorate of Florey? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: Tea Tree Gully's Community Wastewater Management System is probably the oldest and largest in the metropolitan area. It has been an ongoing issue for the north-east for around 60 years. Since being elected, I have made representations to successive ministers, including you, sir, about this anomaly. I understand from the council the \$91 million pledged likely includes householder conversion costs for decommissioning septic tanks and connecting to mains sewers that can range to up to \$12,000, depending on site conditions. I believe a bipartisan commitment to addressing this anomaly could enable conversion works to start before the next election to the benefit of all in the COVID economic recovery.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: This isn't the Legislative Council.

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:40): I thank the member for Florey for her question. I know this is a matter she has been following up for some years, which is in marked contrast to the opposition, who were in government for 16 years. They had an epiphany over the last few weeks. As well as the member for Florey bringing this to my attention, the

person who has been bringing this to a significant amount of attention over recent weeks, months and years, and who initially brought this to my attention a couple of years ago when I became the minister, is of course the member for Newland, whose strong, dedicated and consistent advocacy stands in marked contrast to the 16 years of Labor administration.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: When it came to the CWMS, all we could hear from Labor for 16 years were crickets. Meanwhile, we heard all the anecdotes and stories that have come across the opposition leader's radar yesterday when he gave his grievance. The discovery of this problem clearly was a significant shock to him. It was not a shock to this side of the house, though, because, as I mentioned, the member for Newland—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —has been a persistent advocate for this matter. It is his advocacy that brought it onto the radar of the Labor Party of South Australia. I know on this side of the house my—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated for one moment. There is a point of order. The point of order is for debate.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I believe the specific question was about whether he would do something—

The SPEAKER: For debate.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —not whether the Labor Party had already announced something.

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

The SPEAKER: Minister for Education, be quiet. We have the point of order. I uphold the point of order. Minister, I can only save you so much, and I ask you to come back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Context is so important in this job, and I needed to provide some context—context, which included 16 years, and then this marked contrast to the advocacy of the member for Newland and his consistent perseverance. There is no doubt this is very much in the government's sights. We have been working very closely with the member for Newland. There are a whole range of challenges with the CWMS and very significant problems being faced by people in the north-east. Not only were those people let down by the Labor Party, they were let down by a hopeless council as well, so we have to—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: For debate? Yes.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Everyone is having a lot of fun; however, minister, there have been some gratuitous references to the Labor Party. I think we have now had enough. Let's go back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I have moved on to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I have moved away from the Labor Party—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and I am talking about the local council. There are perhaps a couple of Labor Party members on that council as well who have not covered themselves in glory, that's for sure—Councillor Lucas Jones and the like. I will continue to work with SA Water and with the member for Newland—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —and we will try to work alongside—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, you can pay for that cacophony of noise. For the rest of question time, I am asking you to leave under 137A. I would like to hear the remainder of the minister's answer, if I may.

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

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I will wind up, Mr Speaker, simply by saying fixing this problem which occurred under many, many years of poor governance from Tea Tree Gully council and a long-term ignorance of this problem by a 16-year Labor government is now very firmly a priority. It's a very, very significant—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is there a point of order?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Is there a point of order, member for Florey? The member for Morphett and the member for Cheltenham can leave for the remainder of question time under 137A.

The honourable members for Morphett and Cheltenham having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: I am dealing with four things at a time here, so I will take that. Is there a point of order? No? Can you please wrap up your answer, minister, and then I am moving on to the member for Florey.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am wrapping up. We are looking at the CWMS. We certainly won't be taking Labor's costings for granted and copying their policy because after 16 years of failed costings we won't be paying any attention to that. I will work alongside this great advocate for the north-eastern suburbs, the member for Newland, and we will make this a priority.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:46): Supplementary: would the minister consider—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, it's going to be back to back.

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Police, it's been a while since a minister was ejected.

Ms BEDFORD: I remind the house that the Tea Tree Gully council was a Liberal council for many years. Can I ask the minister: is he prepared to commit any funding to this project?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:46): The member for Florey would be aware that SA Water, which is a key stakeholder in this process, has an ESCOSA determination, which is worked through at the moment, so that is something I will work alongside SA Water and ESCOSA on to see how that is determined in the coming weeks and months.

WINE INDUSTRY BUSHFIRE RECOVERY SUPPORT

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (14:47): My question is to the minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting the South Australian wine industry to recover from bushfires?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:47): Yes, I can. I thank the member for MacKillop for his excellent question. He knows only too well how important the wine industry is to the South Australian economy. Yes, sadly, we saw a number of vineyards within South Australia affected by bushfires. There are about 500 hectares of vineyard that have been affected either by bushfires or have been affected by smoke.

Through the course of that we had a large public meeting in the Adelaide Hills at Hahndorf in the member for Heysen's seat, I believe. What that meeting gave us was a much better understanding of the previous experience of vineyard operators and owners who had been through the Pinery fires, what they had experienced and how they had rebuilt after the fires had gone through.

One of the great scourges of bushfires within vineyards is when we have smoke taint in those vineyards. The government listened to the industry through that public consultation and we put a \$335,000 program in place in consultation with the Australian Wine Research Institute. We subsidised those wine grape samples so that we could actually ascertain whether the berries had been impacted and smoke had penetrated the skin, which rendered that fruit unviable to be processed into wine.

What we saw through that consultation was that we would give three subsidised smoke-taint samples to individual growers in the Adelaide Hills and the KI fire scars. We would also give subsidised samples to those areas and those vineyards that were impacted by smoke. As many wine lovers would know, a smoke-tainted wine is undrinkable and also comes at great cost to the industry and the individual grapegrower.

To be able to do those early smoke taint tests gives those wine grapegrowers, those winemakers, a competitive advantage not to have to continue to put inputs into that product. What we saw over that time was we gave 92 vouchers and a total of 577 samples were tested. Along the course of that way, about 50 per cent were in the mid range, so some of that fruit was impacted and some of it was not and went on to make wine.

Further to that, we worked with the Wine Grape Council of South Australia and, again, the Australian wine industry research to undertake surveys of assessed vineyards that had been damaged. They worked with a very well-regarded Clare business, Rural Directions, to undertake mapping and overlay that mapping onto vineyards so that they could assess the damage and understand exactly what the fire meant to their business long term.

Once that data was collected, it was put onto a topographic image and then that image and data was given to those vineyard operators. As an example, in the Adelaide Hills, a pinot noir vineyard was directly impacted by fast-moving fire and smoke and it was given an assessment that that vineyard would be inoperable for the forthcoming vintage. Again, that is more information that those wine grapegrowers and winemakers needed as valuable information.

We are also funding a unique, longer term smoke taint research project, taking samples with green berries. Again, that gives much earlier detection and it gives much earlier indication to those winemakers to stop putting inputs into those vineyards. It is about working with the industry, it is about a government that cares for the industry and it is about a government looking to grow the wine industry.

HOUSING STIMULUS PACKAGE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:51): My question is to the Premier. Was the Premier scheduled to hold a media conference at Glandore at 1 o'clock this afternoon regarding housing industry stimulus?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52): I don't have any information on that, but I can find out.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

HOUSING STIMULUS PACKAGE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:52): Supplementary: was this media conference cancelled because the third party scheduled to stand up with the Premier was not supportive and was critical of the Premier's stance on housing industry stimulus?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Point of order: the question is hypothetical in its construction.

The SPEAKER: It definitely at least contained some argument or opinion, so I will take that one. Member for Lee, do you want to rephrase or have another go?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Did the Premier or his office cancel a scheduled media conference this afternoon because a third party scheduled to stand next to the Premier was unwilling to support him?

The SPEAKER: I will allow the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:52): I don't have any information on the points that are made by the member opposite. What I do know, though, is that the federal government have announced their HomeBuilder program and it is one that we are very supportive of here in South Australia. Housing construction is a very, very important sector—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —in South Australia. It is one that is vital in terms of employing people in this state. I was looking at our housing approval figures for April, sir, and I think you would be very interested. On a seasonal basis, South Australia had a very significant increase in April.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, be quiet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I've really got no idea what is going on over there at the moment.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Housing approvals in April were up very significantly on a seasonal basis, whereas in Australia they were down—I think more than 900 approvals last month. This is a sector, though, which we are very concerned about because it does employ a lot of people in South Australia.

The federal government has announced their HomeBuilder package. We have been working with them for some time, understanding what they are putting forward. We know that now with the \$25,000 that they are putting forward, this can be put together with the \$15,000 that the people of South Australia, the taxpayers of South Australia, offer to first-home owners. There are some conditions associated with it, but it has potential now for a \$40,000 payment to those first-home owners in South Australia, which is absolutely excellent.

It's great that we had 900 housing approvals in April, but we've got to see those in May and June and July and August and September, so we are grateful for the federal government's support in that area. As the Treasurer has indicated, we are considering other measures here in South Australia and we will announce those when they are completed.

CHILDCARE SECTOR

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:55): My question is to the Minister for Education. How many job losses is the government expecting in the childcare sector as a result of the decision to change the ratios in long day care?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:55): I thank the member for the question. For those who are wondering what she is referring to, the National Quality Framework into the childcare sector has had all states, with the exception of South Australia and New South Wales, having a consistent approach to ratios, whether the ratio is 1:10 or 1:11, indeed, in some circumstances. South Australia has now moved, with the support and concurrence of other states, to be in line with the National Quality Framework in that area.

This is an area where I think, to be clear, there are going to be no changes to government services. There are no changes proposed to government services as a result of this. There will be no changes in any preschools or children's centres as a result of this change. Indeed, I believe there will be a number of increases in jobs in this area as a result of demand growing in this area. I think we will see that in the whole childcare sector in the years ahead, particularly as we look to enhance the opportunities for traineeships in child care, which the Minister for Innovation and Skills is very heavily involved with, including in terms of funding to ensure that there is a pipeline of young people taking on the roles to fulfil the job opportunities in this area. That's one great opportunity.

This year, there have been further increases in expectations as a result of the National Quality Framework on qualified staff in childcare centres as well. I don't think that the change in ratios, which makes us consistent with the national setting, will indeed see enormous changes in too many individual centres, but I think I understand where the member's question comes from and I think there will be some centres that will be glad to take advantage of the opportunity to change in some rooms 1:10 to 1:11, but I would not anticipate that being an enormous number of staff changes and I would expect that that would be supplemented by staff increases in other areas.

But out of an abundance of caution I will take on notice whether there is any modelling that I am not aware of right now that has been done that suggests otherwise, but I am pretty confident that we are going to see more people working in this area in the years ahead than we have at the moment.

REGIONAL ROADS

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:57): 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 supporting South Australia's recovery through upgrading regional roads?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:58): I can, indeed. I thank the member for Finniss for his question and do note the very near completion of the Torrens-Crozier roundabout, a very key intersection in his electorate. I have had representations from people who may or may not be related to the member for Finniss about the naming of that roundabout and I will consider those requests in due course. I'm not sure that the budget extends to a brass bust, but I will go and have a look.

Even before COVID-19, this government has had a strong agenda—in fact, a record agenda—about delivering infrastructure here in South Australia. As part of our \$12.9 billion infrastructure program, we are actually upgrading over a thousand kilometres of regional road over the next four years—a thousand kilometres out of 10,000 being fixed under this government. I think the tally is up to about \$1½ billion that this government will spend upgrading roads.

Of that thousand kilometres, 300 kilometres of road are actually being upgraded as we speak. In the coming months, we will see a \$22 million package of works on the Ngarkat Highway for the member for Hammond and I think the member for MacKillop goes down that far, and to reinstate the 110 km/h speed limit that both of those MPs have been badgering me about for about the last two years.

We have underway a package of works part of which falls under the Roads of Strategic Importance package that we were able to secure funding on last year in the member for Flinders' electorate. It was started in April and will be completed this month—16 kilometres of shoulder sealing along sections 15 ks north of Cowell to Lucky Bay Road and from Cowell to the Birdseye Highway, as well as audio tactile edge lines that will also be put in place.

We will also see a \$15 million package of works starting in the coming months. A tender has just been awarded on the notorious Browns Well Highway, a highway that the member for Chaffey and I drove, and it is fair to say that there are some sections of that that get a little bit dicey. This

government has put money on the table to fix that again to reinstate the 110 km/h speed limit that we have promised.

There are works all over South Australia, and whether it is the \$6.5 million of work going on on the Cleve road, again in the member for Flinders' electorate, or whether it is on the Sturt Highway (actually in my electorate), the \$8.5 million package around Truro, and some work that is happening north of Truro in the member for Stuart's electorate, as well as a \$7.8 million package worth of works on the South Eastern Freeway that is completed. I think technically it helps out the member for Hammond more than it helps out the member for Kavel, but I think we can all share the road and share in the fact that this is a road that has needed a significant amount of investment for a long period of time.

We have also put in money to help improve the productive capacity of our economy, and that is why the Naracoorte roundabouts that are being upgraded in the member for MacKillop's electorate to help beef production in that area, and more efficient freight movements in that area, are so important, or whether it be again across on the West Coast, the Bratten Bridge upgrade, which I know is going on at the moment because the local mayor, Sam Telfer, has been trying to take credit for that work, even though it is funded by the state and federal governments. There are some pretty good construction photos at the moment on his Facebook page, and I encourage members to go and have a look.

There is also starting in coming months \$14 million for the construction of road access upgrades for Thomas Foods International. That is business that is going to underpin—and already does—and will further underpin red meat production here in South Australia. This government is willing to invest to get high-productivity vehicles access to that plant so that we can keep more cattle and more small stock being processed here in South Australia with those processing jobs here in South Australia, especially after the scenes we saw of the fire at Murray Bridge and the devastation that that has caused for that community.

The people of Murray Bridge and the people in the member for Hammond's electorate and all regional South Australia, especially those farmers growing that livestock, can know that they've got a government that is willing to invest to have those jobs grow right here in South Australia.

HORROCKS HIGHWAY

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister give us an indication or an update on the commencement and the tendering of the Horrocks Highway?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:02): I thank the member for Frome for his question. It gives me the chance to highlight the fact that, in his electorate, we are getting on with work on the Blyth Plains Road at the moment, shoulder sealing work that he and I had a look at. There is also work going on on the Goyder Highway, between Crystal Brook and Gulnare, again to be able to improve the speed limit back up to 110 km/h that we promised at the last election.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: But wait, Mr Speaker, there's more: \$55 million to fix the Horrocks Highway. After taking an invitation from the member for Stuart to talk to some locals in his electorate up in Port Augusta, I took the opportunity to drive back the entirety of length of the Horrocks Highway, and it is fair to say that there are issues the length and breadth of that highway. Down at the bottom end, it's fair to say that with the level of traffic some overtaking lanes might be in order and also some pavement correction.

In engineer parlance, not only do we need to correct potentially some of the horizontal curves but also I understand we also need to correct some of the vertical curves, and that is also on the plan. Further north, though, there is a large amount of shoulder sealing work that needs to be done south of a little town called Wilmington and for about the good 300 to 350 residents who live in the town of Wilmington.

There is work that is in the final stages of planning along all of that corridor. What is interesting about the member's question is that what I am speaking about now is the \$55 million bucket that we were able to secure in last year's budget—80:20 funding with the federal government. It would be remiss of me in this answer and the previous answer not to mention our good friends Rohan Ramsay and Tony Pasin, as well as the Deputy Prime Minister, Michael McCormack, who have been massive supporters to help us secure this money.

We have actually spent money on the Horrocks Highway even over and above this \$55 million, including works around pavement correction around Roseworthy, and that Roseworthy-Templers section that was undertaken last year, as well as other works further north in relation to bridge connections. As a government, we have put the money on the table. It is there in the budget. The member for Frome does not have long at all to wait for works under the \$55 million package to get underway.

But I think it is fair to say, for the people in the electorate of Frome, especially for the people in and around the Clare and Gilbert valleys, they have already seen more work being undertaken by this government, putting paid to our commitment to regional South Australia, fixing country roads so that people stop dying on them and we can actually get on and deliver the road network that the most productive part of our economy has been promised for decades.

CHILDCARE SECTOR

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Education. Why did the minister decide to allow unqualified staff to be allowed to be counted in the educator-child ratio?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:05): I thank the member for the question. While I don't necessarily agree with exactly the way she's framed the question, I do understand what she's talking about. This is indeed a matter which she and I had some discussion about during estimates when she was the minister as, indeed, this is a body of reform that was part of the National Quality Framework in which South Australia was previously inconsistent with most other states in both of these areas.

As a result of the changes, which now have been agreed by all ministers, that South Australia will become consistent with the National Quality Framework alongside many other states, we will from late July, it is anticipated, allow childcare centres to have a three-month probationary period for some of their staff to be able to count towards the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Consistent—

Mr Picton: Are they trained?

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kaurna!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —with the National Quality Framework—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —that is required in childcare centres. This, as I have said—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —in the previous answer, is consistent with also encouraging—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —more traineeships, more opportunities for job pathways into centres. It is consistent with the National Quality Framework, what we expect of our childcare centres. It will also have the benefit of ensuring that those families—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —who entrust their children to the care and the educational services—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —and the development services provided in our childcare centres have the opportunity, where there is an opportunity for a cost reduction, to benefit from that cost reduction. That is something that I think will be welcomed by families. I think at a time when we do have right now a privileged provision as a result of the federal government's COVID-related childcare benefits, where people do access free child care, that is something that is not going to last forever. The federal government has made it very clear that that is not going to last forever.

So, consequently, when we return to a position where families become essentially people who are paying for child care to a very significant extent, then it is something that ensures that families can enable themselves to afford that childcare, so long as that is on the basis of a strong quality framework, that which the former Labor government signed up to in about 2011 or 2012. South Australia's rules in relation to that framework are now consistent with that National Quality Framework. It is not a radical proposition—

Ms Stinson: You're lowering our standards.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —it's a proposition which is accepted by Labor governments in many states, indeed one of them accepted by all Labor governments.

Dr Close: Let's just race to the bottom for everything, shall we?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The shadow minister for education describes every Labor state government in Australia as racing to the bottom, and I don't think that that is a fair characterisation. I don't think that is a fair characterisation at all. I think that what has happened is that we—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —have a National Quality Framework, and South Australia is now more consistent with that National Quality Framework—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —than we were prior to these changes. It is anticipated these changes will take application from late July. Government preschools will maintain the 1:10 ratio for disadvantaged children. We are talking about, in this case, three year olds and above, but the opportunity is there for non-government children centres in this circumstance to move from 1:10 to 1:11 for those three year olds and above.

Grievance Debate

HOUSING STIMULUS PACKAGE

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:09): If you ever wanted an example of how badly this government is managing the state's economic recovery from the impact of the coronavirus restrictions, you only need to look at its performance today.

On the very day the federal government announces nearly \$700 million of support for the national housing industry, on the very day the Prime Minister announces additional funding to keep tradies in jobs and on the very day the South Australian housing construction industry begs this state government to match the federal government's support and get in behind and back the South Australian construction industry, what does the state government do? It announces another tax increase, another round of hikes in fees, charges and taxes for South Australians, a round which of course includes increases to licensing and registration costs for tradies—on the very same day!

This is this state government's response. This is its contribution to the state's economic recovery in the housing construction industry. Should we be surprised? The whole country has known for the entirety of this working week that today Scott Morrison, Prime Minister of Australia, was going to announce a support package for the national housing industry. We know this because for the last four days it has been spread across every newspaper in the country.

And what has happened this week? We have had not one but two cabinet meetings here in South Australia, two opportunities for this government to make a decision to match that funding. Of course, the Premier would have known what the federal government was doing because this package was concocted by the national cabinet of which the Premier is a member. So there were no surprises here for the state government: they knew what was coming and they made a deliberate decision not to support the South Australian housing construction industry.

They have been begged for weeks by industry leaders, by builders, by small business owners, by individual tradies, to get in behind them and help them keep jobs going during these difficult economic times. Not only have we heard nothing for the housing construction industry here in South Australia but today we get a massive slap across the face to this industry with another round of taxes, fees and charges. It is remarkable.

We have nearly got an Everest to climb as a state. We went into this calendar year with the highest unemployment in the nation. We went into this calendar year with our economy at a standstill, with jobs growth stalled. I am pleased that the Premier can at least bring himself to make an announcement about stimulus funding, but what we would like to see is that talk actually backed up by action because what the Premier is not doing is he is not spending that money.

No-one in this government can tell the media, can tell the public or can tell this parliament how much of that money has actually been spent out in the community. There is not one minister responsible in the entire government, in either chamber of parliament, who is responsible for this state's economic recovery. No-one knows what is actually going on out in the community. No-one knows how much government money has been spent—or, more to the point, not been spent yet—to support South Australians in their jobs.

Over 40,000 people in this state have lost their jobs in the last two months. Every day that this government delays costs South Australians jobs. Today's delay has cost jobs, tomorrow's delay will cost more jobs and every day that this government remains silent on the housing construction industry, every day that this government cannot bring themselves to look industry leaders in the eye and be honest with them about whether they have got their backs or not will cost more jobs in this state.

The Premier says, 'Don't worry. I am told I was born for this.' Well, if the Premier was born for this challenge, I have to say that I would hate to see how he manages a challenge he was not born for because there seem to be a lot of challenges that this Premier is not up to, and this economic response to the crisis engulfing this state is clearly beyond this government. It is beyond the Premier, it is beyond the Treasurer and it is beyond every single member of this cabinet. They need to act and they need to act quickly.

REGIONAL JOBS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:14): With times of crisis also come times of opportunity. During the pandemic we have all had to rethink the way we live, work and spend our leisure time. One of the biggest re-shifts has occurred around traditional work patterns, flexibility and the nine to five workday. Working from home has become the new normal for some, and it has become clear that the new office environment does not have to involve a CBD location.

The pandemic has opened up a major opportunity to rethink the way we work and the traditional office. Why should your location dictate your job options and opportunities, and why should your job options be dictated by your location? Rather than a city-centric approach, why can we not look at a model that spreads economic and government functions more evenly across the state? This is called decentralisation. This is a word that I heard quite frequently before the state election but have not heard too much since.

Of the 100,000 people employed in the South Australian public sector, only a small percentage are located outside metropolitan areas. New South Wales has 6 per cent, while South Australia has just 0.2 per cent of the workforce based in regional areas, the lowest of all states. The Regional Australia Institute has created a new initiative called the Regional Australia Council 2031. This is the first of its kind in Australia.

Ten major Australian businesses have committed to this initiative, which is encouraging people to live and work in regional areas. There are many who believe that South Australia's regional areas are set for a post-pandemic boom. South Australia is a land-rich state with a low population density, ideal for tree changes and sea changes alike. People will be looking for housing affordability, lifestyle, a sense of community and less commute time, but they will also be looking for good jobs.

Governments need to invest in regional areas to make the most of this opportunity. Departments and positions responsible for making decisions that affect regional people I believe should be based in regional and rural areas. Accountability is paramount. I still find it ironic that Country Health SA, an organisation dealing specifically with regional health, has its main office in King William Street in the CBD of Adelaide. Why not Mount Gambier, Port Lincoln, Port Augusta, Port Pirie or any one of our other regional areas?

Mr Hughes interjecting:

Mr BELL: Even Whyalla. Sorry, Eddie. We want the best and brightest to make South Australia their home and place of work. We need greater investment in our regions. The funding has to be there to back up ideas and initiatives. Things that metropolitan people take for granted—infrastructure, connectivity and support, co-working spaces—are sorely lacking in our regions. It is here where the state government's Regional Growth Fund could provide a solid kickstart.

The state government has committed \$150 million over 10 years through the Regional Growth Fund, with three major projects in the Limestone Coast awarded. However, \$15 million per year, divided amongst the seven original councils of South Australia, equates to just over \$2 million per year per region. I can tell you that much more needs to be done in this space. Millions and millions, if not billions, are spent in our capital cities and regions deserve their fair share.

To see any real economic investment, I would like to see the commitment for this fund increased to \$100 million over four years. Now is the time to invest in our regions. If we want the best and brightest working and choosing to work in regional South Australia, we have to offer them every possible option and incentive. I have heard the catchcry #RegionsMatter; now it is time to make that a focus.

EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:19): I rise to speak in support of early childhood educators. These are remarkable people who are deeply committed to developing, nurturing and educating our youngest South Australians. Day in and day out they are there for our young people and their families, with their work having a lasting impact on those they support. I know my own family remembers well the care and education provided by early childhood educators.

These workers currently undertake their incredible work in an environment where the sector is suffering from a lack of government funding, a lack of governmental leadership and a lack of basic resources to combat the ongoing COVID-19 crisis. Childcare operators, parents, workers and their union, the United Workers Union, are pleading with state and federal governments to properly resource them to cope with the pandemic. These workers, who are charged with looking after our community's young children, are campaigning for basic support. It is extraordinary that they need to do so, that any early childhood educator lacks basic resources to ensure hygiene, cleaning and protection at this time.

In a recent national online survey, 1,100 workers said that they and their centres' families are more at risk as a result of increasing attendance. The survey also found that 69 per cent of educators believe that the health risk to themselves and the centres' families and children is increasing as more children attend their service. Eight in 10 educators believe that additional staff are needed at their centre to maintain adequate health and hygiene practices, and 69 per cent of centres do not have a health and safety representative. Early childhood educators cannot practise social distancing. They absolutely deserve immediate support and resources.

On behalf of their members, the United Workers Union is calling on the national cabinet to immediately adopt a six-point plan to urgently address these issues. The plan includes ensuring every child has their temperature taken before being admitted to the centre; providing enough PPE; comprehensively cleaning all areas, objects and surfaces; rostering enough staff to ensure the extra cleaning required can be done as well as educating children; ensuring everyone entering centres washes their hands; and staggering start and finish times to better enable any social distancing.

This basic plan must operate in every centre for the safety of children, workers and their respective families. These early childhood educators have such a huge responsibility placed on them at work. These workers give our youngest South Australians the best possible start in life, playing a fundamental role in their mental, physical and emotional development. Overwhelmingly women, these hardworking South Australians have dealt with the added pressure of keeping children in their care safe throughout the crisis. One childcare centre director summed up the frustration being felt across the country:

There has just been no clear policy for the sector. We are not schools. We are working with very young children where the recommendations that have been put in place about social distancing don't apply.

Educators are taking great care and consideration about the pandemic, but we also need support and resources from the government to ensure workers are as safe as possible. We need recommendations and funding from our leaders specific to early childhood.

Workers, parents and our community must have confidence that centres are safely operating. So far, the Marshall Liberal government has not provided any clear direction to early childhood education services, despite the fact these are front-line essential workers. I call on both the state and federal governments to immediately implement the six-point plan, a plan utterly focused on safety. The plan contains commonsense and necessary procedures that many people and parents in our community would assume are already being undertaken. I also call on the federal government to categorise early childhood educators and care providers as essential services.

The extraordinary work of early childhood educators should be recognised, valued and respected at this difficult time and always. Our system of early child care was already under strain through years of federal Liberal neglect and privatisation, and we cannot afford to lose centres because of this current situation. In closing, I thank the outstanding United Workers Union leaders for speaking up and out for fairness, safety, dignity and respect at work, and I also thank every early childhood educator for the difference that they make in children's lives and to the very fabric of our community. I will continue to advocate to ensure their voices are heard.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:24): I wish to acknowledge Mr Fred Harford for his work to identify important road safety concerns in my community. Mr Harford is a retired ambulance officer. He has seen firsthand the devastating impact of road trauma. Mr Harford has raised a petition of 260 residents concerning speed limits on Bald Hills Road, Mount Barker, at the approaches to the Bald Hills Road and Springs Road roundabout and between the roundabout and Hartman Road along Bald Hills Road.

The approaches to the roundabout are dangerous. The speed limit on all approaches is 80 km/h, whereas the speed limit is 60 km/h on the approaches to three nearby roundabouts along the same road, that is, both freeway interchange roundabouts and the third at the intersection of Old Princes Highway and Bald Hills Road. Significant safety issues also exist at the intersection of Scarborough Way and Bald Hills Road where a large volume of residential traffic enters and exits a housing estate in an 80 km/h speed zone.

These issues have been raised with the minister. I understand that they are not matters that can be resolved by ministerial direction; however, I call on the department to consider again the significant safety issues that have been identified. I am closely familiar with these issues. I also live in Mount Barker.

I bring up in the house another road safety concern in relation to Flaxley Road, Mount Barker. Flaxley Road links townships and new housing developments south of Mount Barker to the Mount Barker township. It is a major arterial road. Housing development has increased along the road. Local residents have rightly raised concerns about the speed of traffic. The department needs to be responsive to the changing landscape in Mount Barker.

I call on the department to consider these issues, and I acknowledge and thank Tracey Tozer, Renny Goodwin and Sarah Webb for their important and valuable advocacy in relation to Flaxley Road. Ms Tozer has responded to three accidents on Flaxley Road recently. As she has said:

When I spoke to DPTI traffic management, they advised that the current speed limit is appropriate for the area, and that they had no plans to make any changes in the distant future despite concerns raised. But the reality is that something needs to happen. I'm sick of hearing screeching tyres, crashing metal and people injured. One day it won't be a simple fender bender, it will be much worse.

As members know, roads in the Hills can be wet and slippery and visibility can be low. Even experienced Hills drivers face difficulties. While I acknowledge that there is a massive backlog of road safety issues left unaddressed by the former government, especially in the country and the Hills, we need to continue to focus the department's attention on Hills roads.

I appreciate that at present, or at least over the last couple of years and continuing, 1,000 kilometres of the 10,000 kilometres of country roads are being repaired by this government. That is a massive financial burden on the taxpayers of South Australia and reflects the years and years of underinvestment by the previous government.

I also appreciate the investment made to resurface the freeway between Crafers and the tollgate, to refit the freeway tunnels, to resurface Mount Barker Junction and to widen the freeway at Crafers. This is vital work in two years of government; however, much more remains to be done.

WHYALLA STEELWORKS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:27): It has been 55 years since the commissioning of the steelworks in Whyalla. Generations of workers, many thousands of workers, including three generations of my family, have worked at the steelworks. It has a proud history and with the right steps it will have a strong future. Whyalla has the only integrated steelworks in Australia that produces structural steel and rail. It is a fundamental part of Australia's manufacturing base. It provides products that make an essential contribution to our construction sector and our rail network and it has done so for many years.

As Australia's only integrated steelworks producing structural steel and rail, the Whyalla Steelworks is part of our sovereign manufacturing capacity. It is strategically important, especially in a world that is increasingly in a state of flux. COVID-19 has hammered home the risks associated with an overdependence on overseas supply lines. What we have in Whyalla is Australian jobs producing Australian steel with Australian iron ore for the Australian market. Let me repeat that: what we have in Whyalla is Australian jobs producing Australian steel with Australian iron ore for the Australian market. Long may it continue.

Do we want to export those jobs? Do we want to depend on overseas steelmakers for a range of structural steel grades and rail? My answer is no. It is not in our nation's long-term public interest to see the end of value-adding to Australian iron ore. It is not in our national interest to see the end of steel production in Whyalla. We need to put the steelworks in Whyalla on a financially sustainable footing, and that will require a major capital injection to modernise the plant.

That will need a partnership between government and private enterprise beyond the \$50 million that was committed prior to a successful bidder by the previous Labor government. There is a technology path to sustainability, to financial sustainability. Elements of that have been publicly canvassed: a new mill to extend product range and double-finished product production is one

element, an electric arc furnace is another element and there are other options as well. Any upgrade has to take seriously the need to continue adding value to our iron ore and how that is best done.

For Whyalla and our state, much is at stake. The GFG operations in Whyalla represent 43 per cent of Whyalla's economy and 42 per cent of Whyalla's employment, with 3,471 full-time equivalents. Direct and indirect labour pumps \$301 million into our economy on a yearly basis. GFG in Whyalla is responsible for \$1.8 billion in expenditure. The steelworks itself directly employs over 1,600 people.

In April, I drafted a letter to the Premier and to the Prime Minister. With a few minor modifications, that letter was also signed off by the Leader of the Opposition and we have received a response from the Premier. I acknowledge that the company has its feasibility study and its work before the government at the moment, and I acknowledge the commercial sensitivities and confidentiality surrounding that, but what is needed now is vision.

Look at Thomas Playford: the vision that existed back then to create an integrated steelworks at Whyalla with incredibly strong bipartisan support at the time led to an industry that has helped this country and employed thousands and thousands of people. We need a similar vision today to give the Whyalla Steelworks a strong future, a future that will serve the workforce and a future that will serve our nation.

NATIONAL VOLUNTEER WEEK

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:32): I rise today to recognise the important work of the many volunteers in the electorate of Waite and acknowledge the celebration of their efforts during National Volunteer Week, which was celebrated last month. Volunteering Australia defines volunteering as 'the time willingly given for the common good and without financial gain'.

Mainly undertaken by individuals, volunteering can cover a wide range of activities, from formal volunteering set up by organisations to a more informal nature that takes place outside those organisations. We are indeed an extremely lucky country with our small communities. There are thousands of Australians, men, woman and kids who volunteer every single day and donate their time for the common good. I would like to extend my gratitude to all of them.

According to Volunteering SA&NT, there are just under one million volunteers in South Australia. Their contribution is valued at around \$5 billion each year, a staggering figure that really puts into perspective the significance of volunteering to our economy and to our communities. Reports within the last decade have estimated the total value of volunteering to be well over \$200 billion annually across Australia, which shows that our society would struggle to function without volunteers.

Volunteering is one of the most meaningful pursuits anyone can undertake. It is a way to give back to your community—to our community. It provides much-needed assistance to the local community and to some of the most vulnerable people in our society. Volunteering can help individuals feel that they belong and are part of a community. It improves a person's mental health and wellbeing, combats stress and loneliness and helps boost confidence. It widens each of our worlds.

Volunteering connects people to others they may never have met if it were not for their volunteering efforts. It can provide a sense of achievement, it can provide a sense of purpose and it does help inspire others. While many of us are time poor these days, the benefits from the individual to the community as a whole are enhanced when we volunteer. Sir, in my electorate, as in your electorate and all our electorates across our state, we are fortunate to have volunteers.

The volunteers in Waite offer their time to support local organisations across all areas. My electorate is blessed with many beautiful bushlands, parks, reserves and historical and heritage sites, and we have the Belair National Park, Wittunga Botanic Garden, Sturt Gorge Recreation Park, Shepherds Hill Recreation Park, Colebrook Reconciliation Park, Blackwood Forest Reserve, Watiparinga Reserve, Warriparinga Reserve and, of course, Karinya Reserve.

Each of these places has volunteers who prune, weed and clean up the green spaces. They plant native plants, help eradicate feral pests and volunteer as guides, administration staff and fundraisers. We also have historical societies and heritage groups, such as the Mitcham Historical

Society, Friends of Carrick Hill, Friends of Urrbrae House, Friends of Waite Arboretum—again, all relying on volunteers to promote the history of our community and surrounding areas, preserving heritage and indeed fighting for heritage as well, as we are seeing changes to the planning code, and to conserve our environment for the coming generations.

Our emergency service volunteers, CFS and SES who have worked so hard this last year also form a huge part of our volunteer movement, along with volunteers from sporting clubs, schools, Scouts, religious groups, aged-care facilities, art groups, libraries, justice of the peace services and service clubs, such as RSLs, Lions, Rotary and Probus. It is great to see, as we are moving out of COVID-19, that these volunteer organisations are getting back up and running and making a contribution back to the community.

To name every volunteer and every volunteer group in Waite is not possible, so instead I would like to mention a few examples of our Waite volunteers who have recently been recognised for their contributions. Ms Doone Winnall offers her time to Rugs with Love, a group of knitters and sewers who create rugs for children in foster care, providing them with meaningful items made with love and care. Then we have the Friends of Old Government House, who dedicate their time to preserving the house that resides within Belair National Park. They recently were awarded a digital donation grant to help them continue the good work in conservation and preservation. I commend all volunteers in my electorate.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:38): I move:

That the house at its rising adjourn until Tuesday 16 June at 11am.

Motion carried.

Bills

SINGLE-USE AND OTHER PLASTIC PRODUCTS (WASTE AVOIDANCE) BILL

Committee Stage

In committee (resumed on motion).

Clause 7.

Clause passed.

Clauses 8 to 13 passed.

New clause 13A.

Dr CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Close-1]—

Page 7, after line 23—After clause 13 insert:

13A—Annual report by Minister

- (1) The Minister must, on or before 30 September in each year (other than in the year in which this section comes into operation), prepare a report on the operation of the provisions of this Act for the financial year ending on the preceding 30 June that includes the following:
 - (a) the number of reports or complaints received from members of the public in relation to breaches or purported breaches of the Act;
 - (b) information regarding the measures taken by authorised officers in relation to monitoring compliance with the Act;
 - (c) information regarding any enforcement action taken by authorised officers under the Act including—
 - (i) the number of persons issued with expiation notices for the purposes of the Act and the general nature of the notices; and

- (ii) the number of persons charged with an offence against the Act and the general nature of the charges;
- (d) an estimate of the volume of single-use plastic products that have been sold, supplied or distributed within the State by virtue of an exemption under the regulations.
- (2) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after completing the report under subsection (1), cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

As indicated, the opposition is very pleased to support this bill and will be watching with interest the way in which it is now rolled out, implemented and observed by the South Australian community.

While I accept the minister's view and share it, that in the main part South Australians seem very ready for this kind of move, and indeed may well become ready for others in the future, we cannot allow this piece of legislation to rest as our answer to the question of plastics. For that reason I move the amendment standing in my name, amendment No. 1, which will enable the parliament to receive an annual report on various matters associated with the monitoring of and compliance with the piece of legislation.

In requiring that annual report, and I say this with the greatest respect for Green Industries and also for the EPA, I think it will serve to ensure that some activity is undertaken within those agencies to make sure that there is ongoing monitoring of the compliance, and I therefore commend this amendment to the chamber.

The CHAIR: Minister, do you wish to make any points or question here?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We are interested in taking a good look at this amendment. I have party political processes to take this to, obviously, and I have not been able to do that prior to today, so I guess the position would be to oppose it. What is the process—oppose it and then—

The CHAIR: Well, it is up to you. You can oppose it and look at it between the houses. I think that is what you do.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Yes, that is it exactly. Can you provide advice, Mr Chair?

The CHAIR: It is entirely your call, minister. Really, I think you were getting close to what you wanted.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Yes, I seek to oppose this amendment but undertake that we will give it serious consideration between the houses, similar to what we did with many of the landscape amendments that were proposed by the deputy leader.

New clause negatived.

Clause 14 passed.

Clause 15.

Dr CLOSE: I believe that clause 15 is the one that will enable the minister to construct exemptions to facilitate people with disability continuing to have access to drinking straws, being the most obvious but perhaps not the only use for it. I invite the minister to explain the process by which the government will consider the process of what the regulation will look like, including the consultation with which groups, and what are the factors that the minister will take into consideration in making a decision?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: This is a very important component of the act which I think we need to have in here to create a level of confidence amongst those in our community who might feel that the act was not necessarily inclusive because it restricts them having availability to something that is critical to the enjoyment or sustainability of their life, to be honest. Our plan is to put together the appropriate regulations to create these exemptions. We will do that through the leadership of the task force.

That task force seems to have worked really well for us to date. It has that broad membership, with people with lived experience of living with a disability on that task force, from a couple of different groups and, as a consequence, perspectives. The process of drafting the regulation will be led, or at least overseen, by the task force. There will be appropriate consultation, which would be probably

through the yoursay.sa.gov.au engagement platform. We would obviously make overtures to the relevant stakeholders in the medical and disability sectors.

I have made it very clear from my contributions in this debate how important getting this right is. I will certainly be keeping a very close eye on it from a ministerial perspective in the coming weeks and months, assuming it passes both houses, when we get these regulations correct. I have given an overview of what I expect that regulation to look like, in that you could not have a situation where sale could be refused.

We also would not be requiring someone to prove that they had a particular disability or medical requirement in order for such persons to obtain those items of single-use plastic. When we are talking about those items, we mean plastic drinking straws, which I think is the key thing we are referring to here—not cutlery or drink stirrers, but the straws.

Dr CLOSE: I appreciate that I am asking a question about the regulation that would be made as a result of this clause, but if I can be indulged to just ask this question: has the minister turned his mind to how to strike the balance, where it is important that people with disabilities not be required to identify but that the response to busy businesses—we hope in future, post COVID—that are offering drinks that might have straws in them is not to simply make them as available as they are now on the basis that they then do not even have to potentially embarrass someone by asking them if they need one? Has the minister turned his mind to how he might capture that in a regulation?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The deputy leader is completely right to raise this and to indicate the trickiness of striking this balance. It will be a bit of a task to do, so we have turned our mind to it to an extent. It would largely be through the communications campaign to the business sector because the trickiness, the awkwardness, would find itself arising at the point of sale, at a bar, at a restaurant table or a place like that.

We will be backing this legislation up with a comms campaign, which I have referred to regularly throughout this debate, which will provide the business sector with that information—what their responsibilities are and what they should not do—through an educational process. Part of this is also providing awareness of the alternatives because many of the alternatives to plastic straws will, in many circumstances, be acceptable to people with disabilities—not always, but in many circumstances—particularly those rye straws or potentially re-usable silicone straws which do not have that same sensory impact that perhaps a metal straw would have.

We acknowledge the importance of getting this right. We are looking at it and we will work through it with the task force. We know that other jurisdictions, not in Australia but overseas, have done this and we will be taking a look at what they have done and how it has worked.

Dr CLOSE: Might the minister contemplate mandating an alternative as opposed to facilitating the continued use of single-use plastic straws?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I do not think we would go as far as mandating an alternative because of that sensory issue for a very small component of our community, but we would certainly be working very hard to talk to the business sector and the hospitality, catering and event sector about what those alternatives are. I also would not like to be too specific because I do think that, potentially in the short-term but certainly medium-term, more alternatives will emerge on the market.

Already there are very plastic-like compostable straws on the market, with which you would not be able to tell the difference, so we are very hopeful that the events and hospitality catering sector will quickly embrace those. I think, and certainly the feedback we get anecdotally is that in the vast majority of circumstances those would suffice.

Clause passed.

Clauses 16 and 17 passed.

New clause 18.

Dr CLOSE: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Close-1]—

Page 8, after line 36—After clause 17 insert:

18—Review of Act

- (1) The Minister must, as soon as practicable after the third anniversary of the commencement of this Act, appoint a person to prepare a report on—
 - (a) the effect on the community of Part 2 and Part 3 of the Act; and
 - (b) any public information campaigns conducted by or on behalf of the Government on reducing the use of plastic products and increasing the recycling of plastics; and
 - (c) any other matters determined by the Minister to be relevant to the review of this Act.
- (2) The person must report to the Minister within 6 months after the person's appointment.
- (3) The Minister must, within 12 sitting days after receiving the report under this section, cause copies of the report to be laid before both Houses of Parliament.

This is probably spiritually similar to the first amendment, but it is about making sure that the act itself remains fit for purpose over a period of time. While at any point a government can choose to review an act, I think that we are all aware that matters are changing so quickly in regard to the environment, to pollution and specifically to the use and abuse of plastic in our world, that it would be useful to ensure that there is a review on at least the third anniversary of the act to ensure that it remains up to date. By then, a lot of work might have been done in regulation, depending on choices made by ministers of the day, and it may well be useful to modify what is in regulation and what is in legislation.

You will also note that I have included a clause about information campaigns. They have been referred to in the minister's speeches. I think it is important that there be a review that looks at how well information campaigns have operated and how well they have worked, not only in the specifics of getting rid of the single-use plastics that are identified in that early clause but, more generally, in the lessening of the reliance on the use of plastic and the increase in its recycling, which will presumably all be allied to the publicity campaigns that will be run. I urge the committee to support this new clause.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Similarly to the last clause, we will oppose this administratively, undertaking to have a discussion with my party room and make a decision between the houses as to our position. I am certainly not opposed philosophically to this. We want to get the balance right, obviously, between too much bureaucracy for GISA and the EPA to have to administer, but I equally see the merit in the deputy leader's position.

New clause negatived.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:56): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIQUOR LICENSING (LIQUOR PRODUCTION AND SALES LICENCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 May 2020.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (15:56): I am very pleased to take the opportunity this afternoon to provide some brief remarks in support of the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Production and Sales Licence) Amendment Bill 2020. This is a quite defined and confined reform in this area, and I might say it is within the context of broader work that is being done to reform and to develop the liquor licensing regime across the board.

For the time being, this bill is quite specific in its application, going as it does to amend that part of part 3 of the act so as to make it abundantly clear—and I will come in a moment to the provision itself—that for the purposes of that category of licence that is the subject of section 39

dealing with liquor production and sales licences, licensed premises relevantly must not be comprised of premises ordinarily known or advertised as a supermarket, convenience store or delicatessen or premises of a prescribed kind. That is provided for specifically to make it clear that this category of licence is not for premises so described in the ordinary course.

The Liquor Licensing Act of 1997 deals with the whole scope of the licensing regime that applies in this state. Put briefly, it covers to begin with the establishment of and the processes for the licensing authorities—the commissioner and the licensing court—which are primarily the subject of part 2, and the operation of the court and its processes and the functions of the commissioner, with applications for licences, the process, who might apply and so on being the subject of part 4 of the act.

What we are here concerned with is the operative part, part 3, so far as it concerns that category of licences being ongoing as opposed to licences of a short-term duration. First of all, the act sets out the structure under which the licences are required. I might say that section 29 is, if you like, the base provision setting out the requirement for a licence in order to sell liquor in the state. Section 30 goes on to identify those specific categories of circumstances of the provision of alcohol in which a licence is not required.

I will just stay with that for a moment so as to characterise what we are dealing with in these amendments to section 39. Members will be interested perhaps to be reminded that there is a range of categories of the provision of alcohol on an ongoing basis for which a licence is not required. Those include, unsurprisingly, the provision of alcohol for medicinal purposes, including in accordance with a prescription; for sacramental purposes; and in the course of an education course, one that has been identified as such and for these purposes by the minister and notified in the *Gazette*. Interestingly, the supply of alcohol in Parliament House by the prescribed authority is also a particular area that is covered by the section 30 carve out.

Also, the provision of alcohol by the master of a ship to a member of the ship's crew is specifically provided for in section 30, as is the provision of alcohol to a patient at a hospital in appropriate circumstances and the receipt of a prize, and there are other circumstances that are contemplated by section 30 that may be the subject of regulations from time to time. We are talking about circumstances other than those, circumstances other than those particular special circumstances in which a licence of a short-term duration is granted and the category of ongoing licence that is the subject of part 3 as it relates to liquor production and sales.

I might just say for completeness that part 6 of the act onwards deals with all manner of related aspects of the regime and its control, including the conduct of businesses that enjoy the benefit of a licence, its application to minors, discipline, offences, enforcement and the like. But we are here concerned with part 3 and for these purposes making it abundantly clear that a licence that is the subject of section 39 is not to be granted in circumstances where the licensed premises are ordinarily known or advertised as a supermarket, convenience store, delicatessen or premises of a prescribed kind.

It is convenient in these circumstances to contrast that, particularly as we commence our journey out of the very comprehensive restrictions that we have all experienced in the course of the COVID-19 public health emergency. There are so many premises that hold relevant liquor licences that have been forced over these many recent weeks that we have all struggled through together here in South Australia and around the world to close down altogether temporarily. What a happy day it was on 1 June when we saw and started to be able to experience again in a meaningful way in this state the reopening and resumption of services in our hotels.

The hotels in my area throughout the hills of Heysen were no exception. As members know very clearly, because I have adverted to it on so many occasions over both this last year and the year prior, I am very proud to be the member for Heysen, within which is contained the best hotel in Australia, and that is not just me saying it. It is important that I highlight that the Crafers Hotel has been judged in multiple years by those who know much better than me across the country for its extraordinary work as an exemplar in this area and has been awarded best hotel in Australia.

Heysen is blessed with so many hotels of very high quality. I think the Crafers Hotel is fortunate to be at the top of a pile of worthy contenders because just down the road from the Crafers

Hotel we are very fortunate to have the Stirling Hotel. The Stirling Hotel is one that I have very much in mind when I say how happy I am that 1 June came around and the doors could be opened in compliance with the ongoing requirements. With full responsibility for those now necessary arrangements, one of the best hotels in Australia could be back open and welcoming locals to come and enjoy a meal and a drink in accordance with the licence that it enjoys. Crafers and Stirling are not alone.

Members interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: There are hotels near and far. I will highlight just a few more. I thank the minister for his interest because we have the Bridgewater Inn just a little way down the road. That is my local, as a Bridgewater local. The Bridgewater Inn is doing substantial and fantastic work, including its support, along with the Bridgewater Mill, for the Bridgewater Callington Raiders just across the road at the Bridgewater Oval—a wonderful precinct. Again, it is wonderful to see those venues back up and running and operating in accordance with the licences that they enjoy.

Just a little way down the road at Macclesfield we find the Hagen Arms Hotel, the Macclesfield Hotel and the Three Brothers Arms, all vying for prominence in Venables Road, right in the middle of Macclesfield, arguably the best main street in all the world. It is a wonderful place to go—take your choice or go to all three.

Just a little way further, to Strathalbyn, one finds locals and visitors alike at the Victoria Hotel, the Robin Hood and of course the Commercial Hotel. These have all gone through enormous privation over the last several weeks, and they have all been really waiting for the day when they can get back on track. JobKeeper has helped, and the way in which we have been able to move through and overcome the pandemic has helped, but we know that they will be looking for every bit of support over these next weeks and months to come.

That is not all: the Greenman Inn at Ashbourne has been recently and comprehensively renovated, and it is a gathering place for the Ashbourne community and just a wonderful place to serve as the centre of that wonderful community at Ashbourne. It would, of course, be remiss of me not to highlight, in particular, the Meadows Hotel, which has been a wonderful fixture in Meadows for such a long time, and the Royal Oak Hotel at Clarendon.

I know not all of us can stand up in this house and so proudly reel off so many of the state's leading hotels. I am fortunate to be able to do so.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You might be surprised about that, member for Heysen.

Mr TEAGUE: I am proud to be able to reel off my list and I am proud to encourage everyone, not just residents of Heysen but residents of South Australia across the board, to be out and about in the regions. I encourage everyone to tick each of these off their list to start with—there is a long weekend coming up—while continuing to patronise our restaurants, our clubs and our venues that have been opened over these recent days.

This is a wonderful opportunity for South Australians in the days, weeks and months ahead to get to know their venues throughout the state and in their local area, and also to get out and discover some of these that they might not have been to before or discovered already. I very much encourage that, and I am encouraged by South Australians who have already been demonstrating that that is very much what they plan to do, and to take this opportunity. We all know that we are still restricted somewhat in our movements, but I think the opportunity we all have here in South Australia to get around the state and to get to know our state better is one we should all take. I commend the doing of that by those in the Hills and also in all parts of the state.

As I outlined at the outset, this particular bill is providing for a very particular set of circumstances, making clear, as it does, that relevantly licensed premises—for these purposes, the liquor production and sales licence—are not to be comprised of those premises that I have described. I look forward to the further and broader consideration of reform in relation to the Liquor Licensing Act and the regime that it covers over the time ahead.

For the time being, I commend this reform and I look forward to working with the government on reforms to come, together with the work we are all doing with the hospitality industry, tourism and the related investments throughout our state with venues of all kinds that are responsibly involved in

the production, the supply and otherwise the provision of hospitality in and around the service of alcohol.

It will remain, I am sure, an area of keen interest for my constituents in Heysen to ensure, in terms of state regulation across the board when it comes to licensed premises, the provision of hospitality—whether that be at the one end on the production side, at our wonderful cellar doors, all the way through to the provision of accommodation, together with food and alcohol and indeed those providers of packaged alcohol.

The proper operation of the regulatory regime in this space is a matter of critical importance to those so many businesses in my area, and I will continue to follow reforms in this area with a great deal of interest. For the time being, I commend this bill to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (16:17): I rise to speak on the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Production and Sales Licence) Amendment Bill and indicate that I am the lead speaker on behalf of the opposition. On the face of it, this move by the government is to be commended. It appears from the contribution of the Attorney that we have a rather clever attempt by one corporate entity (a recent entrant, I believe, into the South Australian supermarket market) to try to become a liquor retailer, which has certainly been something which we have precluded here in South Australia for many, many years under governments of both persuasions.

That is not to forget the frottage, if I can put it like that, a former attorney-general under the former Labor government had with contemplating the sale of selected alcohol products in locally owned supermarkets. It was quickly found that developing such a model and trying to limit it to South Australian-owned retailers and limit it to South Australian-produced products was unfeasible. It was also, of course, important to recognise that no-one could be comfortable that doing so would not have a very substantial impact on other South Australian small businesses, particularly small businesses in the hotel industry.

We have heard the member for Heysen talk about some of his hotels in his electorate, which are almost as good as the hotels that exist in my electorate, but I take my hat off to him for trying. I am very fortunate to have people who reside in my electorate and who own and operate hotels in my electorate.

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Minister for Primary Industries makes a comment, and I am sure that he probably has a similar situation with some of the hotels in his electorate that are owned by locals of his electorate as well, and if that is the case that is something to be celebrated.

I used to represent, before the efforts of the member for Heysen, an electorate which contained some part of metropolitan Adelaide and which had some of the densest population of hotels in South Australia. I am not talking about Port Adelaide, which was always thought to have the densest population of hotels, but I am talking about just over the other side of the inner reach of the Port River, which used to comprise part of the electorate of Lee. I am talking about suburbs including Ethelton, Exeter, Birkenhead and Peterhead, which have a large number of hotels, and also, of course, Semaphore and Largs Bay.

While my current boundaries do not quite have such the density of hotels that perhaps the previous incarnation of the electorate of Lee had, I am still very pleased to say that there are still a large number of hotels, and all of them very proudly employ a large number of South Australians and employ a large number of locals from the electorate as well.

I think we should all recognise the importance of the hotel industry in supporting jobs, particularly for young South Australians. There are a lot of young South Australians who get their first job in a hotel, whether they start off in a kitchen or whether they start off as a glassy, for example, before they are able to work at that premises as a responsible person in the service of alcohol. It does not end there, of course. There are also a dwindling number but an important number of local South Australian-owned and operated bottle shops and direct liquor retailers here in South Australia that should also be recognised in the course of this debate.

It is once again a dwindling number in the current configuration in the electorate of Lee, but an important number nonetheless, one of which is attached to the Lakes Hotel with West Lakes Cellars, and one close by in my electorate, which is part of the South Australian-owned Fassina chain of bottle shops. That is not to downplay the numerous BWS, Celebration and Liquorland-type outlets, which, although they may not be ultimately owned by South Australians, certainly do employ local South Australians.

These are all operations, businesses, small businesses that stand to lose significantly if a large multinational corporate like Aldi were able to start retailing liquor from their increasing number of premises in South Australia. It would put those South Australian small businesses at a distinct disadvantage, and it would be done on the basis of, I think, a business model which takes advantage of a loophole in the Liquor Licensing Act and which certainly was not intended to give rise to this sort of retailing activity.

That is why, I think, on the face of it—and obviously we have some questions to ask during the committee stage and presumably in the other place as well—this seems to be a good measure from the government and from the Attorney-General. I note that the Attorney takes this measure to this place at a time when we as a community and particularly the government—and I think they deserve some credit, not always but some credit—for trying to be flexible with liquor licence holders at this time.

I thought it was a positive announcement from the Attorney that she would make use, and the liquor licensing commissioner would make use, of what capacities they had under the current law and regulations to enable licence holders to temporarily transition to other arrangements in order to maximise their opportunity of operating as we continue the emergence from restrictions put in place to minimise the risk of the coronavirus spreading. I think that is also a positive thing.

I do not envy the commissioner because I imagine there are all sorts of complexities and intricacies and competing issues which need to be considered about whether a particular licence holder should have that flexibility and, if they do, what sort of licence they move to, on what basis, and so on. But I think that is a good thing because for many, many decades not only has the hotel industry supported a lot of South Australian workers but so have restaurants, cafes and, in more recent memory, the emergence of small bars, particularly in the city centre.

Like all other small businesses that have been forced to close because of the necessity of trying to limit the spread of the coronavirus, they not only want to get back open and trading again, and not only do the public want to get out and support them again, but they also need to find the smoothest possible ways that they can sustainably operate their businesses in these difficult times. We had that example three or four weeks ago now of the message going out from the government that restaurants and cafes could reopen for business from a particular date only for many venues to be stymied by the realisation that they did not hold the right liquor licence.

I am not quite sure who was putting it about that the fault of that was the former Labor government and the complexity of the liquor licence laws. We have certainly had the opportunity to amend those laws if indeed it was foreseen that that was going to be a consequence. I thought whoever was shopping that argument around to the media in an effort to deflect attention away from the government was being very disingenuous. Nonetheless, finally there is some clarity and, importantly, the opportunity for many more of these businesses to operate.

I think also worthy of reflection is what sort of role we think South Australian-owned and operated small businesses should play in comparison with what sort of role large national or multinational corporations should play in our economy here, particularly in the retail sector. We have always taken the view on this side of the house that it is worthy, when the opportunity arises, to support wherever possible South Australian owned and operated retailers, particularly supermarkets. Again, another resident of the electorate of Lee, Roger Drake and his son John-Paul Drake, operate a large network of South Australian owned and operated supermarket retailers, employing thousands of South Australians.

There are many Foodlands still here in South Australia. There are many locally operated IGA supermarkets as well. Many of them own relatively small outlets. Many of them operate outlets under 400 square metres of retail space. Whether they are above 400 square metres or below 400 square

metres, we think it is worthy to try to provide a legislative and regulatory environment that gives those businesses the best possible chances of success. Things have been increasingly difficult for these retailers over the last 10 to 20 years in particular, as we have seen more aggressive, more well-funded incursions into suburbs and neighbourhoods not just by Coles and Woolies but by other retailers entering the space, including Aldi.

There are many people in my electorate who shop at Aldi, including the Aldi at West Lakes on Frederick Road. But it is worth noting that one of the ways in which that retailer is able to provide goods at a comparatively lower cost, even to Coles and Woolies, let alone to South Australian-owned and operated supermarkets, is their operating model. They make a particular point of minimising the number of staff who are present within their premises during opening hours to reduce employee costs and that contribution to their overall costs.

That may sound fine as a business owner and operator to minimise that sort of cost, but the real impact for many South Australians is fewer job opportunities at those organisations which have a growing presence and market share in the retail environment. In South Australia, I think the market share we have for independent retailers is approximately 30 per cent. In other states around Australia, it is somewhere between 5 per cent and 10 per cent.

The difference, of course, is that those other states have a deregulated model of operating hours and operating provisions, which is what the Liberal government here wanted to introduce. We have always resisted that because we know that the impact will be a leg-up for those larger, better funded, corporately supported retailers—not just Coles and Woolies but others like Aldi—to gain an increasing market share.

The dry economic rationalist amongst us, usually over that side of the house, would say, 'That is a good thing. It should be up to the consumer.' Well, it is not a good thing if it means that thousands fewer South Australians will be employed in the retail sector. It is worth reflecting on the figures that South Australian independent retailers regularly provide to governments, oppositions and members of parliament about the average amount per hundred dollars that are spent on wages in those different types of retailers.

Of course, it is no surprise that it is the Foodlands, the IGAs, the South Australian-owned and operated retailers like the Drakes, which proportionally employ more South Australians. Not only do they employ more South Australians, but being locally owned and operated means that the profits that are generated largely stay in South Australia as compared with the profits that are generated by the Coles, the Woolies and the multinationals like the Aldis. That is why we have always taken this position.

I am glad that the government, at least in this way, is recognising that South Australian-owned and operated retailers are worthy of some protection from the incursion that the likes of an Aldi is trying to make within the South Australian market, because I think it is a recognition that they do not hold the same promise of contribution to jobs or economic activity on average that other retailers do. That is critically important at this point in time as we seek to support an economy which has been battered from the impacts of the restrictions put in place to limit the spread of the coronavirus.

I do hope that the rejection by the parliament of the government's attempts to amend the shop trading act in that way are left alone and not reargued because, over the next two years, as we expect to be in economic recovery, what we need to see are more efforts like this that help support South Australian owned and operated enterprises from the incursions of multinational players. We need to see fewer attempts to change the laws that make it easier for nationals or multinationals to increase their presence here in South Australia because, quite frankly, it is bad for our economy.

The promise of saving 10¢ a litre on a carton of milk or 20¢ on a loaf of bread is not worth the significant loss of employment and livelihoods that it would create across the South Australian economy. I think it is in that vein that I draw the distinction between this bill and what it seeks to do and the defeated bill that we have previously seen, which sought to amend shop trading hours.

We even saw the Treasurer come out as we were entering into the midst of these very tough but necessary restrictions and say, 'Well, to enhance social distancing opportunities, we are going

to increase shop trading hours.' The response from Aldi, Coles and Woolies was to reduce their opening hours, not expand them, which came at some embarrassment to the Treasurer and to the government.

It was also remarkable that we were saying to South Australians, from another ministerial direction about shop trading hours and what could and could not occur for ANZAC Day, that we could have people entering shops as long as they maintained social distancing but not RSLs. I thought that was remarkable. I thought it was a very poor look for what was a tin-eared attempt by the Treasurer to try and stamp his relevance and mark on the coronavirus restrictions and the management of it by the government.

As much as we have taken exception with several of the ways that the state's economic recovery has been handled by the government, one thing I can say has been pleasing is largely the absence of the Treasurer from that, because I would have thought that that cold, unimaginative hand which he brings to government financial matters, let alone economic matters, could be cast to one side so that we could genuinely support the community of South Australia and the economy. I hope that the—

Mr Pederick: He's written a blank cheque for Health.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sorry, the member for Hammond was winding me up.

Mr Pederick: I said he has written a blank cheque for Health, which it would have hurt him to admit to.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: 'He has written a blank cheque for Health.' I am sure the Minister for Health would be pleased to hear that, although it does not quite explain the 370 nurses who have received notice that their services of employment are no longer required.

I hope that the government continues in the vein of this sort of bill, gets in behind South Australian-owned and operated retailers and makes those changes that give them the support they need in order to not only get back up and running to get their operations up to speed again but to maximise the opportunities they have to employ South Australians, because it is exactly what our economy needs. If this is what the government is doing here, then it is to be applauded. I think the distinction between this and its shop trading hours reform is something that should be noted.

I would be pleased to leave my remarks there, but I am waiting for another member to be ready to commence theirs, so I will continue to the point at which we reach that juncture in time and I will not be the last contributor to this debate. I have to say, though, he is not making it easy on me to conclude and pass over the speaking opportunity to the member for Hammond, because I understand he is yet to resume his place.

Mr Pederick: Someone is going to jump me, though.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: There we go. If we are handing over to the minister for the regions, then I will be pleased to conclude my remarks now.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Alas, member for Lee, we all must conclude our remarks at some point in this place.

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (16:39): I guess we all have a story to tell about a local hotel, a local pub or a local club, and I will reflect on a few of mine in the seat of Chaffey. I have quite a unique situation, a different set of rules from a lot of the privately owned hotels, because in the Riverland we have community hotels. They are not owned by individuals; they are owned by the community, and they were set up during the soldier settlement era. Those hotels in the main Riverland towns are just that, and there is an agreement that there is only one hotel per town and only one club per town. They were set up with a board structure, and to this day that is still the way they are managed, but there are some outlying hotels that are individually owned.

If I start the journey from Adelaide and head back into the great electorate of Chaffey, the first hotel I come to would be the Sedan Hotel. It is famous for being positioned on a five-way junction on the highway, and there are always many, many stories to be told there. The Pinningtons who manage it are really great hoteliers. They realise that it is a marginal-type pub, but they have their

regulars who are always at the front bar and always have a story to tell when I call in, and they always serve up a great meal if I stay there. Of course, we have to drink responsibly, and to be able to do that we need a great pub meal—and there is nothing better.

As we make our way through, coming into Blanchetown we then run into the Blanchetown Hotel. I know that the manager there, Wes, also does an outstanding job. The Blanchetown Hotel is quite a historic hotel. It overlooks the River Murray and is enshrined in history because it has been there such a long time. It is home to Lock 1 and is a great asset to the town.

If we look further, just down the river—we have to come out of Blanchetown and turn right to head to Swan Reach—is the Swan Reach Hotel, which is also enshrined in history. It sits high on a cliff overlooking the River Murray and the town. It is a great pub: a longstanding family have owned that hotel, the Johnstons, and they continue to keep it open. They have been through some very slim times, particularly when that part of the area was devastated by the Millennium Drought.

The diversity at that part of the river is obviously reliant on shack owners, and anywhere below Lock 1 is where you will find the majority of the shacks on the River Murray. The area above Lock 1 does not lend itself to shack owners, as such, but lends itself to the houseboat industry—but that is a story for another day.

If we come out of Blanchetown and turn left, we head towards Morgan, a unique river town. They have two pubs across the road from each other. At the Terminus, Phil, the manager there, does a great job, as does the Commercial. They have their loyal attendees who grace the bars there and whenever I call past it is always one beer in one pub and another beer in the other pub, just to keep everyone happy. I regularly attend a number of these pubs when I am out and about having my politics in the pub. It gives those local constituents an opportunity to come and vent their opinions and also to catch up. If they have any grievances unassociated with the chat of the day, that is exactly what we do there.

After we have been to Blanchetown, turned right to go to Sedan or left to go to Morgan, all of a sudden we come into the Riverland and the larger towns there, and that is where we find the community hotels. Those hotels, as I said, have a board structure. Basically, they are part of the fabric of those Riverland towns. As I said, there is one hotel per town and one community club per town, and they all have a unique distinction.

Of course, we come to the Waikerie Hotel, which was recently burned down and, in association with their vision and their future, the board rebuilt it and it is an absolute picture now in the main street. It is not on the river, but it is a landmark in the town of Waikerie. One of the trademarks of Waikerie is that they do not have local rubbish bins: they have big oranges on the footpath that people put their rubbish in. That is much to the displeasure of the council because, every time those bins have to be emptied, the bin collector cannot come along, flip them up and put them in the back of their truck: they have to get out and empty them manually. As a sidenote, that is just part of the experience in Waikerie.

Just up the road from Waikerie is the Cadell Club—and Cadell is a very small river village—and it is a unique experience in that it is only open a number of days per week and run by volunteers, who do an amazing job. It is one of the landmarks of that town and it, too, is sponsored and patronised by a loyal group of locals. There are some commuters who come up from Adelaide and have blocks up there. Every time I drop in, there is always someone new in the Cadell Club. They have fought the lean times. That community band together and the volunteers keep that club alive. It is an absolute testament to their commitment not only to keep the club alive but to really keep the fabric of that small town alive.

Into Barmera, there is quite a majestic hotel at the bottom of the main street. It is also complemented by the Barmera Club, which is really the Barmera footy club. They have just done a massive renovation. I talk about these pubs and clubs because the reason they survive is that they are patronised by local people who are passionate about these landmarks. All the pubs in the Riverland are landmarks because they have significant history and they have significant stories to tell.

Everyone has a sporting hero in a Riverland town. I could go on for a very long time about the prowess of the Riverland greats in sporting history. The walls are adorned with pictures of sporting greats. Whether it is in Waikerie or Barmera with a Ricciuto, a Light or an Ebert, pictures of a number of footy greats and waterski greats adorn the walls.

A little bit farther upriver, we get into Berri. Berri has quite a famous hotel up there. The Berri Hotel has had many, many renovations, but it has also had a passing trade. People from right around the Riverland used to congregate at the Berri Hotel, at the Vines. It was always the Vines disco on a Friday night. People would even come up from Adelaide just to attend the Vines disco—how about that?

Mr Pederick: Isn't it on anymore?

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

Mr Pederick: Outrage!

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE: It has moved on, but I will get to that in a minute. What we see is that a lot of the younger ones have moved on from the Vines. They moved upriver to another Riverland town, and I will get to that soon. We cannot go straight from Berri upriver; we have to go across the river to Loxton. The Loxton Hotel is a beautiful hotel at the bottom of the main street. It does not overlook the river, but it is adorned with history, and it is also a hotel/motel. It has some accommodation and it really is a great hotel run by a very progressive board. The diversity in these hotels to remain viable in small country communities is testament to the fact that they have stood the test of time.

Of course, the Loxton Club is another institution that has a different following. As I said, it is a one-pub town and a one-club town. It has its followers, but it is now neighboured by the newly built sport and rec centre and has a huge sports precinct around it. That gives people the opportunity to watch their sport, play their sport and also walk next door to the club and overlook all that sporting precinct and have a nice cold frothy one. Sadly, the Berri club has closed. There were some shenanigans going on there, with the takings going missing and all of a sudden it disappeared. That is a story for another day. I have talked about all the clubs.

My home overlooks the only village settlement left in Australia and that is the Lyrup village. The Lyrup Community Club has a huge history. As I said, Lyrup is classified as the last remaining village in Australia. It is adorned with the support of the bowling club and that is one of the feeds into that small club. What I can say is they serve the meanest crumbed prawns. I eat a lot of crumbed prawns and I have to tell you they are probably the best in the state. It is a Riverland village, away from the sea, but they just know how to perfect the crumbs on those prawns. I have to give them a plug for that because it is one of my favourite meals.

All the towns have footy clubs. They are a great institution and we understand that. One of the hotels I have saved until last is the Overland Corner Hotel. It is an historic mudbrick hotel that was built in 1859. When you go to the Overland Corner Hotel, you sit down at the bar and you have a beer with a ghost, because there is a patron ghost that sits with you at the bar. Many a tale has been told about the ghost. The more beers you have, the more talkative the ghost is. It really has a story to tell.

The hotel was submerged from top to bottom during the 1956 floods. It was built for the drovers, the Cobb & Co. coach, way back. I had a vineyard property next to the Overland Corner Hotel and I very rarely got to visit Phil and Renske Reddy, but they always serve a very good meal and a very good cold beer. It is an historic pub and a lot of tourists call in there for the experience of having a conversation with a ghost.

As I said, we all have a story to tell about our pubs, our hotels and our clubs. They are all great stories. Many of us have a story to tell about our local. It is a part of the social network in today's society, although things have changed over the last 20 to 30 years. People have to act more responsibly when visiting their local and then driving so, as I said, they have to drink responsibly but also at the same time maybe have a cold beer, buy a carton, take it home and have a beer there or a wine.

The stories about the pubs are fond to everyone's memory. Everyone has a story. I am not going to be overtly political about what this bill is about, but what I would say is it is great to tell a story about the local pubs. It is great to tell a story about some of life's experiences in the bar, in the lounge, at the disco. Country pubs are part of that regional history and they are part of their town's fabric and history.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:54): I rise to support the Liquor Licensing (Liquor Production and Sales Licence) Amendment Bill 2020 and acknowledge that what we are doing here in the main is not allowing supermarkets to sell liquor, which has been a longstanding position in this state.

What we are also not affecting is stores like the Coomandook takeaway bottle shop, which is there with the local general store, and it also does not affect places like Walker Flat or Nildottie either. I recently visited the Walker Flat store, which has the post office and the liquor store there, and, sadly, the owners have it on the market. They may walk away if there is no interest in buying that seven-day-a-week facility to service the local community, which would be a real loss. I am not reflecting on the current owners; it is a tough gig working anything seven days a week and I commend them for that.

Certainly, in relation to the little shop at Coomandook, it is very handy. It is three kilometres from my home, from the farm. You can go in there and pick up a few light refreshments if you so desire and take them home. Certainly, 25 or 30 years ago, when I was working in the shearing sheds, it was very handy to pick up a couple of light refreshments as you went past and you might run into a couple of mates on your way through. Whether it is general stores with attached businesses like that or hotels, as the member for Chaffey, the Minister for Regional Development, was indicating, they are a place for real camaraderie and getting together.

I reflect on what the Minister for Primary Industries was talking about with the Vines disco disappearing. It happens a bit through regional areas. There is a bit of a drop in population or just a change in how things happen, and we have had it happen in my area. I have sadly been around for a few decades now when I have been old enough to drink, but I just want to reflect on a couple of venues—it was the same venue rebadged; I cannot remember which order it was. It was called the Oasis once and then the Ranch (or the other way around), which a licensee who is still in licensed pubs in Adelaide, John Meek, ran between Jervois and Murray Bridge. That was quite the spot to be and there were quite a few live bands out there (it is now a private house), but that sort of went by the wayside over time.

I would just like to reflect for a very short period on John Meek's contribution in the licensing industry and the entertainment industry. He currently runs—or has run; some of the doors are slowly opening—the Black Bull, the Woolshed and Downtown, where he has invested several million dollars to get them up to speed. These venues are licensed for several thousand people all up.

This is obviously part of the issue with COVID. We all understand that while we are working with the corona restrictions people with these large venues are struggling to get them back on their feet. It was easier—I think we have done great work as a government and with the people of South Australia complying with the requirements—when the state basically was shut down, to a degree. It is far easier, it seems, to shut down a state than to open it up.

Even so, I think the Premier and our government are doing a fantastic job in a measured way. At the end of the day, we have to keep people safe and we have to keep people alive. If you look at the worst-case scenarios, what you get is some of the situations that have happened overseas in many countries, including Italy, where the decision was being made that if you were over 60 you did not get a ventilator if you were crook. As I understand it, that was just the blanket decision that was made: if you ended up in hospital, you would not be revived.

I am not saying that was going to happen here; we have done very well here. Sadly, we have lost four people to this virus, but I must commend our front-line people, our health professionals, our health workers and everyone in the field, the police and the government for what they are doing in this crisis.

I note that The Woolshed was slowly opening up the other day. I get a bit of a kick when my 19-year-old son finds out where I am on a Saturday night. I might have been at a function back in the day—not that long ago, pre corona—and he would say, 'What are you doing? Why don't we catch up for a drink?' It is quite good: you go in there, and there are a lot of young people in there from my electorate. There may or may not be a lot of road signs, which for some reason have ended up in the bar, that reflect places around the back of Cooke Plains and Malinong in my electorate. I am not sure they how they got there, but that might be another story. People are always made very welcome.

From what I understand, when the pubs had to shut down, John Meek had 76 kegs that were all on tap and he had to get rid of them. I do not know what he did with them; he might have had to tip them down the drain. But I would just like to acknowledge him. I get that not everyone is into licensed premises, but he has managed to supply entertainment both in my electorate and with what he has going on in Adelaide. There are plenty of struggles with getting liquor licences and working around them. Good on him. He has a fairly red-hot crack and puts everything on the line, I can tell you.

I mentioned this in my maiden speech: about 25 or 30 years ago I was working with a group of other young people between Keith and Geranium, and obviously Coomandook is fairly central to there. I worked with a group running the Sandblasters balls. I was the president for a time, and I was the treasurer. At our peak, we were turning over about \$100,000 at these events. It was a challenge, I think, for the authorities on the licensing—and I get that—but they are very contained events. People turn up, you usually have a live band and you pay an all-inclusive fee. There are drinks on the Saturday night, people stay overnight and then there are a few light refreshments on the Sunday.

Sadly, for a range of reasons these events have essentially disappeared from South Australia. I know they had the Stonerollers at Murray Bridge, which is one of the lingerers, and I know Deniliquin still runs a very strong event later in the year.

Mr Teague interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Denny's still going.

Mr Teague: Goondiwindi's still going.

Mr PEDERICK: Goondiwindi has a function that still goes, I am informed. These are fantastic events in the country.

The main thing that came out of this event that we used to run down there was the fact that we donated tens of thousands of dollars into the community. It was so fantastic to go to places like the school where I spent most of my schooling, Coomandook Area School, and donate something like \$5,000 of playground equipment or a different group of CD stackers for Geranium Primary School or something to Tintinara, something to Keith, something to the Coonalpyn area. I know we donated a tank to one community; I think it was at Peake. It was money going back into the community.

I note that there were challenges with the authorities with working through licensing matters. There is nothing more daunting, as a couple of young blokes and a couple of young girls, to go to licensing and be in a room in Adelaide with about 15 or 20 people and going through how the licence was going to work. We did not have to do that all the time, but it was good that we got an outcome where we managed to get the show functioning.

I do not think they were called superintendents at the time, but over time I have caught up with John Atwood, who was the equivalent of the police superintendent of the area. He was based in Murray Bridge, and we have some quiet, cordial conversations about how we used to work together on making this function work for both of us. I did reflect one day that it might have been a bit easier dealing with us than the Hells Angels at Ponde, and I think he agreed with me.

That was a great time, but things disappear. There is a bit of a dearth of options for young people in Murray Bridge at the moment as far as entertainment venues go. It has been that way for a while, and I know that is reflected to me by even some of my staff talking to me. I guess it is only an hour up the road to Adelaide, but people have to stay somewhere and that sort of thing. But, as I indicated, back in the day there was a bit on. There was the community club happening and then people would end up down the road.

There may be an option. We have three hotels and a community club in Murray Bridge now: we have got the Swanport, Karen Milesi's Murray Bridge Hotel, but we have the Bridgeport, who are finally—and during this crisis—doing a major rebuild to build something fairly similar to the new Port Lincoln Hotel. That is the new Bridgeport Hotel right on the edge of the river and it will be a fantastic venue in the future. It is owned by the Tregoning group. It is about a \$40 million build with six storeys and 99 rooms of four-star accommodation.

I have had people reflect to me that they hope they have something that can keep the young ones there on weekends and have a bit of local entertainment because it is needed. We have taxi services and all that sort of thing to make sure that people can get home and do the right thing. People look for entertainment. As we come out of the coronavirus, it is just so good to go to a venue. A week ago tonight, I went around to the Strathmore hoping that I could walk in—I think it was 10 plus 10 licence rules then—to see if I could get a meal at a hotel. I said I was on my own and they said that was alright. You realise that just the opportunity to go somewhere is fantastic.

The next day I had lunch across the road at 2KW up on the roof and that was good as well. It was just nice to get back to a bit of normality, as we have all had to retreat into our caves for a while. That is the reality of what life has been. I genuinely wish the venue owners, whether they own restaurants, small bars or especially those who operate big venues, like John Meek, keep going and find a way through this crisis.

I know there has been a lot of support through JobKeeper from the federal government and support obviously from us and the Attorney-General varying licences to make room in outside venues so that we can do our best with the 80 maximum now and 20 per area. That will slowly ease up over time. I understand that publicans and venues want to hastily open up these venues. I absolutely get that, but at the end of the day we have to do it in a measured way so that we do not have a breakout, because if we have breakout all of a sudden we will have to swing the clamps back on and we will have a real problem with corona rearing its ugly head again.

I also want to talk about some of the venues and places throughout my electorate. We have many hotels from Pinnaroo to Milang. I mentioned the hotels in Murray Bridge and there are also clubs there. The new horseracing club is a fantastic venue. The new greyhound club is a great venue. There are many smaller clubs, such as the footy clubs, the bowling clubs and that sort of thing. At Tailm Bend, we have the railway hotel and the Riverside overlooking the river. If you get down my way, there is the Peake Tavern and the Lameroo Community Hotel, and in Pinnaroo you have the Golden Grain and the Pinnaroo Hotel.

In fact, there was an amusing story that I have told here before so I will give a fairly abridged version. We were down there as part of the select committee into grain harvesting in 2011. We thought we would go to the Pinnaroo Hotel for dinner. We came in unannounced, which was a bit of a problem. They said, 'We have a few schnitzels. We will get them on the go.' They cooked them up and then realised they were one short. To his great credit, the member for Chaffey and I decided we would go half each on a schnitzel so we could make sure the Labor members, the other Liberal member and the crossbench member from the committee could get a full schnitzel.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: So bipartisan.

Mr PEDERICK: So bipartisan. The love was in the room. It is something that occasionally we reflect on. The member for Mawson and the member for Frome were there. It comes up with a bit of jocularly over time. It probably did not hurt me at the time, I must say, to only have half a schnitzel. They are the things we do in the Mallee.

I want to reflect on some of the other things they do in the country, like the Geranium bowling club, where I started bowling over 30 years ago at Night Owls. Now that I have been the president of the South Australian Parliamentary Bowling Club for a few years, I probably should have started bowling 40 years ago and I might have been better. Night bowls is a great way for country people to get together—well, anyone, it does not have to be in the country. I think night bowls is a great way for people to get into the game, and there are a lot of younger people bowling.

I think this is a move in the right direction. What we are doing with these amendments is addressing deficiencies that have been identified with the new liquor production and sales licence

category and to reinforce our long-held position that alcohol should not be readily available in supermarkets. It amends this licence category to state that the licensed premises must not be comprised of premises ordinarily known or advertised as a supermarket, convenience store or delicatessen, and provide for a discretion that further premises can be prescribed.

The bill makes a transitional provision to ensure that the amendments to this licence category will apply to licences already granted and to existing applications. It also seeks to address a loophole under this licence provision that allows businesses to sell liquor that they have not produced through direct sales transactions, such as online sales or by mail order.

It is proposed to limit the sale of liquor by direct sales transactions to the licensee's product only, except where the sale is by wholesale or where liquor is sold in quantities of 4.5 litres or more. The proposed amendment would ensure that an LPS licence is only granted to genuine liquor producers and wholesalers. Additionally, the bill includes an amendment to expand the circumstances where a person can seek a review of a decision made by the commissioner with the permission of the Licensing Court.

With the few minutes left, I want to also reflect on the great wineries throughout this state. The other day I mentioned in another speech how good our wineries are in this state and how Langhorne Creek sometimes gets overlooked. It is a fantastic winegrowing region in my electorate, with hundreds and hundreds of hectares of vineyards. These people here have had to adjust their systems regarding licensing arrangements and whether they can be open or not. I commend them all for what they are doing, but I want to acknowledge a couple of them.

I know a lot of work is going into different facilities at different wineries in my electorate. Lake Breeze at Langhorne Creek is building a new function centre and Bremerton is doing a fairly sizeable expansion, and that will enhance the opportunities in the region as well. There is a whole swag of wineries: Bleasdale has been around since day dot, essentially, and Angas Plains Wines and a whole range of others contribute to the local area. They have had it tough. I know they have ramped up the online sales, and that has been very handy for a lot of them, and things are opening up as we come out of the coronavirus restrictions.

There are lot of different licence categories and that has caused a few issues in regard to how things have opened up over time. I want to commend the government in that, as we saw there were gaps needing to be filled, we worked through some of those issues. There is a whole range of licence, including:

- short-term liquor licences;
- small venue liquor licences;
- club liquor licences;
- packaged liquor sales licences;
- short-term five-year liquor licences;
- residential liquor licences;
- wine export licences;
- event endorsement for short-term five-year licences;
- liquor production and sales licences;
- on-premises liquor licences;
- general and hotel liquor licences; and
- restaurant and catering liquor licences.

It is a mixed space and there are real reasons for that. I think we have had some real outcomes moving forward, getting people back into venues, whether it is a small shop like the one in Coomandook, where they sell off the premises, or a small bar in the city, or a place like the East End Cellars (and Michael Andrewartha was one of my classmates at Urrbrae back in the late seventies;

it is a bit scary when you reflect on how long ago that was), or a hotel or restaurant. I commend everyone for hanging in there and now getting on board, working through all the restrictions and doing all the right things so that we can enjoy these venues into the future.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:15): I thank all members for their contribution to the second reading of this bill. Whilst it has been rather expansive in the breadth of matters raised in the contributions, it adds the colourful flavour of the industry we are trying to assist here.

If I could just say that, although the bill itself is relatively narrow, in that it is dealing with a potential problem that we had brought to our attention as a government by the commissioner as to this particular licence and its tension with a very clear position of the government and the previous government, liquor in supermarkets was not something that was intended. Whilst in the reforms under the previous government, which did rationalise some of the licences (and this one in particular), the liquor production and sales licence is actually an amalgam of the old producer's licence and the wholesale liquor merchant licence categories.

So we are dealing with a cohort that has a special licence, which is intended to make provision for winegrowers/producers who had the wholesale outlets and really the development of what has become a major cellar-door industry and an opportunity to enhance regions in South Australia that are already rich in tourism. So it is a certain category this is designed for. In short, what has occurred is that, although there was no intention for supermarkets to have liquor available in their product, some supermarket owners do grow grapes and produce wine, and there was potential for it to be argued that persons operating those outlets would take advantage; indeed, applications have been made.

This is a very discrete area of remedy to, in this bill, make provision for the liquor production and sales licence to very clearly identify that it is not to apply to outlets where the premises are advertised and ordinarily known as a supermarket, convenience store or delicatessen. I have to say that I am never overjoyed by seeing the words 'convenience store'—it is very American. It is like a corner store, but in any event I do not want to in any way detract from the importance of this piece of legislation. However, on the advice of parliamentary counsel, it is important here to identify that we are clearly separating out this category and making it clear that this is not, and was never intended to be, addressing supermarkets.

Although this definition is there, other members have raised with me the question that we have other types of licences, one of which is available for small stores, that is, local stores. They are very often in the country and very often the only outlet for food, coffees, and things of that nature in a very small township or settlement. Some are even smaller than towns, and there is no local hotel, there is no local liquor store and there is no local outlet, and persons who live in that settlement or town and surrounds would have to go for quite extensive drives to neighbouring regional towns to be able to access liquor.

These small stores, and there are probably 30-odd around the state, as I say, very often in regional communities, have a special, different category of licence from what we are talking about here today to enable them to sell a small provision of alcohol. It simply means that the local people in those towns or communities are able to go down to their local store, get a takeaway chicken, buy a sixpack of beer and be able to go home and enjoy a refreshment that most other people in South Australia have the benefit of. So we do have a special category for those. I just want to make it clear that there is no application of this bill to affect that licence, which is independent of the production and sales licence that is what is being dealt with today.

Thank you very much for that. I acknowledge Mr Soulio and his team in the commission for the support that they have given us in understanding this issue that has been identified and working through it with us as to how this be dealt with. Legislation seemed to be the only way to make it abundantly clear that that is the current position of the government. I just want to acknowledge also the work of some of the stakeholders, including the South Australian Wine Industry Association, which is a significant stakeholder in this area.

I also want to say in concluding on this bill that, although this potential weakness, loophole—whichever way you want to put it—has been identified in this legislation, we have a very significant

industry and contribution of those in the food retail outlet business. Supermarkets are a major player in that space and provide an extraordinary level of service in what they provide to us.

They have, through their stakeholders and individually, presented to the government, and I am sure to the opposition, very significant submissions and some quite powerful arguments for the relaxation, I suppose, of the opportunity to sell alcohol from their outlets, namely, the supermarkets.

It is not the view of the government at this point and it was not at the time of this legislation, and—I say this with confidence—it was not the view of the previous government at the time we dealt with this legislation, and it was not even the view of Mr Tim Anderson QC, who is the retired judge who had done a comprehensive body of work for the previous government in liquor licensing reform, that supermarkets come into this space.

I do not know what will happen in the future. It may be that these things change over time, but that is the position of the government at present, and this will just make it crystal clear in this legislation. Again, I thank members for their contribution and am happy to answer any questions in committee.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Deputy Premier made some allusion in her closing remarks about the consultation that had been undertaken. Could she provide any further detail about who exactly participated in the consultation and what the views offered to the government were in those consultations?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: In short, the SA Wine Industry Association, Adelaide Hills wine, Department for Trade and Investment, McLaren Vale wine industry association, Barossa Valley wine, Clare Valley wine, Coonawarra wine, Currency Creek wine region, KI wineries, Langhorne Creek, Padthaway wine region, Riverland wine, Limestone Coast wine, Wrattobully wine region and the Australian Hotels Association.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Could the Attorney outline whether applications have been made to—I cannot put it euphemistically—exploit the loophole that we are seeking to close and who made those applications?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that the Liquor and Gambling Commissioner, Mr Soulio, whom I have referred to earlier in this contribution, had received applications from Aldi supermarkets as a producer of wine for six of its Adelaide stores. I cannot otherwise make any comment in relation to other applications, because they are currently before the liquor licensing court.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 and 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My question to the Attorney is: will these provisions in the bill close all potential loopholes with respect to supermarkets, delis and convenience stores?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: As I am advised, yes. I had some quite lengthy discussions, of course, with the commissioner in relation to this matter as well, but I also have the excellent services of the officer of that division here today. That is correct.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Attorney noted in her speech that an applicant for a packaged liquor sales licence that is not the subject of changes in this bill may be granted permission to sell alcohol in a supermarket if the licensing authority is satisfied that there is a proper reason for doing so. I know she spoke about regional circumstances, but could the Attorney provide other examples, or even an exhaustive list if she has one, about when this could possibly happen?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised that the most common one, of course, is Asian stores, which are food outlets where they have a rather unique product. I am assuming that it similarly applies to other types of cultural based liquors that might be sold, usually associated with a food outlet of that cultural mix—so Indian; I imagine that there would be some Turkish options, etc. I cannot say I am a connoisseur of these types of liquors, but they obviously are there in a complementary role with other cuisines.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is the government, or indeed the commissioner, aware of any circumstances beyond those sorts of supermarket-type retailers?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: We will take that on notice, just in case there is. I am probably trying to think of a situation not dissimilar to what I was referring to before in a circumstance where there may not be any other facility available, where that might be available to, say, a small supermarket in a town. There may be a cultural section within that and it is able to be sold within those premises. We will check that, and if there is anything else that has that type of specialty licence, we can forward that to you.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Is there any impact on alcohol retailers that are attached to, but not necessarily inside the main premises of, supermarkets at this point in time?

The CHAIR: No, and I am sure the member would remember when we debated this legislation back in 2017, I think it was, that there had been some relaxation in relation to the facilities around the adjacent area. That is the popular option available to supermarkets now, that is, to have something next door, separate entrances, capacity to ensure that the people who are working within a food area may be a certain age and not require the same standard of those who are working in a liquor store next door, who have to be over 18 and obviously have to have some checks, etc.

There is a different level of surveillance, a different level of obligation, in relation to the provision of alcohol, obviously to protect minors, and so on. As I understand it, there has been no problem with that. That has continued and remains the usual option, if I can describe it is that, of supermarkets to have an accompanying enterprise next door to be able to offer as geographically close as they can a liquor outlet.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Last question on this bill.

The CHAIR: A point of clarification, I guess.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is a point of clarification, indeed. Thank you, Chair. Can the Deputy Premier advise, and perhaps she may need to take this on notice, whether there are any applications submitted and being considered for such premises, as we have just discussed, from retailers attached to a supermarket premises,?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot give you an answer to that today, but we will take that on notice. This relates to any pending applications currently in the commission. At the least, I can give you the number—I may not be able to give you the names, and I will just see about confidentiality on that—of those seeking to have a standalone but adjacent separate entrance facility next to a supermarket. It is a different licence, but I am happy to take it on notice.

Clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (17:32): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

RETURN TO WORK (COVID-19 INJURY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

**RAIL SAFETY NATIONAL LAW (SOUTH AUSTRALIA) (RAIL SAFETY WORK) AMENDMENT
BILL**

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:34 the house adjourned until Tuesday 16 June 2020 at 11:00.

Answers to Questions

CHILDREN IN CARE

In reply to **Ms STINSON (Badcoe)** (12 May 2020).

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection): I have been advised:

It is no longer the practice of the Department for Child Protection to use hotels, motels or caravan parks for the placement of children and young people.

Since March 2018, outside of holidays, hotels and motels have only been used where accommodation is required for the convenience of the child or young person.