

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16 June 2020

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

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

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (LICENCE DISQUALIFICATION) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2020.)

Mr ODENWALDER (Elizabeth) (11:03): I rise to speak on behalf of the opposition on the Statutes Amendment (Licence Disqualification) Bill. I am the lead speaker, and perhaps the only speaker on this bill, but that remains to be seen. I indicate from the outset that we will not be opposing the passage of this bill through this place. We certainly will not be delaying it unduly, but we do of course, as always, reserve our right to interrogate and also to make changes, or to attempt to make changes, in the other place if we deem it necessary.

We will be using the time in between the houses to consult further with stakeholders because, once again with this government, what we see here is a bill that is in part reproduced from a bill—quite a hefty bill—prepared for and by the previous government. We see this time and time again. We see a bill that was quite a large body of work prepared for and by the previous government brought to this place. For whatever reason, it failed, parliament prorogued, as is the case with the origins of this bill, and then the government, after lengthy delays, brings back a small part of that bill for us to consider.

On that basis, I see no reason for us to oppose these measures, certainly not in the House of Assembly, but I would say that it is another example of that sort of delay, of the cherrypicking of work done by previous governments. It does raise the question why the entirety of the 2017 bill, the Statutes Amendment (Transport Portfolio) Bill, quite a hefty piece of work that not only addressed inefficiencies in the court system around licensing and things like that, which are worthy measures—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

Mr ODENWALDER: You have done all of them? You broke my flow, Attorney. It does raise the question why all the measures in the bill have not been enacted by this government, why they have not done it sooner, why they choose now, apparently on the back of a conversation with the Chief Magistrate, to introduce these efficiency measures. I will say again that we do not oppose them. These were measures brought in by the previous government, supported by all sides, I am advised, yet 2½ years later we see a small sliver of that work reappear in the parliament.

I will get back to the bill at hand before I go on. There will be a short committee stage but, as I said, we will not be delaying this in any particular way. I see the member for Heysen is here. He may also have a lengthy contribution, and I look forward to that. The bill essentially makes two small and minor changes to the Motor Vehicles Act and the Road Traffic Act to make the calculation of licence disqualification easier. I enjoyed, as I think the Minister for Transport did, the Attorney's contribution, the Attorney's second reading explanation, and the examples she gave of how this might work in practice.

I will try to distil my understanding of the bill. It deals with circumstances in which a police officer issues an immediate loss of licence and the same driver is then subject to a court-imposed licence disqualification. Under the current law, a minimum disqualification period is based on the level or seriousness of certain offences. If a matter reaches the courts, a disqualification period may

be imposed that is longer than the minimum. When the court imposes a disqualification, certain calculations are required that take into account any time already served under an immediate loss of licence. In some cases, the immediate loss of licence may have expired before the court imposes a final penalty.

The current law, as I understand it, allows the court to set the disqualification period and take all relevant factors into account. The bill does not change the outcome necessarily, but it is an efficiency measure and it saves some time in making the calculations, we are told. The changes to the Motor Vehicles Act I am advised are consequential to this and they ensure consistency between the two acts.

This did form part of a larger body of work introduced into the parliament by the member for Lee, the then minister for transport, and it was a considerable piece of work aimed at efficiency and also at road safety. I think it underlines this government's lack of commitment to road safety overall. Since the election, one of the first measures in the first budget was to disband the Motor Accident Commission, to prevent it from doing its work in the last six months of its life even. During the life of the last government, we saw the road toll, the number of deaths on our roads, steadily decline over the last 10 years.

Upon the election of the government, and concurrent with the disbanding of the Motor Accident Commission and the running down of its functions, we saw a spike in road deaths, which we are still seeing continue. Of course, we have seen a drop in the road toll over the last three or four months, but that is because most of the state has been in some sort of lockdown. In fact, you would think, all other things being equal, you would see a far greater drop in the road toll than we have seen, considering the drop in road traffic. I am sure the Minister for Transport has the statistics on the decrease in motor traffic over the last three months.

The Hon. S.K. Knoll: I do.

Mr ODENWALDER: Excellent. I look forward to your contribution, minister, because it underlines the point that the road toll in the first three months of this year, all other things being equal, should by any measure have dropped considerably. Time and time again, we have called for the reinstatement of the Motor Accident Commission, for the reinstatement of its functions, in terms of it being an independent body charged with advising the government and advising the public on road safety measures, measures that appeared to work over the last 10 years.

During the life of this government, we have also seen complete bewilderment from the motorcycle rider community on the government's lack of action in terms of the loss of life and the road trauma suffered by motorcycle riders. We saw a significant spike in 2017 of motorcycle road trauma which led to the then minister, the member for Kaurua, convening the Motorcycle Reference Group which made a whole series of recommendations through CASR to government, none of which have seen the light of day.

As this government has progressed over the last two years, the motorcycle community has become increasingly frustrated. They have come to see us. They came to see me. They came to see the member for Croydon, the Leader of the Opposition, and said, 'We are confused. The government is not listening to us. In fact, it will not even consult with us. It will not meet with us. Not only will it not enact the measures recommended by the CASR report, it will not even convene the Motorcycle Reference Group to find out what we want or if indeed we still want those recommendations re-enacted.'

As it happens, they did want some of the licensing provisions around motorcycle licensing enacted, so in the absence of any action from the government, in consultation with the shadow cabinet, I decided to bring a bill in here which did precisely what the CASR report recommended, which is to make the licensing of novice and new motorcycle riders more stringent, to place greater safeguards around early licensing, to make the licensing period longer, to make the age of an initial licensee higher, all those measures which are proven and, as we are told by the experts in CASR and elsewhere, which will significantly reduce road trauma and death among motorcyclists.

The government's record on road safety is not good. It appears to have taken the Chief Magistrate's advice in introducing this efficiency measure, which on its own is perfectly fine, but as I said before, there was a significant body of work introduced in the previous parliament which

not only addressed efficiencies around licence disqualification and all those other measures which do clog up our courts—I accept that, and they clog up police work as well—but also road safety. I look forward to the committee stage. I look forward to finding out where the rest of these measures have gone. I hope that the Attorney can speak on behalf of the road safety minister and the Premier in terms of assuring the public that they are going to start taking road safety seriously.

In fact, the immediate post-COVID emergency time presents them with an opportunity to readdress road safety, to look at changing traffic patterns. They are already reassessing our needs for public transport, which is another story which we will get to later on, but it does present an opportunity for them to reassess how our roads are being used, what measures might be put in place, including a reinstatement of an independent body like the Motor Accident Commission in order to keep road users, pedestrians, cyclists and motorcyclists safe. I look forward to the speedy passage of this bill through this place. There will be a couple of questions in committee, as I said, but we will not be delaying it unduly. I commend this bill to this house.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (11:13): I rise to commend this bill to the house and take the opportunity to make some observations about how it will operate. I have listened carefully to the member for Elizabeth in his contribution to the debate and his endeavour to provide some context around the development of the bill and work that might have been done by the former government in the course of its time in power.

I understand there was a transport portfolio bill that progressed some substantial part of the way along the journey up to the election, or indeed at least up until late 2017, and might have addressed a range of things, including some of the subject matter that is presently before the parliament. It caused me to reflect on the difference between process on the one hand and delivery/outcomes on the other.

There is one thing that we have seen very clearly in the very early days of this Marshall Liberal government, which came to power in March 2018. In just these first two years, we have seen outcome after outcome after outcome. As the Premier oft indicates, a corollary to that is 'underpromise, overdeliver' and be able to talk about what has actually been done. What are the outcomes?

The process and the consideration of a range of different things that might be brought before a parliament and might be taken through the process to become law are all very well, but we as legislators are here working for a real community comprising real people, who live their day-to-day lives very much in an environment where it is not theory and process that govern but the outcomes that are delivered and here, relevantly, the subject of legislation that comes to this place and is passed through this place.

I welcome the opposition's indication that it will support the bill. I am usually somewhat discombobulated by this formulation that comes along about reserving the right to analyse things in committee, in this case all the more so perhaps given that the member for Elizabeth has emphasised how much this is the result of the good work of the previous government. I will listen carefully in the committee and, if that was really rising no higher than a general catch-all in case something occurs at the last moment, well and good.

Otherwise, I note the member for Elizabeth's reflections about the work that has been done on this by the previous government. It is unsurprising, therefore, that it would support this bill. It will be interesting to see if there is any as yet unrealised source of question or analysis that might come at later stages, but let us proceed in the meantime with a degree of optimism about what we might expect in terms of the smooth passage of the bill.

The bill regularises a process that involves the interaction of police with the courts and is very much directed towards simplifying the process of imposing relevant mandatory periods of disqualification in the context of court process following police imposing a disqualification by a notice. Those who are following the debate and taking an interest in this specific area need look no further than section 47IAA of the Road Traffic Act, where the work of the amendments is to be found.

The bill would amend subsection (9)(e), as it presently stands, to ensure that there is one of two clear available channels for the court to follow when matters come before the Magistrates Court

as a result of charges being pressed following police having issued a notice imposing a period of disqualification.

In the first of those two cases, the court will be dealing with circumstances in which the police have imposed a period of disqualification and the matter comes before the court before that period has ended. In those circumstances, as those who are following the debate I think would readily acknowledge, understand and support, the relevant period may be backdated so as to commence at the time that the initial disqualification commenced—the on-the-spot disqualification, or, as it is described in the section, an immediate licence disqualification or suspension by police.

So, there are some cases in which there will be an immediate loss of licence imposed on the spot by police in the appropriate circumstances. There is then a charge that follows and the matter comes before the Magistrates Court before that period ends. In that case, the new subsection (9)(e)(i) will allow for the commencement of the period imposed by the magistrate to apply from the date of loss of licence.

The second of the two circumstances is where the period of disqualification by police has expired by the time the matter comes before the magistrate, subject of charges, and the magistrate is going about imposing a period of licence disqualification. In those circumstances, the bill would provide for the period that is to be imposed as a period of licence disqualification by the magistrate to take into account that completed period of disqualification.

There is perhaps one point of further clarity and understanding that is worthwhile focusing on for a moment in this regard. Section 47IAA as a whole deals with the power of police to impose immediate disqualification or suspension. Subsection (4)(b) provides for the notice that is given by police of immediate disqualification, in the case of a person who holds a driver's licence, for the licence to be suspended for the relevant period as defined, and the relevant period is then defined in terms of the mandatory minimums for a first offence.

This is where one might ask: why would the notice that is issued by police for disqualification ever vary from the mandatory minimum, and why, therefore, would it be necessary for a magistrate to be routinely or regularly imposing some different period of disqualification? One of those circumstances is going to be where the offence is a subsequent offence. Just to be clear about the potential for there to be a difference, the relevant period of the police notice might be appropriate in a whole range of circumstances, including those where the offence is a first offence, but it almost inevitably will not be equivalent to the mandatory minimum in circumstances including a subsequent offence.

To illustrate that point, for a category 2 drink-driving offence, which is a relatively serious drink-driving offence defined in section 47A of the act, there is a mandatory minimum disqualification period of six months for a first offence, but that then goes up to two years if the offending is sustained and there have been multiple offences. Similarly, the more serious category 3 drink-driving offence starts at 12 months and proceeds to a mandatory minimum period of three years for multiple offending.

That might make it clear that, while the relevant period of the police notice is issued on the spot, and therefore in the case of a licensed driver the period applies from the moment of offending, the relevant period might well in many cases ultimately be the entire period of disqualification. Where the matter comes before the court and all the circumstances are considered, there may be two different possible sets of circumstances: it may be that the magistrate determines that it is appropriate to apply some greater period of disqualification than the mandatory minimum but, secondly, it is conceivable that it comes to attention that a different mandatory minimum is applicable in the circumstances, in which case there is at least a necessary extension of the period of disqualification.

So one can see where the court needs to deal with the extension of a period of mandatory disqualification imposed by police, either the result of the exercise of judgement and all the circumstances following a charge or in direct compliance with the act and the whole of the landscape of mandatory minimum disqualifications as they apply, where it might transpire that there are multiple relevant offences, and then the need to apply a different period.

It is a practical matter that is part of what the Magistrates Court is dealing with on a day-to-day basis. It is for that reason that, notwithstanding it having not been brought into force by the previous

government as part of its broader portfolio work, it has remained a source of unnecessary complexity and complication in the day-to-day business of the court. For that reason, as I understand it, the court has continued to seek this reform and the government has responded accordingly.

It ought to provide, therefore, in one aspect of detail in the administration of this area a means by which a court can dispose of this business in an orderly way and without having to get out the abacus, the calculator or other tools to do a complicated calculation as to time. It need not do that where these matters are clarified, which is the subject of the bill.

I have referred to the category 2 and category 3 drink-driving offences that are provided for in the section. Section 47IAA also relevantly provides for mandatory minimum periods of disqualification in circumstances of the refusal to submit to an alcotest or breath analysis. In the same way, the same structure of mandatory minimum imposition applies to the refusal or failure to submit to a drug screening test, oral fluid analysis or blood test. Further, this applies in the particular circumstances of a driver in an accident refusing to submit for tests when being treated at a hospital.

As I said at the outset, this is reform that is, for all substantive purposes, wholly contained within section 47IAA of the Road Traffic Act. It includes an essentially consequential amendment to the Motor Vehicles Act to bring that in line with the substantive amendment. It will make the business of the court more straightforward and efficient. It is an outcome that we should all support, and I commend the bill.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (11:33): I thank members for their contributions, particularly the member for Heysen. The opposition raised a matter as an expression of concern, followed by an indication that they will support the bill. Nevertheless, the concern raised by the member was, 'Why now, 2½ years after a new government?'—I wish it was 2½ years; I think we are two years and three months, which has been a generational change of government in this state—because this had previously been part of an eight-tranche reform that was presented by the previous government.

The Chief Magistrate of the Magistrates Court, Judge Hribal, had been seeking this reform for a number of years, which overlaps with the previous government to date. In short, the answer is that, although there are other areas of reform that have been picked up, and some advanced and some continuing in the previous bill, this aspect that is the subject of this bill is one that is exclusively within the domain of a request by the chief judge. While these other matters are being looked at—and I will indicate what they are shortly—this was one that was easily severable and one that we could advance.

That is precisely why the government of the day have said, 'Look, this is a machinery operation in relation to court efficiency. The Attorney-General has brought this to our attention, along with the Minister for Transport, and we can easily address it.' Sometimes I come to the parliament, as newly a member of the government, and the opposition complains that we have just taken a little piece to advance, and why do we not wait until we get it all ready and do all the reform? Now they are complaining because we have taken a piece off, which we think is easily severable and which we can present, and that is precisely what we are doing.

Judge Hribal has raised this with me as Attorney-General and, although it was within a package of previous transport reforms of the member for Lee, who was the minister for transport during the introduction of the previous composite bill, as I said, this was a matter that could easily be excised.

The road traffic law and regulations, which was introduced by the member for Lee as a composite bill back on 15 November 2017, was largely to cover reforms, including dealing with the procedure for expiation of offences detected by safety cameras. The administrative burden of having declarations was also a concern, and there was a process to bring matters online. I would have to say that this government has been very active in making sure that we provide services online.

There was a significant penalty for the nomination of statement having false and misleading information in it in creating an offence. I remind the member that we recently passed legislation in this house which allows for offences relating to online information. It was largely to accommodate the court's advance of the ECMS program to enable online lodgement and a portal access.

Documents being lodged electronically has meant that we have had to recreate a specific offence for that. In fact, only recently, I think in the last week, I wrote to the Chief Justice and other heads of jurisdiction that that law had passed and was now to be operational.

The second was to make sure that companies could not just shield unsafe drivers who worked for them by not disclosing their name when they got a penalty for a road traffic offence. I think the boss used to pay \$300 and there would be no disclosure of who was driving. It was higher than the usual rate, but it was designed to be able to process matters and get a fine processed, without the employer presumably having to go around, search all his truck drivers or whomever might have produced the offence and be able to identify them. Obviously, in some companies where there are a very significant number of employees or people on different shifts or people who share vehicles—there are lots of examples—this is sensible law reform, and in fact we have already done it. That is the second.

The third relates to expiation of notice, the first and second offences, in relation to being unregistered and uninsured. I am not sure what has happened with that, but I will certainly follow it up with the Minister for Transport. In relation to the immediate loss of licence and the consequence in relation to a number of those aspects, we are dealing with that now, and it is important reform. A seventh area of the bill relates to light vehicles that are illegally parked on clearways. I do not know the answer as to the progress of that, but I am happy to make an inquiry.

The eighth initiative, which was proposed by the previous government in this bill, was to make changes to the Motor Vehicles Act to ensure that all licence holders gain the requisite driving experience at each licensing level. I know we have had lots of different changes in relation to provisional and unrestricted drivers' licences. I do not know whether we still have a heavy vehicle licence. I think we still have motorcycle licences that are different. There is different, graduated licensing. We can make some inquiries as to the advance of that, but there seems to be hardly a session of the parliament where we are not making some changes to licences, both in standards and suspension of licences. That is a matter we will certainly have to follow up.

I make this point: back in November 2017, I think the previous government had a different agenda of the importance of priority. It was all about electoral boundaries. The member for Lee, who was the minister for transport, comes in with his comprehensive bill, says this was important reform to make it faster, fairer and whatever their other slogan was at the time, and then does nothing more about advancing it. They were in government; they could have actually dealt with this issue, but they did not.

They set the priorities, and I do not take any view on any of these other reforms. On the face of it they seemed sensible, and some things we have advanced and some things are under consideration. However, it is up to the government of the day to prioritise what they progress in the parliament. Whilst the member for Lee introduced this piece of legislation, apparently long-sought—including by Judge Hribal, in relation to the aspects of which she was seeking relief for her magistrates in the assessment of periods of disqualification or suspension of licence—the priority of the government of the day was electoral reform.

What happened in that last week? We spent all of Thursday with the attorney-general and various other players, including the now Leader of the Opposition in the other place, as he was at that time, rushing around to prioritise what was important for them. That was to remove provisions under legislation relating to electoral boundaries, in particular section 83. That was their priority: get rid of the fairness clause, have all these meetings with the Greens about how that was going to progress, throw it in on that last day when other important legislation was left swinging in the dust. That is what actually happened.

So, please, when members come into the house and decide that this government has taken up the responsibility of important reform—some of which is still being considered, as I understand it, but which we are happy to follow up—we will action areas of priority. This is one which could have been done, even by the attorney-general, as a separate bill if he wanted to, back in 2017. We all know what the priorities of the previous government were, and it was not this. So spare me the crocodile tears about the failure to advance something when the situation is patently different. I have a very long memory. I think I am a very forgiving person but I never forget.

As to the substance of the bill, that has been clearly identified, with an indication from the opposition that they support it. As I said, I thank the member for Heysen for his assessment of that as well, and the importance of us advancing this legislation. I commend the bill.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

Mr ODENWALDER: I have a few short questions. I thank the Attorney for her fulsome second reading wrap-up. She answered, in part, some of the questions I have. The remainder of the questions I am sure will not tax her or her advisers' minds unduly. Notwithstanding the Deputy Premier's speech about the government's priorities in the last term, the question still remains why this measure has taken two-odd years to get to this parliament, given that the Chief Magistrate then and now wanted this particular change. We will leave the other changes for now, but why has this change taken so long?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I think it was implicit in the matter I raised that this was part of a transport portfolio bill back in 2017. There are three ministers in our government, and I think there were three ministers in the previous government, who had different responsibilities from the Motor Vehicles Act, the Road Traffic Act and one another—we are not amending it today, but I will just quickly find it—the Expiation Offences Act.

The Minister for Transport has responsibility for at least two of these, and there may even be a third. We also have a road traffic minister who has a say on these matters, the Minister for Police, in our government. I cannot remember who it was in the last one, but there was one. I remember Michael O'Brien, the member for Enfield, at one stage took that role, but I cannot remember who was the most recent one before the change of government. Was it the member for Kaurua, perhaps?

In any event, whilst there is an overlap of interested members, directly in their portfolios, in these bills, they are dedicated to the Minister for Transport. Whilst that bill was re-consulted on and progressed, my recollection is that Judge Hribal raised it in her meetings with me, as to the advance. I have some correspondence from 2019 in which she raised that, and then us going through the process of extricating that from other matters that had not been advanced so that we could do it as a standalone matter.

Mr ODENWALDER: I appreciate the Attorney's answer. You hinted at this again in your second reading wrap-up, but will you take on notice the progress of the other matters which you said you would in that speech? Will you or perhaps the Minister for Transport take that on notice and provide the house with a report about the status of those other measures?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I cannot answer for the Minister for Transport, but I think I indicated two things in the contribution I just made: firstly, most of these seemed to be meritorious ideas at the time, and whether they are easily translated into the former bills process we are yet to see. I undertook to bring them to the attention of the Minister for Transport and, doubtless, he can deal with the matter when he deals with the other substantive matters that remain outstanding.

Mr ODENWALDER: Apart from the Chief Magistrate, then, what other further consultation has occurred on this bill in the last two years? Was it just the Chief Magistrate or did you consult with, for instance, police or councils?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My understanding is that SAPOL are in the process and, because it was administrative, Judge Hribal. I think as a matter of course these amendments go off to the Chief Justice anyway, do they not? The bill may have in the end, but I think it is just a process. I know I sign about eight usual suspects when it comes to bills that relate to court matters: Chief Justice, Chief Judge, magistrate and so on, and SAPOL is obviously in that sort of group.

Obviously, this was consulted on by the previous government. These have been identified areas of reform that were sought, and we were excising that piece for progress. Certainly, SAPOL in the consultation came back to us to confirm that they also appreciated this legislation being advanced

to the extent that they of course operate the prosecution unit, which appears in the Magistrates Court, so I expect they would have the heavy lifting to do in relation to these matters. Police officers at the time were ensuring their ILOs, which is the instant loss of licence.

They issue those notices in the first instance, but they also have the heavy lifting and the progressing of these matters in the Magistrates Court, and obviously the magistrates themselves. But it is an efficiency measure for the purposes of the magistrates in then having to deal with the determinations—and I think in fairness we need to make sure that there is a just and equitable approach to those who are appearing who might be subject to a disqualification or suspension.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 4 passed.

Clause 5.

Mr ODENWALDER: I will be brief. Given the Attorney's previous answer, how much time could you expect to save per case, do you think, with this measure in place? What will the efficiency be? Has there been some work, an estimate?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I could not give you a time limit. I suppose it would depend on the mathematical capacity of magistrates who hear these matters or their clerks. They do not have associates in the Magistrates Court, so some poor, hapless person has to sit down and actually do the calculations on these things and, I imagine, provide a brief to the magistrate. It is a time issue. Also, of course, if you do not create a law which is easily implemented, of course it is usually vulnerable to error. I think the important thing here is that that date of commencement will be clear.

Nobody has ever suggested to us that we get rid of ILOs, because they are an important tool in taking people off the road who are clearly intoxicated or under the influence of drugs or who are refusing to have a test. It is one way or the other—there are about four or five different offences we are covering here. Nobody has ever suggested that we take away that immediate action process.

Really the only other thing that can be done by the police—and sometimes they do assist in this regard, as the member probably knows—is that they may assist in obtaining alternate transport for the person who might be detained at the time of identifying that an alcohol or drug problem is evident. They might call an Uber or whatever the current situation requires. I know that the police try to assist those who might be left. For example, if somebody is left in the car who might be a partner or small children, clearly they have got to get home, so police obviously assist in this regard. I think that is a good thing to do, but the driver, who is the subject of an alleged breach of these laws, needs to be able to lose their licence straightaway.

It just becomes complicated when you have mandatory minimum periods which then apply. This is the legislative resolution of that. It will make it easier for the application by the adjudicators and, with that, ipso facto, the prosecuting officer, and the defence counsel if they have representation, in hearing these matters. It is a time saver for everyone—no lengthy verbal areas of calculation which can be in error in the submissions by counsel and minimising the room for error in a determination by the magistrate.

These are the general reasons that hopefully will save a lot of time in the Magistrates Court, which has, as members know, a very high turnover of people attending every day. In fact, it is one of the courts that has been the most complex in terms of managing the COVID situation because many people attend in person and are required to respond to a summons or warrant and they may have other support persons.

There is a high turnover of cases, and it has been a very complex exercise to try to keep magistrates and staff members safe while at the same time ensuring we have a timely progressing of administration, so it is a case of anything we can do to assist the court. In that regard, I want to commend Judge Hribal for her excellent attention in dealing with a very difficult period for the high turnover court she deals with here in Adelaide, as well as in the suburbs and our regions.

Mr ODENWALDER: My question follows on from that. I assume there has been a decrease in these types of offences during this COVID period during the time the Magistrates Court has been under the pressure you talk about. What has been the decrease, and what is the quantum of that

decrease in these types of offences being brought through the Magistrates Court? I understand that you might need to take that on notice.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I will have to take that on notice. The Commissioner of Police has made statements in relation to COVID and its consequences in relation to crime generally, and I understand that overnight arrests are down considerably. If we are talking about drug and alcohol-affected people, whilst the closure of restaurants and hotels has been a nightmare for the people who operate and work in those businesses in terms of economic damage, the instances of people out in the public arena has a meant significant reduction in the consumption of alcohol while people are out and about.

How much of that is translated to the consumption of alcohol and/or drugs at home—people might be at home because they might be mature aged and protecting their health, or because of any other COVID circumstances—we are yet to identify, but it seems that overall there is a reduction in overnight arrests.

Whether that is translated in relation to motor vehicle circumstances I do not know, but I do know that during the two or three months we have been in this period of heavy isolation there has been a big reduction in motor vehicles on the roads. It is crawling back; I think we are back to pre-COVID traffic when it comes to 3.30 in the afternoon or 8.30 in the morning because schools are back. All these things have an impact on motor vehicle use.

I do not have the data on that, but I am sure the police commissioner is keeping a fairly close eye on it. As I said, conduct arising out of the consumption of alcohol in a public place has been significantly identified during the period. People do not want to be locked up in their houses forever and it does not mean they have stopped consuming alcohol, but they might just collapse on the couch rather than going out driving and committing an offence.

Mr ODENWALDER: This is my final question, I hope. Could the Attorney tell the committee whether there have been any other measures requested by the Chief Magistrate, whether there are efficiency measures or other things that have not been enacted or brought to the house yet?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am advised there are none specifically. I meet with the Chief Magistrate on a regular basis and from time to time she raises her recommendations with me, which I have largely implemented. Often they are in Attorney-General portfolio bills, as you might appreciate. I cannot think of any that are current that she has asked for, but she certainly makes comment in relation to criminal law reform.

She is, of course, a party who is regularly consulted, and I think the last area about which I specifically consulted with her was in relation to keeping her informed about provisions for commercial tenancy under COVID-19 bills because it is her court that would ultimately be the appellate body dealing with disputes between landlords and tenants in a commercial or retail circumstance. As you know, SACAT is the body that deals with residential matters under that legislation. I think that is the last thing I specifically dealt with with her, but I try to make sure that we advance where we can.

If there is a current portfolio bill or other amendments coming, obviously we add to them, especially if they are to affect other courts. Sometimes, we might need to change the other courts, whether that be the Coroners Court, Supreme Court, District Court, her own court or the Youth Court, which are the principal courts in the court structure, or the environment court and others.

As the member would know, the Magistrates Court is not only a very busy place but it is also the court of first instance for certain civil matters and all criminal matters. Although the superior court has the capacity to receive information in relation to a felony charge, it does not as a matter of course. The magistrates deal with all these matters in the first instance, from murderers to shoplifters, so it is a very busy court.

I try to make sure, in relation to something like major indictable reform, that although she does not deal with the final matter, her magistrates have to deal with everything in the first instance. It is important that I get a very clear understanding of how any law reform like that has an impact on their court.

Clause passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

WAITE TRUST (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2020.)

Mr DULUK (Waite) (12:02): I rise to speak on the Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill 2020. As the member for Waite, this bill does indeed hold significance for my constituents and the community we live in, its heritage and the legacy of Peter Waite.

Before addressing the bill itself, I wish to pass on my sympathies and those of the electorate to the family of Mrs Marion Waite Wells, who passed away last week at the age of 94. Mrs Marion Waite Wells was the great-granddaughter of Peter and Matilda Waite. She was also the foundation president of the Friends of Urrbrae House and a strong supporter of her local community. We have lost a pillar of our community, and again I extend my sympathies to her family.

As we know, the purpose of bill is to allow the Minister for Education to vest part of the land, which is subject to the terms of the Peter Waite Trust, in the Commissioner of Highways to allow for construction of the upgrade to the Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection. The land is currently owned by the Crown in the trust and, given the Crown cannot compulsorily acquire its own land, the bill is needed to free that land from the trust. The land in question is part of the Urrbrae Agricultural High School campus.

This land forms part of the proud legacy of Peter Waite, who, on arriving from Scotland in 1859, proceeded to establish himself as a property manager and pastoralist. He worked closely with Thomas Elder and was a strong advocate for agricultural education. His passion for improving South Australia's agricultural standing led him to gifting 45 hectares to the state government to establish an agricultural high school. At the time he said:

I have been much influenced by the wonderful work our agriculturalists and pastoralists have accomplished hitherto in face of the very great odds they have had to meet. With comparatively little scientific training they have placed our wheat, wool and fruits in the highest estimation of the world.

Our agricultural machinery has been found good enough even for the Americans to copy; and our farming methods have been accepted by other states as the most up to date and practical for Australian conditions. We have now reached a point where it behoves us to call science to our aid to a greater extent than hitherto has been done, otherwise we cannot hope to keep in the forefront.

Since the time of those words of Peter Waite, Urrbrae Agricultural High School, and the Waite campus that is now part of the Adelaide University, has certainly done that: it has kept up with the science to aid the betterment of the agricultural sectors.

Peter Waite also gifted many hectares of land to the University of Adelaide to be used for agricultural studies and as a public park. His legacy continues today with the great work happening at Urrbrae Agricultural High School and at the Waite Agricultural Research Institute as part of the University of Adelaide.

Heritage and local history are of great importance to me and to many of my constituents, and undoubtedly to members here who represent the surrounding electorates. The seat of Waite is home to many heritage buildings and sites, including the Urrbrae House historic precinct and the Waite gatehouse lodge. Preserving our heritage buildings and character suburbs adds to the charm of our communities, tells the history of our neighbourhood and benefits future generations.

As part of the upgrade to the Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection, I believe the preservation of Peter Waite's legacy of historic trees and the Waite gatehouse is very important. Heritage preservation was identified as a key concern of local residents who provided feedback to the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure as part of its consultation on the project. I thank the department for seeking a second round of consultation in recent months from local residents on this very issue, after, I think, the department realised that the preservation of the gatehouse and the historic trees, as part of the Waite Arboretum, was of great concern to many who will be impacted by this proposed development.

Those who responded to DPTI's community consultation expressed their apprehension about the impact of the Waite gatehouse, the significant trees, Peter Waite's legacy and the heritage value of the Waite campus. Many local residents around Netherby and Urrbrae reminded me of the role they took in ensuring, in the 1990s, that the Netherby Kindergarten was not carved out of the Waite campus but that it sit on its current site today.

I have been in constant liaison with my community regarding the proposed upgrade, as well as potential impacts to the state heritage listed Waite gatehouse and the avenue of trees on the eastern side of Fullarton Road. I have also met with Dr Wayne Hervey from Friends of Waite Arboretum to understand their views on the proposed development. I was pleased to hear, as I mentioned before, that the department has recognised community concern regarding the future of the gatehouse and is conducting further investigations to see what design mechanisms can be met and if the Waite gatehouse can be preserved as part of this development.

It is also encouraging to hear that the department is working with Heritage SA, the University of Adelaide and other stakeholders on this project. As planning progresses, I implore the government to listen to the many South Australians who want to preserve these key heritage pieces, not just in my electorate but across our whole state. Another key concern of local residents is the impact of those living along the two roads in question, the devaluing of land, the loss of frontage and the acquisition of land for the project.

Another key concern about the project—and something we must consider in progressing this important project—is around significant trees. There are many in my electorate who have taken part in the department's feedback who have said the same. I thank local resident Mrs Joanna Wells for her advocacy of the strong protection of the significant trees in the arboretum as part of this project. She has certainly been going around the electorate, suburbs around Waite, Kingswood and Mitcham, fighting for the trees at the arboretum, which is fantastic.

Since 1928, the Waite Arboretum has been a place of tranquil beauty and botanical treasures. It comprises 27 hectares and 2,500 specimens from around the world, growing on annual rainfall of 618 millimetres without supplementary watering after establishment. I did not know until recently, when I was talking to Dr Jennifer Gardner, that indeed the only time when the trees in the arboretum are watered outside of rainfall is when they are initially planted. After that, they survive on what nature provides. That is why the arboretum is such an important ecosystem, not only in and of itself in its location but in what it gives back to science and those who are interested in all things botanical.

The values of the trees in the arboretum are quite incredible. A 2017 report by Dr Jennifer Gardner, Marian McDuire and Erica Boyle, entitled *An i-Tree Ecosystem Analysis*, found the structural value of the surveyed trees (about 50 per cent of the Waite Arboretum collection) to be about \$13 million. Carbon storage of 1,167 tonnes, equivalent to annual carbon emissions from 910 vehicles or 373 single-family homes, is captured in the arboretum. Air pollution removal is 1.2 tonnes per year, equivalent to annual emissions from 160 vehicles or 36 family homes. Carbon sequestration is 34.3 tonnes and oxygen production is 91.5 tonnes. These are just some of the environmental benefits that are captured by those trees that sit on the corner of Fullarton Road and Cross Road.

These significant trees have been around for almost 100 years. They add so much to the local environment, and to have them torn down unnecessarily and without due consideration as part of this project I believe would be a huge loss. Once again, I ask the government to take these valid concerns into account as they move forward on this project.

The Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection is a vital part of the daily commute for many residents in my electorate and surrounding electorates and, indeed, those coming down from the Adelaide Hills. For many people living in Waite, this intersection is one of the only intersections that they travel through to get to the city. About 60,000 vehicles go through the intersection each day, and with it being the site of a number of horrific crashes we can understand the need to ensure that this intersection facilitates efficient and safe traffic flows.

There is also a strong desire from my constituents and many others in the Adelaide Hills that we seek to remove heavy freight vehicles from the South Eastern Freeway, Cross Road and other suburban roads. Once again, I remain disappointed at the KPMG report released not long ago into freight movements across South Australia and believe that in not pursuing alternative freight options around the back of the Adelaide Hills or through the south we are missing out on great opportunities to undertake road freight reform in South Australia.

One of my constituents, Dr Ken Moxham, summed up this issue well when he was talking about freight movements and alternative plans. In this case, he was referring to GlobeLink and he said:

...GlobeLink offered a viable plan to get the freight trucks off of suburban roads—

including Cross Road—

roads [that voters] use to go to work, to take their children to school, and to shop.

Getting freight road transport away from normal suburban roads and off the freeway is what most people including myself found attractive in the GlobeLink idea and I want to encourage you—

as in me—

to do all in your power to commence activities to achieve this goal.

Whilst that disappointment remains, it is good to see that alternative freight routes are still on the agenda. The RAA released a report to that extent last week. Residents of the Adelaide Hills, Mitcham Hills and Urrbrae area would completely agree with the RAA's assessment that 'major freight routes along busy urban corridors should be avoided wherever possible'. For many in my electorate, this includes Cross Road.

The RAA's advocacy for an alternative freight route, such as the route via Truro, to be used by higher productivity vehicles is one that would receive a lot of support from commuters, including my constituents who regularly use the South Eastern Freeway, Cross Road and Portrush Road. Once again, I ask the state government to work with industry, work with the federal government, and indeed work with the community, to develop alternative road freight routes for the benefit of my constituents and all South Australians.

In conclusion, I am supportive of the upgrade to the Fullarton Road-Cross Road intersection. Safety is so important and too often we see road fatalities in our community. Of course, this intersection was subject to an horrific motor vehicle accident just some months ago. At the same time, we can get transport right, we can get the commute right, we can get traffic flow right, but we can also look after and protect heritage trees at the same time. I believe in this proposed development we can do both: we can look after our environment and protect heritage, and save it for future generations, and we can look after the motorists of South Australia, which is so important.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Oh for 618 millimetres!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (12:15): I indicate to the house that I am the lead speaker for the opposition on the bill. I have to say that listening to the member for Waite's contribution concerned me a bit, given his inability to actually engage with his electorate appropriately, given the cloud that he is under personally because of his actions on a drunken night here at Parliament House. That is now before the court, so I will not go into that in any great detail. I just feel for the people of Waite, as they do not have a parliamentarian who can actively advocate for them in this matter. I was interested to hear the member's concerns about traffic coming down the South Eastern Freeway using the Portrush Road—

Mr DULUK: Point of order, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There is a point of order, member for West Torrens. Yes, member for Waite?

Mr DULUK: Standing order 127: personal reflections on a member, the member for West Torrens saying that I cannot advocate on behalf of my community. I respectfully ask that he withdraw those statements.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Waite has asked that the member for West Torrens withdraw comments that he made reflecting on the member for Waite.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will not, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You will not. I have asked the member for West Torrens to withdraw the comments. I have not directed him to. In essence, he does not need to, but I would ask him in the remainder of his contribution to be conscious of the fact that he needs to stay on topic.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. I also note that the member for Waite talked at length about Portrush Road and Cross Road and people from the South Eastern Freeway using that intersection. I point out to the people of Waite that they were told before the election that an incoming Marshall government would build a bypass road to avoid those traffic congestion issues on Portrush Road for people coming down the South Eastern Freeway.

Of course, those promises made by the member for Waite and members opposite in the lead-up to the last election were abandoned, so I think that anything those members talked about in terms of improving congestion on Portrush Road and Cross Road would be treated by the people of Waite with the same level of scepticism that they had once GlobeLink was abandoned by this government. I think, given the member for Waite's personal problems, they will take everything he says with a pinch of salt.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens, I have asked you to stay on topic, please.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Thank you, sir. The Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill alters the operation of a trust. The Speaker has yet to rule whether this is a hybrid bill or not. There is some debate about whether there should be a select committee to look at whether or not changing the purposes of this trust is the appropriate manner in which to deal with this matter. It is certainly the opposition's view that if the standing orders require having a select committee, we should comply. We should absolutely comply, because, let's remember, at the very beginning Peter Waite vested this land to the state for a purpose. The government is now using its power in the parliament to alter that purpose.

The government is altering that purpose for a common good: to build a road. The outcome of a select committee could very well be that this is overwhelmingly popular, that we do want to see part of the Waite land gifted to the people of South Australia through Archibald Henry Peake, whose portrait sits up in this parliament and after whom the seat I won in 1997 was named, used for this purpose.

Mr Waite approached Archibald Henry Peake about vesting this land for educational purposes. He gave one portion of the land to the University of Adelaide and another portion of the land to the state government to encourage and incentivise agricultural practice. It has been a huge success. The minister is in a very difficult position here and I have some sympathy for him. He wishes to upgrade an intersection because the local MP, who used to be a Liberal, probably will not be the candidate for the Liberal Party at the next election and they are going to need something to talk about with their new candidate they are going to run in opposition to their former member who is no longer a Liberal.

My guess is that this intersection was fast-tracked so that the government would have something to talk about in the seat of Waite. So here we are, an upgraded intersection; I am sure the government will argue it is a worthwhile upgrade, but we are changing the use of the trust. To the minister's credit, I raised an issue with him about, once the trust is vested to the Minister for Education so that the land can be used for a road upgrade, whether it is the government's intent to return the

remaining part of that portfolio that is on the title back to the trust for those purposes. I quote the bill under clause 4—Variation of Waite Trust at subclause (3) as follows:

If the Commissioner no longer requires any land vested in the Commissioner under this section such land may be revested in the Minister in accordance with the scheme prescribed by the regulations.

That is, once we have finished building the road, once we have finished with the land that we need to build this road upgrade, because the member for Waite can no longer be a Liberal Party candidate and we have to find a new one so that we will have something to talk about, the question then becomes that it is entirely up to the discretion of the minister or the commissioner to revest the land for the purposes that Peter Waite set out.

My guess would be that the people of Waite and the people of South Australia want more than a promise from the minister and more than a promise from the parliament. They would want it in writing in statute that it must revert the land. The minister told me, when I raised this matter with him, that it was always his intention to revert the land, and I take him at his word. I think he is being completely honest with me about that but I think it serves a public purpose for the minister to move an amendment in committee to amend this clause. If I attempted to move that amendment here, I would not be successful without the support of the government. I would need the government's support.

I can flag that if the minister does not move this amendment we will have discussions between the houses, and I can assure the minister that someone will move this amendment in the upper house, whether it is the opposition or a crossbench member. I think it makes sense. I think everyone in this parliament wants that to occur once the government has finished with taking as little land as it needs for the purposes of this road and vests it back to where it was originally.

I am advised that one of the reasons the entire portfolio is being handed over to the commissioner for the purposes of this road upgrade is that the department have not yet finalised their plans about how much land they are going to need for these road works. In effect, the government is asking the parliament to give the department a blank cheque for how much land they take and then a promise that they return it after it is completed.

It is very hard for parliamentarians by committee to work out what engineers need to make this road work, so I accept that first part of the department's and the minister's argument. It is hard to know how much land to compulsorily acquire until the designs are completed because there are some very sensitive issues to deal with, including some property of historical value that is diagonally opposite and directly opposite this intersection upgrade.

The question for the opposition is: do we support this bill on the promise that it will be returned once the land is taken? Consider the government's history on making promises with roadworks like GlobeLink. I still see no 24-hour airport in Murray Bridge. There is no sweeping freight line and new highway going around the Adelaide Hills straight down to the port of Adelaide, connecting up with the Northern Expressway and the Port River Expressway, to bypass all that freight, as promised before the election.

So when the minister says to me, 'It's always our intent,' I want to take him on his word, but the government's track record on transport promises is pretty flimsy. I suppose the question then becomes: will the minister move an amendment? The second question is: do we hold a select committee? I think it is pretty clear that we have to, and I do not know why we have not considered that. The standing orders are clear: this fits the definition of a hybrid bill.

We are changing the purposes of land that has been entrusted to the state on bequest in a trust. That requires a select committee. Why? So we can go out and speak to the people impacted, so we can put an advert in the paper and let people know that the government is planning this. What are people's views? Let's hold a public meeting at the Waite. Let's ask people what their views are. Do they support this? Let's find out how South Australians feel about this land that has been gifted to them for a particular purpose that the government is now changing.

I think the government will argue that, when a former Liberal government changed the purposes of land used in the Waite Trust in the 1990s under then attorney-general Trevor Griffin, that hybrid bill and that select committee were sufficient for prospective parliaments to do as they

please. If it is a hybrid bill, the Speaker rules that it should be a hybrid bill and the government then does not want it to be a hybrid bill, the question then becomes: will the government use its numbers on the floor to suspend standing orders to rush this bill through?

I will wait for the advice from the Clerk and the Speaker about whether it is a hybrid bill or not. I understand that parliamentary counsel believe that it is not a hybrid bill, but that is a matter for us as a parliament and the Speaker. It will be an interesting test to see what path we go down here. On the face of it, we take the minister on his word. There is nothing to suggest that he is planning anything else, but let me give you a scenario that is not that uncommon. This is a very large portion of land. I am not sure exactly how large the title is, but it is a large portion of land.

The entire title of that portion of land has been taken out of the trust and vested in a different minister, who changed the purposes of it. Let us say that, 20 or 30 years from now, the school closes. How many schools have we seen throughout South Australia be redeveloped for housing? A future parliament, a future treasurer and a future minister might think, 'Well, this is prime land. It's on the corner of Portrush Road and Cross Road. It gives us the ability to develop it. There is no need for legislation anymore; the government in 2020 did that for us. It's already vested in the minister.' The minister can then hand it up.

Mr Pederick: You did it on Grand Junction Road.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not sure you can compare Grand Junction Road with the Waite. If the Liberal Party thinks it is similar quality land, maybe, but I think Peter Waite might disagree with the member for Hammond. I keep wanting to say 'Goyder' for some reason; I do not know why. I think it is because that is where the member for Goyder used to sit when I first came to parliament.

I think it is important that this parliament expresses its view that, yes, okay, the government wants to upgrade this intersection—we will allow that to occur—but once you finish using the portion of land that you want for this intersection, the remainder of that land on that title must be returned immediately for the purposes of the Waite Trust, as established.

Then, if the government is right and this is overwhelmingly popular, that everyone has been calling for this, that this is absolutely necessary, what is the problem with forming a select committee as we are required to by standing orders? Or are we really now going to suspend standing orders and use the government's numbers to suppress giving the people of South Australia what is their right, bestowed on them by parliament: to have their say about whether or not we should change the use of this land?

I did a bit of research about Peter Waite because I did not know much about him—guilty as charged. I am not an expert on Peter Waite, but I understand he wrote to the Premier. I got this from a webpage on the internet, which I will disclose. It is about the Waite historical precinct. People may have already seen it and know it, so I hope I am not repeating myself. It reads:

In October 1913 Peter Waite wrote to the Premier of South Australia, Hon. A. H. Peake, and the Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, the Rt. Hon. Sir Samuel Way—

two very renowned names in South Australia—

informing them that subject to his own and his wife's life interests, he intended presenting the Urrbrae property of 54 hectares to the University. The eastern half was to be used for scientific studies related to agriculture and the western half—

the part in question—

as a public park. He also intended handing over 45 hectares adjoining Urrbrae to the Government of South Australia for the purpose of establishing an agricultural high school. This statement of intent was subject to South Australian Parliament making the gifts free of succession duty.

So he did not want us to tax him for handing over the land, which I think is a pretty good deal, and says a lot about the times that he may have been charged for giving a gift. It continues:

In explaining his gift Peter Waite wrote:

'I have been much influenced by the wonderful work our agriculturalists and pastoralists have accomplished...in face of the very great odds they have had to meet.

He goes on to say:

With...little scientific training they have placed our wheat, wool and fruits in the highest estimation of the world—

indeed, the wheat and grapes on the carpets of this parliament reflect those agricultural pursuits of the early 19th century—

our sheep have been brought to such perfection that they're sought after not only by all the sister States but by South Africa.

Anyway, he goes on to talk at length about all this and, given his contribution to one of the largest industries in South Australia, we should continue to train the next generation of farmers and agriculturalists in this state on which we rely so much for our economic prosperity.

I do not think Peter Waite would begrudge us taking a bit of land for a road. I am not saying we should not, but I think he would look with suspicion on any government that changed vast portions of that land that are not being used for a road and then not revert it back once they are finished, calculating how much they need for that road.

Even if it is the intention of the government without the amendment to return this land by regulation, I think this parliament owes it to Peter Waite and other philanthropists who have done so much for South Australia and especially our regional South Australians. Those institutions have done so much to help those families dealing with, quite frankly, very moderate land.

South Australian farmers have done remarkable things with the land and the rainfall that we have here in South Australia. If you searched *Hansard* for 'the driest state in the driest land and the driest country in the world', it would come up repeatedly in this chamber. Water is the lifeblood of this state because we have so little of it.

This is a man who gave so much to South Australia at great economic cost to his family, no doubt. The least we can do is make sure that once we have upgraded the public amenity that we need to upgrade, we give the rest back—not 'may' give it back, but 'will' give it back. The way to do that as parliamentarians is not to rely on the promise of a politician but to act like a legislature and legislators and compel it. That is our job.

If the minister will not move an amendment, I can foreshadow to the house that the opposition will move its own amendment in the upper house that, once DPTI have completed their design work and taken the land that they need for the road, the remaining land be returned back for the purposes for which it was intended. I do not think it is in any way slowing down the operation of the road.

To the select committee, I will be fascinated to know when the Speaker will rule because I understand that before second reading speeches are completed we will need a contingent motion to establish a select committee. I will take advice on how that is done. Obviously, the opposition would like to populate that select committee if it is so ruled.

I would say to the government that I suspect they are going to get a select committee one way or another, either here or in the upper house. I think it probably makes more sense to do it here than the upper house because I think we can do it a bit faster so as not to delay the passage of this bill and for DPTI to be able to do the work they do, get out there and build the road, because the government have abandoned GlobeLink. In the end, the government need something to talk about in Waite because there is not much else to talk about in Waite that they can talk about with any conviction.

With those remarks, the opposition reserves its right between the houses on this bill. I eagerly await the ruling of the Speaker on whether or not this is a hybrid bill. It is my very strong view that it is a hybrid bill and that the house should immediately form a select committee on the conclusion of the second reading debate. I am happy for the Minister for Transport to chair it as long as there is opposition representation on it and we hold at the very least one public meeting—just one—where we go out and hear the views of the people of Waite and the broader South Australian community about whether or not they are happy for this change. With those words, I look forward to other members' contributions.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:39): I rise to contribute to the debate by providing some brief remarks in commending the bill to the house. I have listened very carefully and with interest to the debate that has preceded. In the context of what has already been said, I move to observe that Peter Waite was very much a modern man of science and technology. He would have, in my view, flourished very much had he lived another century to be alive today. His family motto became 'Do and hope'.

At the time that he made his really extraordinary gift to the state and to the university, he was very much occupied by both his own life experience of the advancements in agricultural practice and of the absolute imperative that as a state, a nation and a modern economy, we must seek out and apply the science in order to continue to make advances and to stay, as he described, at the forefront. He was in a very good position to judge because his life after he came to Australia at the age of 25 was punctuated by continuous and extraordinary success in his chosen field.

He came out from Scotland, the source of many proud immigration stories in our state, going back to the very early days and continuing to the present, not as a young man of great wealth or as someone who brought a whole lot of capital to invest in South Australia, as did some of his contemporaries and particularly the generation older than he. He followed his two older brothers who had made the move to South Australia, and he had the friendship, the mentorship, one might say, of the elder family, who had already become well established in South Australia by the time that he arrived.

He came to South Australia—and again the modern parallels and the relevance continue to resound—having completed an apprenticeship, of which the member for MacKillop might be proud, in ironmongering. He had completed his apprenticeship and he had decided that the prospects for advancement were very much in Australia. He then went on to see great success as a manager and administrator, particularly of pastoral property, throughout his working life.

It is well also to observe, as is the case with other benefactors of around his time, Peter Waite's life story was not without fundamental and serious tragedy. It was part of his whole life from the very beginning. His father died in the year of his birth, falling off a horse. His mother was left to bring up him and his brothers, and so he knew hardship in a very practical way right from the very beginning.

If we fast-forward all the way to 1913 and his gift, his gift occurring late in that year was preceded by the shocking and horribly sad development of the news of the death of his son David. He also lost his older brother, James, very shortly after he arrived in South Australia, so he suffered loss throughout his life. He and his wife suffered the loss and the premature death of children as well.

In coming to the point in 1913 when he made this extraordinary generous gift, it was, I hazard to summarise, motivated by what was a clear legacy of the application of education and science to particularly agricultural pursuits. Secondly, sadly, to a significant degree it was perhaps motivated by what he had seen as the loss of significant family members, particularly, in David's case, the son who might have otherwise continued on with Peter's life's work.

Another observation by way of context might be to say that two large parcels of land are the subject of Peter Waite's gift. Firstly, the 54 hectares comprising the Waite estate were where he and his wife and family ultimately lived from the 1870s on and the location of Urrbrae House, which after renovations in the 1880s became one of the state's significant residences and a house of technology—the first house, we understand, to have an electric light and a fridge and so on—and a significant residence and home to the Waite family on that 54-hectare estate. Secondly, over the road, the adjoining 45 hectares were also gifted and are more particularly the subject of this bill.

Had they not been gifted for the purposes to which they have been so productively applied over this last more than a century, then it would be reasonable to expect that that land, so close to the city as it is, would in all likelihood have been at some point filled with residential development. It would have become a relatively near southern suburb of Adelaide and, as the surrounding suburbs show, it would have been in great demand from about that time.

So the situation that might have faced a government today, as it does in so many other cases where road developments are required, might well have involved the compulsory acquisition of

residential property. If one considers that for a moment, and the inevitable difficulty associated with those sorts of growing pains structurally, there might have been another kind of complexity in these circumstances.

Happily, in a very practical sense, because of the gift of this land by Peter Waite we have seen the establishment of Urrbrae Agricultural High School, the Waite Arboretum, the university facilities and the wonderful things that they continue to permit, and we have heard reflected on in the course of the debate the amenity that it provides to the city and surrounds. It means in a practical way that what we are contemplating here is the use of a particular small portion of that land to provide for the growing pains of a city, a capital city that is growing a century later and requiring that further infrastructure capacity.

It is not for me to hazard an opinion, and it is not relevant either, as to what Peter Waite might have made of all that, but I suspect that he would have been proud and delighted to see—a century after what his gift brought in terms of the use of the land—the way in which it has provided a home for the advancement particularly of agricultural technology in that time. It might be reasonable to say that he would be wholly unsurprised if the result of all that learning and application of technology and the modern economy that followed did not lead to a certain amount of need for infrastructure growth and so on in those surroundings.

I think he would find that wholly unsurprising, and I suspect that he would be among the first to say, 'It's good to see that Adelaide has grown and thrived over the century following the gift,' and, as it were, onwards and upwards continuing the legacy. Of course, that is a matter of irrelevant speculation, in that what we are dealing with is legislation and the circumstances in which there are provisions according to which the gift was made and formalities and so on. I say that by way of context because the evidence gives us a picture of the kind of man that Peter Waite was, and the occasion to debate the bill is an occasion to reflect on the extraordinary significant life and gift that he gave.

What is clear is that in many ways the means by which the land was originally given, the trust, has in all respects crystallised. What we have is a set of terms according to which the land has been given. We also understand that land owned by the Minister for Education relevantly cannot be acquired by the Commissioner of Highways in the way that it would be acquired compulsorily in residential or other developments in the more common circumstances.

I say that briefly really to highlight that what we are dealing with is land that has been gifted to the minister and that for nearly a century has been crystallised as such. It has been land upon which the high school is located and continues to carry on. It happens, therefore, to be held by a person, in the minister, from whom compulsory acquisition cannot be applied. Contrast that with a gift to someone else: if it were not the minister, as I understand the situation, to whom the land was gifted, then it could be compulsorily acquired and there would be no need to turn one's mind to the terms of the trust or to the need to specifically legislate for it because the commissioner would exercise powers as they ordinarily do in terms of an infrastructure upgrade.

It is the combination of two things that lead us to reflect on the terms of the trust and, in turn, the life and gift of Peter Waite. It might be contrasted in all sorts of ways with the usual circumstances in which parliament might consider what constitutes a hybrid bill. I have listened carefully to the debate about that matter, and I understand the government has advice, and I expect that advice steps out the reasons why when considering the spectrum of interests on the question of what constitutes a hybrid bill and whether or not this one falls in that category.

I would be unsurprised if that advice were able to make it really quite clear, in this case, that it is the peculiar situation of the land being held by the minister which is really the operative cause for us to be here considering the matter, so the minister's holding of the land and the difficulty with compulsory acquisition. In my view, that is an explanation as to why we are here in the form that we are here.

I very much welcome the opportunity it brings to have reflected in some very brief way on the life of Peter Waite. Whilst listening carefully to the contribution of those who would seek some further assurance, the interests of South Australians, of those who use the road and environs and,

as I hazard, also in line with the life and nature of the man who made the original gift, align to make it a wholly unsurprising development for the advancement of the infrastructure in the local area.

Thanks and appreciation to Peter Waite. I wish the progress and implementation of the works that this bill will facilitate can happen posthaste, with a view to improving the infrastructure and surrounds for all of us into the next century to come.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

Sitting suspended from 12.59 to 14:00.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (BAIL AUTHORITIES) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

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

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Reports received pursuant to section 15(2) of the COVID-19 Emergency Response Act 2020—

Flinders University—Annual Report 2019

University of South Australia—Annual Report 2019

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Aboriginal Heritage—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Dangerous Substances—

Dangerous Goods Transport—Fees

Fee Notice

Fee Notice—Dangerous Good Transport

Fees

Employment Agents Registration—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Explosives—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

- Fees
- Fireworks—Fee Notices
- Security Sensitive Substances—Fee Notices
- Fair Work—
 - Fee Notice—Representation
 - Representation—Fee Notices
- Land Tax—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices
- Petroleum Products Regulation—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices
- Return to Work—Prescribed Class of Injury
- Work Health and Safety—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices
- Rules made under the following Acts—
 - Work Health and Safety—
 - SafeWork SA Code of Practice—June 2020—
 - Abrasive Blasting
 - Confined Spaces
 - Demolition Work
 - Excavation Work
 - First Aid in the Workplace
 - Hazardous Manual Tasks
 - How to Manage and Control Asbestos in the Workplace
 - How to Manage Work Health and Safety Risks
 - How to Safely Remove Asbestos
 - Labelling Hazardous Chemicals
 - Managing Electrical Risks in the Workplace
 - Managing Noise and Preventing Hearing Loss at Work
 - Managing Risks of Hazardous Chemicals in the Workplace
 - Managing the Risk of Falls at Workplaces
 - Managing the Risks of Plant in the Workplace
 - Managing the Work Environment and Facilities
 - Preparation of Safety Data Sheets for Hazardous Chemicals
 - Spray Painting and Powder Coating
 - Welding Processes
 - Work Health and Safety Consultation, Cooperation and Coordination

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

- Regulations made under the following Acts—
 - Child Safety (Prohibited Persons)—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fees
 - Disability Services—
 - Assessment of Relevant History—Fee Notices
 - Fee Notice
 - Housing Improvement—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices
 - Fees
 - Supported Residential Facilities—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Administration and Probate—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Associations Incorporation—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Authorised Betting Operations—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Fees

Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Building Work Contractors—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Burial and Cremation—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Conveyancers—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Co-operatives National Law (South Australia)—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Coroners—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles)—

Fee Notice

Fees

Criminal Law Consolidation—General—False or Misleading Information

District Court—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Environment, Resources and Development Court—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Fees

Evidence—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Expiation of Offences—Fees

Fines Enforcement and Debt Recovery—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Prescribed Amounts

Freedom of Information—

Fee and Charges—Fee Notices

Fee Notice

Gaming Machines—

Fee Notice

Fees

Guardianship and Administration—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices
Labour Hire Licensing—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Land Agents—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Land and Business (Sale and Conveyancing)—Fee Notices
Legislation Revision and Publication—Emergency Management and Other
 Directions
Liquor Licensing—
 Fee Notice
 Fees
 General—Fee Notices
Lottery and Gaming—
 Fee Notice
 Fees
Magistrates—Fees—Fee Notices
Magistrates Court—Fee Notice
Partnership—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Plumbers, Gas Fitters and Electricians—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Public Trustee—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Relationships Register—
 Fee Notice
 Fees
Second-hand Vehicle Dealers—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Security and Investigation Industry—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Sentencing—Fee Notices
Sheriff's—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
 Fees
State Records—
 Fee Notice
 Fees
Summary Offences—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Supreme Court—
 Fee Notice
 Fee Notices
Youth Court—
 Fee Notice
 Fees

General

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

- Bills of Sale—Fee Notices
- Community Titles—Fee Notices
- Heavy Vehicle National Law (South Australia)—
 - Expiation Fees—No. 2
 - Fee Notice
 - Fees
- Local Government—General—Fees
- Motor Vehicles—
 - Accident Towing Roster Scheme—Fee Notices
 - Expiation Fees
 - Fee Notice—Accident Towing Roster Scheme
 - Fee Notice—Proof of Age Card
 - National Heavy Vehicles Registration Fees
- Passenger Transport—Fee Notices
- Rail Safety National Law (South Australia)—Fees and Other Measures
- Real Property—Fees
- Registration of Deeds—Fees
- Road Traffic—
 - Expiation Fees
 - Miscellaneous—Fees
- Roads (Opening and Closing)—
 - Fee Notices
 - Fees
- Strata Titles—Fees
- Valuation of Land—Fee Notices
- Worker's Liens—Fee Notices

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. S.K. Knoll)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

- Development—
 - Fees
 - Open Space Contribution Scheme
- Private Parking Areas—Expiation Fees

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

- Controlled Substances—
 - Fee Notice—Pesticides
 - Fee Notice—Poppy Cultivation
 - Fees
 - Poppy Cultivation—Fee Notices
- Education and Children's Services—General
- Food—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices
- Retirement Villages—
 - Fee Notice
 - Fee Notices
 - Fees
- SACE Board of South Australia—
 - Fee Notice

Fee Notices
South Australian Public Health—
Fee Notice
Fees
General—Fee Notices
Legionella—Fee Notices
Wastewater—Fee Notices
Tobacco and E-Cigarette Products—
Fee Notice
Fees

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Mines and Works Inspection—Fees
Mining—Fees
Opal Mining—
Fee Notice
Fee Notices
Fees
Petroleum and Geothermal Energy—
Fee Notice
Fee Notices
Rules made under the following Acts—
Mining—Warden's Court—Miscellaneous

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Adoption—
Fee Notice
Fees
General—Fee Notices

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Aquaculture—Fee Notices
Fisheries Management—
Fee Notice
Fees
General—Fee Notices
Industrial Hemp—
Fee Notice
Fee Notices
Fees
Livestock—
Fee Notice
Fee Notices
Pastoral Land Management and Conservation—
Fee Notice
Fees
Plant Health—
Fee Notice
Fee Notices
Primary Produce (Food Safety Schemes)—
Egg—Fee Notices
Fee Notice—Egg

Fee Notice—Meat
Fee Notice—Plant Products
Fee Notice—Seafood
Meat—Fee Notices
Plant Products—Fee Notices
Seafood—Fee Notices

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Fire and Emergency Services—

Fee Notice

Fees

Firearms—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Fees

Hydroponics Industry Control—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Police—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

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

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Animal Welfare—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Botanic Gardens and State Herbarium—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Crown Land Management—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Environment Protection—Fees

Heritage Places—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Historic Shipwrecks—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Marine Parks—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Native Vegetation—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

Radiation Protection and Control—

Fee Notice

Fees

Water Industry—

Fee Notice

Fee Notices

*Question Time***BUS SERVICES**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier now admit that the bus cuts announced by his government on Saturday were in error?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:11): As a proud member of a cabinet government being asked my opinion, I think that these changes are—

Mr Picton: What does the Premier think?

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana, we have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —wideranging. These changes really help to deal with a severe lack of interest in public transport by former governments going back a long period of time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my right and left!

Mr Pederick: I think we need a history lesson.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, leader, and member for West Torrens! With respect, members on my left, you have asked your question. The minister is attempting to answer it. I would like to hear the answer. The minister has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Back in the late nineties, minister Diana Laidlaw took a decision to outsource bus contracts in South Australia.

Mr Malinauskas: The first round of privatisation.

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The result of those changes—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Again, we set ourselves the standard when we first came to government, and that is putting bums on seats. Over the proceeding decade, what we saw was a 15 per cent increase in bus usage in Adelaide as a result of those changes. It also helped to make the system a whole lot more efficient. Interestingly, more people caught buses 10 years ago than did when Labor left office—a wasted decade. Their record on public transport usage—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —stands there for all to see, that against the backdrop of increasing population we see decreasing bus usage.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: That is not a legacy that I think one should be proud of but, then again, I think there are plenty of legacies on that side of the house that they should reflect on. We

have done something that's quite extraordinary; in fact, it hasn't been done for a long period of time, and that is—

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —we actually asked our customers what they want.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Elizabeth is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Why is it that people were choosing not to use the service? Against a backdrop of having the cheapest public transport in the country, why is it that people were choosing not to use the service? Mind you, we asked our customers what they thought, as distinct from members opposite, who didn't even want to know the answer to the question in the first place.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think the department had to go back to physical paper records to try to find the last time the former government actually undertook a customer survey from their customers.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe, Deputy Premier, Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Far and away the biggest bit of feedback we get is that people want more frequency of service. Far and away that is the biggest bit of feedback we received, that the reason—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Members on my left! Members will be leaving shortly if this continues.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that people were not using the service was because it didn't provide a level of frequency that they felt comfortable using. We know from that research that where we can get frequency of service to below 12 minutes, and ideally around eight minutes or less in peak, people will stop looking at a timetable, just rock up to a bus stop and then expect that bus to come in the knowledge that there is a service that is going to come with a frequency and get them to where they want to go more quickly. That is feedback that we have listened to as a government and it is part of the reforms that we announced over the weekend.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my left, I remind you that interjections are disorderly. If they continue to that level, members will be departing the chamber early today.

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Is there any possibility that the Premier will overrule his minister and the changes to bus routes announced on the weekend?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:15): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —because it allows me to get to the second main bit of feedback that our customers gave us, and that is that they want a shorter journey time. They want to get from

A to B more quickly. Again, these two things when combined together form the basis of what we have put out for consultation over the weekend: a more frequent network and a quicker network. What we have been able to achieve here are some 1,100 new bus stops, of which around 220,000-odd people live within 800 metres. Not an average of 800 metres—

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

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Debate, sir. The question was: would the government change its policy?

The SPEAKER: I have the question. I have allowed the minister 20 seconds to provide a bit of preamble. I will listen carefully and ensure that he doesn't deviate or debate.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So 1,100 new Go Zone stops—that's a fact rather than opinion—and also 200 kilometres of new Go Zone, providing an increased service to 220,000 South Australians, 220,000 South Australians who will live within a maximum of 800 metres. I do note that there were tweets over the weekend that tried to equate maximum distance with average distance in other jurisdictions. Maybe if you are going to make comparisons, apples with apples is a much better way to go about it than apples and oranges.

Within 800 metres of a Go Zone—that is the biggest expansion of the Go Zone network that our state has ever seen, a phenomenal step forward that is going to drive patronage growth. Where this has been undertaken in other jurisdictions, that is precisely what it does. I know that anytime there is reform it is difficult, and especially made more difficult when you have members of different political parties out there, not—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Has the minister finished his answer? The minister has completed his answer.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

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

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Yes, you. If this continues, you will be leaving.

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): My question is to the Premier again. Will the Premier guarantee that patronage will rise as a result of the bus cuts announced on the weekend?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:18): I don't accept the premise of the question at all. The idea that we are doing anything other than reorganising our service in a way that people want to use—

Mr Malinauskas: There's no \$46 million worth of cuts?

The SPEAKER: Leader!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Cheltenham! You are obviously still grumpy from the Showdown result, as am I, but that's not an excuse.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: By reorganising the bus network in this way, we will see an increase in patronage, and the reason we know that is because that is what interstate and international experience tells us. This change isn't being taken in isolation: it comes off the back of us announcing a couple of weeks ago that we are switching to new apps based on the Google Transit feed

specification, which means that we can give better real-time information to our customers to help them make informed choices about what they want to do.

It comes off the back of us spending almost a billion dollars in upgrading parts of our public transport network, whether that be the Paradise park-and-ride, which I know is going fantastically at the moment and there is a whole series of concrete pours happening as we speak, as well as finally electrifying the Gawler line—something that those opposite tried to do for a decade and just couldn't get done—as well as making sure that we deliver the Flinders Link train extension.

That helps to form part of the broader network of changes that we are making in public transport. These routes are out for consultation now. We do look forward to the feedback that people provide, but I want to put on the record for the house that, yes, there are some bus stops that are going. We have been up-front about that; we were up-front about that from day one. Of those bus stops, 31 per cent had zero average daily boardings—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

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

The SPEAKER: Minister for Energy and Mining—helpful as always, but please.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —and 71 per cent of those stops had five or fewer boardings on them.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: For those people, we are not saying that you don't have access to a service. What we are saying is that you may need to walk a little bit further, but in exchange for that you will get access to a high-frequency corridor. Again, that is what our customers asked us to do.

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Playford!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: And in their 'reveal choices' through the customer service survey they said, 'We want frequency above anything else,' and that's precisely what we are delivering them here.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: In addition, 1,100 new Go Zone stops, 200 new kilometres of Go Zone coverage, which will see an increased service for 220,000 South Australians. Also, I want to point out that what we have in our current network isn't an equitable level of service right across our state. There is a differential level of service that is provided right across our state, and once you have accepted that premise, and certainly the former government accepted that premise, what you need to do is to take the assets you have—the 1,000 buses and bus drivers who come with them, as well as all the other back-of-house assets that we have—and you need to try to provide the most amount of good to the most amount of people possible. Again, that is precisely what we are here to do.

As a government, you have to govern for all South Australians and go with what works for as many people as possible. Again, for those 220,000 South Australians who are going to get access to a better service, they are precisely going to see the benefits of the changes that we are seeking to put in place.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Not in Aberfoyle Park!

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens is now warned. I am going to give the leader one more and then we are moving to the member for Heysen.

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:22): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier support the bus changes announced by his government on the weekend?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:22): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question. We have long considered the poor performance in terms of public transport in South Australia. As the minister has already outlined to the house, when we came to government we inherited a situation in which there were fewer people using our buses in 2018 than there were back in 2010. This was completely unacceptable.

We have set up the South Australian Public Transport Authority. We have looked at international best practice. As the minister outlined, we have spoken with consumers and asked them why they were not using the bus service in South Australia, and now we are putting in place a plan to significantly increase the patronage of our buses in South Australia.

So this is a really important reform. It was a reform that the previous government, of course, as per everything else, kicked under the carpet. They were not prepared to do the hard work to actually address the issues as to why people weren't using public transport in South Australia. We currently have approaching \$1 billion worth of expenditure in South Australia on public transport—again, programs that those opposite neglected while they were in government.

We are very proud to be doing the work for the electrification of the Gawler line. This was a project that the previous government promised, took off the table, promised, took off the table. We are fixing that promise that the previous government made. They made plenty of promises with regard to public transport. I seem to remember they were going to electrify the line down to Outer Harbor.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: They were going to electrify the line down to Grange. I have been down there recently—no electrification whatsoever. We are fixing the work that was left to us by the previous government, so I am not taking any lectures whatsoever from those opposite. I would like to commend the minister—

Mr Brown interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Playford is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —for the work that he is doing to bring our public transport up to an acceptable standard, addressing issues like cleanliness, like frequency of service and, importantly, like having mobile phone charging services on our new trains here South Australia. These are the things that people have been asking for. More than that, he has benchmarked international best practice for that first mile, last mile investigation—in fact, experimentation—that we are doing, trials that we are doing at the moment in multiple locations around South Australia. We want to provide a much better service than we inherited from the previous government, and that's precisely what we are rolling out.

CORONAVIRUS RESTRICTIONS

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (14:25): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is continuing to lift COVID-19 restrictions and supporting the recovery of the South Australian economy?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:25): I thank the member for Heysen for his question with regard to the lifting of restrictions in South Australia. A priority of this government is safely lifting restrictions so that we can return the economy as quickly as possible and create as many jobs as quickly as possible in South Australia.

As members would know, back in March this year we put a very strong border policy in place. We did that very quickly, and that has served our state well in terms of reducing the spread of the coronavirus in our state. We have moved very quickly as a nation to put an international border in place, but we put our own state border in place to stop that spread of infection that was coming

across the border. It is now time to gradually and carefully remove that border restriction, as other jurisdictions around the country move to much lower levels of infection.

I have stated right from day one that we don't want to have those state borders in place one day longer than we need to. We have needed to have them in place in the past, but we now, as of Friday last week, have made it clear that we will lift all state borders as of 20 July. This gives plenty of notice to people who want to move interstate or invite people from interstate for business needs, for social needs, for family reunification needs. So we are giving people notice that, as of 20 July, all state border restrictions will be lifted.

What we have announced today following the Transition Committee meeting this morning, which considered further legal advice on this matter, is that we are lifting that requirement for 14 days of self-isolation for citizens coming across the border from the Northern Territory, from Western Australia or from Tasmania. We think this is a movement in the right direction. I do emphasise that this does not mean that those other jurisdictions are bound to lift their restrictions on people going from our state into their jurisdiction, but we have all agreed, as part of the national cabinet, that we will move back to removing state and territory borders.

In fact, as part of our three-stage process, we identified that stage 3 would remove those interstate borders. Stage 3 was going to occur in July for all jurisdictions. We originally chose 3 July as the start date for stage 3. You would note that, as of Friday last week, we brought that forward to 29 June. We have shown a lot of flexibility with regard to the restrictions so far, and when we have cause to be able to bring them forward, that's exactly and precisely what we do.

You would note that today is 21 days that we haven't had a new case in South Australia, and that is something we are very proud of. It can only be done with the full cooperation of the people of South Australia, who have assisted our health professionals and SAPOL in this mighty effort to combat the coronavirus here in our state.

The new arrangements will come into effect as of midnight tonight. I do note that for those people who are already part way through a 14-day isolation, they will be relinquished from that obligation to complete that 14-day obligation. So if they have come from Western Australia, the Northern or Tasmania and they are part way through that 14-day isolation, as of midnight tonight they will not be required to complete that full 14 days of self-isolation.

Two other announcements that come from the Transition Committee this morning: first of all, public assemblies up to 300 will be lawful as of Friday this week, and then also some further clarification around indoor classes. This was an issue where there was a differential set of arrangements compared with other gatherings. What we have decided this morning is that, where there is the current restriction of 10 persons per room in an indoor class abiding by the one person per four square metres, which is the current arrangement, that can be extended to one person per seven square metres, up to a maximum of 20 for fitness classes, yoga classes and dance classes. I know this is something that's going to be very much welcomed by those sectors.

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Will the operation of the government's new bus network cost more or less when compared to prior to these changes?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:29): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question and in doing so note that the great benefit of these changes is the fact that we're able to drive the existing dollar that we have within public transport further. The opportunity to be able to provide a higher and better level of service to more and more South Australians is a key reason why these reforms need to take place.

But it's not just the high-frequency corridors that we're able to look after and to help improve across our network; it's the use of on-demand services, something that we have been trialling in Mount Barker in the electorate of Kavel and note very strongly the success that trial has seen. In fact, we have seen a doubling, if not—

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

The SPEAKER: For debate. I have the question: it was about costs. I believe that the minister thus far has answered it in a manner that is germane to the question, but I will listen assiduously, as I always try to do. Minister, I will be listening.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We have seen a doubling if not tripling of the number of people who want to use the on-demand service versus the fixed-route service at Mount Barker. The trial up there especially has given us very strong feedback showing that these on-demand services work, which is why we are now looking to roll them out on the Le Fevre Peninsula and Seacombe Gardens, as well as in Blackwood—helping people have an option to be able to catch a bus from their door, or within 150 metres of their door, and take them where they need to go within that on-demand footprint. The other reason we need to drive patronage growth, especially amongst—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: are you giving the member 40 minutes to answer the question or four?

The SPEAKER: That is definitely not a point of order, so what I am going to politely ask the member to do is to leave under 137A for the remainder of question time for a bogus point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: It was a bogus point of order.

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

The SPEAKER: Minister, I have given you some latitude. I do appreciate that the question was about costs and there may be several variable factors that are related to costs. I have given you ample opportunity to get to the substance of the question and I ask you to come back to it.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: When it comes to the existing budget and the existing costs, what I can say is that what we achieved from that existing bucket of money under the former government was the lowest level of public transport usage in the nation—the lowest level of public transport usage in the nation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We have the question.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What we are able to do here is to drive patronage growth using that existing bucket of money. We think that is an extremely good way to use public money, taxpayers' money that goes into subsidising some 80¢ out of every dollar spent in public transport. But in utilising this bucket of money it's not only just about how this directly and positively impacts upon potential public transport users; it's about what it does to our broader road network.

What we know from our Keep Metro Traffic Moving report is that congestion is getting worse, and one of the reasons it's getting worse is that under the former government not enough people jumped on a bus, which means that they were in their private vehicle, especially those workers who use their cars during peak hour traffic. The opportunity here, using this extra 200 kilometres of Go Zones to drive people away from their cars and into buses during those peak hours in the morning and the afternoon, is what is going to help create existing capacity within our road network.

That is, again, another reason why these reforms are so important—because it's not just the people catching the bus who will benefit; it's the people using our roads who will also benefit. They have had to deal with the fact that a poorly patronised and organised public transport network and bus network has meant that more and more people than need to be are on our roads in cars sitting in peak hour congestion.

So, coupled with the \$12.9 billion that we're spending over the next four years to help improve infrastructure in South Australia, these reforms will also help to drive people, especially during the morning and afternoon peaks, onto buses so that we can free up that broader network for others.

BUS SERVICES

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:34): Supplementary: can the minister advise the house whether these changes are required to meet the government's \$46 million worth of public transport savings?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:34): There was no specific savings task that was applied to these new contracts. What it essentially did is, through the new bus contracting arrangements that I note that didn't go so well back in 2011, when the contract was awarded to Light-City Buses, and in fact I think we had a dedicated transport services minister, Mr Speaker, the Hon. Chloe Fox, whose sole job it was to drive patronage growth—

The Hon. D.J. Speirs interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —across the network. In fact, she managed to make it go backwards. So there is no specific savings task that was attributed to this. In fact, the reason that it was done was, using the existing bus operators that we had as part of the tender process, we worked with them about what a redesign of the bus network—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —could be, and that's what is out for consultation and for feedback at the moment. These reforms—and again I do understand that in any reforms such as this that there are winners and then there are people that are going to find it—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —more difficult. But what we need to do here is go with what works, for—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Wright!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —the most amount of people possible. Having a bus stop at a bus stop where an average of zero passengers get on on a daily basis doesn't seem like a good use of taxpayers' money, and it's why we have needed to redesign this network.

Ms Stinson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Badcoe, please.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I think that as spenders of taxpayers' money we need to always be looking at ways that we can do things more efficiently. Part of these changes means that we can reinvest in these higher frequency corridors. Again, that is going to help to drive patronage on our bus network and, as no less than the RAA comment, it's also going to have a positive effect across our broader road network for bus users as well as car users right across our city.

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:36): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier assure the house that all members of his parliamentary team support the proposed changes to bus services announced by his government on the weekend?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:37): We are out for consultation at the moment, and we welcome and want the feedback that comes with that. As distinct from what may have happened in the past, we are keen to talk to our customers and seek their feedback. It's precisely why—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Wright! It was a question about support. The minister is talking about consultation. It's within the purview of what I think is an answer per the standing orders. I would like to hear the answer.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: So we welcome and look forward to that feedback from electorates right across the city to help make sure that we get these reforms done as right and as correctly as possible, making sure that we take on board all of the feedback that we are provided, something that we have done when we have undertaken changes to our network previously and something that we will continue to do to make sure that we deliver the best network that taxpayers can afford and also that our bus users and our train and tram users want to use on a daily basis.

WATER PRICING

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:38): My question is for the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister inform the house how South Australians are set to benefit from the Marshall Liberal government's massive water bill reductions, including in my electorate of Elder?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (14:38): I thank the member for Elder for her question. The Marshall Liberal government—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —has put cost of living and cost of doing business at the very heart of its agenda since taking power in March 2018. We have had a very clear agenda to do this and we have driven forward that agenda, whether it's the huge reductions that we have seen in the emergency services levy, the reductions in payroll tax for our small and medium-size—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —businesses and, of course, the very, very significant—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —land tax reductions that have been seen unfolding across the state. This is something that we made a very clear commitment on, and we are getting on with it, no more so than dealing with a very significant reform to the way SA Water undertakes the charging of water and sewerage supply in South Australia. For far too long, SA Water was used as a cash cow, particularly under 16 years of Labor government in this state. In fact, when Labor came to power in 2002, the average water bill in this state was \$236 per annum. When they left office in 2018, the average water bill per annum was \$782, a tripling of that bill.

That impact was felt in every household connected to the SA Water network across our state. In metropolitan Adelaide and throughout many parts of regional South Australia, households and businesses were punished every quarter when they received their water bill, with money being ripped out of their bank accounts and handed over to the government to prop up the bottom line. We know this is the case because our independent inquiry into water pricing, undertaken by respected South Australian businessman Lew Owens, showed exactly that: the regulated asset base had been falsely inflated in order for the previous government to pillage SA Water—well, really to pillage SA Water customers and take money out of their pockets.

We went to the election saying that we would look into this situation, and that's exactly what we have done. We have seen, last week, the ESCOSA determination for 2020-24 handed down, and we have seen a generational reset in the way that water pricing is undertaken in South Australia. That will deliver very significant savings to South Australian households and businesses, money that they can confidently do what they like with. We really hope that they will have the confidence, moving forward, to spend that extra money that they will get to stimulate the South Australian economy, particularly in these difficult times.

The savings that we are seeing are comprised of a 10 per cent reduction in the water supply charge, a 10 per cent reduction in the sewerage supply charge and very significant overall reductions in water prices. This will deliver a \$200 per annum saving on the average household water bill and a \$1,350 per annum saving on the average business water bill. This is a significant amount of money. I asked SA Water if anything like this had occurred, in terms of savings being handed to the customer across the nation, in recent memory, and this has not happened. South Australia is leading the way when it comes to putting downward pressure on water pricing, and this is occurring in households all across the state, including in the member for Elder's electorate.

The average house in Colonel Light Gardens, in the member for Elder's electorate, where the Leader of the Opposition's parents actually live—he continually says that on social media—will save \$285 to \$375 per annum on their water bill. This is great news for South Australians and great news for the member for Elder's electorate. We look forward to delivering these savings.

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Why does the Premier believe the people of Aberfoyle Park no longer need a direct bus service to the city?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:42): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What's being proposed here is actually something that's going to significantly improve journey times from Aberfoyle Park, in the southern suburbs, right through to the city.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The opportunity to be able to interchange with the new Flinders Link train station, a \$140 million project that we are delivering—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —in this four-year term of government, means that people are going to be able to save seven minutes in journey time to get themselves to the city—a seven-minute shorter journey time. For those who don't want to interchange across to a train, there is a massive opportunity for them to be able to interchange with existing buses at existing points. Whether that be the five Go Zones that are operating out of the Marion hub or the three Go Zones operating out of the Flinders hub, as well as the other connector and peak-only services, there will be a huge opportunity for people to get to town more quickly than what they can do now.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: This is all about listening to what our customers want, and that is to deliver higher frequency but also to deliver—

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hurtle Vale is warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —shorter journey times. Especially for people of the outer suburbs, the ability to have a more direct route, and a quicker route, to get into town is a key consideration about whether or not people choose to use a service. The opportunity here to be able to get to town seven minutes faster than you do now, over a 50 or 60-minute journey, is a massive step forward that's going to encourage more people to use the service.

BUS SERVICES

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:44): My question is to the Premier. What advice can the Premier give to Peter from Golden Grove about how he should access public transport under the Marshall Liberal government's proposed bus route changes? With your leave and that of the house, Speaker, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BOYER: Peter, a 76-year-old man with mobility issues who uses a walking stick, currently has a bus stop 50 metres from his front door, but under your proposed changes he will need to walk 800 metres up and down hills to access his closest bus stop.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:45): It's very difficult in this chamber to give a specific answer to a specific question without having the details.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Not wishing to—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is called to order and warned.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: What I would say to Peter is: please contact. We are happy to provide direct information about what the alternative options are. There is a spectrum of transport that's available for people with mobility issues.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member for Hurtle Vale, please!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Between the taxi subsidy scheme, community transport operators, as well as public transport, we provide a range of options for people with a range of mobility situations. We need to look into each of those cases individually. In terms of public transport, we certainly do accept the fact that we do have to create a network of options for people with different mobility situations because getting on or getting off a bus does require the ability of someone to be able to walk. Certainly, when they get to their journey they also need to be able to get from their—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth, I am going to ask you to leave for the remainder of question time. I have given you fair latitude today; you are still interjecting. Please leave under 137A for the remainder of question time.

The honourable member for Elizabeth having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale, I remind you that interjections are out of order. The minister has the call. Minister, have you completed your answer?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: Sure.

The SPEAKER: He has completed his answer. Member for Finniss and I will come back to the member for Wright and then the member for Florey.

DROUGHT ASSISTANCE

Mr BASHAM (Finniss) (14:47): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Could we start again? Members on my left, please!

Mr BASHAM: My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house how the government is helping to reduce costs for families and farmers who have been and still are impacted by drought conditions?

The Hon. T.J. WHETSTONE (Chaffey—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:47): I thank the member for Finniss for his very important question. He, as one of the great advocates for regional South Australia, knows only too well the impact that drought has had on regional communities.

While we have seen some relief over the recent beginning of the season, there are still parts of the state that are severely impacted by drought and they, too, have not had the rains that others more fortunate have seen. What the government has done is work with the dry working group, and I think that has been an absolutely commendable group of industry people and government representatives to give us the advice and the understanding as to exactly where taxpayers' money should be put to support that primary sector that is in drought.

We have announced our \$21 million drought support program and it has been very well received. The council rate rebate to date for those on Farm Household Allowance: we have seen 146 approved for over \$511,000. The pastoral rent rebate: 177 pastoralists have received almost \$700,000. We are also driving down the cost of stock loss. As an election commitment, we have employed three FTEs as wild dog trappers and introduced the \$120 dog bounty. We have seen that 684 wild dogs have been trapped to date. That's an outstanding result for those pastoralists and the primary producers of livestock that have been decimated by wild dogs.

We have also at the moment put into place \$200,000 for the dog bait program. That sits alongside \$25 million for the generational piece of infrastructure, the dog fence. That rebuild commenced nearly two weeks ago now, and I have seen the first areas of that fence that have been replaced. It's very exciting that these pastoralists, these livestock owners, are now seeing the fruits of a government that is governing for all of South Australia. It's really important. Also, it reduces the wild dog management costs to those pastoralists by up to \$97 million. That's an outstanding result for those people.

There is \$100,000 for the Soil Erosion Emergency Action Fund to address soil drift and stabilise paddocks. For any of you who have been over on Eyre Peninsula and on the Sturt Highway who have seen those paddocks drifting across the highways, it breaks your heart, so we are putting money there to help stabilise that country and help farmers who have been impacted by that sand drift. There is \$1 million for Rural Business Support, and we have boosted the unique Family and Business mentor program. Those FaB Scouts are doing an outstanding job looking after the health and wellbeing of our primary producers through a \$1.7 million program.

We are also spending \$5 million to match the commonwealth government's On-Farm Emergency Water Infrastructure Rebate Scheme. That is a contribution of up to \$50,000 for upgrading water infrastructure, helping those farms to droughtproof. I think it's also important to note that this initiative is a collaboration between the commonwealth government and the state government to give our farmers the assistance they need to upgrade that water infrastructure. The 353 applications approved to date have put \$4.6 million back into those local communities.

The \$330,000 for the community drought recovery events has been impacted by COVID-19, but that money will be rolling out. I want to congratulate the Minister for Education, who has also doubled the State Education Allowance for geographically isolated parents to \$4,300. It is an outstanding package helping our drought-affected farmers because #RegionsMatter.

BUS SERVICES

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:51): My question is to the member for King. Does the member for King still stand by her remarks to the house earlier this year regarding access to public transport in the north? With your leave, Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BOYER: On 18 February this year, the member for King said, 'People living in Salisbury East should be able to easily catch one bus to Golden Grove and Tea Tree Plaza.'

The SPEAKER: The member for King is not responsible to the house for such matters.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: they were her own comments, sir. If she can't be responsible for her own comments—

The SPEAKER: I thank the member for Lee.

Mr Pederick: How long have you been here?

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, helpful as always. I maintain my ruling. I am going to take another question from those on my left. If not, we are moving to the member for Florey. Member for Wright.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier is warned.

BUS SERVICES

Mr BOYER (Wright) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Does the minister stand by the remarks made in this house by the member for King earlier this year regarding access to public transport in the north? With your leave and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BOYER: On 18 February this year, the member for King said, 'People living in Salisbury East should be able to easily catch one bus to Golden Grove and Tea Tree Plaza.'

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (14:53): As part of these changes—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —we will see a massive increase in high-frequency routes in the member for King's electorate. At the moment, there are zero high-frequency corridors in the member for King's electorate—zero. There is a low-frequency service that very few people choose to use. As part of this, we are able to now deliver 53 Go Zone stops within the member for King's electorate. Each one of those people living around those stops is able to get a 15-minute frequency interpeak and a 10-minute or less frequency within peak.

One of the great improvements that we are also able to make is in relation to people living on Target Hill Road. At the moment, people along various parts of Target Hill Road are having to take some 25 minutes to get to the Golden Grove shopping centre. Under these changes, we will be able to reduce that to 15 minutes to get somebody up to Golden Grove to get to the Golden Grove shops.

We have also increased Go Zones down on the flats in various parts of Salisbury that, again, are going to provide people with greater opportunity to be able to get access to a high-frequency corridor. Again, what the old network provided was that, if you lived close to town—five, six or seven kilometres from town—you were able to get a high-frequency bus going past your main street, but for the people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Settle!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —of the outer north-east, as well as along the coast and down south, there were a whole heap of people who did not get access to that same level of service. What we were able to achieve here is some 1,100 new Go Zone stops—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: —that are going to provide people with the same equitable level of service as people living closer to town. We think that is a massive step forward, one that is going to benefit huge numbers of people within the electorate of King and one that we know is going to drive public transport usage right across our city, especially in those outer suburban areas.

RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (14:56): My question is to the Premier in his capacity as Minister for Aboriginal Affairs. How many South Australian Indigenous people suffer from chronic kidney disease, expressed in both a metro and non-metro figure, and how many regional and remote patients are required to travel significant distances to access regular dialysis treatment? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: The federal government has recently announced a welcome \$35 million for Indigenous health projects. Almost \$2 million of that will go to Victoria's Monash University to look at reducing the burden of chronic kidney disease in the Indigenous population. Unfortunately, it is a three-year project, but it does actually underline how important the situation is with renal disease.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:56): I thank the member for her interest and I acknowledge her longstanding interest in matters to do with Aboriginal affairs and also with reconciliation. In recent times, the member has also had a very keen interest in terms of renal dialysis on the APY lands and we certainly commend her interest in that.

We are very proud as a government to have supported the establishment of a permanent dialysis capability in conjunction with Purple House at Pukatja (Ernabella). That service has been very well received, although I do note and inform the house that that service has been suspended for this current period during the Biosecurity Act restrictions onto the APY lands.

I don't have a detailed answer for the member today, but I am very happy to go and take a look at this. It is a very important issue. One of the very important pieces of work that was done probably less than a decade ago was the Central Australia Renal Study, which looked at how we were dealing with patients with kidney failure in central Australia, whether they be in Western Australia, the Northern Territory or in South Australia.

The previous government did fund a mobile renal dialysis unit that would go community to community, although, as the member would be aware, this didn't satisfy people who wanted to be based and domiciled on the APY lands, which really forced people into having to relocate, mainly to Alice Springs or down to Port Augusta and, of course, some people to Adelaide.

There is a very important set of issues that we need to look at with regard to renal failure within Indigenous communities across the country. Part of it is what is our immediate response to providing the appropriate level of services to those people who are living with this disease. The other issue is how we prevent more people being afflicted with this condition. I will take the question that the member has asked and come back to the house with an answer.

I will also note that later this week we will be receiving the draft of the refreshed Closing the Gap framework. The member would also note that the Closing the Gap arrangement was originally put in place by the former Labor federal government when prime minister Rudd was in place. This ran its course, and at the time of refresh instead of the bureaucrats and the government of the day coming up with a framework and essentially providing that to Aboriginal communities across Australia, Prime Minister Morrison flipped that equation and actually worked with Aboriginal communities right across the country to come up with a new framework for the refreshed Closing the Gap.

We received that draft report this week, and it is my understanding that the Prime Minister's intention is to have the Coalition of Peaks come together in early July and ultimately for all states and territories to work together in funding the next phase of that Closing the Gap. I don't have specific information as to whether kidney disease and renal failure is part of that, but I certainly will be inquiring as soon as I get that draft.

RENAL DIALYSIS SERVICES

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:00): Supplementary: will the Premier use his best endeavours to make sure that some of the Monash money is actually used to look at the prevention of kidney disease and make sure some of that work actually focuses on South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:00): Yes, I am very happy to make that undertaking.

BUS SERVICES

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:01): My question is to the Premier. Premier, how much does a bus ticket cost?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:01): I think that really depends on whether somebody purchases a single ticket, whether they purchase a multi-ticket and from which area they are going. We do have limited services in regional South Australia, which does have a different rate, but I am happy to find the details that the member requires.

I'm not sure why he can't find that information himself, but if he is struggling to find that information I will be more than happy to provide him with a detailed answer.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport and then the member for Lee.

WATER PRICING

Mr MURRAY (Davenport) (15:01): Thank you, Mr Speaker.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MURRAY: Sorry?

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr MURRAY: I'll then buy the Repat for you, how's that? My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Can the minister outline to the house this government's approach to setting the regulated asset base of SA Water and whether he is aware of any alternative approaches?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:02): I thank the member for Davenport, a strong advocate for his electorate and one of those electorates in the middle southern suburbs that will really benefit very substantially from the Marshall Liberal government's approach to resetting the way that water and sewerage prices are calculated here in South Australia. Properties like those found in Happy Valley, Aberfoyle Park and Flagstaff Hill, those middle Australia suburbs, are really going to have those reductions in their water pricing of \$200, \$300, \$400 per annum, and that will make a great difference to the member for Davenport's constituents, I have no doubt.

The way that water pricing is set in South Australia is through the use of evaluation of what is known as the regulated asset base, or the RAB for short. It reflects the value of SA Water's assets—things like pipes, treatment plants, the desalination plants and all the things that work together to create an efficient and effective water utility. That regulated asset base is then taken into consideration as a key component used by the Treasurer of the day and then handed over to ESCOSA when calculating what water prices will be going forward.

From opposition, this party felt very strongly that the regulated asset base was being overinflated and that a figure that was too high was being handed to ESCOSA to feed into its pricing determinations. So we made a commitment, a commitment we followed through on, to get respected businessman Lew Owens to undertake an independent investigation, and that resulted in Mr Owens's investigation making a very clear, very decisive finding that in fact the previous Labor government had done what we suspected they had done: they had overinflated the price of the regulated asset base, which over many, many years had fed directly through into the tariffs being charged—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —to South Australian households and businesses, and year on year—

The Hon. T.J. Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for Primary Industries!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —it ripped hundreds and hundreds of dollars out of South Australian households and into the coffers of the government led by the South Australian Labor Party.

Just quoting a couple of quotes from the independent inquiry, which amongst other things said that, despite the Labor government claiming it was acting in the interests of consumers:

...that was not apparent and it appeared that the main driver of the decision was the securing of revenue for the Government.

The report also found that the process for setting the regulated asset base:

...was not transparent, balanced or credible: the decision was taken without proper public consultation or explanation, and there was no demonstrable effort to balance the interests of consumers against those of the Government.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: That is a shameful record and we have to find out who knew about this.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Well, one person who knew a lot about this was actually the member for Lee, who at the time was the deputy chief of staff. It was found at a hearing of the Budget and Finance Committee that he actually asked the commission—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: —to calculate how much could be raised for the government if you were to raise the RAB by 5 per cent, 10 per cent, 15 per cent. The member for Lee is someone who can never be trusted when it comes to cost-of-living issues in this state or water pricing.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister will be seated for one moment. The member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Hon. Michael Wright, member for Lee up until 2014, isn't here to defend himself. This is an outrageous attack on him.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has made his point, and I caution him; he is beginning to reflect on members.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: In my concluding seconds, I can say confidently that the Marshall Liberal government is ending this grubby cash grab from South Australians and resetting the way that South Australians receive their water and sewerage charges in a fair and balanced way.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee.

WATER PRICING

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:06): The current member for Lee—thank you, Mr Speaker. My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier think it's acceptable that more than 2,000 residents on Delfin Island, West Lakes, will no longer have access to bus services?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:07): I don't accept the premise of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: There is access to bus services. The great news is that access to those bus services is going to become more frequent, and that is the fantastic news for residents. Again, I do want to stress the fact that we are out for feedback and consultation at the moment. We want to hear from people what they think, and we are very keen to take that feedback on board. As always, when undertaking reform of this type, it is difficult.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Light!

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The alternative would be to do nothing and let our bus network patronage continue to decline, to basically get to a worse and worse outcome for taxpayers' money.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee will leave for the remainder of question time under 137A. When he leaves, the minister will have the call.

The honourable member for Lee having withdrawn from the chamber:

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

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Energy and Mining is close to the edge today—very close to the edge. You've been doing it all day. The Minister for Transport has the call.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: The option could have been to allow patronage to just go backwards further and further as fewer people choose to use the service, or to actually look at a way that we can drive growth. That's precisely what we are doing here by providing the opportunity for people to get to a higher frequency service, which is exactly what they have asked us to do. I look forward to the feedback coming through and look forward to being able to help individual South Australians understand the benefits that this new system is going to mean for them.

TAXI INDUSTRY

Mr CREGAN (Kavel) (15:09): My question is to the Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government. Can the minister update the house on how the government is reducing costs for tour operators, country taxi services and chauffeur operators?

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (15:09): We know that during COVID-19 various sections of regional South Australia have suffered, especially those connected to the tourism industry, whether that be in my electorate or in the member for Kavel's electorate. He and I have had discussions around the impacts the restrictions have had on, for instance, charter bus operators being able to take people to wineries—some of their bread-and-butter business—especially as some of them were looking to come out of what was a horrible bushfire season and hopefully rebuild by being able to essentially use the state government's #BookThemOut campaign to encourage people to go back to the Adelaide Hills.

But then, when the coronavirus hit and restrictions were put in place, it again made it all the more difficult for those same communities. It is why, using the government's economic and business jobs fund, we're putting \$1 million on the table to essentially forgive accreditation fees for bus operators, those tour operators who we know suffered as the coronavirus restrictions came down. They are the same bus operators whom I know have benefitted greatly from the easing of restrictions over the course of the last few weeks.

There are also country taxis. Country taxis are in a different situation from metropolitan taxis, and I appreciate the question the member for Mount Gambier gave in the last sitting week around the difficulties they have had. They are impacted differently from the way that metropolitan Adelaide is but are still worthy of support. That is, again, why they are included as part of this \$1 million forgiving of fees over the next 12 months.

Then we have chauffer operators who, again, provide a more personalised service especially for incoming tourists, whether they be from interstate or overseas, providing them with an experience that helps to show off the best that South Australia has to offer. I have certainly had some very positive feedback from regional electorates right across South Australia and my own electorate, from my two taxi services, as well as from a number of small tour operators.

They are small businesses that have availed themselves of other schemes that the federal government has put in place in relation to JobSeeker and JobKeeper, but also should and now have support from their state government, forgiving fees that they would otherwise need to pay. We are doing what we can to help small businesses to grow, thrive and survive through this coronavirus pandemic.

Ministerial Statement

SAFEGUARDING TASKFORCE INTERIM REPORT

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General) (15:12): I table a ministerial statement of the Hon. Michelle Lensink MLC, referred to in another place on this day.

Grievance Debate

BUS SERVICES

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (15:12): Over the course of the weekend an incredibly significant announcement was made by the Marshall Liberal government. They announced a comprehensive, wideranging set of sweeping changes to our public transport network, principally to our bus services, that constitute the single biggest cut to public transport in the history of South Australia.

It has taken a number of days for the breadth and depth of these cuts to start to disseminate amongst the community in South Australia but, as South Australians grow more familiar with exactly what these changes mean to them, I think we are going to increasingly hear just how concerned those affected people are. Already, over the course of the last 48 hours, the opposition has been inundated with examples of real people who have done absolutely nothing wrong in recent times. They have been good, loyal citizens of the state and have now found out that a fundamental service upon which they depend has been taken away from them.

Yesterday morning, I went out to the north-eastern suburbs and spoke to about 10 different individuals who each of their own volition conveyed to me a story about what this cut would mean to their daily lives. I was there with the member for Wright, and I found myself growing increasingly agitated at the news and the stories that these people were conveying.

Take Christine, the mother of two amazing young women who are both studying in their own right. One is studying chemical engineering—I think her name is Josephine—and the other young woman, Elsa, is studying physiotherapy at university and working part-time at the Lyell McEwin Hospital. Christine was explaining to me how they recently moved to South Australia and chose to buy in the location they currently live, close to the M44 service, so their daughters could get to and from university and to and from their places of work. Now that service is being taken away, only months after they decided to purchase land in that location for that explicit reason.

The practical consequence of that for Christine's daughters is that Elsa is now going to be faced with the prospect of walking an additional 30 minutes in the morning to be able to catch the alternate service that she requires to get to the Lyell McEwin for work. She will be walking in the depths of night along a creek bed that is unlit in the dark of the morning and in the dark of the night to be able to service our state at the Lyell McEwin. Christine's other daughter is faced with the prospect of, after doing a 10 to 12-hour day at university as a chemical engineering student, also having to extend her travel time for the privilege of going to university—an absurd situation.

I met Paul, a cancer sufferer, who relies on having to go to the RAH on a frequent basis in order to get his treatment. He needs that public transport service to be able to get to and from the RAH. He does not have regular access to a car—again service taken away. I met other individuals, including Denise, whose husband, Peter, has to get to and from the city to get to the dental hospital. Again they are having that service taken away. I met Steve, whose son is autistic and requires public

transport to get to and from his daily routine, a routine that he depends upon for the sake of familiarity and also to be able to engage positively in society and the economy, and he has just had his service taken away, and that was all that one bus stop—one bus stop.

Now we hear that this is being replicated 500 times across metropolitan Adelaide—at least. The overall majority of South Australians will go to bed tonight not even knowing whether or not their own bus stop still exists because this government will not be transparent about exactly what services and what stops are being taken away. Let me make it perfectly clear: this is just the beginning. We are going to fight these bus cuts all the way because there are thousands of stories, like those I have just told, of people who depend on us to do exactly that.

We will not allow the voiceless to go unheard, we will not allow the most vulnerable in our community to miss out on a service that is elementary to state government and we certainly will not allow that to happen in the middle of the biggest economic crisis in the state's history, when 40,000 people lose their job in one month and 100,000 are underemployed. Now is the time to be investing in public services, not cutting them, not privatising, and that is why we will fight this every step of the way.

CORONAVIRUS RESTRICTIONS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:17): As all members of this house would know, we are working our way through a very difficult time in South Australia, as people are all over the world, in regard to the coronavirus. We are not careless, and not taking anything for granted, but we are optimistic that there is light at the end of the tunnel.

Our Premier has led our state extraordinarily well, with extraordinary advice from the Commissioner of Police, the Chief Public Health Officer and many others. He has taken the view that we will follow every single bit of expert medical advice that comes our way in regard to restrictions but, ideally, no more. Our government has not wanted to impose unnecessary restrictions on the state due to the coronavirus. We do everything required, everything recommended, everything that is healthy, but no more where it can be avoided.

Members will remember that at the beginning of this challenging time the Premier made a call to say that people should still attend the closing festivities of the Fringe. That was an opportunity that was assessed as being safe; it was fun. Why would you prevent that if it was not necessary? You will remember, Mr Speaker, the Premier encouraging people over the Easter break to get out and about and enjoy Easter in a safe, responsible way, keeping personal distance, keeping personal hygiene at the highest possible level, doing everything as responsibly as we can, but please enjoy it. We saw exactly the same thing again on the June long weekend.

After our last sitting week here in parliament, I drove home to Wilmington on the Thursday night, as is my wish at the end of a parliamentary sitting week so that I can be in my electorate all day Friday. I have to say that the traffic on the highway between 6.30 and 10.15, or whatever it was as I was driving home, on the whole was quite significant, much more than on a normal long weekend.

Being out and about in my electorate on Friday and throughout that long weekend, it was an enormous pleasure to see people out and about: country people out and about and metro Adelaide people out and about. I know this was happening on Eyre Peninsula, on Yorke Peninsula, in the South-East, in the Riverland, in the outback and in many other parts, as well as in my electorate. It is very important that this is allowed to happen. Our Premier has done everything he can to sensibly reduce restrictions in the same way that he sensibly imposed them when it was necessary at the start.

Activity in regional South Australia is absolutely vital for regional communities. Getting tourists out and about is absolutely critical. It is important for those tourists and Adelaide people to be out and about in country areas—beautiful weather, beautiful scenery, beautiful people to engage with, wonderful tourism and produce experiences to enjoy. However, it is also very important for local people, because it is creating jobs in regional areas, where it is very hard to do.

It is creating fantastic social engagement in regional areas. Regional areas have people who get on well and who love working and socialising together, but we are all the richer, in a social way, when metropolitan people come to our area as well and weave their social contributions into our part of the world. So it is incredibly important economically and socially and incredibly important in regard to local employment in country areas.

Another often overlooked fact is that we need tourists in regional South Australia so that we can retain the services that we have there. Let me give you an example. There might be a pub, a hotel, a motel or a supermarket that perhaps only gets 10 per cent of its business from tourism, but if that 10 per cent were to disappear it might also equate to the net profit that business makes over a year. If that 10 per cent is not there, that business may not be able to be there, in which case the other 90 per cent of the customers of that business would not have that business, and we would lose our shops, our service stations, our hotels, etc. So thank you to Adelaide people for coming to regional South Australia. We know you benefit from that, but we benefit from it also.

SMITH, MS A.M.

Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (15:22): Today, I will be speaking about the terrible tragedy that was the death of Ann Marie Smith and the consequences of that and what has happened since we discovered, almost four weeks ago, that Ann Marie Smith passed away. She was found in her chair, she obviously was not getting the supports that she required and she had complex needs. She was taken to hospital and died within 24 hours. The community is fearful about that.

The community has expressed a lot of anxiety about that, and since that happened dozens of people reached out to us, asking us to get answers about how this could occur in a community where we are investing a lot of time, a lot of energy and a lot of love and care into people with disabilities. How does this happen in our community? This horrific story of alleged neglect and loneliness and a community that has let someone down is absolutely shocking.

We know that there are questions that need to be answered by the state government. We know that the state government has continued to have responsibility in the area of transition from the state disability funding model to the NDIS. We know that the state government continues to have responsibility in terms of the screening of people who work with vulnerable adults. We know that the state government should have had a line of sight over Ann Marie Smith.

For the past two years, we have been asking questions about how this was happening. How was the state government ensuring that people like Ann Marie were looked after—people with complex disabilities in our community who move from one system to the other, who were subject to the institutional layering of policy that we know causes people to fall through the gaps?

We have asked questions about what has happened in terms of the handover of Ann Marie from a support coordination point of view. We have asked about the screening of workers looking after people who have complex disability like Ann Marie Smith. We have asked for answers around the Community Visitor Scheme. We have tabled legislation about the Community Visitor Scheme. This week, that legislation has been supported in principle by the Law Society, which is the peak legal body in South Australia.

Today, we have finally seen the tabling of the report delivered by the task force set up by the government to investigate what they call 'gaps in the system'. South Australians rightly want to know how these gaps affected someone like Ann Marie Smith and how they were left to develop over time, during this transition from state to federal funding.

Ann Marie Smith barely gets a mention in this report. She is introduced as a terrible tragedy within the foreword of the report, but we do not see a deep dive into how the state government failed Ann Marie Smith. We know that the federal government has undertaken an independent inquiry into Ann Marie Smith, but the state government has pulled together a task force that is sadly overlaid with government officials who have been part of the system that let down people with complex disability—people like Ann Marie Smith.

We have no issue with people on that task force who have lived experience and who are supporting their loved ones and working in the space. We have absolute respect for those people, but what we are not seeing in this report are detailed descriptors of what has gone wrong with the

state system. There are suggestions about changes to the Adult Safeguarding Unit, which has only recently been operational in South Australia.

We have seen an admission that the Community Visitor Scheme must be developed, supported and strengthened, which is what we have been asking for, not just for two weeks. We have been asking questions about this for two years. We acknowledge that the Law Society has made some commentary in regard to some improvements that can be made to the legislation.

These are simple amendments and we are prepared to work with the government on this. What we do not have is a light being shone onto the failures of this state government over the past two years during the transition from state to federal funding.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:27): Since being elected to this place two years ago, few issues have been raised with me by constituents more than the Tea Tree Gully council's Community Wastewater Management System. My community has rightly been angered by the dramatically increasing service charge for being on the system and the increasing number of problems with the system, including blockages.

The weekend before last, I visited a property in Banksia Park where the backyard was quite literally being flooded by sewage bubbling up out of the inspection point at the back of the property. Sewage was flowing through the backyard, under the pergola, through the garden and around pot plants before reaching the front of the property, where it was pouring into the gutter and down the street, into the stormwater system.

Most distressing and, quite frankly, outrageous was the fact that this is the sixth time that this has happened to this family in the past 18 months—the sixth time! My community has been putting up with it and paying for it for far too long. I have spoken about the CWMS a number of times in this place. Two weeks ago, I spoke about the need for the state government to intervene and finally deliver a long-term solution for my community.

I am thrilled that the Marshall Liberal government has listened to my concerns, and those of my community, and is delivering a solution to this decades-old problem. Announced by the Minister for Environment and Water, the government is investing \$65 million for SA Water to convert CWMS households from the common effluent system to SA Water sewerage, at no cost to households. This will save the average household \$400 a year and provide a better service.

There will be no need to have the backyard, garden, footpath, driveway or garage floor dug up every four years to empty the septic tank. SA Water customers also have the benefit of a well-resourced 24/7 service to respond to the problems that may occur, albeit much less frequently. Planning for the transfer of property started immediately, and SA Water is working to develop a schedule for the conversions.

It is also worth welcoming Labor's belated interest in this issue. Whilst it is disappointing that they did not do something about the CWMS while they had the chance during their 16 years in government, and there are some questions about how exactly they arrived at their figure—I suspect, in the typical Labor fashion, they simply asked council, 'How much do you want?'—their interest in this issue is certainly better late than never, despite the conditions attached to their promise. At the end of the day, though, my community wants a solution to this issue. That is exactly what we are doing, and we are starting right now. Planning is starting immediately, and we expect to see the first properties transfer across to SA Water in 2021.

We believe that it is only fair that the council makes a contribution to this project. Ultimately, these assets are the council's and, after charging ratepayers for years for a service that is becoming increasingly problematic, and quite frankly a financial liability for the council, it is only reasonable that the council play a fair and reasonable part in solving the problem. We cannot have a situation where councils just allow their assets to fall into a state of disrepair, ask for the state government to bail them out but then take absolutely no further responsibility for the solution. It is ultimately in the council's interest and the interest of their ratepayers that this situation is fixed.

I would also urge council to place an immediate price freeze on the CWMS service charge now that there is a solution. I understand that the council recently voted to continue with the planned

fee increases, but the situation has since changed. The fee, which is set to reach nearly \$900 per year, has been increasing on the basis that it is required to fund upgrades and renewals to the system as well as costs associated with asset depreciation. As the Marshall Liberal government is now providing a long-term solution for the system, there is now no longer justification for the increases.

I have written to all councillors, urging them to abandon the service charge increases in light of the government's announcement. As I have said before in this place, the Tea Tree Gully council's CWMS has been a problem for decades. For decades, councillors and governments have simply kicked the can down the road and ignored the concerns of the community. I am proud to be part of a government that has listened to these concerns and acted swiftly to deliver a real, long-term solution that will save households money and provide a better service. We are fixing this.

AUSTRALIAN GIANT CUTTLEFISH

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:32): I rise today to talk about the Australian giant cuttlefish. People are probably aware that just outside Whyalla, on the Point Lowly peninsula, each winter there is a massive, unique breeding aggregation. Cuttlefish can generally be found around the Australian coast, from the south of Queensland all the way around to Geraldton in Western Australia. The Australian giant cuttlefish breeds in pairs or in very small groups of up to five or six.

What we have outside Whyalla, on the Point Lowly peninsula, is a massive aggregation. We are talking about hundreds of thousands of animals aggregating in a small area in what is a spectacular display. It is truly unique. People from overseas have commented on the nature of the aggregation, and Professor Roger Hanlon of the Woods Hole Oceanographic Institution, which is the largest independent oceanographic institute in the United States, has called the breeding aggregation 'the premier marine attraction on the planet'. That just gives you an idea of how this is viewed by cephalopod experts and others around the world.

We have had a number of major documentary makers come to Whyalla and spend time filming the breeding aggregation. David Attenborough's people have also been over to Whyalla and spent time filming the aggregation. It is an amazing event and, as I said, it is a unique event.

What has this minister done? He has reduced protection for the aggregation. Until a few weeks ago, if you were to draw a line across Spencer Gulf from Wallaroo to Arno Bay, all the area to the north was protected and a no-take zone for Australian giant cuttlefish. The minister has massively reduced the protected area and now even cut out some of the breeding aggregation from protection—and the animals from the northern Spencer Gulf largely only breed on the rocky fringes of the Point Lowly peninsula.

We already have one or two commercial fishers, right outside the boundary of the current protected area where the aggregation is, catching the Australian giant cuttlefish. It is totally unacceptable. It has been attacked by divers in this state, interstate and overseas. The decision has been attacked by environmentalists, it has been attacked by tourist operators and it has been attacked by motel owners. There was absolutely no pressure to lift that degree of protection that existed for the cuttlefish.

The protection was brought in back in the late 1990s, when the commercial sector, over a period of a few years, decided to directly hammer the aggregation in order to get a pittance overseas. Back in 1996-97, they took out 263 tonnes from the aggregation. It was absolutely appalling behaviour, so protection was introduced. It is incredibly disappointing to see this minister seriously dilute the protection that exists.

I would call upon the minister to rethink this, given there was no pressure from the recreational sector and no pressure from the professional sector to dilute this protection. I would call on the minister to reinstate the full protection in the northern Spencer Gulf.

HEYSEN ELECTORATE

Mr TEAGUE (Heyesen) (15:37): I am very glad to have the opportunity to rise to highlight that businesses are getting back on track and reopening in the Hills in the face of the COVID-19

global pandemic, notwithstanding the very real privation that many local businesses in the Hills have been through over recent weeks and months.

I can think of no better example than Sue Pryor's swimming school at Strathalbyn, which last Tuesday reopened and, very happily, reopened at a time considerably sooner than it might otherwise have done, notwithstanding that restrictions have been lifted so that swimmers can return to the pool. I was very pleased to be poolside with Sue and her manager, Tabitha Lewis, last Tuesday, 9 June, to see the first of the aquarobics classes coming to get back into the pool. Sue warmed the pool up to 34°C, and those attending the class were getting into the warm water for the first time in a very long time.

Sue is particularly passionate about delivering these services to the local community at Strathalbyn. It is all about fitness and health and wellbeing, but it is more than all the feel-good benefits of those services: it is a very real example of how the government's intervention has made it possible for the business not only to see it through this struggle but to get back on track sooner than they otherwise would have.

Sue illustrates the point very effectively. She is quick to point out, as so many businesses have, that employees have been in receipt of the federal government's JobKeeper assistance over this time, and that is undoubtedly core to keeping the show on the road. However, Sue has made the point that the state government's \$10,000 emergency business grant—which Sue Pryor Swimming has received—has made it possible for the business to reopen a lot sooner than it otherwise would have.

She says, 'We might have survived this, but we might not have opened the doors until a couple of months from now—two or three months from now. As it stands, we have JobKeeper assistance together with the state government \$10,000 grant. That means that we can reopen albeit in somewhat constrained circumstances. We can get classes back up and running, and we can be on a steady trajectory back to normal operations.'

It is a wonderful illustration of the resilience of local small business in coming through this. It is a wonderful thing to see the joy on the faces of those who were coming back to the pool and to see Sue and Tabitha so satisfied that their business was providing services once again to the local community. We know that local sport and fitness and wellbeing activities are hugely important.

I have worked throughout this period also, for example, with Don Cranwell, the President of the Hills Football League, who has worked with the different clubs that participate in that league. Some of them are highly organised and well resourced, others are very much working on maintaining the basics of the footy club to keep operating—different needs but all with a common goal to get back on the field just as quickly as possible, to get the community back to the grounds enjoying that activity of being able to follow football matches as soon as possible, and ensuring that the fabric of the community is supported by the return of sport.

Don has been in close cooperation with the SANFL and with their community people, and they have in turn been in close dialogue with the government and the Transition Committee to make sure that, as soon as the restrictions can be lifted to the extent feasible to make games possible and the attendance of crowds possible, we will do that just as quickly as we can.

Whether it is Sue Pryor Swimming at Strath and her classes and community leadership or Don Cranwell and his leadership of the Hills Football League, I very much applaud those who contribute in the community to keeping up the wellbeing of both business and community activities.

Bills

WAITE TRUST (VESTING OF LAND) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:42): I am very pleased to speak to the Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill 2020. I just want to note that we are doing this because of the collaboration between the Morrison and Marshall Liberal governments, who have committed \$61 million to upgrade the Fullarton Road and Cross Road intersection.

Cross Road and Fullarton Road are both major traffic routes serving traffic to and from the Mitcham Hills area and the South Eastern Freeway so, obviously, over my life I have used it many, many hundreds of times. Cross Road also forms part of Adelaide's outer ring route, which plays a key role in moving Adelaide's traffic efficiently and safely. The outer ring route is a key freight route connecting to export and import gateways and intermodal terminals.

Approximately 53,000 vehicles travel through the Cross Road and Fullarton Road intersection each day, and it currently experiences travel time delays, particularly in peak periods. Over the five-year period between and including 2014 and 2018 there were 39 crashes, including 17 casualty crashes. The upgrade of the intersection will improve travel times, safety, network reliability and economic productivity.

It has been identified that land acquisition will be required to accommodate the project, with every effort being made to minimise the extent of the land required in order to contain costs and limit the impact on the property involved. By a transfer dated 26 February 1914, certain land at Urrbrae owned by Peter Waite—and I will be having a bit more of a conversation about Peter Waite during the contribution—being a portion of the land subsequently contained in Certificate of Title Register Book volume 5352 folio 559, relevantly and now CT volume 5540 folio 952, was transferred to the Crown.

The land was a gift for the purposes of the establishment of an agricultural high school and is therefore subject to a charitable trust for that purpose. The Minister for Education, as the registered proprietor in fee simple, holds the land subject to the Waite Trust. As trustee, the Minister for Education is bound to adhere to the terms of the trust. Failure to do so amounts to a breach of trust and is actionable under the Trustee Act 1936.

The Minister for Education is unable to authorise use of the Urrbrae Agricultural High School land that is inconsistent with the charitable trust. The Commissioner of Highways is also unable to acquire the land under the Highways Act 1926. Therefore, an amendment to the Waite Trust is required to take land for roadwork purposes. The Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill 2020 operates to vary the Waite Trust to free a portion of land contained in Certificate of Title Register Book volume 5540 folio 952, of which the Minister for Education is the registered proprietor in fee simple, to be vested in the Commissioner of Highways for the purposes of carrying out roadwork.

Accordingly, the bill is strictly targeted, specific and limited in nature and will not impact upon any other charitable trust land nor the remaining portions of the Waite Trust land. The project is also an important part of economic stimulus activity in response to the COVID-19 pandemic. This bill will assist in ensuring the project can proceed with the required speed and efficiency.

We have had a bit of conversation from various members in the house on the contribution of Peter Waite to the state of South Australia, obviously for agriculture mainly. In October 1913, Peter Waite wrote to the premier of South Australia, the Hon. A.H. Peake, and the chancellor of the University of Adelaide, the Rt. Hon. Sir Samuel Way, informing them that subject to his own and his wife's life interests, he intended presenting the Urrbrae property of 54 hectares to the university.

The eastern half was to be used for scientific studies related to agriculture and the western half as a public park. He also intended handing over 45 hectares adjoining Urrbrae to the government of South Australia for the purpose of establishing an agricultural high school. This statement of intent was subject to South Australian parliament making the gifts free of succession duty. In explaining his gift, Peter Waite wrote:

I have been much influenced by the wonderful work our agriculturalists and pastoralists have accomplished hitherto in face of the very great odds they have had to meet. With comparatively little scientific training they have placed our wheat, wool and fruits in the highest estimation of the world; our sheep have been brought to such perfection that they're sought after not only by all the sister States but by South Africa.

Our agricultural machinery has been found good enough even for the Americans to copy; and our farming methods have been accepted by other States as the most up-to date and practical for Australian conditions.

We have now reached a point when it behoves us to call science to our aid to a greater extent than hitherto has been done, otherwise we cannot hope to keep in the forefront.

In 1915, Peter Waite bought the Claremont Estate of 21 hectares and 45 hectares of the foothill part of the Netherby Estate, both of which adjoined Urrbrae, transferring their ownership to the University

of Adelaide. Before his death, Peter set aside shares in Elder Smith and Co. Ltd for the purpose of providing income to the university for the advancement of agricultural education.

Urrbrae Agricultural High School, which is part of this land, is a public high school with approximately 1,016 students. It is adjacent to the Waite Agricultural Research Institute of the University of Adelaide and the CSIRO agricultural research facilities in the suburb of Urrbrae. The school was founded in 1913 through the bequest of Peter Waite—as we know, he was a South Australian pastoralist and public benefactor—as a school to teach agriculture to boys. In 1972, it enrolled its first two female students, and in 2002 it achieved its first-year level that was equally represented by both genders.

Just for the record, I am part of the Urrbrae student group, the alumni. I only managed to be there for one year and then had to go back to the farm, but at the time, in 1978, I think there were 600 or 700 students with only about 70 or 80 girls there at that time. It took a while for it to grow to pretty well equal numbers of boys and girls by 2002.

The school is designated as a special interest school in agriculture and the environment and is the only comprehensive special interest agricultural secondary school in South Australia. Its courses are strongly focused on agriculture, horticulture, viticulture, aquaculture, environmental aspects of the earth and other environmental subjects, and certificates are awarded in those areas.

Urrbrae also has a strong science and technology background, with extensive technology workshops and many related courses available to students. Certainly when going through some of their workshops there are many state-of-the-art facilities utilising CAD and other technology, with excellent hands-on facilities to train students for the future. It has plenty of environmental and automotive technology, offers education programs for adults, and also houses a TAFE campus.

Urrbrae Agricultural High School has an application process for students in year 7 who wish to attend Urrbrae in their secondary school years. Unlike most public schools, Urrbrae is not part of the zonal system and does not necessarily accept students based on where they live. Being the only comprehensive, special interest, agricultural secondary school in the state, it has students from all over the state. Students from country and distant areas often board locally, as I did when I attended in 1978—I was at Caulfield Avenue, Clarence Gardens—and many students travel long distances to school.

The campus includes a 35-hectare farm—the total size including farm, wetland, school and TAFE is 45 hectares—and year 10 Urrbrae students give tours to visiting students from other schools. Urrbrae also has a swimming pool, a rock climbing wall, grass tennis courts, asphalt tennis courts and playing fields. A large corner of the site has been turned into a wetland, which is open to other schools to visit. Apart from the excellent work that is done at Waite, there are many thousands of students over time who have come through Urrbrae Agricultural High School, whether dealing with the agricultural course or the general course.

As I indicated before, it has some excellent facilities and they do a great job educating students for the future. That is important, especially in these times when farming is on a bit of a rebound at the moment. Even though we have had some dry years, we have had an excellent start. Some areas are still a bit dry around the state but certainly in my home area, around Coomandook, we had another 16 millimetres of rain over the weekend and things are flying out of the ground.

We had an excellent start to the cropping season, probably the best in about 10 years. Everyone got a good kill of weeds as they came up, and it is looking really good. It was quite frosty last week, which does not help, but I think most farmers—in fact, probably all of them—would rather have a frost in June than October, when that silent thief comes in the night, when you think you are almost there, and it can take out your whole crop if you are at a low level. It breaks your heart because you are nearly there. As my father always used to say, 'You haven't got it until it's in the bag,' or, these days, in the bin. No surer a word was said.

I note the member for West Torrens talked about agriculture. I just want to talk about the Waite Institute and the work they do now that it is all part of the University of Adelaide. They do great work on that campus right here in Adelaide. One of my boys is doing mechanical engineering. He is in his second year at the University of Adelaide. They also have the Roseworthy campus, so they have multiple campuses training our people into the future.

One thing that has been held up, mainly because of Labor's failed policy with regard to agriculture in this state, is bringing on genetically modified foods. There has been risk to research in this state over many, many years—well over 16 years—where they have a plant accelerator, where half of it is dedicated to general breeding of crops and the other half dedicated to genetic modification. It just held this state back from where it could have been and where it will be again into the future. It was held back for so many years because of a flawed policy position.

Some people will not applaud me for it, but I am one in this place who will give acknowledgement where it should be given to people on the other side. I will acknowledge the current member for Giles, Eddie Hughes, and the work he did to find a point where there was a bit of give and take for both groups—the Labor Party and the Liberal government—to get there, but we now have the opportunity for genetically modified canola to be grown in South Australia.

Mr Teague: Peter Waite would have applauded it.

Mr PEDERICK: Peter Waite would have been cheering; he would be cheering from the grave. This is what Peter Waite donated the land for, so that we can get the up-to-date research to get those foremost farming ventures going. As Peter Waite indicated, our machinery was being copied by the Americans 100 years ago. Our farmers and innovators have been taking our machinery over to the Middle East—John Shearer machinery. All around the world our machinery is cutting edge, and a lot of this has come from the donation of Peter Waite.

I want to reflect a couple of other comments that the member for West Torrens made about GlobeLink. Obviously, one end of it was going to start in my electorate, around Monarto. We committed before the election—this is what we committed to, because a bit of misleading goes on in this place—to a \$20 million study to see whether it was viable to put a four-lane road and rail around the back—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Where did you say that?

Mr PEDERICK: It's in the policy.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Where did you say, '\$20 million study'?

Mr PEDERICK: Read the policy.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: It's pretty simple. Read it, Tom.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: You have been here since 1997.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: No-one believes you. No-one believes a thing you say.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PEDERICK: 1997, mate. You've been here a long—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Like pairs, no-one believes a thing you say.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You can't keep your word.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond and member for West Torrens, settle down! Both of you, settle down!

Mr PEDERICK: Okay.

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, do not provoke the Father of the House.

Mr PEDERICK: So we put up—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How's your pool?

Mr PEDERICK: I'm getting there, mate; I'm getting there. I'm getting to you.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: How's your pool?

The SPEAKER: Member for West Torrens!

Mr PEDERICK: So \$20 million, and we ended up spending I think only \$1 million or \$2 million to get the study up. He mentions something that did not happen. I can tell you a couple of things that did not happen under Labor's time. I will go back to the multifunction polis under former premier John Bannon. The best thing that land was used for down at Port Adelaide by the silos was in 1992 and 1993, the wet year we had in South Australia, when some of us were carting our own grain to Adelaide. I know I took at least a dozen loads down to the Port, and the best use for that land was bunker sites for the amount of grain that was pouring in. In our area, usually a 16-inch rainfall area in the old language had about 28 inches of rain for the year, and we used that land for bunker sites. So that was a multifunction polis.

Then I get to the Gillman site, which was quite a failed policy that the former treasurer, the member for West Torrens, was directly involved in. The former government promised 6,000 jobs in the oil and gas industry, which I also worked in for a couple of years, years ago in the early eighties, up in the Cooper Basin. Out of Gillman, there was not one job—not one job. In fact, it ended up in front of Bruce Lander, in front of ICAC. What happened at ICAC? We had the member for West Torrens called in, in front of ICAC, with his own public servants talking about how he treated them.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order, sir: while you are happily in conversation with another member, the member is talking about events that have nothing to do with this bill. But I understand, sir, you have a different point of view when it comes to Labor members.

The SPEAKER: No, I respectfully do ask the member for Hammond to come back to the merits of the bill. Member for West Torrens, I also respectfully ask you to cease interjecting.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Member West Torrens, I am going to ask you to please settle down and, member for Hammond, I will ask you to come back to the merits of the bill in the second reading debate, please.

Mr PEDERICK: Well, at least I am not using conversational swearing, as was outlined in ICAC, and Bruce Lander indicated that the member for West Torrens would not answer questions directly.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, please. Member for West Torrens, this is most unhelpful.

Mr PEDERICK: What I would like to say is that some of those on the other side, especially those who have been here for a while, like preaching about things, but they want to have a good look at history. You suddenly have some great allegiance to the agriculture sector, when I know that when the Labor Party had one of their seminars at Pinnaroo the member for West Torrens had to ask someone where it was—that is how much they know about regional areas in this state.

What I will say, under the Waite Trust bill, about Peter Waite, is: what a great, charitable thing to do for this state—to put this land in place for agriculture. He would have loved to see genetically modified crops far earlier in the piece. He would be very pleased and cheering from the grave that that has happened, and I note his association with the Elder family, with agriculture generally in this state and with pastoral lands.

You do not see too many charitable gifts like that, and I am sure that in regard to the vesting of land bill here today we will be accessing the minimum amount of land to make this project, this \$61 million project, work for the many tens of thousands of vehicles that traverse Cross Road and Fullarton Road every day for the benefit of all South Australians.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:02): I would like to thank all members who contributed on

this bill. It is an important piece of legislation, and I want to outline to the house why it is an important piece of legislation.

This change will allow a \$61 million project, one that is key to our outer ring route and one that deals with the key congestion point of all the traffic heading down the Mitcham Hills corridor to Fullarton Road, as well as with the huge amount of traffic that exists on the outer ring road route of Cross Road. Helping to create better access and improve turning access for vehicles is extremely important, and it has become even more important after the very tragic death of Jo Shanahan at the intersection.

This bill is timely because we are at a stage where we are keen to keep the process moving so that we can meet the original time lines of this project, made all the more important because of coronavirus and because of our need to provide a job stimulus for the economy in a timely manner. It is certainly the will of the government to deal with this legislation as expeditiously as possible so that we can undertake further design work concurrent with consultation work, concurrent with other land acquisition work, and together with getting the procurement ready in the background. What we do not want to see is a delay to this project because this bill winds its way through this parliament in a less than timely manner.

The biggest reason why this bill needs to go ahead and go forth in a timely manner is that it allows us to minimise the impact of this project upon the surrounds. If you look at the northern side of Cross Road, there is established housing, some of which has historic value. On the south-eastern corner, you have the Waite Arboretum, and there has been much discussion about what that means to South Australians, and then you have this Waite Trust land, which houses Urrbrae high school and other things.

The opportunity for us to excise this bit of land means that we can minimise the impact upon very significant trees, trees that Peter Waite himself planted on the other side of Fullarton Road. The opportunity to excise this land means that we can still have the school continue forward on its existing footprint with only minor impacts to its car park and a couple of open areas. Excising this bit of land means that we can also help to keep the cost of this project to the South Australian taxpayer as low as possible.

It is very important that this goes ahead in a timely manner so that we can keep this moving to keep jobs flowing from our record \$12.9 billion infrastructure program. I thank all speakers in the house and I thank the opposition for their help, support and concurrence on this bill. It is another example of how this parliament can work together in the best interest of the people of South Australia, which is made even more important during this global pandemic. I look forward to its speedy passage through both houses of this parliament so that we can get on and deliver the jobs, the road network and road safety benefits that South Australians are imploring us to achieve.

Bill read a second time.

The SPEAKER (16:07): The Waite Trust (Vesting of Land) Bill affects the interests of a local body, namely, the charitable trust referred to as the Waite Trust. The Waite Trust land was transferred to the government in the early 1900s as a gift, with the objective to advance the cause of education, more especially to promote the teaching and study of agriculture, forestry and allied subjects.

The purpose of this bill is to specifically set aside a portion of the land subject to the trust for a purpose that is perhaps different from that envisaged when the land was first transferred. As such, the interests of the local body are affected by the acquisition of a portion of the land for road upgrade purposes, which is arguably inconsistent with the Waite Trust.

The bill therefore meets the criteria of a hybrid bill as defined by the joint standing order (private bills) No. 2 because, in accordance with the precedents established by the house and the application of the joint standing orders, the bill has been introduced by the government, the Waite Trust is a local body and the bill does not promote the interests of local bodies generally. Therefore, based on our precedent, I refer and rule this bill to be a hybrid bill.

Referred to Select Committee

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL (Schubert—Minister for Transport, Infrastructure and Local Government, Minister for Planning) (16:08): I move:

That the bill be referred to a select committee pursuant to joint standing order No. 2.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I move:

That a committee be appointed consisting of Mr David Basham, Mr Josh Teague, the Hon. Dr Susan Close, the Hon. Anastasios Koutsantonis and the mover.

Motion carried.

The Hon. S.K. KNOLL: I move:

That the committee have power to send for persons, papers and records, to adjourn from place to place and that the committee reports on Tuesday 30 June 2020.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (ELECTRICITY AND GAS) (ENERGY PRODUCTIVITY) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 3 June 2020.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:09): I rise and take great pleasure in taking the opportunity to make some brief remarks in support of the Statutes Amendment (Electricity and Gas) (Energy Productivity) Bill 2020, advancing, as it does, the Marshall Liberal government's agenda to deliver on outcomes and not just on process.

We have heard already today, and I reflect on the earlier contribution of the member for Elizabeth on another matter, about the experience of a regime that gets caught up in process for process' sake, the bundling up of material that might ultimately hold together or make a difference or do something if it were implemented but not actually ever getting there. Contrast that with what we have seen since March 2018, the election of the Marshall Liberal government: an outcomes-driven government, a government that says, 'Alright, what we are about is delivery and, more particularly, underpromising and overdelivering.'

Talk about outcomes, not process. Where there is a practical improvement that can be made, then go ahead and do that. That has seen its expression in so much of what has been brought to this parliament in the short time since the Marshall Liberal government was elected, sweeping away 16 years of Labor government in this state, 16 lost years when the state was subjected to that kind of approach. Now we have a whole new way of going about it: practical improvement and outcomes rather than process. Again, it is writ large in the subject of this bill.

The bill, as it does, will amend the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997 to enable a very outcomes-driven practical improvement to the retailer energy productivity scheme. What those who follow this area have seen in the past as a Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme will now be shifted to a productivity oriented scheme so that where retailers identify ways in which they can deliver their services so as to increase productivity, then this scheme will support them in doing so. So it is not purely efficiency, but productivity. It broadens the scope under which the scheme can be applied.

We know that the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme is the scheme that is operated to provide incentives for South Australian households and businesses to save energy by establishing energy efficiency targets and then delivering on those eligible energy efficiency activities. What the new scheme will do is provide for those retailers to move to a situation where they can improve on productivity as well, and then have eligibility under this new scheme.

The energy efficiency scheme has been around now for the better part of a decade. It was established under parallel regulations for electricity and gas back in 2012, so it was therefore timely that the Retail Energy Efficiency Scheme underwent a review. That review took place last year, in

2019. A key recommendation coming out of that review was that the scheme be expanded from next year to include additional measures, energy demand management and energy demand response activities.

The proposed new scheme that will come into action shortly as a result will continue to have a focus on efficiency but will be expanded to a more meat and potatoes approach to the whole system, if you like, with a view to improvements on productivity, activities that will reduce end-use energy consumption for both households and business, activities that will reduce both costs and consumption for households and business, and activities that will provide broader energy market benefits, which might include reduced wholesale electricity prices, network costs and overall improvements in energy system security.

I would just pause for a moment to consider the importance of improvements in energy system security. It was only a few short years ago, of course—it is easy to remember now that we have found ourselves in this new environment of confidence that has been brought on since March 2018. Remember, we have just been through two typically long, hot summers in South Australia, the last one punctuated tragically by some of the worst bushfires that the state has seen in a generation.

In the present context, we have also seen that we have managed to carry on through those two long, hot summers in South Australia without a significant or sustained blackout of our electricity networks in the state. That is down very much to the diligent and capable work of the Minister for Energy leading a very capable team in implementing measures to do all we can to ensure we have a reliable network. We are very quick to come back to the position that we were in some decades ago when people did not think about power and particularly energy security all that much, because they assumed that you would turn on the light at home and the light would actually come on with the switch.

It was not so long before that that we had come to a point (and I remember it well), through the course of 2017 in particular, where we had really reached a generationally low ebb. We had come to a point where businesses throughout my electorate of Heysen in the Hills had come to routinely regard it as just good business practice—it could be in a variety of circumstances—to invest several thousand dollars in diesel generator backup systems for the business in the expectation that the new par for the course in the dying days of the old Labor government was that you expected having to be ready for, perhaps, a week of blackout in the summer, and that if you had stock in the fridges that you needed to keep cool, you might need to power that yourself, and in any number of a range of other circumstances of all kinds of seriousness, let alone the interference in domestic circumstances when you do not have energy security and reliability.

Of course, that was all capped off by the entire statewide blackout that we suffered through on 28 September 2016, a day that will live in infamy in South Australia's history. Where this scheme is tremendously important in focusing as it does on not only efficiency but also productivity and in dealing with all those indicia of a healthy energy system, it is right that activities that are concerned with improvement of energy system security are very much to the fore. I certainly applaud the initiative to ensure that where an incentive scheme is in place then it is there to see real practical improvement on the ground with the result that there are real and improved outcomes.

Certainly, this is among that suite of measures that we have seen already in these early years of the Marshall Liberal government that are going about restoring confidence by doing these practical things to ensure that there is robust improvement. I do draw particular attention to those particular activities that bring an energy market benefit related to improved energy system security.

The introduction of this new productivity scheme requires amendment to be made to both the Electricity Act of 1996 and the Gas Act of 1997, as I adverted to at the outset, to provide for the broadening of the scope necessarily, and so there is this bill before the house that will provide for those necessary changes to those two acts, and that is the subject of part 2 and part 3 respectively of the bill.

It is well to note that the final design of the productivity scheme will be the subject of regulations to follow. As a result, parts 2 and 3 of the bill, which set out the amendments respectively to the Electricity Act and the Gas Act, go to the characterisation of those regulations and anticipate

those regulations applying to the new REPS (retailer energy productivity scheme) in substitute for the REES (Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme) that preceded it in both those acts.

As other members do, I look forward certainly to seeing the full scheme as it is expressed in the regulations in due course and, more particularly, to the outworking of the new scheme. This is an area in which we see leadership in South Australia and leadership by our minister and the very capable people in his department in charting a course that we might anticipate is likely to be followed by other states in an environment in which there is a great deal that occurs necessarily in a coordinated fashion.

We on this side of the house are of course committed to a strong and thoroughly cooperative national energy market, the efficiencies and the benefits that come with that to this state, which is the result of being able to efficiently export particularly our abundant renewable energy generation that is here in this state, and also to ensure that there is a very smooth interaction between South Australia and the rest of the country.

This is not one of those areas in which the legislation proceeds in lock step but one in which here in South Australia we can demonstrate leadership, encouraging the more efficient and more productive use of energy and, in so doing, lead the way to the better application of technology in this space as well.

I take the opportunity to thank the minister for bringing this bill to the house and recognise the tremendous turning around that has occurred in just this very short period of time in this state in this energy environment, from a situation in which electricity prices were high and getting higher, where energy supply was unreliable and becoming increasingly so, to a situation now in which energy prices are steadily coming down for households and business and in an ever more reliable environment. That is not just me saying so; it is what South Australians have seen over more than two years now. I applaud the minister for his work in this area and particularly in bringing this bill to the house. I commend the bill.

Mr PATTERSON (Morphett) (16:29): I also rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Electricity and Gas)(Energy Productivity) Bill 2020. On reading the bill, it is in itself a short bill and homes in on a very specific area of both the Electricity Act 1996 and the Gas Act 1997, but I think it is very important in terms of the benefits it will have. Specifically, the existing act refers to the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme, and by looking at changing just one word, which in itself seems a small change, it actually opens up a big span of opportunities for this state and for electricity and gas consumers who will benefit from it.

I will touch on the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme. It was set up by the South Australian government and has been running for a number of years now. The idea is to provide incentives for both South Australian households and businesses to save energy. To do this, the minister sets energy efficiency targets through regulations that are to be met by electricity and gas retailers. The retailers in turn then deliver these energy efficiency activities to householders and businesses, and these are set by thresholds in the regulations that the minister sets out.

Retailers must have a certain number of customers to participate, and the larger ones have to not only deliver these energy efficiency activities to households and businesses but also provide energy efficiency activities to priority group households. If you can increase the efficiency of electricity usage, that means the actual amount of electricity used by the appliances in a household or business is reduced, thereby providing a cost saving for the actual end consumer and also, if you think about it from a macro point of view, reducing the overall demand of the system. As the member for Heysen so eloquently stated, that has become more and more problematic, in not only South Australia but also Australia, as we transition from what was a centralised, coal-fired, predominantly base load system to having distributed energy resources throughout the country.

In terms of the current objectives, they are to reduce household and business energy use, with a focus on low-income households, that will in turn produce associated energy costs and greenhouse gas emission benefits as well—that is the aim. The regulations regarding the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme currently operate until the end of 2020 and are required to be reviewed by the end of 2019. Of course the energy minister has conducted the review, and it was done in a number of elements: in November 2018, an independent evaluation of the scheme and then, out of

this evaluation, in April 2019 a Review into the Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme Issues Paper was released, and 19 written submissions commented on that.

The first aim of the independent evaluation aim was to look at whether the scheme should continue and, if it did, where the opportunities were in the future for the scheme to deliver benefits to South Australian consumers. The independent evaluation found a number of factors about the scheme. It found that it has been effective in delivering its objectives and efficient by delivering a net economic benefit while meeting those objectives. So the energy efficiency measures that were put in actually not only reduced energy usage but also had a net economic benefit.

It was also equitable, by delivering benefits to householders and low-income householders across the state. In terms of the administration of this scheme, comparing it with those of other states, it was administratively simpler, which in turn kept costs down. Of the scheme's expenditure, I think about 4 per cent was on costs, so a lot of the benefits are going directly to consumers.

In terms of actual efficiencies, it found that this scheme supported 8.5 million gigajoules of energy savings for South Australian households and businesses and that it is on track to deliver over \$1 billion in energy bills savings to South Australian households and businesses over the 2015-20 period, which includes \$328 million in energy bill savings for households, of which \$155 million in energy bills savings were for priority, low-income households. Additionally, it also provided \$720 million in energy bill savings for businesses and reduced greenhouse gas emissions, on track, over the period, reducing emissions by over one million tonnes of CO₂ equivalents. The independent evaluation found that the scheme performs well compared with other Australian schemes in relation to the administrative costs.

Certainly, the evaluation showed there was a strong case for continuing the scheme. It then went on to look at not only what measures are available from an energy efficiency challenge point of view but also, at the broader level, what the electricity market looks like in South Australia, noting that it has changed significantly since the scheme was first introduced. The Australian Energy Market Operator provided a recent South Australian electricity report in November 2019.

That report noted that the changing energy landscape is continuing to have a profound impact in South Australia, with several records broken in the last 18 months and grid demand becoming increasingly variable. The report itemised, to a greater extent, that the distributor Energy Resources, which are predominantly the rooftop solar of households and businesses, represent about 10 per cent of total South Australian electricity generation. Approximately 34 per cent of South Australian dwellings now have rooftop photovoltaic systems installed which, throughout Australia, is equal highest with Queensland.

The growth in rooftop photovoltaics means that, especially around midday, and especially in summer months, rooftop solar is providing a lot of input into the grid. That means that the operational demand from the grid is now reducing, especially on sunny and low-demand days. If you look at how this plays out, on Sunday 10 November 2019 in South Australia we had quite a mild day. At 2 o'clock, it was sunny, with temperatures around in the mid-20s. That meant that people did not have to heat or cool their homes very much, but the solar output from the rooftop solar was very high, and this led to a minimum demand of around 450 megawatts. At that time, solar photovoltaic was providing 830 megawatts, which equates to roughly 64 per cent of the operational demand.

This is the effect the new intermittent energy landscape is having upon the system directly in South Australia. That produces challenges, and that minimum has been reducing over time. While that was the minimum, it has been happening more often these days when it is mild and more rooftop solar is providing energy into the system, so we are getting these drops in minimum demand during daylight hours. But, of course, when you get towards the sun going down, all that rooftop solar starts going out of the system, so the system has to ramp up very quickly as well, and to provide that it needs to be done through dispatchable sources, which at present, and looking at the map from that day, was mostly gas and a little bit from the interconnector as well.

These are the sorts of challenges that our system in South Australia is confronted with. We have low minimal operational demand happening more regularly and being forecast to continue, but also at the same time quite high peaks where the energy demands start to peak as we get into the

late afternoon and people are coming home from work and putting on the air conditioner, etc. The system itself is having to comply with these demands.

I have a few other points in regard to what the market was like in South Australia. On 24 January 2019, there were a number of records set across South Australia, where operational demands soared to 3,114 megawatts. That is a level not seen since 2011. Again, at the same time as we experience a peaky nature of energy supply, we also see the peaks increasing. At the same time, even in winter, we are starting to get record highs of winter operational demands as well. On 24 June 2019, there were roughly 2,500 megawatts sent out.

These are the challenges, related to the intermittent side of the energy supply, that have to be coped with by the system. There are measures around that, and one of those is demand management, the ability to try to reduce those peaks. While energy efficiency certainly will have an impact in reducing those peaks, the energy efficiency measures that the current Retailer Energy Efficiency Scheme was looking to provide are more across the board. Not only do they happen at 6 o'clock, when the peak is occurring, but they happen across the day. They suppress demand overall, but we really need our system to be able to cope with the ups and downs of demand to be able to also have some demand response.

The review into this scheme recommended that that is an issue that can be addressed very well by expanding the scope of the scheme, which gets back the changes in the amendment bill I was talking about. We are amending section 63AB of the Electricity Act by removing 'efficiency' and substituting it with 'productivity'. Similarly, in subsequent amendments, instead of having a REES shortfall the bill amends that and substitutes it to specify an energy productivity shortfall. The idea is to go from concentrating on a scheme that looks at energy efficiency and expanding it to look at energy productivity, so not only is efficiency taken into account but also productivity.

I will continue in that vein, in terms of where things are going, also from an Australia-wide perspective, because I think it is important. With the National Electricity Market, what is becoming more apparent, and what the energy minister here in South Australia is trying to do, is to work with our system as part of the National Electricity Market. Rather than trying to go it alone, we are recognising that the National Electricity Market is relying more and more upon interconnection, having more interconnectors throughout the network, to provide reliability and redundancy.

I think it is quite apparent—even most recently back in February, when the interconnectors to Victoria went down and South Australia was islanded from the rest of the electricity market—how important an interconnector is. Had we had an interconnector to New South Wales operating, it would have meant that we were not as reliant. It is obvious that we were doing it on our own, and that is why it is very pleasing that, from the first days of this Marshall government coming into power, we worked extensively to get an interconnector to New South Wales.

It was very welcome news when the regulator signed off on the interconnector between South Australia and New South Wales earlier this year. That is certainly the first step, and of course it still has to be built, but those are the sorts of measures that are required in this changing landscape. They are at the high level and are certainly going to be required to provide reliability and security in our system.

To go further, if we talk about some of the other measures that are going to be required at a smaller level, then demand response and demand management are certainly going to be important going forward, not only at a larger level but also at the consumer level, whether that be businesses or households. These measures that are being put in place are certainly going to be very important going forward.

I will just touch on the review into the energy scheme and some of the aspects it was looking at. These include introducing productivity into the scheme, having a productivity target expressed in that scheme, and doing it in such a way that it will include residential properties and businesses. There are some big opportunities in terms of efficiency and productivity gains that can be made by larger businesses, so the scheme is looking to expand to those larger businesses via the regulations.

It is important to make sure that the concentration of retailers does not just focus on these businesses. The idea would be to also set some residential targets and encourage those retailers to provide these productivity and efficiency gains to consumers. It is also important to make sure that it

is spread into the regions and not only through metropolitan Adelaide. There is potential for a target for regional retailers so that they are able to focus their efforts on the regions, which will be quite important.

Interestingly, New South Wales has conducted a similar review into their efficiency scheme. Out of that review, they are also looking at moving to a focus on demand response technologies. I think it is becoming more apparent that it is heading in the correct direction, not only in South Australia but in New South Wales. As the member for Heysen said, as a leader, South Australia is coping with high levels of intermittent energy sources and is then having to put in place steps to successfully accommodate that. It will be looked at with interest by the other jurisdictions and also, I think, acted upon by them as well.

In summary, while this bill is not long in detail, it will certainly have a really high impact on consumers, both business and residential, by reducing costs as we continue to decarbonise our energy sector. It will also reduce the overall system energy, keeping that under control. This will in turn improve the reliability and security of the energy system. It will reduce those peaks, which in turn will reduce those very high wholesale prices that are naturally passed on to businesses and households in South Australia.

It is a very good step forward. I commend the minister for bringing this to the house and look forward to its passage through parliament.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Basham.

FREEDOM OF INFORMATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 8 April 2020.)

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (16:49): Mr Deputy Speaker, I thank you for giving me the call and the opportunity to rise and to make some brief remarks in commending the bill to the house. The Freedom of Information (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020 is a thoroughgoing reform of freedom of information law in this state. It perhaps does it a disservice somewhat to describe it as a miscellaneous amendment bill covering, as it does, really quite wideranging and core matters going to the subject of freedom of information and the principles to be applied in the context of freedom of information and its interaction with government in this state.

It might better or colloquially be termed the 'freedom of information reform bill'. Its contribution to updating the legislative framework for this state is significant and I might say overdue. I will say a little bit more about that in a moment. I know we are not permitted to overly use visual props in the house, but perhaps just to illustrate I might paint a word picture. We see a relatively thoroughgoing reform bill before us that the Attorney has brought to the house. It comes after what has really been a pretty sorry history of inaction again by the previous Labor government. They had 16 years during which time we saw the advent of all sorts of technology.

We saw the advent of the widespread use of electronic communications and the increasing take-up in institutions of online facilities and all the benefits those technologies bring, many of which gradually came to be in use in this state, no doubt thwarted to whatever degree by the heavy weight of the previous administration, but nonetheless made their way through into common use. They provided an opportunity for reform and particularly in this space to make it possible for people to interact with the freedom of information environment in a more up-to-date way.

Notwithstanding that, we saw very longstanding inaction by the previous government, so it is somewhat surprising that, as I stand here, as I lift in my left hand a copy of the bill and hold—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Point of order: unfortunately, the member for Heysen is making a display to the house.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He did give fair warning of that. He made note of the fact that it is not usual to use a display. In fact, just a day or two ago I was reading the latest edition of Erskine

May and it touched on this very topic. The Speaker at the time ruled that a member should be able to make adequate description with his words. I am paraphrasing there, but that, in essence, is it.

Given that, I have given the member for Heysen some latitude. I understand the point he is trying to make, but I suggest he may have used his display for enough of this contribution.

Mr TEAGUE: I thank you for your guidance, Mr Deputy Speaker. Perhaps I might better illustrate this in a way that might stand the test of perpetual record on *Hansard* to say that I have, according to my examination, documents that are printed on roughly the same kind of paper and are of similar weight. In my left hand, I have 29 pages—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Mr Deputy Speaker, I rise on a point of order. There is now clear defiance from the member for Heysen to your most learned ruling, sir.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Here is my thought on this, member for Lee: he is not actually using the display.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: He's using his words.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is using his words.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: He is waving them around like a windmill, sir. Some of us are worried about the effects of windmills.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: He is making a comparison. Member for Lee, I am not going to find in favour of that point of order, but I have given the member for Heysen due warning.

Mr TEAGUE: The bill runs to 30 pages. I have a bundle of amendments that are provided under the name of the member for Lee.

Mr Boyer: Under the name?

Mr TEAGUE: Yes, under the name of the member for Lee.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: In the name of the member for Lee.

Mr TEAGUE: Yes.

Members interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: They are.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Can I just interrupt for a moment, member for Heysen. Member for Lee, I understand you are going to be making a contribution shortly. You will be making a most extensive contribution and you will be uninterrupted, I am sure, as the lead speaker. Now that we have discussed the use of props or otherwise, we will let the member for Heysen continue.

Mr TEAGUE: Thank you, Mr Deputy Speaker. I think they are showing signs of fragility on the other side. Suffice for me to say that the government bill runs to 30 pages of eloquently and precisely expressed material that I commend. I have a bundle of material before me in the name of the member for Lee that runs to a full 14 pages.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: Only 14? It should be 16.

Mr TEAGUE: There is a separate sheet as well. It might be 14 or 15 pages. It does remind me—

Members interjecting:

Mr TEAGUE: No. Whether it is 5 per cent, 10 per cent or 15 per cent, it relies on—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, I am sorry to do this; I am going to interrupt again. The same chapter of Erskine May also makes reference to the use of copious notes. It is generally accepted. It is noted, but generally accepted.

Mr TEAGUE: I think there must have been a very similarly lengthy consideration that the member for Lee went to in thinking about how one goes about setting an appropriately high regulated

asset base when one is considering how one can go about charging South Australians more than they ought to be charged for water in this state—those unfortunate customers of SA Water.

It is directly the result of what has been described aptly in this house over recent days, and which I think bears substantially more scrutiny, as 'the cooking of the books' in that respect by the previous government with a view to charging South Australians over the odds for water. It is something that we have promptly got to grips with and got on top of so that we can reduce that burden to South Australians, and South Australians will see much lower water prices as a result.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Heysen, we have canvassed this during question time. I am going to bring you back to the bill at hand.

Mr TEAGUE: And the bill in both hands as it was. The point that is being made is that we have had years—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

Mr TEAGUE: —and years of development in this area, yet nothing has happened until the new government has come along and the Attorney has brought to this house this important reform, this important Freedom of Information (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill of 2020. It certainly goes about a thorough updating of the legislative environment in line with changes in technology that have taken place over those years, and I have referred to one or two of them in my earlier remarks.

Those developments have been applied, sadly, interstate. Jurisdictions have taken the opportunity to apply those changes, and so I suppose we have the advantage of being able to refer to those in bringing this reform to the house. But, as I say, it has been far too long. The review that took place last year, a consultation draft of the bill, preceded public consultation, and the bill that is now before the house followed the results of that public consultation.

A number of key changes that are the subject of the bill are, firstly, that it will enshrine principles of freedom of information as they relate to their role in facilitating and ensuring good and accountable representative democratic government in this state. They will enshrine proactive disclosure. They will reinforce presumption in favour of disclosure, as well as enforcement provisions, so as to ensure that documents can be obtained, including by the Ombudsman, and they will create an offence of improperly interfering with the making of a decision, relevantly, under the act.

They will also—and I have reflected on this earlier—update the act to reflect electronic communications and electronic information management and storage methods. They will ensure, in circumstances where there are increasingly large volumes of material on the electronic record, an extension of the time for agencies to deal with requests and internal reviews respectively with a view to thereby minimising the number of laps around the block responding to deemed refusals and so forth.

The Freedom of Information Act has been in operation in this state since 1992, and we have seen from time to time amendment that has occurred in the time since then. As I characterised this bill at the outset, we have seen over the journey that there have been changes that have resulted from concerns raised by members of the public and media and members of parliament from time to time in a rather sporadic fashion.

This bill takes an overall view in terms of its updating of the legislative environment, and it responds to what we have seen as growing demands within the community for increased government transparency and accountability. The last very significant round of changes was in 2004, I am advised. We have obviously seen the better part of a generation of development, particularly on the information management side, in the period since then.

I note in particular we have seen the report of former ombudsman Mr Bingham on the broader environment, his 2014 report titled, 'An audit of state government departments' implementation of the Freedom of Information Act 1991 (SA)'. The report essentially was an analysis of how 12 government departments were going about managing their responsibilities under the act. The 2014 report contained a number of recommendations for amendments. Those, I am told, are fully endorsed in turn by the current Ombudsman, Mr Wayne Lines.

I was perhaps rather general in my introduction to that unfortunate history of inaction in remarks at the outset. Against that background of an act that has been on the books for the better part of 30 years but, more particularly, has not seen really comprehensive reform for 16 years or so and is the subject of a considered report by the relevant officer going back now many years, it is really a source of some disappointment that there has not been a greater appetite, particularly by the former government, to act on that, and so I am very pleased that we are where we are now and that we are moving on those reforms.

There might be more to say about this in what I anticipate might be a next stage. It is not clear whether or not the opposition wants to press any of these amendments but, in the event that there is a committee process and the amendments are considered, there may be an opportunity to delve into this in some more detail.

I simply draw attention in this short period of time that remains to a comparison between the first of the principles and objects of the act, which is the subject of clause 4, in what would be the new section 3(1)(a), which is really quite a succinct statement of principle. It provides:

- (a) that representative democratic government is supported and enhanced by ensuring that proper public scrutiny of government activities occurs;

I could not put it better or any more succinctly than that. The mover of the amendment would put it in a somewhat more verbose manner and, in my view, an unnecessarily Orwellian manner, but we might hear about that some more in the committee.

Suffice it to say, that is the core principle and objective for which the act is there. It is appropriate that the act is updated in this generational way in the way that it is. As I have said, it does it, in my view, somewhat of a disservice to describe it in the way it is. It might better be described as the 'freedom of information reform bill', which I commend to the house.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (17:09): I rise to speak on the Freedom of Information (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill that has been moved by the Deputy Premier. How extraordinary that we have the member for Heysen criticising another member of parliament for filing amendments to a bill. This is one of our key responsibilities as members of parliament. If it was meant as some sort of whack, it had all the impact of a ball of cotton wool touching carpet.

We are getting used to that, of course, from the member for Heysen, but he would do well to pay some attention to the contributions that are to be given by the opposition on this bill. While he very quickly glosses over the history of the Freedom of Information Act in South Australia, it actually has a very important history and a history that is very demonstrative of how we see freedom of information laws not only enacted but applied in South Australia.

It is my understanding—I will not say recollection because some of this occurred before I was even born—that in 1977, I think, a working party was put together under the former Dunstan government and a keen interest was shown in this by a then member of the other place, the Hon. Chris Sumner. That had been done not only presumably because some members, including Mr Sumner, were keen on the concept of freedom of information laws being enacted here in South Australia, but because there had been movement in that regard in other jurisdictions, notably in New South Wales, and there had been movements towards those efforts in the commonwealth as well.

It was done primarily, but not by a great distance away from other objectives, because it was recognised that a citizen of a society should have access to and an understanding of what information was being kept about them by their government and also, of course, because that citizen should have the capacity, under certain constraints, to be able to correct that information—not any information, of course, but information that that citizen would rightly be concerned about.

We are not talking about altering necessarily police records or court records or things of that nature, although in some instances that may be necessary or attractive, but in general that was a key principle. Not too far behind that was what we now are perhaps more familiar with about freedom of information laws and that is being able to get access to documents of government to try to gain better access to, understanding and even participation in the decision-making of government.

But the journey from that working party in the late 1970s to 1991, when the bill was passed and assented to, was not just, as the time period indicates, a long and tortuous one. There was of course the fact that not only had the working party completed its work and provided its report only some months before the 1979 state election, but at that state election there was a change of government and the Tonkin government was formed. The Deputy Premier opposite me probably is able to recall much more quickly than me, let alone accurately, who the attorney was in that Tonkin government.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman: Trevor Griffin, of blessed memory, as they say.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Of course, the Hon. Trevor Griffin, then of the other place and who I think was the attorney during the subsequent Brown government as well, albeit for a relatively contracted time in government for the Tonkin administration. Despite ongoing requests and, later, demands through the parliament and also the media from Mr Sumner, there was no progress made on the introduction of freedom of information laws during the course of the Tonkin government. Of course, in 1982 there was a further state election. The government changed again to the Bannon Labor government, when Mr Sumner found himself in the position of attorney-general and had the capacity to move relatively quickly to bring about a freedom of information bill into parliament and have it enacted as law.

So you might be asking yourself, Mr Deputy Speaker: what happened between 1982 and 1991? There was genuine work and genuine attempts during the course of the early and mid-1980s to bring these laws to fruition, but you only need to cast your mind back to some of the media reports of that time to see what some of the literal frustrations of this process were. We had reports from the government of the day that there were dire warnings from the Public Service that having a scheme of freedom of information would be too expensive to administer. It would be unwieldy; it would be an unreasonable diversion of resources, which of course is a term with which those of us who have applied for freedom of information requests have no doubt become familiar; and so on.

The Sir Humphreys of the day did their job for a number of years in frustrating the desire of those in government, indeed those in parliament, to see these laws brought about. However, Mr Sumner was not the only person in the other place who had a passion for this. The Hon. Martin Cameron had a passion for this. I believe that, during the term of the Bannon government, he was leader of the opposition in the Legislative Council as well as health minister. He moved at least one if not two private member's bills to try to engender a freedom of information regime. Of course, as you might expect, there were disagreements between the government and the opposition over the nature of those changes, intervening state elections during that time, and no progress was made.

I raise that issue of that strong advice coming from the public sector—that this would be too expensive or unwieldy to manage a new freedom of information regime—because that has some relevance through to today not just with the administration of the current act but, I am sure, as the member for Heysen alludes to, in response to some if not all of the opposition's amendments. Yes, it is a comprehensive bill—30 pages long—and, yes, the opposition has filed pages and pages of amendments because this bill requires it. This bill needs amendment.

I do not question the intent of the Deputy Premier in moving this bill. She herself in opposition moved a private member's bill to amend the Freedom of Information Act. It was not quite as extensive as this bill, but it is certainly an indication that the Deputy Premier then, as she does now, had a very keen interest in this matter. I come back to those early principles of ensuring that a citizen has the capacity to access information that a government holds about them, indeed, have the opportunity to correct that information as well as the opportunity to gain access to documents of government to understand the operations of the government, the decision-making of that government, and so on. Now more than ever, perhaps, the freedom of information regime is extremely important in South Australia.

I said that the member for Heysen might be interested in this because the Hon. Martin Cameron—you might recall this, Deputy Speaker, and probably much better than I—was one of the three members of parliament who formed the Liberal Movement. He not only joined that movement, along with Steele Hall and Robin Millhouse, but continued to seek election and

continued to be elected. Eventually, those members of the Liberal Movement—I cannot remember after which election; I think there were five members of parliament at one point, rather than just the three who commenced it—were welcomed back into the fold of—

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, that particular practice is—how shall I put it—an old-fashioned practice in the current context.

The Hon. V.A. Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think, if I can put it like this, perhaps some attorneys are more worthy than others, and that is not a reflection on whether any current or recent attorneys are worthy to be on the bench. However, perhaps the public consent for that sort of behaviour might be slightly less these days than it was previously. Although, as an aside, I notice that it is not uncommon in the federal sphere for these sorts of moves still to be made—but that is a digression.

In any event, it was on the welcoming back to the fold that these Liberal Movement MPs came back into what became, and is now, the moderate faction of the Liberal Party. I think it is a reasonable thing to say that small 'l' liberalism is reasonably reflected in the pursuit of a freedom of information regime. Why should citizens not be free to know what their government holds about them, let alone free to know what their government is doing in other regards, and be able to have access to documents that demonstrate that?

Once the laws were assented to in 1991 and came into operation on 1 January 1992, there commenced for the first time a freedom of information regime here in South Australia. The act has been amended a number of times, more often than not as other acts have been amended, but in its own regard it has been amended a number of times—in 2004, 2006, 2008, 2012 and so on—albeit most of those were relatively minor amendments, compared to the breadth of the changes either here or in 2004. It is interesting to note that a broad sweep of changes was sought in 2004, approximately two years or so after the 2002 election; and here we are in 2020, approximately two years or so after the 2018 election.

I would have hoped that the freedom of information changes that we are seeking in this bill would reflect a genuine correction of those current problems that South Australians experience with the current regime and would also perhaps try to identify some ways to appropriately open up the freedom of information regime and also perhaps try to provide some capacity for freedom of information applications to either be obviated—for example, through what we see in the bill here with the consideration of a mandatory disclosure regime—or be made in a way which makes navigating the freedom of information process easier for applicants. This is regardless of whether they are one-off applicants, such as members of the public who have a particular interest in information about themselves or a particular issue.

As we saw from the extensive report produced by the Ombudsman in 2014, unless one is practised as a freedom of information applicant, the process is almost unanimously successful in putting off people who find themselves rebuffed for whatever reason. Certainly, my experience with the freedom of information regime has been from both sides. In the first instance, I was the minister responsible for an agency that was in receipt of a large number of regular freedom of information applications.

These requests were not just from opposition members who had an interest in transport matters but also from members of the media who were trying to seek departmental information on matters in which they had a particular interest, as well as from members of the public for a whole variety of reasons—whether they had a general interest in transport matters or a particular experience in the transport system as a user, or whether they were regulated by the transport agency.

I could not tell you with any reasonable estimate how many applications were submitted and dealt with—although these sorts of statistics are sometimes regaled in departmental annual reports. It was certainly very usual that freedom of information applications and determinations were made completely separate from ministers, unless a minister found themselves as principal officer of the agency or office of the minister and was then obliged to make determinations. I always thought that was a very strange way in which the act operates.

I can understand that it is desirable to have ministers as agencies so that people can access documents that are relevant to ministers. Of course that is important, but making the minister the principal officer of the agency then creates this perverse arrangement, which continues to this day, where the minister can make determinations about applications for documents about themselves or their office as that agency of the minister.

There is an inherent conflict of interest there, particularly when applications are coming in from members of parliament—perhaps opposition members of parliament—to the minister, or coming in from the media, or coming in from members of the public who may disagree with the minister's superintendence of their portfolio responsibilities. It gives the minister the opportunity to release or not release documents. I think that is a flaw in the freedom of information regime and it should be attended to.

I do not want to remove a minister as an agency and remove the capacity to access documents relevant to a minister. However, to have a minister making those determinations—that practice, in my view, should end. Those determinations should be required to be made by someone else: ideally, the chief executive of the department or other agency for which the minister is responsible, or their appropriately superior senior officer who can be trusted with that responsibility. I will not jump into the weeds on all the amendments that we have put to the bill yet, but that is something that I think would be a good starting point for when we consider the operation of the regime in regard to ministers.

The member for Heysen only really touched on one point relevant to the bill and relevant to the amendments that are filed by the opposition; one was the change to the objects of the act. I was astounded that the government seeks to remove the reference in the current act to ministers of the Crown. I think that is a very backward step in terms of ensuring that a key objective of the act is ensuring that those few people who are responsible for the activities of government are front and centre with the act's objectives in making sure that the public is able to not only access documents in practice but, in principle, hold those ministers to account. I think that is something that should be remedied.

Of course, people perhaps more practised in this topic can debate this more eloquently and accurately than I, but I also thought the manner in which the government sought to canvass that former direct reference to ministers of the Crown, if that part of the bill is passed, through a reference to, as the member for Heysen quoted, representative democracy, clearly confuses the purpose of a freedom of information act in holding the executive government of the day to account.

Representative democracy is what we do in here. The member for Heysen, the member for Hammond, the member for Newland and I represent our electorates. We are one in our community chosen on a periodic basis to come in here and represent their interests. That is the concept of representative democracy. This parliament holding an executive government to account is known as responsible government. To try to confuse those two fundamental concepts of our system of government I think shows some poor drafting in trying to change the objects of the act from what they are currently, where it very specifically says that an object of the act relates to ministers of the Crown, and confuses it with this general ill-targeted set of words about representative government. That is but one of the many areas we seek to canvass.

It is not only the opposition that has a keen interest in the bill. We have had access to submissions from the media. A joint submission was put in by the Australian Broadcasting Corporation, the Seven Network, *The Advertiser* and InDaily. I am pleased to have access to it because, when the bill was first canvassed in the second half of last year and consultation opened on perhaps what we might call an exposure draft, those submissions were due to be received (and I am happy to be corrected here) on 24 January this year. As you can tell not only by the length of my comments so far but also by their content, the opposition had a key interest in the bill and we were also interested in the views of other key stakeholders, if I can put it like that, of the bill.

Consultation ended on 24 January and the government, as I am advised, was asked for copies of submissions and, as I understand it, that request was denied. A freedom of information application went in to get copies of these submissions, and that application was denied. An internal review to that determination was lodged, which released two emails and two attachments but no

public submissions. Like most determinations that are made unreasonably, I am advised that this is the subject of an external review. This process is being engaged in by the Hon. Kyam Maher of the other place, the opposition's shadow attorney-general.

Despite the farce of a freedom of information application being required to get access to public submissions and that application being denied, we are fortunate to have copies of these submissions. The media raised a number of issues and put recommendations to the government. It recommended the introduction of publicly assessed benchmarks and sanctions for improper departmental fulfilment of requirements under the FOI Act to increase accountability and incentives for applying the law as it was intended. We touch on this in a number of our amendments.

They also recommended that the current definition of a document should be expanded to include more recent modes of electronic communication, including text messages and the use of computer or mobile applications. This is something that the bill touches on, and a topic of discussion during the committee stage will be whether the definition that has been inserted into the bill by the government not only meets the media's request but also satisfies what we might encounter in terms of not only current forms of documents but also current forms of communication between those in government.

They also recommended that the bill should include a waiver of applicant costs if an agency fails to meet the time limit and should not increase the time limit for processing applications. The media also recommended greater transparency in the calculation of costs for FOI applications and the waiving of costs up to a threshold of \$1,000 for media, as currently occurs for members of parliament. Both those two recommendations find their voice in the opposition's amendments, not necessarily strictly according to the recommendation from the media submission but we think in a way that canvasses the issue well and hopefully in a way that the government can agree requires attention.

Recommendation 5 is that a proactive disclosure requirement should be expanded to make FOI applications a last resort. That is an interesting recommendation. I agree that the bill countenances a proactive disclosure regime or a mandatory disclosure of certain information regime. I am the first to commend the Deputy Premier that she has introduced changes to the FOI regime in her bill that provide for a proactive disclosure regime. Our concern, though, is that this does not go far enough. The proactive disclosure considered in the bill merely requires that a premier of the day must cause a policy about proactive disclosure to be in existence and to be applied to government agencies.

That proactive disclosure regime could be as expansive or as narrow as the government of the day sees fit. Proactive disclosure was introduced in South Australia by the former Labor government—indeed, by the previous premier, the Hon. Jay Weatherill—and applied to a range of areas that were most frequently canvassed in freedom of information applications either by the opposition or by the media, such as expenditure by ministers, in particular travel expenses, hospitality, food and beverage expenses and so on.

We were pleased, initially, that on the change of government the current Premier, the member for Dunstan, continued that proactive disclosure regime, but it has not taken too long for this government to already start watering down the proactive disclosure regime, now removing itineraries of trips that are made overseas by ministers. The ludicrous reason that was given for this was, 'It's a security risk.'

Fancy saying that several weeks after the return of a minister from overseas back to South Australia, being up-front about the hotel where they stayed was a security risk. That is just, as I said, ludicrous and certainly and unfortunately is an indication that this government does not take the proactive disclosure regime seriously. The member for Heysen, a former lawyer, maybe a continuing lawyer, who apparently does not enjoy large numbers of pages comprising documents—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Apparently this aggrieves him. I would tender perhaps that the member the Heysen started out in the wrong profession if that is his wont. If he does not like a lot of documents, he chose, as they say in *Indiana Jones and the Last Crusade*, poorly. Unfortunately, he has jumped from the frying pan into the fire. If he could only find another profession more

subsumed by documents than the legal profession, well, perhaps it is that as a parliamentarian and legislator. My heart goes out to him. We are here for him, though. We are here for him.

It is with great pleasure that I can report to the member for Heysen that within the onerous weight of the documents comprising the opposition's amendments that have been placed at his feet, he will be pleased to know that at least a full page, if not more, comprise one amendment, and that is a more detailed, proactive disclosure regime. So we will be, at that juncture of the committee stage, regardless of how the committee finds, whipping over that page so quickly that the member for Heysen no doubt will find joy and fulfilment with the speedy progress through the documents which will be—

Mr TEAGUE: Point of order: I hasten to raise the point of order now because I fear the member for Lee might soon sit down. Imitation, I concede, is the greatest form of flattery. I was concerned that there was the beginning of what looked to me as though it was becoming a display by the member for Lee. I note the member for Lee's concern in that regard.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Heysen. So you are not actually suggesting that there was a display; you are just suggesting that there almost was. I ruled previously, when the member for Lee raised a similar point of order—well, we eventually got to the point where copious notes were acceptable. So I think in this instance I will rule the same. The amendments themselves may be copious. We will find out. The member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Thank you, Deputy Speaker, and to quote another film, 'As usual, your slightest touch commands obedience.' That is *Gladiator*, for those in the cheaper seats. Recommendation 6 from the media—

Mr Pederick: Bring back John Rau.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Well, let's not go too far. Let's not wish that upon—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: To quote another film, *A Bridge Too Far*.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: *A Bridge Too Far*, yes, indeed, thank you, Deputy Speaker. In fact, I remember remarking, as I handled a bill I think on behalf of the former member for Enfield, 'Where would we be without him and the member for Bragg?' And the answer was, 'At home with our loved ones.' The last recommendation—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Lee, you are tempting fate here. I think you have been on your feet for a good half-hour.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The final recommendation of the media was that there should be the uploading of freedom of information documents on a disclosure log, and that should occur following the agreement with the applicant of an appropriate date, or after 90 days, whichever is first. That is a point I expect some quite lengthy consideration of by all members.

Currently what happens, sir, as you may be aware, is a determination is made by an agency and it is published on that agency's website and made publicly available in the appropriate area that the agency maintains for that purpose. They are not necessarily applications made about an individual's personal details, of course, but for the purposes that we are familiar with—trying to get documents out of government, for example. The determination, with or without documents, depending on what the determination is, is uploaded to that website.

That is a matter of consternation, I can understand, for the media, because they may well be in the middle of what they consider to be an investigation into a particular matter, and it would be a significant disadvantage to the media in that regard if, as part of a broader investigation, some documents were released to them but at the same time published on the agency's website. It is conceivable in that instance that that media outlet or media entity might be dissuaded from continuing its investigation into a broader matter if suddenly documents become publicly available that allow other media agencies or other individuals to—how can I put it—get the jump on them. That is one way of looking at it.

The other way of looking at it is, if an agency determines that these documents should be available to an applicant and we have a regime already that they should be publicly disclosed, then

why not just disclose them and put them out into the public as quickly as possible? I for one see both sides of the argument. I can understand why the media would want to make sure that there is some regime in the making of a freedom of information determination that either the applicant agrees with the agency to immediately release them on the agency's website, or, if they do not provide that agreement, then wait 90 days until those documents are automatically released.

I am looking forward to the contributions of other members in this place on that particular matter because, as I said, I see both sides of that argument. I think there are strong arguments both in favour and also against that proposition. We have canvassed it in our amendments because we think, at the very least, that is something we should have some consideration of, a debate about and reach some position on.

The other submission that I want to draw attention to is from what I presume is another heavily document-burdened institution, and that is the Law Society of South Australia. Members of that august body surround me, so I choose my words carefully, but they have also made some recommendations to the bill. Without reading it verbatim, they congratulate the Attorney on putting a bill out for consultation and being willing to countenance changes to the act.

Again, I think the Attorney, as someone who has had a keen interest in this area, does deserve that recognition, but the Law Society's concerns are quite different and separate from those the media raises. They have some discussion in their submission about the changes to the external review process and the further appeal of a determination to the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal. We should note here that there has already been significant change in this regard.

Perhaps either the member for Heysen or the member for Enfield can correct me if I am wrong here, but previously if one was unsatisfied with a determination after pursuing it through the internal review process and pursuing it through the external review process, one's recourse then was to the District Court of South Australia. The introduction of the South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal (SACAT) has enabled a different, perhaps I can say more easily accessible legal jurisdiction in which to test these matters. That is not to say that the District Court is now unavailable at all, but what the Law Society is referring to here are changes to the way in which external reviews can be made by the SACAT.

External reviews by the SACAT will only be on issues relating to the application of exemptions and agencies will no longer be limited to reviews on errors of law. I am sorry, the external review applications must first be made to the Ombudsman and only then by the SACAT with permission, and then the external review by the SACAT will only be on issues relating to the application of exemptions. It is those two points that the society has concerns with: the first being the limitation in the type of freedom of information decisions that are reviewable by the SACAT, and the second is the proposed power of the Ombudsman to be able to provide written submissions to the SACAT on a review application.

It is our view that the Law Society raises that first issue about the limitation of the type of FOI decisions that are reviewable by the SACAT—that is something that needs some consideration as part of this bill as well. The Ombudsman—excellent though he is and, unfortunately for him, tireless as he is in working through the innumerable external reviews that he receives, including from me as a member of parliament—is not always infallible, and there will be times when people wish to appeal his decisions. While it has been the Hon. Kyam Maher in the other place who has engaged directly with the Law Society on this bill, it is my understanding that the society rightly has concerns with that limitation on the SACAT process.

The Law Society submission goes on to talk about the scope of reviewable decisions with regard to clause 35 of the bill and say that the proposed provisions would, in effect, exclude a number of decisions made by the Ombudsman from external review, including decisions about whether or not the request was unreasonable, whether an extension of time for making an application should have been granted, whether an application was appropriately dismissed, or whether an application was appropriately declared vexatious.

The opposition has a grave concern about the capacity that the bill provides for an agency to determine that an applicant or an application is either frivolous or vexatious. I do not doubt there

are some out there who are making applications that are frivolous or vexatious or, indeed, that there is a pattern of behaviour that could be considered frivolous or vexatious. I am very concerned that the bill seems to confer the capacity to make a determination about that application on the agency themselves. In the instance I referred to before, where the minister is the principal officer of the agency—that is, themselves in their office—you could see how this provides a temptation that this capacity to adjudge someone's application as frivolous or vexatious is unwarranted or unreasonable.

We are also looking forward to exploring with the Attorney the role of the Ombudsman in SACAT reviews because there are likely to be strong arguments in favour as well as against the Ombudsman playing a role in those reviews. I can see that there would be situations where it may assist the original applicant for the Ombudsman to be a party to those proceedings. I can imagine from the Ombudsman's perspective that he has a lot to do and that the last thing he wants to be dragged into is an enormous number of SACAT reviews of those decisions. That is something that our amendments seek to canvass as well, but moreover we look forward to the discussion with the Attorney about how the regime her bill proposes is likely to function and then how in practice people might experience that for better or for worse.

The extension of time frames was a surprising inclusion in the bill, increasing the period for a determination from 30 days to 45 days. An increase of 50 per cent, no doubt, comes from that same streak within some areas perhaps of the Public Service that were advising the Hon. Mr Sumner in the mid-1980s that this is very onerous and too expensive. Of course, it raises the question about what level of effort and resourcing is put into FOI regimes.

The Attorney says there was suboptimal performance under the previous government and it would be churlish and inaccurate of me to completely disagree. I am sure that in the Attorney's experience alone, let alone that of other members of parliament, or other members of the public, there were many occasions when agencies were unable to meet that 30-day time period. Perhaps, if you were lucky, you would have received a cursory letter saying, 'Unfortunately, this is technically a deemed refusal,' and that might be the last you hear about it. I seek leave to continue my comments at another time.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

LABOUR HIRE LICENSING (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

Received from the Legislative Council and read a first time.

At 17:58 the house adjourned until Wednesday 17 June 2020 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***PUBLIC SCHOOLS**

51 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (2 June 2020). Can the minister provide:

- (a) a list of public schools that have doctors, nurses or psychologists available to students?
- (b) a list of public secondary and R-12 schools that offer specialist maths, physics and chemistry in year 12 on their campus?
- (c) a list of public secondary and R-12 schools that offer more than one language in year 8?
- (d) the number of schools in each of the school improvement model categories, and their index of educational disadvantage?
- (e) how much it costs the Department for Education to administer NAPLAN testing each year?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education): I have been advised of the following:

(a) All schools have access to a statewide service of psychologists, noting that timing of access can be challenging at times in light of regional workforce shortages.

Regarding doctors and nurses, there is no central data held by the Department for Education, as general health services are not a standard part of the education service model. However, individual students may have access to medical professionals for individual needs.

(b) The number of government schools with students registered with the SACE Board to undertake stage 2 specialist maths, physics and chemistry in 2019 is provided in table 1. That is the number of schools where the learning took place. Also provided is the number of home schools these students came from. All students have access to these subjects, either through local partnership arrangements between schools, or through Open Access College. The list of teaching sites with students registered is attached.

Table 1

Number of schools with active enrolments in stage 2 chemistry, physics and specialist maths in 2019

Stage 2 Subject	Number of schools with students registered in these subjects in 2019* (teaching site)	Number of schools with students in these subject in 2019 (home site)
Chemistry	80	92
Physics	75	90
Specialist Mathematics	47	60

* N.B. Open Access College is included in school count. Students from any school can enrol in stage 2 chemistry, physics and specialist maths through Open Access College.

(c) The Department for Education's languages data collection concluded on 2 August 2019. The data collected describes the languages taught at public schools during 2019.

The data is self-reported by schools. The list of schools with year 8 students studying languages is provided below in table 2.

Table 2

List of schools with more than one language studied at the school among enrolled Year 8 students

School name
School of Languages
Aberfoyle Park High School
Adelaide Botanic High School
Adelaide High School
Banksia Park International HS
Birdwood High School
Blackwood High School
Brighton Secondary School
Charles Campbell College
Craigmore High School
Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School
Glenunga International High School
Glossop High School
Golden Grove High School
Hawker Area School
Heathfield High School
Henley High School

School name
Marryatville High School
Meningie Area School
Mitcham Girls High School
Mount Gambier High School
Murray Bridge High School
Naracoorte High School
Norwood Morialta High School
Nuriootpa High School
Open Access College
Parafield Gardens High School
Playford International College
Port Lincoln High School
Renmark High School
Reynella East College
Roma Mitchell Secondary College
Salisbury East High School
Salisbury High School
Seaford Secondary College
Seaview High School
Underdale High School
Unley High School
Woodville High School

(d) In 2018, each school received a report on their 'stage of improvement'. Schools were assigned a stage based on overall academic performance and school level changes in performance over time.

The stages of improvement information enabled schools to receive more tailored advice, support, and resources from central office and local education teams based on their needs and context.

The stages were produced to inform the start of the three-year school improvement cycle and have not been updated since 2018.

The department made a commitment to school leaders not to make the stage of improvement reports publicly available and has not done so to date. Releasing the information would allow the creation of school performance tables or 'league tables' which would be contrary to the public interest in ensuring high quality schooling.

(e) NAPLAN administrative costs can fluctuate year on year. This is due to CPI, increases in paper prices, the number of students undertaking NAPLAN testing, the duration of the NAPLAN Marking Centre and the number of markers engaged to mark the writing assessments. The NAPLAN administrative costs (excluding transition costs) are approximately \$3 million.

Attachment 1

Government schools in 2019 with students registered with the SACE Board in stage 2 chemistry, physics, and specialist mathematics

Subject	School
Chemistry	Aberfoyle Park High School
Chemistry	Adelaide High School
Chemistry	Australian Science & Mathematics School
Chemistry	Banksia Park International HS
Chemistry	Birdwood High School
Chemistry	Blackwood High School
Chemistry	Booleroo Centre District School
Chemistry	Bordertown High School
Chemistry	Brighton Secondary School
Chemistry	Burra Community School
Chemistry	Charles Campbell College
Chemistry	Clare High School
Chemistry	Cleve Area School
Chemistry	Coomandook Area School
Chemistry	Cummins Area School
Chemistry	Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School
Chemistry	Edward John Eyre High School
Chemistry	Eudunda Area School
Chemistry	Gawler and District College B-12
Chemistry	Gladstone High School
Chemistry	Glenunga International High School
Chemistry	Glossop High School

Subject	School
Chemistry	Golden Grove High School
Chemistry	Grant High School
Chemistry	Hallett Cove School
Chemistry	Hamilton Secondary College
Chemistry	Heathfield High School
Chemistry	Henley High School
Chemistry	John Pirie Secondary School
Chemistry	Kadina Memorial School
Chemistry	Kangaroo Inn Area School
Chemistry	Kangaroo Island Community Education
Chemistry	Kapunda High School
Chemistry	Keith Area School
Chemistry	Loxton High School
Chemistry	Lucindale Area School
Chemistry	Mannum Community College
Chemistry	Marden Senior College
Chemistry	Mark Oliphant College (B-12)
Chemistry	Marryatville High School
Chemistry	Mitcham Girls High School
Chemistry	Modbury High School
Chemistry	Mount Barker High School
Chemistry	Mount Compass Area School
Chemistry	Murray Bridge High School
Chemistry	Naracoorte High School
Chemistry	Northern Adelaide Senior College
Chemistry	Norwood Morialta High School
Chemistry	Nuriootpa High School
Chemistry	Ocean View P-12 College
Chemistry	Open Access College
Chemistry	Orroroo Area School
Chemistry	Para Hills High School
Chemistry	Parafield Gardens High School
Chemistry	Paralowie School
Chemistry	Penola High School
Chemistry	Plympton International College
Chemistry	Port Broughton Area School
Chemistry	Port Lincoln High School
Chemistry	Renmark High School
Chemistry	Reynella East College
Chemistry	Riverton and District High School
Chemistry	Roma Mitchell Secondary College
Chemistry	Roxby Downs Area School
Chemistry	Salisbury East High School
Chemistry	Salisbury High School
Chemistry	Seaford Secondary College
Chemistry	Seaton High School
Chemistry	Seaview High School
Chemistry	The Heights School
Chemistry	Thebarton Senior College
Chemistry	Tumby Bay Area School
Chemistry	Underdale High School
Chemistry	Unley High School
Chemistry	Urrbrae Agricultural High School
Chemistry	Victor Harbor High School
Chemistry	Waikerie High School
Chemistry	Willunga High School
Chemistry	Wirreanda Secondary School
Chemistry	Woodville High School
Physics	Aberfoyle Park High School
Physics	Adelaide High School
Physics	Australian Science & Mathematics School
Physics	Balaklava High School
Physics	Banksia Park International HS
Physics	Birdwood High School
Physics	Blackwood High School

Subject	School
Physics	Bordertown High School
Physics	Brighton Secondary School
Physics	Charles Campbell College
Physics	Christies Beach HS & South Vocational College
Physics	Clare High School
Physics	Cleve Area School
Physics	Craigmore High School
Physics	Cummins Area School
Physics	Eastern Fleurieu R-12 School
Physics	Edward John Eyre High School
Physics	Findon High School
Physics	Gawler and District College B-12
Physics	Glenunga International High School
Physics	Glossop High School
Physics	Golden Grove High School
Physics	Grant High School
Physics	Hallett Cove School
Physics	Hamilton Secondary College
Physics	Heathfield High School
Physics	Henley High School
Physics	John Pirie Secondary School
Physics	Kadina Memorial School
Physics	Kapunda High School
Physics	Keith Area School
Physics	Kingston Community School
Physics	Le Fevre High School
Physics	Loxton High School
Physics	Mannum Community College
Physics	Marden Senior College
Physics	Mark Oliphant College (B-12)
Physics	Marryatville High School
Physics	Millicent High School
Physics	Mitcham Girls High School
Physics	Modbury High School
Physics	Mount Barker High School
Physics	Mount Compass Area School
Physics	Murray Bridge High School
Physics	Naracoorte High School
Physics	Norwood Morialta High School
Physics	Nuriootpa High School
Physics	Open Access College
Physics	Orroroo Area School
Physics	Para Hills High School
Physics	Parafield Gardens High School
Physics	Paralowie School
Physics	Playford International College
Physics	Plympton International College
Physics	Port Broughton Area School
Physics	Port Lincoln High School
Physics	Renmark High School
Physics	Reynella East College
Physics	Roma Mitchell Secondary College
Physics	Roxby Downs Area School
Physics	Salisbury High School
Physics	Seaford Secondary College
Physics	Seaton High School
Physics	Seaview High School
Physics	The Heights School
Physics	Thebarton Senior College
Physics	Underdale High School
Physics	Unley High School
Physics	Urrbrae Agricultural High School
Physics	Valley View Secondary School
Physics	Victor Harbor High School

Subject	School
Physics	Waikerie High School
Physics	Willunga High School
Physics	Wirreanda Secondary School
Physics	Woodville High School
Specialist Mathematics	Aberfoyle Park High School
Specialist Mathematics	Adelaide High School
Specialist Mathematics	Australian Science & Mathematics School
Specialist Mathematics	Banksia Park International HS
Specialist Mathematics	Birdwood High School
Specialist Mathematics	Blackwood High School
Specialist Mathematics	Brighton Secondary School
Specialist Mathematics	Christies Beach HS & Sth Voc College
Specialist Mathematics	Cleve Area School
Specialist Mathematics	Craigmore High School
Specialist Mathematics	Glenunga International High School
Specialist Mathematics	Glossop High School
Specialist Mathematics	Golden Grove High School
Specialist Mathematics	Grant High School
Specialist Mathematics	Hallett Cove School
Specialist Mathematics	Hamilton Secondary College
Specialist Mathematics	Heathfield High School
Specialist Mathematics	Henley High School
Specialist Mathematics	Kadina Memorial School
Specialist Mathematics	Kingston Community School
Specialist Mathematics	Loxton High School
Specialist Mathematics	Marden Senior College
Specialist Mathematics	Marryatville High School
Specialist Mathematics	Mitcham Girls High School
Specialist Mathematics	Modbury High School
Specialist Mathematics	Mount Barker High School
Specialist Mathematics	Murray Bridge High School
Specialist Mathematics	Norwood Morialta High School
Specialist Mathematics	Nuriootpa High School
Specialist Mathematics	Open Access College
Specialist Mathematics	Para Hills High School
Specialist Mathematics	Parafield Gardens High School
Specialist Mathematics	Paralowie School
Specialist Mathematics	Playford International College
Specialist Mathematics	Plympton International College
Specialist Mathematics	Port Lincoln High School
Specialist Mathematics	Renmark High School
Specialist Mathematics	Reynella East College
Specialist Mathematics	Roma Mitchell Secondary College
Specialist Mathematics	Seaview High School
Specialist Mathematics	The Heights School
Specialist Mathematics	Thebarton Senior College
Specialist Mathematics	Unley High School
Specialist Mathematics	Urrbrae Agricultural High School
Specialist Mathematics	Valley View Secondary School
Specialist Mathematics	Wirreanda Secondary School
Specialist Mathematics	Woodville High School

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

66 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (2 June 2020). What are the names, titles and salaries of departmental staff working in the Treasurer's office at any stage between 1 May 2019 and 1 May 2020?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised:

- The following table lists public sector staff employed in the Treasurer's office at any stage between 1 May 2019 and 1 May 2020:

Title	ASO Salary Classification
Office Manager	ASO8
Executive Assistant to the Treasurer	ASO6
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6

Title	ASO Salary Classification
Ministerial Liaison Officer	ASO6
Ministerial Liaison Officer including Cabinet	ASO6
Parliamentary Officer	ASO4
Senior Business Support Officer	ASO4
Senior Correspondence Officer	ASO3
Correspondence Officer	ASO2

- There were no staff seconded from the department to the Treasurer's office between this period, a seconded employee is an employee who is paid for by the department and not the minister's office.

TREASURY AND FINANCE DEPARTMENT

67 The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (2 June 2020). Which consultants and contractors have been engaged to by the Department of Treasury and Finance since 1 July 2019?

- What is the cost of each of these engagements?
- What services have these consultants and contractors been engaged to provide?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier): I have been advised that:

As at 30 April 2020, the Department of Treasury and Finance had engaged and made payments to the following contractors and consultants:

Consultant Name	Description	Cost (\$)
ACCRU Harris Orchard	Process review of insurance within Super SA	24,000
Aktis Performance Management	Assessment of Job and Person classifications	1,073
Athena IOC	Review and updates for Super SA Unit Pricing Management Guidelines	59,100
BBB Advisory	Super SA call centre review	42,200
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Probity services for Super SA insurance delivery model	1,153
Bentleys (SA) Pty Ltd	Commercial advice on the tax structure of trusts associated with the 2019 Land Tax reforms.	25,000
Brett & Watson Pty Ltd	Actuarial services—Super SA	7,500
Converge International Inc	Employee Assistance Program	16,566
Culturalchemy Pty Ltd	Facilitation of Executive Strategic Alignment workshop for Super SA	13,000
Deloitte Access Economics	Economic and Business Growth fund—economic assessment of proposals	142,796
Deloitte	Creation of financial advice model for Super SA	80,708
Deloitte	HR21 system penetration & vulnerability assessment	35,921
Eliot's Automotive Services	Professional engineering services for the investigation of workplace incidents	2,124
Ernst & Young	Lease accounting advice and associated financial modelling in relation to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital.	35,898
Ernst & Young	Comparison of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital abatement regime with other relevant projects nationally and associated advice	58,297
Grant Parsons	Legislative review—Land Tax project	3,200
GRG Consulting Engineers	Professional engineering services for the investigation of workplace incidents	1,812
High Heel Consulting Pty Ltd	Staff mentoring sessions	1,695
KPMG	Financial modelling advice—PPP	29,738
KPMG	Super SA culture and brand review	194,870
KROON Technology	Professional engineering services for the investigation of workplace incidents	36,718
Mercer Consulting (Aust) Pty Ltd	Triennial review of police and ambulance Defined Benefit superannuation schemes	8,700
Mozzler Pty Ltd	Super SA cyber security review	5,760
Opteon Property Group Pty Ltd	Valuation of car parking bays for 2019-20 FBT return	1,364
Payroll Matters Pty Ltd	Provision of technical payroll services	21,000
Powell & Co Pty Ltd	Probity advice	750
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	Land Tax model methodology review project	69,689
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	SA Lotteries Commission assurance assessment	9,738
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	Independent review of employee payroll	4,168
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	Super SA insurance strategy and future delivery options	66,000
Richard Dennis	Legislative review of the Small Business Regulatory Reform Agreement (SBRRA)—Project 2	6,080
The NTF Group	Ongoing superannuation specialist assistance for Super SA	63,938

Consultant Name	Description	Cost (\$)
The University Of Adelaide	Estimating inflation expectations for regulatory decisions	17,250
The University Of Adelaide	Technical advice on hazardous substances materials for emergency services	102,906
Thomson Geer Adelaide	COVID-19 Business Advisory Group board fees	7,917
Tridant Pty Ltd	Cognos system support	8,364
	Total	1,206,993

Contractor Name	Description	Cost (\$)
ABFA Pty Ltd	Review of current Government school bus services and branch planning day	2,700
Acuity Partners Pty Ltd	Procurement support services	36,463
Arcblue Consulting (Aus) Pty Ltd	Update of the Market Approaches policy and scheduling of the procurement Policy Review program	482
ASC Training & Development Pty Ltd	External analysis and report of training strategy for the Basware NG project	4,480
Aurecon Australasia Pty Ltd	SA Schools PPP project—Technical Advisor	402,818
Australia Post	Provision of payment processing services	307,150
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Probity Advisor to various projects managed by the Commercial Projects Group	134,564
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Support for SA Health financial accounting transition to SSSA	8,174
BDO Advisory (SA) Pty Ltd	Probity advice for electricity procurements	58,257
Bentleys (SA) Pty Ltd	Domiciliary equipment service AS-IS process mapping	2,111
Between Pty Ltd	Critical IT support	115,394
Bravura Solutions Operations	Minor enhancements of the ePASS system and replacement of domain controllers	545
CBA	Provision of payment processing	626,216
CKM Management Solutions Pty Ltd	Management accounting services	21,781
Comprara Pty Ltd	Delivery of targeted procurement training courses	3,700
Deloitte	Strategic review of Scope Global	39,782
Deloitte	Security assessment of the Basware New Generation application	35,700
Deloitte	Super SA internal audit services	147,653
Deloitte	Super SA cyber security review	20,090
EBMS Pty Ltd	Development of a contract management system (Nimblex) for Strategic Procurement	89,329
Enclave Project Delivery	SA Schools PPP project—Project Director	282,141
Ernst & Young	SA Schools PPP project—input to market sounding, risk register, RfP and EOI process	398,543
Ernst & Young	BAS automation generation and data analytics for History Trust GST compliance	1,838
Ernst & Young	Super SA taxation services	62,155
Fraser Financial Modelling	Variation to payroll data tool for management reporting	313
Fueltrac	Monthly Procurement audit	4,455
Fujitsu Australia Ltd	Interim support and application management services	1,181,403
Funds SA	Local funds management—evaluation and strategy selection	41,400
GAAP Consulting	Provision of accounting masterclass sessions	5,921
Greencap—NAA Pty Ltd	Asbestos testing—sample identification of residential property	5,770
Harrison McMillan Pty Ltd	SA Schools PPP project—Procurement services	27,368
Honjo Pty Ltd	Project management services—electricity procurement	187,220
Industry Fund Services Pty Ltd	Financial planning services for Super SA members and presentations at Super SA seminars	44,649
Investec Australia Limited	Commercialisation advice—Motor Vehicle Registration project	32,679
IT Sutherland	Annual records archiving program—project management support	17,817
Jacobs Group (Aust) Pty Ltd	SA Schools PPP project—cost consultant	40,139
Karmabunny Web Design	Super SA website modifications	5,725
Key Energy & Resources Pty Ltd	Electricity procurement support	21,015
KPMG	EoFY Reporting Tool support	24,947
KPMG	State Procurement Board lead reviewer program	146,707
KPMG	Taxation Advice on Super SA's statutory obligations	42,418
KPMG Financial Advisory	Accounting and tax advice for Land Services commercialisation	341,696
Lane Print Group	Provision of printing and dispatch services	240,692
Les Jones	Organisational review of Financial Services	1,830
Major Training Services	State Procurement Board training	2,000
Minter Ellison Lawyers	SA Schools PPP project—legal advice	1,251
MPH Architects	SA Schools PPP project—Technical Advisor	97,906
Nerkle Business Modelling	Management accounting services	53,350
Nucleus Media Australia Pty Ltd	Website discovery and technical scoping	11,455

Contractor Name	Description	Cost (\$)
NW & JR Carr T/AS Carrsview	Contract services to support FBT year end for the SAFECOM/PIRSA/DPTI team	11,433
On:Creative	Design of land tax notification forms	7,810
Photo Mechanical Products Pty Ltd	Production of compliance plates with sequential serial numbers for Gas Fitting Work licence holders (SafeWork SA)	1,860
Powell & Co Pty Ltd	Probity advice—Management Platform Services procurement	6,750
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	Financial advisory services for SAHMR12 building	156,175
PriceWaterhouseCoopers	Departmental internal audit services	152,531
Purchasing Index Pty Ltd	Benchmarking report for SA Government stationery pricing	33,147
Randstad Pty Ltd	Short term fleet hire maintenance	39,728
Rice Warner Pty Ltd	Super SA insurance strategy and future delivery options	17,469
Rigby Downs Consulting	Schools PPP project—technical financial advice	20,385
Rixstewart Pty Ltd	SA Schools PPP project—Facilities Management Advisor	73,659
Spark Group	Super SA online calculator modifications	940
Square Holes	Market research, testing and review in relation to payroll tax exemptions for small business	14,375
SRA Information Technology Pty Ltd	Ongoing development, implementation and maintenance of SafeWork SA's Infonet system	159,437
Stephen Bray	Review of FBT manual for SA government agencies	600
SWOOD Financial Solutions Pty Ltd	Transition and creation of agencies in the Masterpiece financial system	19,840
The University of Adelaide	Graduate Development Program training	13,674
Thomas Project Management	Project management services for SA government Mainframe Transition project	47,856
Unico Computer Systems Pty Ltd	Commercial agreement, benefit realisation and transition of Super SA systems	50,700
WT Partnership	Independent review of the SA Schools PPP project	61,000
	Total	6,271,561