

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 16 March 2021

The **SPEAKER** (Hon. J.B. Teague) took the chair at 11:00 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (11:02): I move:

That the committee have leave to sit during the sitting of the house today.

Motion carried.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:02): I move:

That standing orders be so far suspended as to enable me to move a motion without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority present, I accept the motion. Is it seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Deputy Premier, do you wish to speak to the motion to suspend?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, thank you. The matter before the parliament, which you, sir, and the President have tabled, is a report from the equal opportunity commissioner, Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace. I have not heard any dissent from the view that we should as a parliament act promptly to deal with this matter and indeed that it is a matter that is deserved of our attention.

For that reason, I seek to suspend standing orders to enable us to move a motion and essentially invite a joint house committee to be established so that we may do just that and reassure the people of South Australia that we have read this report, we understand it and we want to commence.

The SPEAKER: Is there any other member who would speak to the motion to suspend or against the motion at this point? There being no further contribution, is the motion seconded?

Honourable members: Yes, sir.

Motion carried.

Motions

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:04): I move:

1. That in the opinion of this house a joint committee be appointed to inquire into and report on the recommendations arising from the equal opportunity commissioner's report into harassment in the parliament workplace and how they are implemented.
2. That, in the event of a joint committee being appointed, the House of Assembly be represented thereon by four members, including the Speaker, of whom three shall form a quorum of assembly members necessary to be present at all sittings of the committee.

3. That a message be sent to the Legislative Council transmitting the foregoing resolution and requesting concurrence thereto.

In supporting this motion—and I understand that other members may wish to consider some amendments to it, and I am happy to address that as soon as we have notice of what they may be from members—it is the position of the Liberal Party that we need to read, absorb and consider the recommendations of this report as a parliament. I would hope and generally expect that the Legislative Council will similarly have done that and will do the same.

It is the position from this side of the house that we do need to address it. It is not a new principle to consider or action plan to have under review. In the time I have been here in this parliament, there have been investigations into harassment, predatory behaviour and discrimination in the workplace, and we have had reports here of others before. I mention just one, namely, the police inquiry because it was a very considered report by the then equal opportunity commissioner, who embarked on a significant program of behavioural reform in that workplace.

Only last night, I was reading her report, in a final consideration after over two years of investment, into assisting the police to become a better workplace, a safer workplace and a place where particularly women in the workforce had an opportunity for advancement and promotion. It is not new, but it is something that has not for a very long time been addressed by this parliament.

Back in 2012, in this parliament we considered the question, for example, of whether we needed to have a code of conduct. The Hon. Bob Such, a member of this house, presided over a committee and provided a report to the then parliament that there should be a statement of principles endorsed by members of parliament. By late 2014, the former Premier the Hon. Jay Weatherill accepted that we should have a statement of principles and that we should all sign up to it.

It was disappointing to note that, at that stage, it took a very considerable time—in fact, not until 2016—before it was advanced but, nevertheless, as a parliament we signed up to that statement of principles. It is interesting for members who are following the consideration of what we do in relation to this report that other jurisdictions have done the same. Some have moved to have a code of conduct, some have not, in the parliaments in Australia, but this report is with us, it is pressing and we must deal with it.

I think it is fair to say that the question of whether we need to review the question of our statement of principles and advance to a code of conduct is a matter we must consider and discuss. It is not a matter for government, it is not a matter for individual members of this house, it is a matter for all of us as a parliament, with the Legislative Council, to give serious consideration to these recommendations and look at those matters, including other jurisdictions and how they have addressed these matters.

Since 2012, we have seen the development of a number of integrity bodies around the nation, including in South Australia, and that in itself brings further overlays of responsibility and accountability, and we are no exception. I am proud to say that this parliament endorsed the government's move last year to introduce judges and members of parliament to the process under the Equal Opportunity Act.

I am proud of that and I am proud of our parliament in passing that legislation. I am equally proud of our Premier who, upon receiving this report—although not even being in the bulk of the recommendations but a piece of advice from the equal opportunity commissioner that the Ministerial Code of Conduct, which we have had for a number of years, should also be upgraded—acted and imposed that obligation into the Ministerial Code of Conduct. That is what is important when it comes to commissioning a report and acting on it, and I am very proud that he did that.

If there is consideration given by this parliament for us as members of parliament to have a committee, which is the usual process, I am happy to indicate to the parliament the composition that I would recommend. This is a matter entirely for the parliament, but I recommend that we do act. It is something that the public expects of us, that we give serious consideration to the recommendations, that we work out how we are going to implement the recommendations that we accept, that we act on them and that we employ whatever we sign up to.

That is what is critical to us. That is what the public expects of us, that is what our constituents generally expect of us, and that is what I think we should expect of each other in our civilised behaviour in this parliament and within the precinct of it, to ensure that those who work with us, those who come to visit us and those who present petitions to us are dealt with in the same, respectful manner.

With that, can I indicate to the parliament that I suggest the recommended joint select committee consist of four people from each of the houses of parliament. I suggest we nominate four from this house and, similarly, four from the Legislative Council and that the committee be vested with the responsibility of considering these recommendations and coming back to us as a parliament to consider how we are going to implement any recommendations or, indeed, if there are any that we think we should do more of or less of.

It is a matter for the committee to consider that it be comprised, from each house, of the Speaker and the President. Sir, obviously you are the gatekeeper, arbiter and protector of this parliament in many ways. We recognise that. I would suggest that it is responsible of us to have the Speaker and the President of the other place to be on the committee, if it is their wish, and that the other representatives from each house include a member of the Liberal Party, the Labor Party and a representative from the crossbench.

I understand the practice in the Legislative Council, which has had a long history of representation of Independents in that house, works on the basis that its respective parties select a nominee for joint select committees and that it is a matter for the Independents themselves to nominate their representative.

I have had an indication that the member for King will propose that she be a member of the committee. We endorse that she, as a member of the Liberal Party, be part of that. I have had an indication that a member of the Independents will indicate that they are willing to undertake a role in that regard, and I have invited the Labor Party to nominate someone. I invite a representative of the Labor Party, the opposition, to indicate who they would wish to have.

If there are any amendment aspects that have not been considered, I am happy to receive those, even if they are being currently prepared by any other member, before we conclude this debate. I think—I am confident, in fact—that the public expects us to act promptly and responsibly in this matter and to exercise whatever we decide in a timely manner.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:13): I support the motion and rise to move an amendment. I move that a new paragraph 2 be inserted, as follows:

That it is the opinion of this house that a code of conduct for members of parliament be introduced and that this committee draft this code of conduct for the consideration of this house.

As evidenced by the overwhelming response to yesterday's March 4 Justice around the country, it is abundantly and absolutely clear that Australian women have had enough and are demanding action, and that they will not stop marching and demanding action until meaningful change is made and until gender equality is achieved in every aspect of life, in our economy, in every aspect of community life, including ensuring that gender equality in terms of representation in this place exists. They will not stop until every woman and girl is safe wherever she works, wherever she chooses to go, at whatever time of the day or night, until women are believed and until we have justice for those who have been raped, harassed or discriminated against.

Women and all who support them will no longer tolerate workplace culture, nor culture in any other place, that enables disrespect, harassment and violence towards women. This includes our parliaments, where Australians, including South Australians, rightly expect the highest standards to be upheld but which too often have been found to be amongst the worst and most resistant to societal change.

As prescribed in the equal opportunity commissioner's recently released Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace, change must include a code of conduct being established for members of parliament. The acting equal opportunity commissioner's review clearly and shockingly showed it to be the case that violence, harassment and sexism occurs in this the South Australian parliament workplace.

As Our Watch sets out, we as a parliament must, as a matter of urgency, play our part and examine the way our structures enable violence to occur and also think about what part we can play in influencing attitudes, behaviours and social norms. It is absolutely imperative that in doing so we develop a code of conduct for members of this parliament.

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (11:17): I rise to speak in support of the amendment that has been moved by the member for Reynell. I think the entire nation has been deeply moved by the events we have seen transpire, particularly around our nation's capital in recent weeks. That was particularly evident yesterday with the March 4 Justice rally that so many members in this place had the opportunity to attend, as was the case around the country.

There are undoubtedly a number of forces at play that contributed to such an extraordinary turnout in terms of the number of people present yesterday at such short notice. Certainly, one of the drivers and I think motivating forces here is a genuine expectation from the Australian community, and indeed the South Australian community, that parliamentarians, leaders of our communities and community, act in a way that is consistent with the expectations that I think we all subscribe to and would seek to uphold.

I think the South Australian public and the Australian community generally find it incredibly disconcerting that there are allegations of very serious sexual harassment occurring within the parliament. We have seen those allegations take place in the federal parliament and then unfortunately the Equal Opportunity Commission report revealed that there are serious allegations of criminal sexual harassment occurring within this workplace.

Indeed, there is an allegation contained within that report of criminal sexual harassment against a member of parliament. That alarms the community, as it reasonably should, and I think South Australians expect action in that regard. I welcome the Attorney-General's resolution moved this morning seeking to introduce a joint house committee to address some of the issues raised within the Equal Opportunity Commission's report and to look at the recommendations.

I think it is important to get on the record this house's view, specifically in regard to the issue around the code of conduct. As the Deputy Premier referred to in her earlier remarks, the code of conduct is something that has been considered and debated within the South Australian community and the South Australian parliament for some time, but I think we have now arrived at the point that it is no longer okay to kick the can down the road on this in a way that does not eventuate in a code of conduct being introduced.

Nothing irritates the public more than a sense that somehow it is one rule for everybody else in the workplace but a different rule within the parliament. That inconsistency is something that we can no longer allow to exist up in lights. The South Australian community expect there to be a code of conduct for this workplace just as there is for theirs. I can say from some experience that almost every private sector and public sector workplace now is subject to some version of a code of conduct, yet that is not the case for members of this chamber or the other; it is not the case for the parliament.

We cannot allow this and can no longer sit by and say it is one rule for everybody else and a different rule for members of parliament, which is why this house, right now, should definitively decide that enough is enough and put on the record our support for a code of conduct applying to members of parliament. The establishment of that code of conduct undoubtedly does bring with it a degree of complexity. This is a unique workplace.

There are circumstances that prevail in our system of Westminster democracy that are not true in other workplaces. This is an adversarial workplace. There is always a contest between major political parties and individual MPs. We do not seek to diminish that, and we would not want a situation where an MPs' code of conduct was being used somehow as a political weapon to unfairly undermine one of our adversaries.

I believe it is within our collective capability to develop a code of conduct in a way that acknowledges the uniqueness of the Westminster system and the role of members of parliament but also acknowledges the substantial responsibility associated with that, to set an example for the rest of our community. We have it within our capability to develop a code of conduct that does not just enjoy bipartisan support but hopefully enjoys unanimous support, not just across this chamber but also in the upper house. We can do this, but we need to work together.

The motion from the Attorney-General to establish a committee I believe is the best vehicle to establish what that code of conduct looks like and how that code of conduct would be applied and, indeed, policed. We can do this together to make sure that we get the balance right between acknowledging the substantial complexity of a workplace like this and upholding a standard that the South Australian community reasonably expects.

I invite the Premier to support this resolution. I invite the government to support this amendment. It is a step in the right direction, and it is a step that would ensure that South Australian people generally understand that their calls are being heard, that their parliament is responding accordingly, that the idea of sexual harassment occurring in this workplace is not to be tolerated and that, indeed, enough is enough.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (11:23): I rise in order to support the motion and the amendment that has been put by the member for Reynell. I think that most of us in South Australia were shocked by the recent report that was commissioned by our parliament looking into workplace standards and practices within the South Australian parliament. We thank the acting equal opportunity commissioner for her report. We look forward to working on all 16 of those recommendations, and I strongly support the establishment of a parliamentary committee to do the work so that we can have recommendations that come back to the parliament.

Every single person in South Australia should feel safe and respected within the workplace, and we here in the South Australian parliament should be modelling the highest of standards. We have had in place for an extended period of time a set of principles that we abide by. In the cabinet, we have the Ministerial Code of Conduct.

One of the recommendations that we have before us is to consider having a code of conduct for all MPs. I think that the committee that we establish should look very hard at this and look at what happens in other jurisdictions—what are the benefits, what are some of the pitfalls with some of the other models that exist—and come back to this house with their recommendations.

I think that it is time for us to make sure that we are a model for all of South Australia. The report by Emily Strickland shines a light on parliamentary practices and, quite frankly, I do not like what we have seen. I know that many members say that there have been significant improvements but what this report tells us is that there are many more improvements that need to be made. We on this side of the house are absolutely focused on making sure that occurs.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:25): I move to amend the amendment by deleting the words to be inserted by the member for Reynell's amendment and inserting the following:

After 'implemented' in clause 1 insert:

and that the committee draft a code of conduct for members of parliament for the consideration of both houses.

This is a tidying up of the language which was necessary by virtue of the haste with which we have been seeking to amend the terms of reference that were provided just an hour or so ago to this side of the house. The intent remains the same as was indicated both by the member for Reynell and also by our leader that a code of conduct be drafted by this committee and that that code of conduct then be able to be considered by both houses of parliament.

The intent remains the same, as I said, that a code of conduct is now beyond time and that for us to wait, yet again, for more consideration and an inquiry and reporting will simply take too long. We need to acknowledge that that is now necessary and we need to move quickly.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (11:27): I rise to support the motion from the Deputy Premier. Obviously, while the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has only now identified an amendment to the amendment previously moved by the member for Reynell, to which previous amendment the Premier has indicated agreement, in the coming minutes we will just double-check the wording that the Deputy Leader of the Opposition has now amended the amendment to.

I want to talk about the substance briefly, though, while some of that consideration is underway. Emily Strickland, as the acting equal opportunity commissioner, gave every member of this house and every member of our staff and every member of the people who work in the parliament

the opportunity to contribute to the survey about workplace practices that are related to this parliament. While a number of our staff and possibly members did not, a great many of our staff and members did, and I want to thank those who did so.

There has been some discussion about the specific examples raised by the acting equal opportunity commissioner in her report. I would hope that the bipartisan nature of this debate today—in fact, not just bipartisan but it includes all the crossbenchers in both houses as well—and the broad spirit of welcoming the report by all sides of parliament will give confidence to those individuals who have reported atrocious behaviour; some examples being criminal as identified.

It will give confidence to them that they will have their accusations taken deeply seriously and be supported throughout the process of making representations to appropriate authorities. I think that the sharing of those stories—story after story—in a report such as this of significant weight certainly does shine a light, as others have identified, on the opportunity for us to improve as a parliament.

I look forward to this committee putting forward recommendations. I look forward to it, I imagine, putting forward a sensible way forward in relation to a code of conduct. I do not want any member of parliament to labour under the misguided idea that this committee is going to be doing all of the work or indeed even the implementation. The decision to implement the recommendations of this committee will be enough. It is on every individual in this parliament—everyone who works for us, everyone who is part of the culture of any workplace—to be a part of that solution in the way that we conduct ourselves at all times.

Not committing a criminal act is not enough. Not just identifying that you are not transgressing against anything in a code of conduct or a statement of principles is not enough. I hope that all members of parliament will take an active responsibility in promoting an actively positive culture in their own workplaces, in this building and indeed in this chamber in the way that we conduct ourselves every day, and I hope that all members will take that encouragement in the very serious spirit in which it is meant.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:31): I want to thank all members for their contribution and indication of support for this motion. I think it is very important that we advance this course for all the reasons that have been said, and we will indicate the composition of the committee shortly. But can I just reflect on a couple of extra matters that have been raised, particularly via the amendment and then the amendment to the amendment, and indicate formally that the amended amendment, or substitute amendment—I think it has to be an amendment to the amendment—is acceptable.

By saying that, we are making a provision that provides for the committee to draft a code of conduct for members of parliament for the consideration of both houses of our parliament. Implicit in the motion is that obligation to provide the means by which we do consider recommendations. Ultimately, it is entirely a matter for this house to determine under what rules we conduct ourselves.

That said, it is very clear that it is not the responsibility of the committee to make a decision about what we do to move towards having a people and culture unit, having a code of conduct, developing a framework, having a strategy, introducing policies and providing personnel to support that—all of the other worthy recommendations that are under consideration by this committee. Therefore, it is important that, if we are to implement those, as per the recommendation, we have some guidance from the committee. We will be looking for that to be presented to us as a parliament so that we can make the ultimate decision. I wish to make that abundantly clear.

I want to make clarifications in relation to three of the recommendations. The first recommendation proposes the establishment of a human resources unit. I will not repeat all of the reasons for it, but it is important. Obviously, it would require ultimate consideration of a government to consider the resourcing of such a recommendation.

I want to make it absolutely clear that two things are happening. One is that our Treasurer, who currently has responsibility for a number of industrial matters and provision of services to this parliament and the employment of a number of our staff, is already looking at how that may be implemented. I want to assure the house that, as a member of the government, he is looking at how that might work because, as members would appreciate, there are very different terms of

employment for people who work within this precinct and in our electoral offices and in our ministerial offices. So it is a little bit complicated, but he has started that body of work.

In relation to the final recommendations, which are 11 and 15 from memory, they ask me, as Attorney-General, to look at amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act and to do two things, which I will paraphrase: streamline the process of reporting and investigation of complaints of harassment, and that includes sexual harassment and discriminatory harassment. Do not forget that in this exercise. This is broader than just a sexual harassment report and I am looking at that as we speak.

Secondly, it was recommended that there be the question of the duty or obligation of an employer to positively implement protections in relation to antidiscrimination and harassment in the workplace. That is also under consideration. I commit, and the government commits, to provide what support we are called upon to support the parliament to consider these matters, including the provision of information.

To complete that, can I say that there are two other things in this report; one is a recommendation that our political parties also develop and employ protections, procedures and guidelines to do that. I can proudly say that the Liberal Party did that early last year. As I understand in public comments, the Labor Party are progressing that.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: At the moment—that is excellent. There are other political parties and—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —obviously that needs to be considered. I advise the parliament that I have written to both the Speaker and the President inviting them to make inquiry with all registered political parties in South Australia as to what they have in their guidelines, policies or principles.

I think it is important that, having received this recommendation, although it is not directly in the purview of a parliament, many of us do represent political parties and are proud to do so, but we also want to be participatory in and members of political parties that sign up to a process to ensure that we act to protect volunteers, members, persons who are involved, candidates, etc., in that.

The final matter, which relates to the recommendation of the Premier in relation to a ministerial code of conduct, has already been acted upon and I am proud to say, of course, that he has done that. That is as per the recommendation, that is, the direct introduction in the Ministerial Code of Conduct to ensure that there is a workplace where sexual harassment and discriminatory behaviour is prohibited. For those of us who have either been ministers or are ministers, we all know what the ultimate sanction of that is: you can be out. I think it is very important—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —that we now, as a parliament, progress this motion to enable us to actually get to work and that would be number one, to invite the Legislative Council to join us in that regard. I indicate that in addition to the Speaker, the member for King, the member for Mount Gambier, and I am happy to note whoever might be the member for the Labor Party—I am getting a smile and a nod.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am just saying, I am happy to indicate that for a resolution today. If we do not have that at this point from the Labor Party, then I am happy to progress with this membership on the basis that the Australian Labor Party will present a nomination in due course as to who they will have on the committee. I am getting a nod in that regard. I am happy to seek a further notation that the Speaker, the member for King and the member for Mount Gambier be members of

the committee, noting that it is proposed there will be a further member of the committee to be nominated by the Australian Labor Party.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would expect, notwithstanding that rude interjection from the member for West Torrens, that they will understand the urgency of us dealing with this matter, and will appreciate that, and look forward to presenting their nominee for the approval of this parliament.

Dr Close's amendment to amendment carried; motion as amended by Ms Hildyard's amendment as amended carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (RECOMMENDATIONS OF INDEPENDENT INQUIRY INTO CHILD PROTECTION) BILL

Standing Orders Suspension

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:42): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended to enable the introduction a bill without notice forthwith.

The SPEAKER: There being an absolute majority present, I accept the motion.

Motion carried.

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:42): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Bail Act 1985 and the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:42): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

On 16 February 2021, I tabled a report of the independent inquiry into child protection undertaken by Paul Rice QC. The government has accepted the six recommendations and taken additional steps to address the issues highlighted in the report. The Statutes Amendment (Recommendations of Independent Inquiry into Child Protection) Bill 2021 implements the two recommendations in the report that require legislative amendment, being recommendations Nos 5 and 6.

The bill (1) increases the penalty for failing to comply with directions made by the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection under section 86 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 to three years for a first offence and four years for any subsequent offences and (2) designates a person arrested for breach of written directions made under section 86 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 as a 'prescribed applicant' for the purposes of section 10A of the Bail Act 1985 so that the presumption in favour of bail does not apply.

Mr Rice QC examined the circumstances around sexual offending in relation to two young people who were under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection. One of the matters considered by Mr Rice QC involved a 20-year-old man who engaged in unlawful sexual offending with a young person who was 13 to 14 years old at the time of the offending.

On 1 November 2019, the chief executive issued written directions to the offender under section 86 of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. The offender breached those directions and was arrested for doing so. The offender was subsequently released on bail. On 2 January 2020, the offender was again served with written directions. He breached the written directions and was arrested again in March 2020.

In response to the pattern of breaching written directions, being arrested, being granted bail and then breaching further written directions, Mr Rice QC has recommended that the penalties for a

breach of written directions should be increased. The current maximum penalty is imprisonment for 12 months. Mr Rice QC said, and I quote:

Bearing in mind...that the Department was endeavouring to prevent the continued sexual abuse of a child under guardianship (which carries a maximum of life imprisonment), a threat of a maximum sentence of 12 months' imprisonment is substantially inadequate.

Mr Rice QC said 'a maximum penalty of 3 years' imprisonment for breach of a written direction would appear reasonable when taking into consideration the nature of the offending, general deterrence and the safety of the child involved'. He recommended this approach in recommendation 5 of his report. The recommendation is given effect by clause 5 of the bill.

Mr Rice QC also made a recommendation in relation to the granting of bail where a person has breached written directions. He noted that the offender in the matter described above was 'given bail on the breach and promptly continued to offend against the child...One way of endeavouring to stop those ongoing breaches is to make bail more difficult upon arrest for a breach'.

Mr Rice QC recommended that the consideration be given to making a person arrested for breach of written directions a 'prescribed applicant' for the purposes of section 10A of the Bail Act. This means that the person would not be granted bail unless they can establish the existence of 'special circumstances' justifying their release on bail.

The presumption in favour of bail in section 10 of the Bail Act does not apply. This recommendation is given effect by clause 4 of the bill. Written directions issued by the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection are an important mechanism for keeping young people safe. They are only able to be issued if the chief executive believes it is reasonably necessary either to prevent harm to a child or young person, or to prevent the child or young person from engaging in or being exposed to conduct of a criminal nature. The bill introduces measures to increase compliance with written directions, which will in turn improve the safety and wellbeing of children and young people under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection. The consequences of not complying with written directions will be made far more serious by this bill.

We are acting swiftly to address the issues in Mr Rice's report, we are committed to introducing this legislation within 30 days and we have achieved that. We also took additional steps to address the issues in the report.

I commend the bill to members. I seek leave to have the explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it. I can say that I have had some indication from the opposition of their support to this approach and so I am entirely in their hands as to when we progress it. But I think the urgency on this matter has been identified, and I appreciate the opposition's support in not attempting to frustrate that in any way.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Bail Act 1985

4—Amendment of section 10A—Presumption against bail in certain cases

This clause amends section 10A of the principal Act to extend the presumption against bail to include an applicant taken into custody in relation to an offence against section 86(4) of the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017.

Part 3—Amendment of Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017

5—Amendment of section 86—Direction not to communicate with, harbour or conceal child or young person

This clause amends section 86 of the principal Act to increase the maximum penalty for an offence against the section to 3 years' imprisonment for a first offence, and 4 years for a second or subsequent offence.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Hildyard.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:50): I move:

That standing orders remain suspended to move a motion forthwith.

The SPEAKER: As an absolute majority is not present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Motion carried.

Motions

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (11:52): I move:

That this house—

1. Commits itself to leading cultural change within the parliamentary workplace;
2. Welcomes the recommendations made in the Equal Opportunity Commission's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace;
3. Declares that sexual and discriminatory harassment will not be tolerated in the parliamentary workplace; and
4. Takes the necessary action to implement Our Watch's Workplace Equality and Respect Standards.

As I have spoken about to some degree this morning, a deep anger and sadness is continuing to be felt by women and our supporters across our nation in light of the harrowing allegations of sexual assault by powerful, entitled men. As I have mentioned earlier in this house, it is a burning anger and an incredible determination that were on display in abundance yesterday at the Adelaide March 4 Justice and at similar marches around the country.

Women have had enough. We have had enough of the violence that sees a woman killed every six days in Australia. We have had enough of sexual harassment. We have had enough of the entitlement and disrespect that lead to violence and sexual abuse against women. We have had enough of the gender inequality that underpins violence, disrespect and harassment. We have had enough of being diminished by the 'not all men' comments when we raise our voices and call out violence.

We have had enough of the fact that most women—many of us in this place and too many of our mothers, sisters, friends, colleagues and daughters—have an experience of sexual violence, harassment or discrimination and that so few in the past have been prepared to report or have been believed when they do so. As many of us very loudly yelled yesterday in solidarity with one another and with the many women for whom it was too hard to attend: enough is absolutely enough. As one speaker put so very well yesterday, the growing sentiment is: if you are not with us, get out of our way.

Over the past few weeks, extraordinarily brave women have brought to public attention the most harrowing accounts of alleged rape and sexual assault—alleged rape, sexual assault and harassment that have allegedly occurred at the hands of male parliamentarians and political staff. We have heard the unwavering, strong, inspirational voice of Australian of the Year, Grace Tame, whose courage is inspiring others who have been sexually abused to raise their voices. Again, I say grace indeed.

It is absolutely incumbent on this parliament to ensure the voices of women such as Grace Tame and others, and those whose voices we have not heard but who have also suffered, are heard. It is incumbent on our parliament to hear and decisively act on the voices of those who spoke out through this review of the South Australian parliamentary workplace. This week has indeed been a watershed moment in terms of our community utterly rejecting gendered violence and inequality.

We will make sure that this is a turning point. Women are angry and are determined to see meaningful change. Across this state and across our nation, women have spoken and we will not be silenced until all of us are safe—as I said in the last sitting week of parliament: wherever we work, whoever is our boss, whomever we work alongside, whatever our position is, when we are at home, when we are out at night, during the day, at school, in a park, at a shopping centre, whatever we are wearing, however much we have had to drink.

I close by saying that I am so sorry for all those who have been assaulted or abused for what they have gone through. We are inspired by the courage these and others have shown in coming forward. It will drive many of us to continue to speak for as long as it takes to ensure every single woman, every single girl, can live her life free from violence, harassment and abuse. I say also: we are also with those who cannot come forward.

The equal opportunity commissioner's review of this parliament uncovered many terrible instances of abuse occurring in this place and in other political and government buildings. This motion is about our parliament committing to immediately commence making overdue changes. It is about declaring what we will absolutely not tolerate, and I commend this motion to the house.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (11:57): I thank the member for bringing this motion and indicate my and indeed our support to it. I, too, after cabinet, attended the rally yesterday, which was a contemporary, loud speak-out of people, particularly women, who feel aggrieved in certain circumstances where they are the victim of discrimination, behaviour which is violent and of course where there is sexual exploitation or discrimination.

It is a voice that is never going to be silenced. It is something that women, and our mothers and grandmothers before us, have had to endure and it is a matter where, as contemporary representatives and as a woman, I personally feel it is very important that we continue to make that noise and to ensure it is heard—and progressively it has been heard and there have been initiatives that have been passed. My parents' generation, my mother's generation and my grandmothers' generation fought to have the right to continue to have employment after they married.

I hear those stories, and young girls hear these stories of women in that generation being forced to retire when they married, being forced to hide their engagement ring just to eke out a few extra months of employment. It seems utterly bizarre to us, but it is important that we do recognise that there are still inequities that need to be dealt with.

The report that was done in relation to the more discrete area of workplace harassment and discrimination is something we have canvassed in this parliament just today, and we are taking up the responsibility to have a good look at it ourselves and see how we can improve it for the occupations of women.

If we look at the employment circumstances of women, in a way we have gone from women having the opportunity to work, the right to work and equitable arrangements for access to superannuation and pay and the like, to the stage where we now have a highly feminised workforce. Great, but that has also brought other complications and responsibilities that we have to deal with.

The military has had to deal with this. All hierarchical places of employment have had to deal with it, including the police force, which I referred to earlier. Even in the parliament, where nobody could fail to recognise the power imbalance that can occur between, perhaps, members in the parliament and others, or members in the parliament and other staff in the workplace, we need to recognise that, and we need to be able to make sure that especially in those circumstances the protections are employed.

At the moment, we have a number of initiatives already in place, and one of them relates, in this motion, to acknowledgement of the Our Watch Workplace Equality and Respect framework guides. I just want to inform the house that the Our Watch's Workplace Equality and Respect framework guides agencies through an organisational change process to promote gender equality. The Workplace Equality and Respect process supports agencies to assess their organisation and identify key actions to ensure that gender equality and respect are at the centre of their workplace.

A total of 24 state government agencies have developed action plans in line with the Workplace Equality and Respect framework. I thank the Equal Opportunity Commission and commissioner for their work to progressively advance that. These action plans, I inform the house,

outline tangible actions at all levels of the business to create a culture that promotes mutual respect, support for those who need it and equal opportunity. These actions also support agencies' submission for White Ribbon accreditation.

I just want to inform the house that paragraph 4 of this motion is well and truly underway. It is being pursued and continued by our government. As Attorney-General, and responsible for the Equal Opportunity Commission, I can proudly say that that is continuing.

The White Ribbon Workplace Accreditation Program engages a whole of organisation commitment to stop violence against women. It aims to foster a whole of organisation commitment to stop violence against women, meeting 15 criteria under three standards to create a safer and more respectful workplace. A total of 24 government agencies are currently undertaking the re-accreditation process, having been first accredited five years ago. All other government agencies will submit their evidence for re-accreditation assessment prior to or on 30 April.

Again, this is not a new concept. We are already signed up to it. We are committed to it. In fact, I seem to recall that the man sitting next to me here was one of the first of our male members of parliament to sign up as an ambassador.

The Hon. D.C. van Holst Pellekaan: Yes, the two of us did it together.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Yes, the mover of the motion and the minister have both signed up. Good on you, because we do need to set an example. The Chiefs for Gender Equity is a group of senior business leaders from prominent South Australian companies representing key industry sectors brought together with the common aim of advancing gender equity. Supported by the Equal Opportunity Commission, the group aims to educate and encourage other SA businesses to better address gender equity in the workplace.

For example, last year the Chiefs for Gender Equity released a suite of practical resources and guidelines for small to medium enterprises to advance gender equity and create supportive, equitable and safe workplaces. This work was possible due to the \$25,000 in funding provided to the Equal Opportunity Commission via the Premier—again, a Premier I am proud to sit next to and be part of his team. We are very committed to that.

I just want let you know what the SA public sector gender equality data standards project is. The aim of this project is to identify and recommend standard definitions for SA public sector workforce gender equality data, with reference to current national gender equality data benchmarks. These standard data definitions will inform a road map for future work to improve public sector workforce reporting capability in relation to gender equality measures.

This project is a partnership between the Office of the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment, the Equal Opportunity Commission, the Office for Women and the Department of the Premier and Cabinet. We not only have to do these things but we have to document them, we have to share them and we have to employ them, and that is precisely what our government is doing. I thank the member for moving the motion and support the same.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:04): I rise to support the motion, as is everyone who is speaking today, which is terrific. I want to point out a couple of features of the importance of this motion. We have been presented with an equal opportunity commissioner report that has a number of recommendations that will be addressed through the committee that we have agreed to establish. One refers to actions of the political parties. But recommendation 6, parts (a) and (b), is specifically about actions that the two chambers ought to be taking.

I commend, therefore, the member for Reynell for stepping up and taking the initiative in articulating a motion that fulfils those two parts of recommendation 6. I think it is very important that we show that there is a sense of urgency and that, while some of us might have preferred to simply endorse the recommendations and move into implementation, we accept that a committee has now been established in order to work through the detail of those. But, at the very least, the one that can be acted on now has been acted on thanks to the initiative of the member for Reynell.

I would also simply like to note, as I think has been reflected in the last two speeches also, the degree of frustration that people feel in the community and that I myself feel that we are still

having to move motions that declare that sexual and discriminatory harassment will not be tolerated. I accept that that is what we have been asked to do and I utterly support that we are doing it. It is so frustrating that we are living in a culture where that is even a question and it is necessary to articulate it.

I took very much to heart, when watching the news last night, the interviews that were done with women around the country at all the various marches. Young women said, 'I know that my grandmother and my mother fought for these issues and now here I am fighting.' Older women said, 'I have been fighting for these issues, yet here we are still fighting for them.' Thank goodness people are still fighting for them. What a shame that that is still necessary.

Let's see each step forward as a step towards progress, a step towards the time when young girls and young boys become teenagers and young adults and do not have to keep talking about this because our culture has moved on sufficiently. Let's not let go of that as our earnest hope and our target that we can reach a place where people are treated with respect, where power is shared fairly and where we do not have to articulate that we do not support sexual harassment and discrimination because it is simply no longer a question that that would ever be tolerated.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:07): I certainly rise to support this motion. We have had a very productive morning in parliament this morning in regard to getting work underway. It is not until that work is done and implemented and we actually see real change that we can be any more than satisfied with having started down that path, but we certainly have started down that path this morning and in a bipartisan way as well.

This motion from the member for Reynell probably best encapsulates, to my mind, what we have jointly as members of this chamber embarked upon today. I certainly support this motion. The member for Reynell and I have worked together on a lot of these types of issues. In fact, together we established Parliamentarians United Against Domestic Violence a few years ago. We were extremely pleased to have all members of parliament at the time, and subsequent members who have come in, sign up for that.

I am very pleased with regard to the work that is already underway throughout government with regard to departments being White Ribbon accredited. One of the key things about White Ribbon accreditation is that it is not just about signing up, getting a tag and coming back next year to see if you are still good enough. White Ribbon accreditation is actually about living the values and delivering and implementing them every hour of the day, every day of the year.

To see more and more state government departments over recent years gain White Ribbon accreditation I think is outstanding and reflects extremely well not only on the government and on the leaders of those departments but also, most importantly, on the people who work in those departments, because if the people who work in those departments do not actually deliver and act on the values associated with that White Ribbon accreditation then it ceases to exist. You do not get accredited for a year or five years and, 'Good, you've passed the test,' so you are assumed to be okay: it is a living, ongoing matter.

There is a lot of work to do. There is absolutely no doubt in my mind and no doubt in the minds of my colleagues that, while we have been progressing in South Australia in these areas for many years now, the progress has not been fast enough and it has not delivered enough yet. So the united effort of all members of this chamber—and I am very optimistic with respect to the members of the other place as well—to come together to speed up the transition to achieve more, to get us to where we need to be as a state, but in this particular situation with regard to our house of parliament leading by example for the rest of the state, is a very important step forward.

I endorse the words of those speakers who have gone before me. I strongly support this motion and say again that this motion encapsulates very well a lot of the commitments that we have made together this morning and the work that is already underway throughout government and throughout the state.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:11): I start by thanking all who have spoken in support of this motion. As much as I was feeling angry and sad yesterday, and have been over the past few weeks, certainly yesterday but also our debate today have given me some hope that there is a way forward on these issues. Hearing the various comments in the speeches about our commitment to making

change certainly makes me feel more hopeful not only about the way forward for our parliament but also, as the member for Port Adelaide said, about the way forward for future generations.

I thank everybody for their comments and reiterate, as the member for Port Adelaide did, that, yes, we did pass a motion this morning that absolutely and rightly sets up the committee to look into and to implement the various intent of the recommendations, including the code of conduct that was agreed to through amendment. This motion, as the member for Port Adelaide said, really is about responding to recommendation 6(a) and 6(b). I think it is also very important for our parliament to make a very clear statement about our commitment to change, to be very public about that statement and also to make a very clear statement about what we will absolutely no longer tolerate and to be very clear about that.

Again, thank you to all who have spoken. Thank you for the cooperation with which people have spoken in relation to this motion. I very much look forward to working with all members of the house very quickly to make decisive, clear change—change which is very much overdue but change which I believe together we can make and which, as I said, will make a difference not only to this house but also for future generations. I commend the motion to the house.

Motion carried.

Bills

LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 2 December 2020.)

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (12:14): I rise to support this important amendment bill from the Minister for Environment and Water. It is a fairly small piece of legislation, but it is actually quite important. The Landscape South Australia Act 2019 commenced on 1 July 2020. I will come back to that in a moment, but what this is essentially about is trying to correct a subsequently identified potential anomaly in that act that may limit the ability to adapt the period in which compliance action can be taken for any unauthorised or unlawful use of water.

Of course, this has a direct impact upon compliance within the River Murray prescribed watercourse, which is incredibly important. The main change will be to provide clarity of interpretation regarding an accounting period for the purposes of declaring a penalty or a charge for unauthorised or unlawful water use. In a nutshell, that is what this is really about, but why is it so important? It is incredibly important that we have the right systems in place so that we can enforce compliance with regard to the taking of water. The taking of water is an incredibly important issue and it comes in many different forms.

In enormous parts of my electorate of Stuart water is like gold. It is probably fair to say it is more valuable than gold. All water in outback South Australia that falls from the sky and is then captured on the land, whether in a riparian context or in dams or however else, and water that comes from under the ground is critical to everything that happens, whether from an environmental perspective or from a pastoral business perspective or from a household residential perspective of needing water in your rainwater tanks because that is all you have. It is incredibly important.

Coming back to the River Murray, we know through very, very hard experience in the first 10 years of this millennium that the River Murray can run dry. It is not an exaggeration. There is an enormous body of work connected to how and why that happens. In fact, there are a wide range of opinions with regard to the taking of water from the Murray. It seems there is more difference of opinion between states than within states. We need to have the right systems in place so that we can enforce compliance, so we need to address this very important issue.

Up until one election ago, the electorate of Stuart included part of the Riverland. Morgan, Blanchetown, Cadell and Murbko were in the electorate of Stuart. They were moved from Stuart to Chaffey, which certainly at one level makes perfect sense, but no member ever likes a boundary change that takes people and country out of their electorates, so that was sad from my perspective.

I certainly understood why that made sense to the Electoral Commission. I certainly understood why the member for Chaffey was very pleased to be able to represent the good people of Morgan, Blanchetown, Cadell, Murbko and that area.

But what that gave me for eight years was a terrific insight into the affairs of the Riverland. I am not an expert like the member for Chaffey—I have never been a grower—but dealing with, supporting, learning from and representing people in that part of the world was an outstanding opportunity for me to learn far more than I had ever known before about the River Murray and the importance of having these systems in place.

The Minister for Environment and Water is also doing some work in regard to how we should be treating people who steal water. It might seem to the average person that taking too much water out of the River Murray may not be that big a deal perhaps, but that is absolutely incorrect. Taking too much water out of the River Murray, or from other sources by the way, is in my opinion and in our government's opinion a serious crime. It is not a crime to the extent of some other crimes, but in a commercial and environmental context it is a very serious crime to be stealing water from the River Murray.

The reason why we have allocations and entitlements is so that we can try to have as fair a system as possible. When people try to cheat the system that is as fair as possible, they are cheating the environment, they are cheating other growers and they are cheating water consumers in Adelaide and other parts of our state. It is actually an extremely important issue.

We have all heard the expression that one day on planet Earth water may well be far more valuable than any other precious mineral or stone or anything else we can imagine. I do not think we are too close to that, but what keeps us away from that sort of situation is good management and responsible use of water. I have to say that irrigators in South Australia are the most responsible water users of any irrigators anywhere in the nation. They are all using closed systems and the very best technology available that growers can afford. We have long ditched the use of open canals from the river.

We are doing everything we can as an industry, as a government, as successive governments in South Australia to try to make this work so that there is enough water to go around. If people steal water, it takes us directly down the path of not having enough water to go around and when we do not have enough water to go around, that is when water will become much more expensive, that is when all the produce directly related to irrigation becomes much more expensive, and at the extreme, that is when we head down to the futuristic view of water maybe being the most precious commodity we have.

It is already the most necessary commodity we have and always has been. Water is the most necessary and the most vital commodity we have. But it is the sensible management of that water that means it is not overly expensive. In fact, it is a pleasure again to commend the Minister for Energy and Water for his leadership, along with the Treasurer and our government more broadly, in regard to bringing down the cost of water for households and businesses in South Australia.

We have made an enormous effort on behalf of South Australians to reduce the cost of living and the pressures that go with that by reducing NRM levies, reducing land tax, reducing electricity costs and reducing water costs, which is very important. We do not want that to go in the other direction because people are stealing water.

When I talk about stealing water, I am not talking about just making a mistake, going over an allocation just a little bit or some genuine error. I am talking at the extreme—about people who deliberately and knowingly take massive amounts of water far in excess of their fair and legal entitlement. In some cases, I know they are doing so deliberately because the risk of being caught and the penalties associated with being caught do not outweigh the benefits of taking that water, using that water, putting it to commercial use and making money from that. We are very focused on addressing that and one of the important but small ways we are doing it is with this bill, so it is incredibly important.

Let me just say that while the thrust of this is about the River Murray—and we think immediately of enormous volumes of water being taken from the river for irrigation and in South Australia far more responsibly than in any other state in the Murray-Darling Basin—it is not only about the River Murray.

We have pipelines from the River Murray—and people would mostly be familiar with the Morgan to Whyalla pipeline—but we also have pipelines that take River Murray water much further into Eyre Peninsula. The three Upper Spencer Gulf cities of Port Pirie, Port Augusta and Whyalla are all run on River Murray water, so negatively impacting the supply of water in the Murray by stealing it out of the Murray is a much broader statewide issue than people might immediately think.

It also has very clear impacts upon the environment, not only the environment within and along the River Murray corridor but right down to the Lower Lakes and the fact that unfortunately for a very long time now, successive governments have been dredging the Murray Mouth, taking sand out of the Murray Mouth, so that it does not build up and water can continue to flow out to sea, as is necessary.

I know that every member of this house would like to see higher flows in the River Murray going out to sea. There is an incredibly complex set of circumstances with regard to the interaction between the states that contributes to that. Rainfall, of course, contributes to that, and the amount of water taken out of the Murray in each of those states contributes to that as well.

Moving on to other parts of the electorate of Stuart and how this might impact us, I will give a short list of examples of the ways different communities get their water. I have mentioned the Upper Spencer Gulf cities on the pipeline. For example, in Wilmington where I live, we have a disused former copper mine that was abandoned because underground water kept flooding it, and with older technology they just could not keep the water out.

That was a shame for the owner-operators of that copper mine, but it has worked out incredibly well for Wilmington because the underground aquifer from the closed copper mine flooded by underground water is now the Wilmington town supply, piped and pumped from about 10 kilometres away to a tank on the side of a hill above Wilmington and then gravity fed back into the houses.

The town of Melrose gets underground water pumped from an underground aquifer not too far out of town, out toward the Willochra Plain, probably the edge of the Willochra Plain would be a fair way to describe it. Just outside the electorate of Stuart, but only by a few kilometres, the town of Quorn also has underground water. To use these three examples, at Wilmington we are very lucky, as we have very good quality water. Those other two towns, Melrose and Quorn, do not have good quality water, so the people in those towns overwhelmingly use rainwater for human consumption and use the poor quality water supplied to them by SA Water for other purposes.

How does this link into the bill that we are talking about? Very recently, there was a proposal, which unfortunately for those three communities did not get up (certainly not this time, but it might in the future), whereby ESCOSA considered to build a pipeline extension from the River Murray pipeline that would run through and to those three towns so that they would get River Murray water instead of the current sources.

Wilmington would have liked it, but it was not that big a deal because the water there is okay, but it would have been a massive improvement for Quorn and Melrose. Hopefully, at another time the Essential Services Commission will determine that spending money on that and sharing the cost across all water users is a worthwhile venture, but it can only happen if there is enough water in the Murray. You cannot extend the pipeline network further into new places in the state so that those communities get the benefit of higher quality water if you do not have water in the river, and we will not have it in the river if the water is stolen out of the river. So it is very important that we consider all the different types of impacts of this legislation.

This fits into the landscape act, as I mentioned before. The Minister for Environment and Water has done a fantastic job, as have all the people working in this space throughout the state, to transition from what were natural resources management boards to what are now landscape boards. There were some boundary changes and some personnel changes. Some of the focus and priorities of the previous NRM boards remained, and some very positive new focus areas and priorities are coming into the work of the landscape boards.

I can tell you that, in the electorate of Stuart, that change has been received very warmly. People in the electorate of Stuart are very pleased, on balance—never is everybody completely satisfied—to have the more practical and broader approach that comes with the landscape act.

People are pleased to have the opportunity to apply for small local community grants to do important environmental work in their areas.

Things that previously may not have made it to the top of the priority list, quite understandably for an NRM board, now can actually receive some direct funding from government through the landscape act and its associated systems because there is money for small groups to do their projects in their areas, the types of things that previous NRM boards would very much have liked to do but just did not quite have the capacity to do.

I would also like to acknowledge not just people working in the Murray-Darling Basin part of our state but people all around our state working professionally and—most importantly with regard to this acknowledgment—on a volunteer basis on environmental matters. The electorate of Stuart runs in the southern end from Truro and Kapunda to the northern end from Oodnadatta to Innamincka, and along the Northern Territory border, the Queensland border and the New South Wales border to above the electorate of Chaffey, and in every single corner of our electorate there are volunteers working with previous NRM boards and now landscape boards to try to do positive environmental work and make improvements in their home patches.

From essentially the top of the Adelaide Hills—the bottom of my electorate, that sliver of the Barossa Valley—all the way up to the South Australian Arid Lands boundary in the Far North of the state, it is tremendous to see people having the opportunity and the desire and willingness to put their effort, skill, capacity, time and own machinery to use for these types of things. There is an enormous number of engagements with Aboriginal communities as well, which is very important.

In the brief amount of time I have left I would like to talk about one of the great challenges with hands-on environmental work, which is the necessary distinction, in people's minds, between improving the environment and protecting the environment. At one level they are the same thing, but sometimes you do have to make a distinction. With regard to removing feral animals and weeds, for example, you are trying to recover from backward steps that have been imposed upon the environment.

In other ways, with regard to the important work in the Murray around Chowilla, for example, it is a combination of both: trying to do some recovery work and also actually trying to, in some cases, put in overflow channels that provide better natural watering of backwaters than has ever been available before outside of flood areas. It is very important work.

I commend this short but important bill. I believe that stealing water from the Murray or from anywhere else is a scourge. People need to have water, and anybody who steals it is taking it away from other people who need it and deserve it and/or taking it away from very important environmental purposes for which this water must also always be made available.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:34): I rise to indicate that I am the lead speaker on this side of the chamber and also that we support this piece of legislation. It is in itself a very brief piece of legislation and does a sensible job of creating the capacity to make regulations in order to put beyond doubt the capacity of the government to regulate the measuring of water and therefore avoid the chance of water theft.

I would like, though, in the time that I have to put some context to why this is such an important albeit brief piece of legislation. The context is of course much greater than simply the question of whether some irrigators have been seeking to take advantage of the annual measurement of water rather than the quarterly measurement. The context is that we have a Murray-Darling Basin that is in a state of continual crisis, not always in the supply water, depending on how the rains are going, but always in the state of governance of the Murray and of the Murray-Darling Basin.

We have the Murray-Darling Basin Plan that we on this side of parliament support, as I know the government do on their side. It is a plan that is at best marginally adequate in the amount of water that has been allocated for the environment and unfortunately is not being honoured in its fullness in the delivery of the water that has been allocated. For that reason, we in South Australia can afford to lose not one drop of the water that comes over the border through any means of over or misallocation, as is dealt with in this piece of legislation.

When the Minister for Energy and Mining was talking about the risk of theft and the importance of protecting our water supplies, my mind kept turning to the way in which the other states

are routinely getting away with exactly that behaviour. While this piece of legislation unfortunately will not be able to fully address that, that is nonetheless the context for the importance of this legislation.

We have other states that have conspired to ensure that the allocation that was agreed to in the plan was, as I say, barely adequate, and that is being generous. More recently, they have conspired to ensure that the 450-gigalitre allocation, which had been established for the health of the South Australian end of the Murray, would effectively not be delivered in full and on time. That 450 gigalitres is due in just a few short years, in 2024, and almost certainly will not be delivered.

We have a government in Canberra that has also gone out of its way to put barriers in the way of South Australia achieving a healthy River Murray and of the Murray-Darling Basin being a healthy system. Those barriers have taken the form of Barnaby Joyce when he was water minister—it is hard to credit that he was ever given such an important role—putting a cap on the amount of water that could be voluntarily bought back in order to have that allocation go to the environment. He put on a cap of 1,500 gigalitres.

Then subsequently this current minister said that, even though there is a couple of hundred gigalitres left within that cap, there will not be any of that happening. The current minister has looked at the 450 gigalitres and said, 'Well, none of that is going to happen through on-farm water efficiency measures.' That occurred just a couple of weeks ago. We have other states that have loud and long said that there needed to be more complex criteria for the approval of any of those water efficiency measures.

Unfortunately and regrettably, our state complied with their wishes and has allowed dozens of criteria to be put in place that make it very difficult for any such efficiency projects to be approved. Now, with any of those that are being contemplated, on farm simply will not be approved while the federal minister is in situ and I suspect while that federal government is in place. We are in pretty desperate straits in South Australia. We would be in desperate straits without climate change. We are still worse with the drying that we are seeing, particularly at the lower end of the Murray-Darling Basin system.

Why does this matter? Does it matter because people here are obsessed with this particular wetland or that particular species? No, although some of us are, some of us do care about those things. But what we all care about is that we continue to have a Murray-Darling Basin that functions, a Murray-Darling Basin where there is water that can be used for human purposes. To do that, you need to have a healthy environment. We can no longer regard this as a choice between those; there must be both.

We will only have sustainable irrigation and sustainable farming through the Murray-Darling Basin if we get it right for the environment. I do not know that that has quite dawned on New South Wales and Victoria. I am certain that it has not dawned on the National Party people who have paraded through the role of being minister federally, but it is very clear to everyone in South Australia that that is the case.

That is why we do have the most efficient irrigators in the country in South Australia. I congratulate them on having taken a lead early. That has happened under both sides of parliament in this chamber in this state. What has not happened, though, is that the National Party interstate has cared one jot for the health of the River Murray in South Australia. They think that is negotiable. They think it does not matter that we have to dredge the Murray open every single day, every single year. They think it does not matter that the Lower Lakes were nearly a complete catastrophe a few years ago.

They do not think it matters because they do not understand that that is how it will affect them, that the river will die from the bottom up, that the salt will go up, that the silt will go up. They think that that is all something that happens elsewhere and will happen at some other time. That time is coming closer and closer, and the longer we dillydally and wait for something good to happen because we are all friends around the table the nearer comes the point of catastrophe and the point of no return. Every South Australian has an interest in this—every South Australian. I cannot imagine a healthy and prosperous South Australia with a dead and dying Murray-Darling Basin.

I endorse and support this piece of legislation. If only we were doing more on every single front to preserve the Murray-Darling Basin system and to prioritise the health of our river in South Australia. If only we were putting every effort at every moment into that. Every time I see it from that side, I will support it, and that is why I support this piece of legislation.

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:42): I rise to support the Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Bill. This legislative amendment is consistent with South Australia's longstanding commitment to water compliance and response to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission. Quarterly compliance was introduced in the South Australian River Murray Prescribed Watercourse in 2019-20 to manage the risk that some water users were taking advantage of the previous annual compliance regime and illegally taking water throughout the year at the expense of both the environment and other law-abiding users.

South Australian water users are renowned for doing the right thing and remaining within their available water allocation at all times, as required by the Landscape South Australia Act and former NRM Act. The bill is proposing a minor, yet essential, amendment that will ensure we maintain our strong reputation as a leader in water compliance across the Murray-Darling Basin and at the broader national level.

The bill proposes to retrospectively apply to the start of the current water year (2020-21) to remove any doubt and explicitly express the terms of the compliance period arrangements and the SA River Murray and maintain our reputation as a leader in water compliance in the basin. It allows compliance action to be undertaken for unauthorised or unlawful water use in each of the states' prescribed water for a period that best suits that resource, rather than the period gazetted in the respective water levy notice.

It also removes a potential legal risk of successful appeal against the imposition of quarterly penalties for water theft in the SA River Murray that has lain undetected in both the NRM and the Landscape SA acts. This proposed amendment reflects the intention of the current Landscape South Australia Act and former NRM Act by enabling compliance action to be undertaken within a time frame that best suits the respective water resource without doubt.

In the SA River Murray, this amendment will help ensure that water can be reliably delivered to all water users, including the environment, when it is required. It will ensure that we are best able to deliver environmental water as intended, manage delivery constraints, inhibit market manipulation and respond to drought conditions. South Australia is considered a leader in water management and, as part of this, a leader in water compliance and enforcement.

We must have the ability to establish and implement appropriate compliance and enforcement arrangements that best suit the state's many different water sources. For example, these resources range from the ancient deep groundwater in the massive Great Artesian Basin and annually flowing streams in the western Mount Lofty Ranges to managed aquifer recharge schemes in the Adelaide Plains. It is simply not logical to think that the best outcomes will be obtained by applying exactly the same compliance and enforcement approach in each area.

While the thrust of the changes is about water, I wish to speak a little more broadly about our government's commitment to natural resources. A key election commitment by the Marshall Liberal government was the repeal of the Natural Resources Management Act and the introduction into parliament of the new Landscape South Australia Bill. The election commitment was based on a need for stronger local representation and a back-to-basics approach, particularly in our regional communities.

The Minister for Environment and Water, the Hon. David Speirs MP, introduced the new Landscape South Australia Bill into state parliament on 20 March 2019. Broadly, the bill established a new framework for how we manage the state's natural resources based on the following important principles:

- decentralised decision-making;
- a simple and accessible system;
- a whole-of-landscape approach;

- keeping community and landowners at the centre of how we manage our landscapes; and
- a back-to-basics approach.

During 2018, extensive public consultation was undertaken with 26 community forums and 23 stakeholder sessions held across the state, attended by more than 1,000 people. More than 250 written submissions were received from the community and stakeholders. Much of this feedback was consistent with our election commitment; however, some elements around boundaries and how the boards interact with communities have been shaped by the community consultation.

Our landscapes underpin our communities, our economy, our wellbeing and our way of life, which is why we all have a responsibility to protect and manage our landscapes for the enjoyment of all South Australians. From 1 July 2020, the Landscape South Australia Act 2019 replaced the Natural Resources Management Act 2004 as the key framework for managing the state's land, water, pest plants and animals, and biodiversity across the state.

The department works in partnership with the eight new regional Landscape South Australia boards, responsible for administering the new act. A new entity, Green Adelaide, will also bring an integrated approach to managing Adelaide's urban environment. A key priority of landscape boards is to support local communities and landowners to be directly responsible for sustainably managing their region's landscapes with an emphasis on land and water management, pest animal and plant control, and biodiversity.

This includes providing greater funding and partnership opportunities with local community organisations to deliver on-ground works on projects. I commend the minister for his work to respond to South Australians' feedback about a more effective way to manage our landscapes. In my electorate, I received a great deal of feedback about unsatisfactory interference by the natural resources board and officers. I am glad our government has listened closely to this feedback and is now getting out of the way of landowners. Similarly, the future of our state in 2036 and beyond depends upon the ongoing health and viability of our vital water resources. The River Murray is the lifeblood of our regions and our cities, and we must always remain committed to maintaining our water security.

Finally, I wish to acknowledge our environmental volunteers in King, our Friends of Cobbler Creek and Friends of Para Wirra. Our volunteers keep our natural areas balanced and sustainable. The way to help our whole community value our local landscape is through grassroots involvement. I thank the Friends of Cobbler Creek, and in particular Stephen Rogers, for organising our recent Keep Australia Clean Day, and I thank every community member who came out and got involved.

In addition, I thank every community member who cleans up after themselves and who is not a tosser. Stephen Rogers has coined the local activity in King as Don't be a Tossler. The local Golden Grove High School students have created posters to support this campaign, and I proudly display these in my Golden Grove office.

This year, while cleaning up along the Grove Way, I was appalled at the number of discarded cigarette butts on the roadway. We must do better. The best results for our local area and across the state will only be achieved if everyone works together to protect our precious natural resources. I commend the bill to the house, and I thank the minister for his ongoing efforts to protect our natural resources for all South Australians.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:51): I rise to support this amended landscape bill because we know here in South Australia how important water resources—and in particular the southern system of the Murray—are to South Australians not only for a healthy environment but also because it is a huge economic driver.

The River Murray and its tributaries make up what is one of the world's great river estuaries, and it is supported with a significant number of storages that contribute to the flows into the system. About 10,000 gegalitres of water is captured, stored and put into the river systems to make sure that we have a healthy environment.

In a past life, I was a very strong advocate not only for the River Murray but also for making sure that the River Murray was tagged a healthy, working river. To have that tag of a healthy, working river we also must have custodians of the river, and in some way, shape or form governments continue to be part of that shaping.

More importantly, my involvement in river management went way back into the days when it used to be the Murray-Darling Basin Commission, which was chaired by Wendy Craik. She was a very strong advocate for better management of the river. David Dreverman was also one of the managers back then. However, we soon realised that the river was becoming very quickly overallocated, and back in 1969 the then Premier—I think it was Steele Hall—eventually struck a deal with the other basin states to give South Australia a secure supply of water so that we could then work our way forward with the building of the Dartmouth Dam.

We know that the Hume Dam, which was built in 1936, has some 3,800 gigalitres of storage, and, of course, we also rely on Lake Victoria. Many South Australians call it theirs and New South Welshmen call it theirs. It is in New South Wales, but it is a critical part of water infrastructure and also contributes to making up those pods of storage. We know that there are other tributaries and other water storages, but they are usually part of an unregulated river system, and so we cannot rely on those pods or dams to be part of what is a reliable supply of water into South Australia.

Listening to the deputy leader, it never ceases to amaze me that someone who appears to be so passionate about the River Murray continues to get her facts wrong. Salinity does not start at the mouth up: it starts from the top down, and it is a matter of how much flush you give it. It is the same with sediment: sediment comes from the top down and exits the river system. Again, we have to make sure that with a healthy working river we do have better managed systems.

As I said, back in 1969 the agreement the South Australian government had with its eastern counterparts was that we would get a reliable 1,850 gigalitres of water into our system and we would make sure that 1,850 was upheld at every given season. Back in 2006, we saw the first signs of cracks in a reliable supply of water. We had the Millennium Drought and we had overextraction of the system, and for far too long we had seen governments acting with their own interest without any other interests for the outside world of what they considered was the epicentre, which was their state.

In South Australia, we have always been the poor cousin at the end of the river, and it has been my concern over many years, since coming out of another life to live in the Riverland to become a food producer. As to people's connotation of irrigators, yes, we do have irrigators but, more importantly, they are food producers. They are the eyes and ears of our river system. Not only do they extract water for economic benefit but they are also the ones out there doing bird counts, they are the ones out there doing fish monitoring, they are the ones out there tagging trees and making sure that we do have a tell-tale so that when there are salinity slugs, when there are blackwater events, when there are environmental issues, we actually understand and better manage them.

We have recently seen blackwater events in the Darling, where we saw large fish kills and deoxygenated water come into our system. There was merry hell to pay, with people standing up and saying, 'This is outrageous.' Here in South Australia we, too, have had blackwater events, yet the Eastern States turned a blind eye. We saw large fish kills and we saw breeding native fish floating in our waterways in those backwaters in some of those environmental assets. We were outraged, but we managed it. We better managed it by giving small pulses of water down the river to exit the blackwater that was having no real effect when it came to the benefit of the environment.

The deoxygenated water was also very poor quality water for irrigating because it had little oxygen in it to give our trees and our food-producing plants the life they needed. It had an impact on environmental trees and it had an impact on our native fish. It showed that when we have a secure supply of water, as we do into South Australia, we can better manage our environment, and we always lead by example. I know that myself, coming in to be a food producer back in the eighties.

In South Australia, we had to constrain and better use our water. The Deputy Leader of the Opposition's poor explanation of why we are so good and why we are so efficient was that we had a cap. We had 1,850 gigalitres of water capped coming into South Australia, and so every litre had to be monitored and used wisely—more wisely than anywhere else in the country—so that we could actually maximise the return on every litre of water used for a consumptive pool into an environment.

That economy soon became more sustained. We will not go on to on-farm; we will use the delivery system. We sealed it all, we put it into pipes and we put it into pumps, rather than opening up sluice gates or using Dethridge wheels, which are highly unregulated, unreliable and not very accurate. We put water into pipes, we sealed our systems, we then pumped it into farm and then we used highly regulated emitters. Originally, we started with overhead sprinklers—large, full surface spray sprinklers—then we used microjets, microsprinklers. This was a transition away from being very inefficient and slowly making our way to being very efficient.

Nowadays, we are using drip irrigation. Some of us are using subsurface drip irrigation, so water never sees the light of day. Water is emitted to the tree root system under the ground so we have minimal loss and maximum efficiencies. That is why South Australia is the leader—because back at the time of that agreement we were forced to use water more efficiently than any other state.

Sadly, New South Wales and Victoria (Queensland to a lesser degree) have a very low allocation of high-security water. In South Australia, it is all high-security water. When any of us drive across the Hay Plain we are aghast at the number of open-channel, open-delivery systems they have over there. Then, once the water is delivered to the farm gate, they use siphon hoses to siphon water out to plants. Again, it is all open water. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

TERMINATION OF PREGNANCY BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

MOTOR VEHICLES (MOTOR BIKE DRIVER LICENSING) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY LAWS) (STAND-ALONE POWER SYSTEMS) BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

Petitions

BRIGHTON ROAD

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens): Presented a petition signed by 110 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to provide the community with a comprehensive business case for proposed roadworks on Brighton Road.

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—

Auditor-General Report—Update to the Annual Report for the year ended 30 June 2020—
Report 6 of 2021 [Ordered to be published]

By the Premier (Hon. S.S. Marshall)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—

First Home and Housing Construction Grants—Confidentiality

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

Government Response to Standing Committees—Statutory Authorities Review Committee:
Inquiry into the State Courts Administration Council—Sheriff's Office Government
Response 2021

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Cost of Living Concessions—Eligibility

Rules made under the following Acts—
Magistrates Court—Criminal—Amendment No. 90

By the Minister for Planning and Local Government (Hon. V.A. Chapman)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Development—Horticultural Netting
Planning, Development and Infrastructure—
Fees, Charges and Contributions—Home Builder
Fees, Charges and Contributions—Phase 3 of Code
General—Home Builder
General—Horticultural Netting
Regulations—General—Phase 3 of Code
Swimming Pool Safety—Fencing

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

Training Advocate, South Australian—Annual Report 2020

By the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport (Hon. C.L. Wingard)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Road Traffic—Miscellaneous—Roadworks

Question Time

MARCH 4 JUSTICE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier stand by his remarks about not moving cabinet yesterday so that members could attend the March 4 Justice? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Dr CLOSE: The Premier was asked on 891 radio this morning whether he believed the march was so powerful and important that he should have moved cabinet, and he replied:

There were certainly Liberal MPs marching, people that weren't in cabinet, but we don't move cabinet.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): Yes, I stand by my remarks yesterday. I think yesterday's rally was an important rally. It was a powerful rally with a powerful message to the people of South Australia. There were Liberal MPs who did attend that rally. I know that after cabinet concluded the Deputy Premier attended part of that rally, so, yes, I stand by my comments yesterday.

MARCH 4 JUSTICE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): Why didn't the Premier attend after cabinet?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:09): I had a full program for the rest of the day.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): My question is again to the Premier. Has the government taken any action to pursue the reports of sexual assault and indecent exposure contained in the acting equal opportunity commissioner's Review of Harassment in the South Australian Parliament Workplace?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:10): Indeed—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —there are a number of aspects that have been already taken up. Firstly, this government acted quickly to ensure there were funding and resources to underwrite and support this parliament undertaking the review. I requested the equal opportunity commissioner—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —to undertake that work as expeditiously as possible. In fact, she worked over the Christmas period and the January period so that when we got back to parliament we would have something to consider. In February, that was presented, as she indicated she would do. It was very timely tabled in the parliament by you, sir, and the President, and we thank you for attending to that.

I would hope everyone in this parliament has since read it, but, as I pointed out this morning, there are a number of things we have already done. The Premier signed up all the ministers of this government to include a specific prohibition in relation to such conduct as sexual harassment and discrimination in their workplace. That has been made very clear. Cabinet has been informed. It is in place.

Secondly, the Treasurer, as I pointed out this morning, is already undertaking the work necessary to support recommendation 1 and a number of following recommendations that might flow from work that is recommended for a people and culture unit and a human resources unit to be either established here in the parliament or accessible to those who work in the parliament. That work is already underway.

What has become clear is that the different contractual arrangements and existing protections for a number of those who work within our parliament need to be provided so the committee that we recommended and passed in this parliament this morning will have sufficient information for them to be able to apply that—identify what is required, where it should occur and to whom it should be available because already there have been identified areas of employment that need to be separately considered. Some already have laws that apply and services provisioned for them.

I don't know specifically what position the Clerk of this house or the Clerk of the Legislative Council has in relation to their employment by the parliament, but that is something clearly the parliament committee will need to have, and this government is already acting to collate that information so we can support that inquiry.

Thirdly, as Attorney-General, there are two recommendations on amendment to the Equal Opportunity Act. If I were to summarise them, one is to streamline the process of how a complaint is received by someone in the parliamentary workplace—if I generalise in that regard—as to how it be applied, that is, whether it be referred to the Speaker or President, whether it singularly identify the question of parliamentary privilege or whether there should be an ongoing role of the Speaker or President.

That is one area of consideration that needs to be looked at and that is a matter I already have people working on. The second relates to the question of the positive duty of an employer within this workplace to apply a protection for those as part of a safe workplace. It's a work health and safety

matter. There is reference to the Victorian system, which applies to all workplaces in Victoria, in the report. I urge members to have a look at it because clearly that is a recommendation of a model that goes across workplaces and not just this parliament. I'm happy to keep doing that list in the next question.

REVIEW OF HARASSMENT IN THE SOUTH AUSTRALIAN PARLIAMENT WORKPLACE

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is again to the Premier. What action has the Premier taken to seek to assure himself that the incident of sexual assault, identified in the report of the acting equal opportunity commissioner, did not involve a Liberal MP?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (14:14): Again, can I perhaps reiterate what has already been placed on the record for the benefit of the member. The survey that was undertaken by the acting equal opportunity commissioner was done on the basis that information provided and subsequent interviews for those who wished to have an interview and put an oral submission was done on a strictly confidential basis, and members will see that at no time during the report has there been a disclosure of the names of persons who completed the survey and/or provided information to her inquiry.

For obvious reasons, that needs to be done to ensure that people come forward and, secondly, that the envelope of confidentiality, which they have been told they are getting, will be respected. For anyone to attempt to go through and, for example, inquire as to anyone here in the workplace who has given a submission and/or provided an interview with the commissioner I would see as being in total conflict of that honour that was given to the party.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I just make it very clear that it would be inappropriate for any member of this parliament, I suggest, to start making inquiry of either each other or other members of staff or former members of staff who may have given evidence or information to the commissioner.

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I just make that absolutely clear. This promise—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Leel!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: —was given by the commissioner. She undertook her work within those terms and people came forward and provided clearly very difficult and sensitive information. I would hope that every person in this parliament will respect that.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Elder, I call to order the member for Lee, I call to order the member for Schubert, I call to order the member for West Torrens and I call to order the leader.

INFRASTRUCTURE PROJECTS

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister advise the house on how the government is building what matters through a strong pipeline of infrastructure projects that will continue to create thousands of jobs—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Elder might just resume her seat for a moment. The member who is asking the question is entitled to be heard in silence. Interjections from my left will cease. The member for Elder has the call and perhaps, if only for my benefit, the member for Elder might repeat the question.

Mrs POWER: My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister advise the house on how the government is building what matters through a strong pipeline of infrastructure projects that will continue to create thousands of jobs, in particular with regard to the six new initiatives on the Infrastructure Australia priority list?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat for a moment. The member for West Torrens rises on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir: the question was full of debate and asserting facts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! There is no point of order. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:18): The member for West Torrens stalls question time like he stalled projects when they were in government. We are getting on with delivering these projects in an important infrastructure pipeline. The member for Elder is so keen because there are a lot of these projects happening in her electorate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: In fact, I was out at South Road this morning with a number of very interested local people and I tell you what: the honks and the waves we got for the project we are doing on South Road, they were over the moon.

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The pipeline—let me talk about it: \$16.7 billion of infrastructure being built here in South Australia. The member for West Torrens just can't handle it: he's got to leave, Mr Speaker. I tell you what, we have a bigger infrastructure spend—

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will cease interjecting. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: It is, of course, unparliamentary, to refer to where a member is located at any time either during the proceedings of the house or anywhere else in the building, and I ask that you correct the minister and call him to order.

The SPEAKER: I uphold the point of order. Reflections of all kinds are inappropriate, as is the use of unbecoming language. I draw members' attention to standing orders 125 and 127 in that respect. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Again, the member for Lee doesn't like it either. But I will talk more about our \$16.7 billion infrastructure spend and what we are doing here in South Australia: delivering better services, more jobs and, of course, lowering the cost for people in South Australia. We are building what matters and that is what is important. Of course, it is important to have that pipeline as well, the pipeline of works, and that is what we've done, putting these new projects on the Infrastructure Australia list. We've got these initiatives there and we will be building against those as we go forward.

Six new initiatives—what are they? Upgrading our freight network, of course, which is very important. This will increase productivity in the state as well. Clearing the road maintenance backlog—it was on a trajectory that was going through the roof under those opposite. We are also fixing the outer ring route as well, a project that has been left to languish as well. Level crossings—

we've got more to do in this state. The opposition, when they were in government, did no work on the planning for level crossings and we are getting on with that work. It's tough work, but they didn't like tough work—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —on that side. They didn't want to go near it. We are getting on with the job. Of course, two water projects as well, pipelines up to the Barossa Valley and also to the north of the state.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The member for Lee barks and chips away on that side of the house. When he was a minister, he did nothing. He left a very bare cupboard with no projects. I stress that figure again: \$16.7 billion. Those opposite have never seen such a big infrastructure spend and we are delivering.

Ms Cook interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, when we came to government, we went to the cupboard to see what planning works had been done, what projects were ready to go and there were none—nothing. The planning cupboard was bare. But we have got these new initiatives, six of them, never more onto the Infrastructure Australia priority list, and we will be—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —doing the planning works so that we are ready to go. We've got \$10 million already being spent on planning works as well, on 30 keys corridors and projects across the state. We are doing that work because we know when they did projects and no planning work, guess what? It was a disaster, and the project list that they didn't do that work on is far too long. We look at the Gawler electrification, 5 per cent designed and they give out the contract. Well, that creates all sorts of problems.

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

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Mawson!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: But don't worry, we are getting on with those projects and we are finishing them. We are finishing them.

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

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We are finishing them. All you need to do—

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

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: All you need to do is go for a drive around town and have a look at some of the work that is being undertaken.

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat for a moment. The member for Mawson will cease interjecting. The member for Mawson is called to order and warned. I remind all members that the minister, in answering the question, is entitled to be heard in silence. The minister has the call.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will talk about these works as well and I want to talk about especially some of the works we are doing in the regions, improving roads out there, because we know what those opposite did when it came to regional roads. Their idea of a solution to crumbling roads and roads they didn't invest in was to just lower the speed limit. That was the way they fixed

all their problems. They did not invest in these projects and we are doing that. Of course, in the last budget, partnered with the federal government, \$210 million is going into widening shoulders and making our roads safer.

We know that's a very important part of what we need to do here: make our regions more accessible and more amenable to people who want to travel in our regions but make them safer as well for the people who live there and the people who are travelling there. So we are getting on with this work and we are delivering what South Australia needs. We know how important this work is. As I said, that pipeline of \$16.7 billion is bigger than those on the opposite side of the chamber ever delivered for South Australia. We are delivering, we are getting on with the work, we are delivering jobs for the people of South Australia and building the infrastructure that matters.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for Kaurana, I warn the member for Schubert, I call to order the member for Chaffey, I call to order the member for Cheltenham, I call to order the member for Hurtle Vale, I warn the member for Playford, I call to order the member for Reynell and I warn the member for Lee.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurana) (14:24): My question is to the Premier. How many vaccinations does the Premier aim that the state government will administer by the end of April?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:24): I thank the member for his question. I don't have that figure with me at the moment. What I know is that we began the rollout of phase 1a of the vaccination program on 22 February. That was the Pfizer vaccine. That has gone extraordinarily well.

There are some very specific complexities around this vaccine due to the cold chain logistical requirements of this. I would like to say that we have done extraordinarily well with putting our own equipment into place in major hospitals across South Australia and managing the rollout of the upgrade of staffing capability to make sure that vaccine is administered effectively.

I also can inform the house that, of course, we were the first state in Australia to roll out the AstraZeneca vaccine, and that was done up at the Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital. I think we feel very proud that South Australia led the nation with regard to this. The AstraZeneca vaccine, of course, is a vaccine which doesn't require the same level of cold chain management; in fact, it's very similar to other vaccines which we use in South Australia. It's particularly important for regional and remote Australia and it's very important for our state, so I am very pleased that that's occurring.

Our Chief Public Health Officer has made it clear from day one that we want to do this right, not rush. Some people are obsessed with the run rate. Overall, we want to provide a safe, effective vaccine, a free vaccine, for all South Australians eligible for this vaccine. That's precisely what's going to occur.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:25): As a supplementary question for the Premier, given the Premier is not aware of the targets that have been set for April in terms of the numbers, can he confirm: is there a target for the month of April?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:26): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his interest in this area. There is some complexity with setting targets.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: There is some complexity with regard to those targets because, as the Leader of the Opposition would appreciate if he has been following this, there is a combination between state government vaccinations and federal government vaccinations.

The federal government is responsible in the first phase (phase 1a) for looking at all of the aged-care facilities and also the disability residential facilities in South Australia. With regard to phase 1b, which will be starting imminently, they are responsible for the management of the vaccine rollout through the GPs. So we are dealing with a combined effort.

The Prime Minister is committed to, and the national cabinet is committed to, regular reporting. I think the first report card went up on Sunday, only a few days ago, and I encourage the Leader of the Opposition to take a look at that. I think that South Australia has had a prudent and careful and effective start to the vaccine rollout across Australia. I expect that to continue into the future.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:27): Does the Premier have a target for the month of April for the component for which he is responsible as leader of the state government?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:27): Again, I just refer the leader to the published information on this which is changing. You can't set a target in isolation of understanding that we have now two vaccines—originally, we were only thinking of one vaccine during this period of time—and, secondly, the rollout of the additional hubs right across the state.

Much of this, of course, will be focused on a joint effort between the state government and the commonwealth where we go with the GPs and, ultimately, potentially where we go with pharmacies right across South Australia. What we are committed to doing is making sure that we are standing up the clinics in the right places so that we can maximise the number of people who have access to the vaccines when they become eligible for that vaccine.

We want an orderly rollout of the vaccine. We want an effective rollout of the vaccine. This is safe. It's effective. It's free. It's not mandatory, but we are very actively messaging to the people of South Australia that they should do this to protect themselves, to protect their families, to protect their workforces or their workplaces, and to protect the overall South Australian community.

We have shown, I think, since day one that by working together we have taken the coronavirus on and we have been able to do extraordinarily well, compared to just about any other place in the world. It has been a real joy walking around the streets of Adelaide and, more broadly, across South Australia in recent weeks when we have been celebrating the Fringe, the Festival, WOMAD and Writers' Week in metropolitan Adelaide and across country SA.

I think we would be one of the few places in the world with this quality of life and, if you like, this low level of restrictions. But it hasn't happened by accident. It has happened by every single South Australian with small—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It has happened through every individual making small sacrifices. Collectively, they are keeping South Australia protected. I thank the people of South Australia for the efforts they have put in place. We can't become complacent. There is still a mighty job in front of us. We've got to have an effective vaccine rollout. This will be what makes sure we get through this year in a strong position.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:29): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier have any targets for vaccination rollout for the second quarter of this calendar year or for the remainder of this financial year for the vaccines that the Premier and his government are responsible for administering—any targets at all?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:30): I have tried to provide a pretty comprehensive update—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —on what we are doing. Maybe some people on that side of the house are obsessed with a number.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Ramsay!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That can't be given because, for the reasons that I have outlined in the last question, and indeed the question before that, it really is dependent—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —upon how many of the clinics can get stood up. What we are doing at the moment, and we have been working on this since last year, is making sure that we have adequately trained, skilled personnel to administer these vaccines within our own hospitals and hubs that emanate from those hospitals and also working with the commonwealth government to make sure that vaccinations for people living in aged-care facilities, disability facilities and then the broader population occur in a risk-oriented, risk-managed way.

I welcome the Leader of the Opposition's interest in the vaccine program. It is, as Professor Paul Kelly and Professor Brendan Murphy say, the largest peacetime logistical exercise in the history of Australia. What we know is that South Australia has led the way in terms of our response to the coronavirus, first of all with our sky-high testing rates here in South Australia through the excellent work of SA Pathology.

I would now like to congratulate the people of South Australia on the excellent way they have adopted the QR check-in. On last viewing, I think we had something like 1.3 million unique users of the QR code check-in app in South Australia. These are extraordinary. This is an extraordinary penetration.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's the interest and the cooperation that we have with the people in South Australia that has kept our state protected. It has kept our state healthy and it has kept our economy strong.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the leader, I call to order the member for Wright, I warn for a second time the member for Playford, I call to order the member for Ramsay and I warn for a second time the member for Lee.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): My question is to the Premier. If the Premier is unable to provide a target for the number of vaccinations administered in the first half of this year, how can he definitively commit that all vaccinations will be complete by the end of the year?

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:32): The Leader of the Opposition has asked a question—

The SPEAKER: Is it a point of order?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: No.

The SPEAKER: The Minister for Education has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The Leader of the Opposition has asked a question—

An honourable member: Why don't you give us a number?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sorry, what was that?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will not respond to an interjection. The minister has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I am trying to answer a question from the Leader of the Opposition. I had thought this was a topic that would be of interest to the people of South Australia. It's clearly not of interest to those opposite, who continue to interject—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Playing politics with a pandemic is an appalling thing to do for anybody.

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will resume his seat. Members on my right will cease interjecting. The member for West Torrens on a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98, sir: that was debate.

The Hon. J.A.W. Gardner: Only if it applied to you.

The SPEAKER: Order! The Minister for Education is called to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I ask you to get the minister to answer the substance of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left! I am unable to hear the member for West Torrens. The member for West Torrens might repeat his point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the minister claimed that the opposition are playing politics with the pandemic. Sir, that is debate, so I ask that you get the minister to answer the substance of the question, if he knows what the answer is.

The SPEAKER: I have the point of order. I am listening to the minister. The minister will remain germane to the question in his answer. The minister has the call.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: I encourage any member of the parliament who shares the strong interest in the vaccination rollout that is held by every member of the government and, I believe, the overwhelming majority of people in South Australia to pay close attention to the advice from our Chief Public Health Officer from SA Health and to the answers given to the house just moments ago by the Leader of the Government, the Premier of South Australia. Having asked—

Mr Szakacs interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Cheltenham!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Having had the Leader of the Opposition put forward a question on behalf of the opposition, I encourage those opposite as a whole to at least reflect on what the answer might be.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

Ms Hildyard: Tell us the target.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Are you interested in the answer?

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister will not respond to interjections. Interjections from my left will cease. All members are entitled to hear the minister's answer. The minister has the answer.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: So, should a member want to know what we have been doing and what we have done, I will happily answer that. The member for Croydon, the Leader of the Opposition, asked a question based on the presumption of his anticipation of the Premier's answer, saying that if the Premier is unwilling to put a target on things, then how can we be confident that we will get there by the end of the year. I believe that's a fair characterisation of the question.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: And the answer is that we are working hand in glove with the commonwealth and all other states through the national cabinet, working hand in glove with SA Health and our public health officers, working with the federal health teams, of course, to get that vaccine rollout across. Of course, we at the moment have the Pfizer vaccine, which we are anticipating, as the Premier said, to be phase 1a. We actually also now have the AstraZeneca vaccine, which has been a new piece of information for that first phase that wasn't originally anticipated. The rollout has therefore adapted and changed. That was—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: The AstraZeneca vaccine was not going to be part of phase 1a—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens is warned.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —until it was possible to do so. And indeed there are other vaccines that are still awaiting TGA approval. We will work with the commonwealth government, we will work with other states, to have a fair rollout that will focus on the health needs of the people of Australia, the people of South Australia, starting with those who need it most and most urgently, and then it will roll out to the whole of the population.

We are ramping up the delivery chains. The commonwealth is responsible for certain areas, the state is responsible for certain areas. The next phase will also include GPs, and the commonwealth and the state will continue to work together to ensure that we meet the goal of as many Australians as are willing to be vaccinated being vaccinated as soon as possible.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Before I call the member for King, I warn for a second time the member for Schubert and I warn the member for Cheltenham.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:37): My question is to the Minister for Education, representing the Minister for Health and Wellbeing. Will the minister update the house on vaccinations in South Australia?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:38): I am pleased to have this question—

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —from the member for King, which is the first question today about what we have done, about finding out how the South Australian government is meeting our responsibilities under the vaccination rollout and what—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: —have been the achievements of our medical professionals here in South Australia so far. It's quite a different question from those asked earlier. As the Premier identified, South Australia has led the world in relation to responding to the pandemic, record testing, world first, and saw early world achievements and things like drive-through clinics. In relation to meeting the responsibilities the South Australian government has under the vaccination rollout thus far, we are also very proud of the work undertaken by our health professionals.

I commend the Minister for Health and all who are involved in the operation for their terrific work. We are bringing the same careful approach to our vaccination rollout and we are being informed by public health advice. We will at every stage take the advice of our public health professionals, and we will work with the commonwealth government and SA Health and the public health officers. We know that the vaccine is safe. We know it's effective. We know it is free for all South Australians and we confirm for those who are interested that it is not mandatory.

In line with the commonwealth government's phase 1a, SA Health clinics to this point have administered more than 8,500 doses of the vaccine to medi-hotel and Airport staff and frontline healthcare workers, including workers at testing clinics and emergency departments. As outlined by the Premier earlier, the AstraZeneca vaccine was delivered in South Australia first out of all states in Australia—that done at Murray Bridge.

This was enabled to be undertaken as a result of our rapid deployment. Within 36 hours of receiving the vaccine here in South Australia it was able to be administered. The early shipping of that AstraZeneca vaccine by the Morrison Liberal government has allowed us to accelerate the rural and regional clinics, extending our reach beyond the metropolitan area sooner than expected. As members should be aware—probably are but may certainly be interested to be aware if they are not—the AstraZeneca vaccine benefits from not requiring the extreme cold storage arrangements that the Pfizer vaccine requires, thus enabling it to be more rapidly deployed in regional communities and indeed remote communities here in South Australia.

We have to this stage already opened regional clinics in Coober Pedy, Mount Gambier, Murray Bridge, Port Augusta health, Port Lincoln, Port Pirie health and in Whyalla health. In those regional clinics in particular, to this date more than 1,000 doses of the vaccine have been administered, making sure our country areas are also receiving that important protection against this pandemic.

Work is being undertaken of course by the commonwealth, alongside our work, in relation to a number of those remote communities as well and some of those other frontline workers. The SA Ambulance Service (SAAS) has also begun vaccination of our frontline paramedics thanks to the arrival of AstraZeneca, and we will continue to work with our health experts to deliver the COVID-19 vaccine to South Australia.

I know that there has been material circulated—I saw some in letterboxes just in the last couple of days—that puts around some very, very unfortunate misinformation that is adverse to public health outcomes in South Australia. I urge all members of parliament to do whatever they can in our communities to encourage South Australians, when we get the call in whatever part of the community we are, whatever our demographic, once the vaccine is available, I encourage all South Australians and I encourage all members to encourage their communities to take the vaccine. It is safe, it is effective, it is free. It is not mandatory.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:42): My question is to the Premier. Why was it important and appropriate for the government and the Premier to set a target for the first three weeks of the vaccine rollout but not to outline a target for any other part of the rollout?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:42): I think the member is getting confused. What we said was that we had received doses which would allow us to vaccinate up to 12,000 people. I think at the end of Monday—

Mr Picton: It wasn't a target?

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurna!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —we got to 8,000, but we made it clear right from day one. I feel fairly sure that the shadow minister, following this in the media, would know that the Chief Public Health Officer and the Minister for Health and Wellbeing in South Australia have said that our number one priority right from day one has been and should always have been a focus on the vaccine rollout being effective and safe for the people of South Australia. We make no apologies for not blowing the target out of the water. We said up to 12,000 and we achieved 8,000. Progress is being made and that will continue into the future.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kaurna, I call the member for Kaurna to order.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:43): Very efficient. My question is to the Premier. Following the Prime Minister's target of four million Australians to be vaccinated by the end of April, how many South Australians will that equal?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:43): I don't have that detail with me. As I stated in all my earlier answers to questions from the opposition today, this is a moving feast because the reality is there are plenty of moving parts to this.

For example, we had no idea that we could be using the AstraZeneca vaccine so early. In fact, we didn't even contemplate that we would be vaccinating people in Murray Bridge or Coober Pedy or Port Pirie. This became an opportunity after the AstraZeneca vaccine became available. I think the commonwealth government is doing an excellent job in procuring those vaccines from overseas.

Ultimately, we want to be manufacturing or producing those vaccines right here in Australia and work is underway to make sure that is exactly and precisely what occurs. We have the CSL facility here in Australia; that is great news. In fact, we will be one of just 20 countries in the world that will be able to produce our own vaccines. At the moment, as you would be aware, sir, we need to procure those vaccines from overseas. There have been some procurements that were held up—we made purchases and those purchases were cancelled.

This is why I say to those opposite, who seem quite obsessed at the moment regarding a target, a number—this is almost impossible to believe. They were in government for 16 years. I didn't see them hit a target once in 16 years, but all of a sudden some of them over there have become numerate. It's a pity they weren't numerate when they were in government. They were absolutely hopeless, but we are not hopeless.

We are working with the people of South Australia on delivering a very, very important vaccination program for the people of South Australia and it's time for the opposition to get on board and put the people of South Australia first rather than play their petty politics.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is warned.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kaurna, I warn the member for West Torrens for a second time. The member for Playford can leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Playford having withdrawn from the chamber:

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:46): My question is again to the Premier. Does the Premier still commit to every South Australian being vaccinated by the end of the year? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: On radio FIVEaa on 23 February this year, the Premier was asked whether he thought everybody in South Australia who wants to be vaccinated will be vaccinated by the end of this year. The Premier responded, 'Yes, absolutely.'

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:46): Yes, that is my understanding.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:46): My question is again to the Premier. Is that a target or a commitment?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:46): It seems quite extraordinary. I don't know why those opposite don't want to get on board. I have provided some relevant detail regarding—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —the complexity of the vaccination program in Australia. I thought it would be evident to most people in this place that it is not a simple process. We've got to have access to the vaccines. We've got to have the rollout of the GP-led respiratory clinics in South Australia and, of course, also the pharmacies. These are not even the responsibility of the state government but, rather than chipping away and trying to undermine the confidence that the people of South Australia should have in this important national endeavour, we are just getting on with it. Let me tell you, sir, when I am speaking to people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: When I am speaking to people in South Australia, they feel proud. They feel proud to live in a state that has had to work together in partnership to deliver an outstanding result for our state. I don't see people stopping me in the street, saying, 'Why haven't you achieved 11,000 rather than 9,000?' There is none of that.

People are grateful that they are being led by a very good health administration, SA Police and a cabinet that is absolutely united in putting the people of South Australia first. That has been our approach since day one of this pandemic and I am happy to put our results here in Australia, and more specifically in South Australia, up against any other place in the world. We now live in the safest state in the safest country. That is something that all South Australians should have pride in, and I think that they do. It is a pity those opposite don't want to get on board.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Kaurna, I call—

Mr Malinauskas: What makes you say that? We are asking questions about the vaccine.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader will cease interjecting. Before I call the member for Kaurna, I call to order the member for Colton, I call to order the Minister for Trade and Investment and I call to order the Minister for Police, Emergency Services and Correctional Services.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Premier, what is the difference between the rollout of the vaccine in South Australia and the rollout in six other states and territories that have had a faster per capita rollout of the vaccine over the past three weeks?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:49): I thank the member for his question. I am not concerned with what happens in other jurisdictions, save when it relates directly to keeping the people of South Australia safe.

We've got an excellent working relationship with the chief medical officers and the chief public health officers in other states and territories around Australia, and we appreciate that cooperative arrangement that we have with them in terms of the data flow that comes into South Australia, but we don't benchmark ourselves against every single part of the way that they operate. We have a very differentiated model here in South Australia. There are things we do at a much higher level.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: With regard to the rollout of the vaccine, we have a different state with different geography. We have a different approach to elements of what we are doing. We were the first state to use the AstraZeneca. This is the first in the country. My interest is not so much in what is happening in other states, other territories, other countries around the world, but in the expert advice that we receive from SA Health here in South Australia. They have done an excellent job keeping the people of South Australia safe since day one, and I expect that to continue well into the future.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. What percentage of hotel quarantine workers have had their vaccine and how many are left remaining?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:50): I will take that detailed question on notice and bring back an answer.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:50): My question is to the Premier. Why have only half of our emergency department and infectious disease workers been vaccinated against COVID at our major COVID hospital three weeks into the rollout? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: Yesterday the health minister, the Hon. Stephen Wade, revealed, and I quote:

In terms of the Royal Adelaide Hospital, I am advised, as in terms of their frontline workers, particularly the emergency department and the, um, infectious diseases department, they are more than 50 per cent vaccinated.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:51): Well, we are working through the people in phase 1a in a prioritised way. I think that as of yesterday morning we had over 7,000 who had been vaccinated and more than 7,000 who had booked in for either their first or second shot. We are working through it in a prioritised way. We are taking the advice of SA Health, and that vaccine program is being rolled out as effectively and as safely as we possibly can.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:51): My question is to the Premier. How many frontline healthcare workers are in group 1a for the vaccine, and how many of those frontline healthcare workers have so far had it?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:52): I thank the member for the question, again, a detailed question, which I will take on notice and bring back an answer from the Minister for Health.

COVID-19 VACCINATION ROLLOUT

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:52): My question is to the Premier. What steps have been taken to rectify bumbles in the vaccine notification system resulting in doctors missing their vaccine appointments? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr PICTON: Dr David Pope, President of the Salaried Medical Officers Association and an emergency department doctor at the Lyell McEwin, revealed to Channel 7 News on the weekend that a text message bungle has resulted in doctors and nurses not receiving their vaccine appointment times and therefore missing their appointments. Dr Pope said, and I quote:

I was going to have a vaccination yesterday and I never received a text message from the system, [it is] greatly slowing down the vaccination rollout. I have to say that frontline staff are being let down.

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER: Sir, point of order: standing order 97. Prior to the leave being sought for the insertion of the explanation, the framing of the language of the question was unparliamentary and argumentative.

The SPEAKER: There is no point of order. Does the minister seek the call?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (14:53): I seek the call. I will take on notice the references in the question that seek information about a specific circumstance and bring back to the house what answer or response is provided by the Minister for Health, indeed, that is appropriate to share, notwithstanding that it may potentially be related to personal details so there may be a more general answer provided.

RENEWABLE ENERGY

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister update the house on how the SA-New South Wales interconnector is driving investment in renewable energy projects in regional South Australia?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:54): Thank you to the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —member for Chaffey—

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader will cease interjecting.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: —for this very important question. While the early works are underway, we are already seeing investment. We have a very significant list of projects investing in South Australia and they are all looking forward to the delivery of this interconnector.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The most recent project to receive planning approval from our planning minister was the Goyder South Project, a \$3 billion project to be delivered in three stages. I met with Neoen very recently. They are getting on with stage 1. They are a company with a track record in South Australia of delivering.

Hornsedale Wind Farm, the big battery at Hornsedale near Jamestown, is an extraordinary project that will deliver an enormous amount of investment and an enormous amount of employment into South Australia. Neoen says the first stage of the project, up to 400 megawatts of wind power, is expected to start construction next year. It will see hundreds of valuable jobs in regional South Australia. The Goyder South project could ultimately deliver 1,200 megawatts of wind, 600 megawatts of power and 900 megawatts of battery storage. This project will be transformational for South Australia.

We also have the Morgan Solar Farm, another project in the member for Chaffey's electorate; 150 megawatts of battery storage has been approved for this solar farm as well. We also have the Port Augusta energy park underway in my electorate of Stuart. The company has made it very clear that the interconnector, which we expect to be built, will be very advantageous in that they may well not have developed that project without it. There is also stage 2 of the Lincoln Gap Wind Farm. All of these projects are linked to the interconnector.

Interestingly, we have also seen very recently AEMO write a public open letter saying that, under all of the model scenarios out there that the AER is looking at, this interconnector is a positive project and delivers savings for electricity consumers in South Australia and in New South Wales. We have also seen the AEMC's response to a rule change request. They said to the proponent that there is enough money for the proponents to get on and deliver this project. Our government has also committed about \$70 million in early works, so it is underway. The work necessary to build this project has started: route planning, environmental clearances, landholder agreements and procurement of bespoke equipment—a wide range of things. This is a fantastic project.

Let me say very clearly that it is one of several planks in our energy policy. We committed to deliver savings of \$302 per household on average annual electricity bills. We have already delivered

\$269 million in partnership with industry, in partnership with the regulators and in partnership with consumers, so our energy policies are working. We are well down the track and we still have more of our energy policies to roll out so that South Australian consumers, whether they be small households or large employers, can continue to benefit from the Marshall government bringing down the cost of living and the cost of doing business.

TRAIN SERVICES

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Will train services from Adelaide to Mawson Lakes resume on Monday 26 April of this year on the Gawler line as scheduled?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:58): I thank the member for his question and I note that the details of the closure of that line and when it will reopen are online on the department's website. This is a really intricate project and one I think that I mentioned earlier was signed with 5 per cent planning done when the former government signed this up. We have got on with that job and we have fixed the mess they have left. We have got this project moving. Those opposite talked about this project on and off for a long, long period of time and never actually delivered it, but we are getting on with delivering this project for the people of the northern suburbs.

There have been some problems along the way, of course, with COVID. COVID has had a very big impact, but no bigger impact than actually signing the contract with only 5 per cent of the planning done. We are assessing all of those things. Again, through COVID, I know there have been some issues, I'm led to believe, with acquiring the signalling equipment and/or the experts to put that in, so that could have an impact. We are assessing that at the moment and, if there are any changes to that timetable, we will let the people of South Australia know.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. What are the two projects assessed as being uncompetitive that were provided funding under the Regional Growth Fund round 2 grants?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (14:59): I thank the member for his question. The Regional Growth Fund is certainly mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report, and we were very conscious of the recommendations made by the Auditor-General in relation to the guidelines, ensuring that we improve our transparency going forward to make sure that it's clear exactly why decisions are made in relation to these grants that are being made. We were very happy to accept the advice of the Auditor-General and his direction in relation to making it more transparent going forward. The particular projects that are—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Take your time mate, take your time.

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for West Torrens will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

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

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: On those particular projects, I am more than happy to come back to the member in relation to exactly what those two projects were. It was prior to me coming into this role that those two projects were identified.

PLANNING AND DESIGN CODE

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (15:01): My question is to the Attorney-General in her capacity as Minister for Planning. Can the minister provide an update to the house on how the new planning system is improving outcomes and helping families, councils and developers build what matters?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (15:01): I am very happy to in my role as the planning minister. I am pleased to confirm to the parliament that at 12.01 on Friday we will be launching phase 3 of the Planning and Design Code and we will be going entirely into an e-planning program.

Why is this important and how does it deliver better provision for our families, councils and the developers in building what matters? Let me give you three examples. Firstly, it aims, as an electronic program, to ensure as an Australian first that we bring all the planning systems together in one easily accessible e-planning platform. You will be able to go in and out and make applications 24/7. You can do them Sunday mornings, if you like, and you can do them in general business hours, and it will provide flexibility in relation to the utilisation of this central development application processing system.

It is a one-stop shop to help guide development across the state and it has a wide range of guides, instructions and videos to help people lodge those applications, find information, determine what development approval is needed and if it is, of course, what needs to be done. All this is to provide a statewide program that will reduce delays, lessen paperwork, etc. We have heard of things being simpler, quicker, easier and better lots of times. I have certainly heard it a lot in the time I have been here in the parliament.

To demonstrate how effective rounds 1 and 2 have gone, can I tell you that the code has been running effectively for rural, which is phase 2 areas, since 1 July 2020 with recent reports showing the system is certainly delivering results. As at 1 March, over 3,000 applications have been lodged through that portal by phase 2 councils. Those applications in regional areas alone are worth over \$620 million.

The accepted development or deemed-to-satisfy pathways—these are for relatively simple projects—are taking councils on average 3.6 days to approve compared with eight days under the previous system. The more complex performance assessed projects are being approved in 14.72 days on average, and that's three days faster than before.

So, yes, it is being demonstrated, and one in seven applications are occurring outside office hours, indicating that users are taking up the advantage of adding flexibility in the system. When the code was considered for this last stage, there were four areas where in the code at its various stages a number of issues were raised.

Firstly, there was the question of lifting the bar on the quality of infill development through the requirement of trees and soft landscaping for each property including better water retention. Protecting our character and heritage: most notably this was through the retention of contributory items as representative buildings, as well as stronger state heritage protections.

Thirdly, there was the issue of protecting native vegetation through the inclusion of new overlay (that has been attended to) and promoting value-adding in rural areas by allowing property owners to facilitate development for value-adding businesses like shops, tourist accommodation or food and beverage production, industries with rural and Adelaide country zones.

Michael Lennon, our Chair of the State Planning Commission, has announced that he will be retiring on Friday. I thank him for his service. He has followed through the hardest part of the development of the Planning and Design Code, and he and other members of the department and commission should be strongly commended.

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Lee will resume his seat. The time for answering the question has expired.

REGIONAL GROWTH FUND

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries. Can the minister advise the house why these two projects were approved after they were assessed as being uncompetitive?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:06): I thank the member for Lee for his question. The two projects that were chosen not to be funded—the reason they were chosen not to be funded was based very much around that one had already received funds under a previous government scheme and one, in the opinion of the previous minister, did not deliver the economic outcomes or jobs set out in the guidelines.

That led to the opportunity to bring other projects forward, and there are some great projects that were funded under these schemes. One that certainly comes to mind is the Chalk Hill winery, a great facility that is now there for many to enjoy at McLaren Vale. We have—

The SPEAKER: The minister will resume his seat. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I rise on a point of order under standing order 98: debate. I specifically asked about the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Members on my right will cease interjecting. The member for Schubert will leave for 20 minutes in accordance with standing order 137A.

The honourable member for Schubert having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: Interjections on my left and on my right will cease. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My point of order is under standing order 98 and that is of debate. My question was very specific about why these projects were approved after they were assessed as being uncompetitive. The minister is choosing to answer a question about why other projects were not approved.

The SPEAKER: The raising of a point of order is not an occasion for the making of an impromptu speech. There is no point of order. I heard the question to include a request of the minister to explain why two projects were not funded—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: —or were or were not funded. In the circumstances, there is scope for the minister to provide some context in relation to projects. I'm listening very carefully to the minister's answer. The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: As I was saying, it was very clear that there were two projects recognised by the previous minister that weren't suitable to be funded. That meant there was an opportunity for other projects to be funded. As I said, there are some projects out there that are fantastic, that have been great projects for our regional communities.

Karoonda is another great example of the investment in the electorate of Hammond, where we have a facility where we are looking to see whether we can get regional businesses to set up in a hub working with the Karoonda council. There are great opportunities there in the regions to see these funds used in very useful ways for their community—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: —to support that community—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Lee!

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM: —and see growth in jobs and growth in our regional sector, delivering for South Australia.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Mount Gambier, I warn for a second time the member for Chaffey. Interjections on my right and on my left will cease and I draw members' attention in particular to those particularly objectionable interjections as between individual members across the floor. They will cease.

ADELAIDE FRINGE, REGIONAL EVENTS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:10): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier confirm whether an ongoing funding commitment will be provided to support and grow regional Fringe events. With your leave, Mr Speaker, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr BELL: This week, Fringe Mount Gambier celebrated its fifth year with more than 60 events across 20 venues, giving some much-needed confidence to the hospitality and events sector. This year, unfortunately, is the final year of a three-year state government funding commitment for the event.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:10): The member is quite right. What we have seen in recent years is an explosion of Fringe events outside of metropolitan Adelaide. I think this is a very good development and the member for Mount Gambier has made very clear to this parliament the economic benefit for his local region. He is quite right in saying that he is ending the third year of a three-year arrangement. The funding is provided to the Fringe, so ultimately they make their decision.

What I can tell the member in this house is that we very significantly increased the funding for Fringe this year in response to the global pandemic. This was a project of increased funding which was provided in conjunction with the federal government and their RISE program. What we have seen from that, I think, is very well-funded venues but also artists' grants that have meant that we have delivered for the second year in a row the largest arts festival in the world. This is something that I think every single South Australian should be very proud of.

I don't have details as to what the Adelaide Fringe will do for next year and beyond. I am happy to take that question to the chief executive and the board of the Adelaide Fringe. They make their own decisions. But what I would say to the member and to any of the regional members or members of parliament representing regional electorates is that we have put an extra \$1 million into the SATC regional events and festivals fund. That is open at the moment.

Any festivals that exist in regional South Australia that require additional money at the moment can make that application. It's a once-off \$1 million to go into that, because we do want to encourage more South Australians to spend time in their own backyard to get out to beautiful regional South Australia. We have a large number of existing regional events and festivals, but also I am hoping that what comes out of this fund is a whole pile of new events, new festivals. Some of them might just be once off but some of them might develop to be like some of the great festivals that we have right across regional South Australia.

So in response to this question from the member for Mount Gambier, I am very happy to take that matter up with the Fringe. But with regard to the SATC events and festival fund, I encourage all members with an interest in regional tourism, regional visitation, events and festivals to look at this excellent program. It's open at the moment. I hope as many festivals and events as possible can be funded out of that massive increase in SATC funding.

BELAIR RAIL LINE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:13): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister please inform the house if the new private operator of the state train network, Keolis Downer, has made any changes to the enforcement of the number of bicycles per carriage, particularly on the Belair line, and how is the government working to resolve this issue for the Mitcham Hills community? Sir, with your leave and that of the house, I will explain a bit further.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: There has been quite a bit of recent media comment in relation to this proposed change and commuters of mine are saying to me, and I quote:

A crackdown with only four bikes allowed on board a carriage is leaving bike passengers to wait for two or three train departures before starting their journey. The Mitcham train station has now been packed with riders as they have not been allowed on the Belair train line.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:14): I thank the member for the question. I have made some inquiries about this, and the policy that is being implemented by Keolis Downer is in fact the policy that was put in place under the previous government. That is the policy that is still in place.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Hurtle Vale!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What the new operators are doing is they are going out to community consultation to have a look and see what can be done into the future. Again, I stress the point that the policy that is being implemented is the policy that has been in place for quite a number of years. Again, as that consultation rolls out, I will happily keep the member informed.

REGIONAL DEVELOPMENT STRATEGY

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:15): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister inform the house when the Regional Development Strategy will be finalised and released to the public?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:15): I thank the member for his question. It is certainly a very important piece of work that is being done to make sure we look after the regions of South Australia, and we continue to see the benefit to the regions of the Marshall Liberal government supporting those regions going forward. This strategy is a very important piece of work, which we are continuing to finalise in development to release. It is very much imminent at this stage. Certainly, we haven't got a particular date on which it will be released, but it is very close to getting to that point of being able to release to the public.

AUGUSTA HIGHWAY

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport. Can the minister update the house on the progress of the rehabilitation of the section of Augusta Highway just south of Redhill, which is causing great concerns to all traffic movements? With your leave and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I wrote to the minister on 3 August last year and received a response dated 10 October last year, where the minister indicated, 'The department is currently working on scoping details for this section of the road.' It is nearly five months since the scoping was undertaken, and I would like this section of the highway to be rectified urgently to reduce the opportunities for any issues of safety and damage to cars and trucks.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:16): I thank the member for the question and note his interest. Of course, he would be well aware that we are putting some \$210 million into upgrading a number of regional roads across South Australia and would note, in fact when he was in cabinet under the Labor government, how neglected the regional roads were. I know he would have an interest in that, having been aware of that at the time. But it's okay; we are getting on with fixing that. Augusta Highway is one that we are putting a considerable amount of money into, and we are doing the study works. I talked about the planning works—

Ms Hildyard: It took nine weeks to reply to his letter. Mind you, that's pretty quick for you, Corey.

The SPEAKER: Member for Reynell!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —previously that were not undertaken by those opposite, and it's a shame.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It's a shame they didn't do that work. It's a shame they left our regional roads to deteriorate. I know the member for Frome would be equally disgusted with the way they left our roads. Again, I know he was in the cabinet at the time, but he would be disappointed with how they were left. We have got on with it. We have invested significant money. There is \$1 billion going into our regional roads over the next four years. As I said, that's part of our \$16.7 billion infrastructure spend. The member for Reynell doesn't like the fact we are investing money in regions and investing money in South Australia. She chortles away—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —any time I stand up and talk about this or the \$214 million we put into sport at the last budget—more money than regional sport and community sport has ever seen before in South Australia. We are delivering. When it comes to infrastructure, our government is delivering, and Augusta Highway is having work done to it. I'm happy to take the specifics of that section of work and what is being done there right at this point in time.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have never put more money into regional roads than what this government is doing, and I am very proud of that.

The SPEAKER: Before I call the member for Florey, I warn the member for Mawson for a second time, I warn the member for Hurtle Vale and I warn the member for Reynell.

DRIVER'S LICENCE DISQUALIFICATION

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:18): My question is to the Minister for Transport. If a licensed driver does not receive their first notice of demerit disqualification through no apparent fault of their own, why are they not eligible to elect for access to a 12-month good behaviour option once they have received notification? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Ms BEDFORD: My constituent not only accumulated 13 demerit points in 2015 but was not notified of the three-month licence disqualification until February this year when attempting to renew her licence. She was told the process server had attempted delivery on three occasions unsuccessfully each time and, as she missed her first notice, she was liable for extra costs and not eligible for the 12-month good behaviour option, which she would have otherwise elected to access and complete if she had been notified at the time of the disqualification.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:19): I am happy to take on board the specifics of that request. I think the member mentioned it happened in 2015. Again, I wasn't in this role back then; in fact, there was a different government in place, so I can't take the specifics of that.

Mr Odenwalder interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Elizabeth!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I said, 2015 was when Labor were in government. Again, I'm happy to take the specifics of that on notice and come back to the member. I did note that she said 13 demerit points were lost in the course of a year and, without again knowing those specifics, can I just emphasise the point of how important it is, when we talk about road safety and keeping people safe on our roads, of mentioning the significant investment we are making in upgrading our roads to keep people safe.

Police are out there doing the great job they are doing, but we do ask people to make sure that, when they are behind the wheel, they do the right thing. That is really important in a holistic approach to actually make sure we keep people safe on our roads. We want to make sure that we have no lives lost on our roads. Any life that is lost is one life too many, again across those three incidents.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: They may laugh and joke about it on the other side of the chamber—

The SPEAKER: Order, members on my left!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —but it's a serious matter. It's a very serious matter. We are building the infrastructure that South Australia needs to make sure we make our roads as safe as possible. Police are out there doing what they can to make sure that people are behaving when they are behind the wheel, when they are on our roads, to keep people safe, but we ask people as well

to make sure they do what they can when they are behind the wheel to take responsibility for their actions.

ALTUS RENEWABLES

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:21): My question is to the Minister for Trade and Investment. Can the minister confirm whether anyone from his department has contacted Altus Renewables regarding their communication, through me, to the government?

The Hon. S.J.R. PATTERSON (Morphett—Member of the Executive Council, Minister for Trade and Investment) (15:21): Thank you for that question. Of course, member for Mount Gambier, when I was down there previously we went and saw some of the sawmills and the importance of the timber industry and also some of the impacts there for their secondary logs, how they can be used. Some market access issues around the world mean they can't be exported out, so how can we use them domestically.

Of course, Altus is a terrific opportunity, potentially. Wood pellets, which can be used for fuel, can be either used here domestically or there are potential export markets as well. Of course, yes, any questions to the department around that progress I can certainly follow up on your behalf and get back to you.

HAMPSTEAD HYDROTHERAPY POOL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:22): My question is to the minister representing the Minister for Health. What are the reasons for the ongoing closure to the public of the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre's pool considering the government's previous closure of the Strathmont Centre pool and the relevant code restrictions prohibiting the use of public swimming pools ended in November 2020?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:22): I thank the member for the question. I will obviously seek details in relation to the matter the member has raised from the Minister for Health or whichever minister is responsible. It might be human services, but if it is health or human services, either way I will bring back an answer to the house.

SERVICE SA

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:22): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Can he give the house any indication of what work is being done to reduce the floor space on any of the Service SA offices, particularly those at Modbury, Mitcham and Prospect? What plans have already been evaluated to reduce the number of face-to-face contact points within those offices?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:23): Thank you very much. I think I know where the member is going, and that is what we are doing to modernise our Service SA centres.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What we have announced is, of course, that we are keeping those three centres open in or around their same vicinity, and we will have more to say on that as that's finalised. But what I can tell the member is that it would be worthwhile—and I think I've mentioned it in this place before—for members to go and have a look at the one in the city and the new one that we have just opened up in Mount Barker, which has been a huge success. It actually has a wonderful concierge on entrance, whereby, as customers go in there and they are looking for service, they are greeted at the front.

It's taking the operators from out the back of the office and behind desks to the front of the office where the service is provided, so really it's putting the service back in Service SA. I commend all the people involved in putting the Mount Barker one together, and that is the model that we want to see rolling out right across our state to make sure that we are getting that service back into these centres and people are getting the services they want.

We look forward to expanding the other ones and working in this more integrated system, allowing people to be more interactive. Again, so many services are now online and available online, which makes it easier.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It was actually discussed with me—I know the leader doesn't want to hear about this either because better service is not something that they are about, but on this side of the house it's what we are about, and this is where we are delivering these better services.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I have outlined that they are staying open. We will keep delivering those better services to the people of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The leader was interjecting there, but I was going to talk about one Service SA centre, and the story that was relayed to me was fantastic. It was a 90-year-old guy who came in and they took him to the terminal and got him online, and he was absolutely flying by the end of this session. He was so happy to be doing all of his operations online. He was very adept at doing everything that needed to happen through the online portal.

We want to do all we can to help people learn how to do this because we are moving into a digital age, and that's what our Service SA centres will be providing into the future.

Grievance Debate

HOVE LEVEL CROSSING

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens) (15:26): I spent a lovely Sunday morning in the beautiful suburb of Hove. It is safe to say that the 100 or so residents who turned up had very, very strong opinions about their local member of parliament. As the local MP—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It would be inappropriate to mention the minister leaving during the debate on Hove, but I would say this: his absence at the largest public gathering in his electorate since COVID was noticed.

I have to say that Hove is not necessarily a hotbed of socialist activity, nor is it a place where people are used to protesting, but the people who came out were shocked and dismayed at the treatment they are getting at the hands of their government. It is fair to say that the people of Hove are confused by the advocacy they are getting from their local MP to the Minister for Infrastructure Transport; it just happens that they are the same person.

I informed the people of Hove, as I was there alongside the mayor and two other councillors, that the person who should be there advocating on their behalf is not just the mayor, is not just the councillors, is not just the local residents: it is their local MP. I have been one of those local MPs who also happens to be the minister responsible for the issue local residents are aggrieved by.

There is one hard and fast rule in politics, and that is: be where you are meant to be, show up, turn up, be accountable, listen to your constituents and, if you have the courage of your convictions to disagree with them, disagree with them politely. Disagree with them and turn up and tell them why you think they are wrong. That is courage. Not turning up and sending back generic letters to individually handwritten letters from your constituents about their proposals I think quite frankly is insulting.

I have to say that I did not think the seat that the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport currently holds would be on our target list, but I have to say—

An honourable member: He's put his hand up.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —he has put his hand up and he is leading with his chin. The platitudes, the sports analogies and talking over people will not work with local residents, nor

will throwing out numbers pretending he is commentating on a sporting match work when it comes to local residents. They want hard and fast facts.

They want to know some basic questions: what is the cost of a rail-under bridge without a new rail line being built? If a new rail line were not built, how long would that rail line need to be closed? These are intelligent people. They want to make decisions for themselves. They do not want to be told what the outcome is of the minister's consultation with his office. They want him to consult with them, the local residents.

I will tell you what else aggrieves them: this rubbish class warfare argument moved and perpetuated by the member for Black alongside the member for Gibson, trying to pit suburb against suburb, trying to pit people who live in Somerton Park and Hove and Brighton, as if they are some sort of elite toffee people looking down on people, against people who live a bit further south. That is not it at all. These are people in public housing. These are people who are community minded and who care about their local communities. To have two senior members of the government behave this way aggrieves them.

I have to say that seeing some of the signs on people's front fences—vast, long, expensive fences—was heart warming. I would have thought that the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport might want to spend some time in his own backyard, talking to his own constituents and listening for a change, being less arrogant and more consultative, talking to them and hearing what they have to say, rather than the threats, the arrogance—

Ms Hildyard: The boundary riding.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, the boundary riding. I have to say that I think the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport is in for a rude shock in his electorate back home.

ABORIGINAL EDUCATION STRATEGY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:31): I am very pleased to have the opportunity to update the house further on some of the important work the Marshall Liberal government is undertaking in supporting achievement by Aboriginal students in our education system through a range of activities—and I have mentioned this several times—and through our Aboriginal Education Strategy, an ambitious 10-year strategy with a very heavy work plan in three-year increments.

Indeed, one of the pieces of work we are undertaking has been the introduction of the Clontarf Foundation into the South Australian education system. For many years, across Australia, the Clontarf Foundation has worked with education systems and schools to encourage Aboriginal boys to turn up to school and to participate in school life. It has used sport, particularly Australian Rules football, and in some states rugby as well, as an entry point, and its great outcomes in employment for Aboriginal learners and indeed attendance before that—attendance and then employment—have been remarkable.

For many years, the former government expressed no interest in engaging with Clontarf. I was really pleased soon upon coming to government when the Premier and I were able to join with the Clontarf Foundation at a lunch hosted by Ish Davies from *The Advertiser* and, indeed, their organisation. The member for Hurtle Vale came along and indicated that the opposition would be supportive of that. I was very pleased with that. For the entire time we have been in government, we have been seeking to roll out this program. I welcome the recent conversion from the Labor Party to also support this program.

The Clontarf Foundation is a charitable not-for-profit organisation. It operates mentoring and behaviour change programs to attract and retain disengaged, at-risk Aboriginal young people to school while promoting more disciplined, purposeful and healthy lifestyles. In 2019, we entered into a three-year agreement through the Department for Education for a pilot program with Clontarf. As part of that pilot program, Clontarf agreed to establish four academies at six of our Department for Education sites.

It is an investment over three years of \$2.8 million by the state government, significant philanthropic contributions to match that and the federal government also matching that. This is an

investment in these young people, in getting their attendance at school, in getting their engagement at school and in getting their outcomes to be positive and employment focused.

I am really pleased to announce that, following a scoping exercise undertaken by Clontarf and my department, three additional schools have now been identified as suitable for inclusion in the pilot program from this year. These are Salisbury High School, Paralowie R-12 School, which is scheduled to commence in term 2, within a couple of months, and Coober Pedy Area School, which will commence their program in term 3, in the second half of this year. Maurice Saah, the principal at Coober Pedy Area School, has told me how excited he and the school community are at this news. I am looking forward to catching up with him later this week, when he is down in Adelaide for leaders day on Thursday, to talk more about it and the great work they are doing.

While the pilot program has yet to be concluded and evaluated, there have been some great outcomes already in improved attendance and greater interest in programs and pathways after completing school as a result of what has already been done by Clontarf in our schools. The programs and activities have strengthened the connections between the students, their families, the community, the school and teachers. That is illustrated, for example, by recent events in Whyalla where Clontarf was able to play an integral role in supporting the students and the community in the face of a deeply saddening incident.

Clontarf has been able to provide support to the students and families after hours, bridging the gap between home and school. Also, pride in connection with local communities has been seen, for example, at Ocean View College. Students at the Ocean View Clontarf academy have assisted in rejuvenating the North Haven dunes through partnering with the Port Adelaide Enfield Council and the Friends of the Taperoo Dunes. Their work on beautifying and rejuvenating the dunes will benefit the wildlife and the local community now and into the future.

The partnership with the council supports students to visualise post-school pathways, such as careers in horticulture or town planning. In partnership with the school-based programs, the Aboriginal Education Directorate, the South Australian Aboriginal Secondary Training Academy (SAASTA) WorkAbout and their private partners, Clontarf has also endeavoured to support goal 3 of my department's Aboriginal Education Strategy to have Aboriginal and young people on pathways to success.

Indeed, I have spoken to all the academies at various times about employment pathways. Just recently at Port Lincoln I heard that Clontarf and its business partners have helped connect some Aboriginal young learners to some outstanding employment outcomes. Indeed, I am really pleased that Clontarf itself has employed a number of its graduates. The program currently employs seven local Aboriginal males and is looking to expand that number as it expands in 2021 and beyond as a result of Clontarf graduates.

I am looking forward to the finalisation of that pilot program. I thank everybody in that body of work and congratulate all the young people who are attending school more and who are really excited about their own futures and taking ownership of their own futures with our help and the help of Clontarf.

Time expired.

TEA TREE PLAZA CAR PARKING

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:36): I am pleased to have this opportunity to rise today to talk about an issue in the north-eastern suburbs that is on a lot of people's minds at the moment and certainly consuming a lot of space, if that is the way to put it, on social media as well, and that is the announcement by Westfield in February this year that it would introduce paid parking at Tea Tree Plaza for the first time since the shopping centre opened pretty close to 50 years ago to the day.

As you might expect, and I do not think it will come as a surprise to any members in this place, that announcement has not been well received. There are many reasons for that, but I think primarily, and the overarching reason, it is that people are still doing it really tough. The year 2020 brought to bear upon South Australian communities pressures on households that had not been seen for decades or possibly at all. Now that we are facing the end of the JobKeeper program, those South Australians whose employment has not returned to what it was and who have relied on these payments will in many cases actually be doing it tougher than they were during the peak of the pandemic.

To all those people—and I have read some comments to this effect on social media—who say, 'Well, this is just a case of a few dollars here or there, a few bucks. It shouldn't matter,' more than ever those few dollars matter to those people whose incomes have been affected so drastically by the COVID-19 pandemic, so nobody should be surprised—certainly least of all Westfield—by the uproar that has met this announcement.

Labor started a petition calling on Westfield to abandon paid parking just a few weeks ago. It has already received almost 4,000 signatures, and that number is still growing very fast. Parking at Tea Tree Plaza has, I acknowledge, been an issue for many years, and these issues have been exacerbated by the growing popularity of the O-Bahn, which terminates—or starts, I guess, depending on how you look at it—at the plaza.

As patronage of the O-Bahn has doubled since 1990, even though population growth has been much slower over that time, pressures on all the park-and-ride facilities along the O-Bahn route have grown. Tea Tree Plaza has not been immune from this, and residents accept, I think, that some of the plaza's parking woes are not of their creation.

The previous Labor government sought to address these problems by building a multistorey car park directly opposite the O-Bahn interchange that opened in January 2014, but such was the enduring popularity of the O-Bahn that over time it, too, became full with commuters very early on weekday mornings. Before the March 2018 election, Labor announced and funded an extension of that park-and-ride.

I am at pains to point out that this was not an election commitment. It was funded and contracts for the construction were signed. Unfortunately, those contracts were torn up by this government in 2018 and, along with a significant delay in the commencement of works for an expanded park-and-ride at Golden Grove, it compounded the existing parking pressures at Tea Tree Plaza.

Added to this is Westfield's decision to refurbish the plaza by building an outdoor boulevard area with new restaurants and cafes, which I think are great and have been very well received by the public in the north-eastern suburbs. That resulted in more car parking spaces being taken away and it has created in many respects a perfect storm, so you can understand why residents of the north-east, who have loyally supported the plaza for 50 years, are so incensed that a big multinational company like Westfield has decided to squeeze a few extra dollars out of those shoppers by introducing paid parking.

What was it that we heard from Westfield about why this was necessary? Well, this is what they said: it would enhance the parking experience at the centre. That is it. How would it enhance the parking experience? Don't know. Didn't say. Although a spokesperson for Westfield has said that a period of free parking will remain, management has not said how long that period will be.

It is not just shoppers, of course, who are outraged. Staff and business owners are also worried about how and what this will mean for them. Paid parking was brought in by Westfield at West Lakes Shopping Centre some years ago and it has been pointed out to me on many occasions that, although an area was set aside for staff with discounted rates, it is often full by 8am, which means that many retail staff who work irregular hours need to pay full tote odds in the car park.

Of course, the overall impact will be shoppers voting with their feet and choosing to shop elsewhere, and this is what has traders at the plaza so worried. But this is not a done deal. We can win this fight, and I use this opportunity to urge all the residents of the north-eastern suburbs who are yet to sign the petition to do so. Let's let Westfield know that they will shop elsewhere if this paid parking goes ahead.

Time expired.

YORKEYS CROSSING

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (15:42): It is a pleasure for me to rise today to speak about the very recent sealing of the bottom approximately two kilometres of Yorkeys Crossing adjacent to the very important Davenport Aboriginal community on the north side of Port Augusta. I thank the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport very much for making this happen.

This is a project that people locally have wanted for a very long time. For those in the chamber who may not be familiar with Yorkeys Crossing, it is a 21 or 22-kilometre dirt road that starts on the eastern side of the gulf in Port Augusta, just off the main national Highway 1, and heads probably north-north-west, I would say, and joins up with national Highway 1 heading up north of Port Augusta towards Alice Springs and goes around the top of the gulf.

It was incredibly important for decades and decades. Initially, when there was not even a bridge across the gulf in Port Augusta, that was the road access around the top of the gulf. It was a long way from Port Augusta. When a bridge was built, the original Great Western Bridge, it could not take such heavy traffic. Then the Joy Baluch AM Bridge, as it is now called, was built, but wide loads and heavy loads still needed another access. I am very pleased that the Joy Baluch AM Bridge is being duplicated at the moment as well.

Yorkeys Crossing has been necessary for a long time for a wide range of reasons when the mainstream road access that supports most passenger vehicles and heavy vehicles is not appropriate. The reason that it was so important to seal the bottom end of Yorkeys Crossing is that it runs north-south on the western side of the Davenport community. As is the case in most of South Australia, and certainly in Port Augusta, wind comes in predominantly from the west, and so the wind from the west crossing some sandhills, then crossing the previously unsealed Yorkeys Crossing and then crossing the Davenport community, meant that every time a car or a truck, any vehicle whatsoever, went up and down Yorkeys Crossing adjacent to the Davenport community the Davenport community was then covered in dust.

There are a range of reasons why that is not good for people's homes, but especially all the more so when you have a community of people with poorer health situations than the average in South Australia and Australia. Many of the people in the Davenport community, unfortunately, are suffering from serious respiratory challenges. That dust across the community has caused the people who live there a lot of grief for a long time and the community has been campaigning for it to happen for an extremely long time.

Davenport Community Council is led by chair Janice McKenzie and CEO Lavene Ngatokoura. Another person I would like to mention is Mr Malcolm (Tiger) McKenzie, who has been a very strong advocate for this program as well. They are three people who come to mind, but certainly there are others. When we came into government I said to the Davenport community that I and our government would do everything we possibly could to get this bit of road sealed so that they would not have the ongoing dust problem that has tormented them for so long.

I am incredibly grateful that this has happened three years into our government. Would it have been better if it were two years into government, would it have been better one year into government? Yes, of course it would have been, but it is not easy to get the funding to do these important jobs, and I am very pleased to have been supported by the Minister for Infrastructure and Transport to make this happen. This will make an enormous difference to the community of Davenport.

Any one of us who happened to live downwind from a very significant dirt road with regular traffic on it, including truck traffic, would understand the stress that goes with that, but when you add to that the importance of providing extra health protection from this dust to a community that does have a lot of people with respiratory illness living in it, this is incredibly important. I am really pleased to have done it. I commend the Davenport community for working with me for so long and I am really pleased that we have been able to deliver this for them.

MAWSON ELECTORATE

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:47): This week marks 15 years since my election into this place back in 2006, along with the member for Light, the member for Hammond and the member for Unley. I want to rise today to thank the 25,000 people in the electorate of Mawson who have backed me in for four elections and to thank them for all the support that I have received from them and for all the good ideas that they have put to me. In some cases, they have been the people who have flagged issues that seem very small at times and then when you dig a little deeper they turn out to be big issues.

One of those issues is PFAS. In April last year, there was a little ad in the paper about a company wanting to dump PFAS from around Australia in the wonderful region of McLaren Vale.

From that one contact, I was able to go out and talk to our community and garner some support and in October last year we had 348 people attend a public meeting at Tatchilla Lutheran College. Just two weeks ago, we finally convinced the EPA not to allow this deadly toxin to be dumped in our local area.

We have also had other wins over the 15 years and one of the biggest ones was when we stopped urban sprawl with a very important piece of legislation called the Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Act. That came from a public meeting in 2009 in Aldinga called the Spring Forum. I went along with the very good news that I had spoken to the Minister for Infrastructure and the Minister for Planning and the proposal for the government to sell off land at Bowering Hill to be subdivided for housing was not going to go ahead. I had stopped it.

People at that meeting said, 'Well, that's all well and good while you are our local member or while we have Labor in government, but what happens after that?' It was clear that they wanted some legislation, so we worked over many, many months as a local community. We would go to cellar doors and put the butcher's paper up and work out what it was that we wanted to preserve that was so special in our local area. We had the environment groups, the grapegrowers, the winemakers, the tourism operators, the business associations, the residents' associations—everyone came together with one goal.

I then managed to get what we wanted through the Labor caucus. We then brought it in here and even without the support of the Liberal Party in either house still managed to get the numbers to get that very important legislation through. It is the best legislation of its type in Australia in terms of protecting what we have. That means that the town boundaries around McLaren Vale, McLaren Flat, Willunga, Aldinga, Sellicks Beach and Maslin Beach are locked in forever, or until both houses of parliament decide that it should be changed, and I think it would be a very foolish government that would try to do that.

We had other wins along the way over the past 15 years. One really important one was building the overpass at McLaren Vale. In terms of infrastructure spends, at \$18 million it was not the most expensive thing that we have done in the south, but the McLaren Vale overpass was very important because three elderly ladies had lost their lives not long before, so again we had a campaign to push for road safety.

We duplicated the Liberal government's idiotic one-way expressway. That was just crazy. Visitors would come from all around the world to McLaren Vale and talk about the road that would close for an hour and a half with a boom gate so that it could change direction. It made sense to no-one, so we duplicated that.

We had the real threat of drilling for oil in the Great Australian Bight. That was one of those campaigns where I was so energised by the passion of the people that I represent, from the older people of Mawson to the schoolkids of Mawson. Students at Tatchilla Lutheran College and McLaren Vale Primary School wrote letters to the Norwegian Prime Minister, and I was able to take those across to Norway and really convince the government that it was a dumb idea to drill for oil in the Great Australian Bight. It was all risk and no reward: none of the oil was going to come to Australia and none of the jobs were going to come to South Australia (or at least to our part), but we had all the risk if something went wrong with the drilling for oil.

The biggest and most important thing that I have been involved in in the 15 years I have been in this place was the Kangaroo Island bushfires. I want to thank and make special mention of the people of the Kangaroo Island community for the way in which they battled those fires for four or five weeks and have battled nonstop ever since to rebuild their lives. It is nothing short of an outstanding community.

Again, to all the 25,000 people in Mawson: you are my bosses. I come in here to do your bidding and to do your work. It is an absolute honour to do it and I hope to do it for at least another five years.

LEVITZKE, MR V.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:52): It gives me great pleasure today to be able to speak on the career of Vaughan Levitzke PSM, the

Chief Executive of Green Industries SA, who is retiring on 30 June 2021 after 17 years at the helm of Green Industries SA and its predecessor organisation, Zero Waste SA.

Vaughan has worked tirelessly for the South Australian government and the South Australian people since entering the Public Service in 1978 as an ecologist with the Department for Environment. He served an impressive 43 years in government and, on 12 March, he handed over the reins as chief executive to commence a period of well-earned long service leave prior to his formal departure as an employee of the government at the end of June this year.

Looking back on his career, Vaughan spent 10 years with the South Australian EPA before being appointed the Acting Chief Executive of Zero Waste SA in July 2003 during the agency's establishment phase, and was subsequently appointed by the Governor in 2004 as its inaugural chief executive.

With an initial staff complement of six people, Vaughan built Zero Waste SA from the ground up to become a well-respected, innovative and effective organisation and positioned South Australia as a national and perhaps international leader in recycling and waste management and, in more recent times, the circular and the green economy. This is recognised across the world.

As an expert chief executive in waste management reform and policy, Vaughan served six ministers for environment and provided evidence before several interstate, national and state parliamentary inquiries and committees relating to waste, recycling and container deposit legislation.

In 2015, an investiture was held at Government House in the presence of His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AO and Mrs Lan Le where Vaughan received the Public Service Medal for outstanding public service in the area of waste management reform and policy. Under Vaughan's leadership, South Australia's first ever statutory statewide five-year waste strategy was developed, lasting from 2005 to 2010. The fourth in the series, the 2020 to 2025 waste strategy, was just recently released in December 2020.

Throughout his tenure as the chief executive of the agency, Vaughan and his team have provided a range of programs and activities that provide support to key stakeholders, including local government, the waste and resource recovery sector, the business community and the people of South Australia. Vaughan was instrumental in the transition of Zero Waste SA to Green Industries in 2016 with a renewed focus on the principles of the circular economy whilst retaining a strong emphasis on resources productivity.

Vaughan was elected the people's choice in the biennial WME magazine leaders list in 2012. Adelaide and its waste and recycling systems were highlighted in the UN Habitat report 'Solid waste management in the world cities' in 2010. In that publication the governance arrangements and outcomes achieved are highly rated and this all comes back to Vaughan's impressive, humble style of leadership.

The recognition that Vaughan has received extends beyond South Australia's borders. He has forged an excellent relationship with key players at an international level, including with the United Nations. He was Australia's only invitee to participate in the United Nations Centre for Sustainable Development Inter-sessional Conference, Building Partnerships for Moving Towards Zero Waste, which was held in Tokyo, Japan, in 2011. He was subsequently invited by the UN to advise on earthquake and tsunami reconstruction for sustainable communities in 2012.

It was from there that Vaughan came back to South Australia determined to ensure that our state was prepared to deal with disaster waste management should the need arise, and that need did arise during my time as the minister with the fires at the end of 2019 and the end of 2020. I think we really saw Vaughan and his agency come into their own as they stepped up to help the fire-affected communities in the Adelaide Hills and, of course, on Kangaroo Island, in bringing to life the disaster waste management framework and reaching out to help those communities in the most impressive way.

It has been a great pleasure to meet with Vaughan on a regular basis in my role as the state's environment minister to learn from him and to build up my experience in this sector during the last three years. Vaughan's leadership, his humility and his character are great traits. He will be greatly missed in the Public Service and I wish him a very happy retirement.

CALISTHENICS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:57): On Friday night, I attended the opening session of the Ridgheaven Calisthenics Club's Graceful Solo Competition at the Golden Grove Arts Centre. Congratulations must go to Tracey Emes, the committee of the club, the volunteers, the sponsors, the families and the supporters of our beautiful and talented calisthenics girls on making such a great competition happen, especially in the face of continuing COVID restrictions.

Our interstate adjudicator, Narelle Potter—herself a successful competitor, coach and now adjudicator—won the Graceful Solo Competition at Ballarat in 1993, the pinnacle some would say at that time of calisthenics competition. It was only a few years before I became involved in calisthenics, so I do regret that I did not see her when she was competing. This was Narelle's first trip out of Victoria since last year. I am sure she had her hands full, along with her writer, Trish Parker, as they had the happy but very difficult task of critiquing the performances of over 200 competitors, each a credit to their coaches and each very well prepared and beautifully presented.

Calisthenics is a uniquely Australian sport, a dynamic combination of gymnastics, all genres of dance, the use of apparatus—and, in our case, that is clubs and rods—marching, which used to be a very big sport in South Australia, singing, acting and miming, all in a competitive setting. It gives girls—mostly girls, unfortunately, although some boys still do calisthenics—confidence and a firm foundation for all sorts of skills in their lives ahead.

It is my honour to be an Australian Calisthenics Foundation co-national patron as well as a life member of the Calisthenics Association of South Australia, a proud 20-year badge holder at Ridgheaven. These are all prestigious achievements for someone who has never ever worn lycra and never plans to because it is such a difficult fabric for so many people to look their very best in.

I was welcomed into the calisthenics community on my election in 1997, and I thank all calisthenics people for their kindnesses and the hours of wonderful entertainment I have enjoyed because of their work and dedication. Many people have made a big impression on me for their commitment to calisthenics. I have mentioned Esme Dobson in a former contribution. Today, I would like to put on record my admiration for the late Mrs Beverley Daysh, who passed away last year on 5 November, which ironically was my birthday.

Along with many dedicated calisthenics people, Bev made a unique contribution to the sport. She was the face of calisthenics in the Royalty Theatre office for many years, and I shared many happy trips with her to Ballarat for the Royal South Street comps and also for the Australian calisthenics nationals all over Australia. Bev did not enjoy good health for some time before her passing, and I will always regret not making the time to see her before losing touch. My deepest sympathy goes to her daughter, Melissa, and all her family and friends on their very sad loss.

Bev would want calisthenics to flourish and grow and go from strength to strength, especially these days when there are so many sports and pastimes competing for attention. I am proud to say my youngest granddaughter has started her calisthenics journey. No matter how long or short it may be, I know she is being nurtured and encouraged by the rigorous framework and culture that have seen progress and delivered results to thousands of girls over the years.

From Tinies, which is girls usually around three years old, to Masters, which is girls and, dare I say, ladies of all ages, calisthenics is a wonderful way of life. For the girls involved and their families and friends, they form lifetime friendships. Without these people competing in calisthenics, it would be impossible for the younger generations to come up through the ranks and to continue.

I was able to make the presentations at two of the Ridgheaven Solo sections. I want to put on record, too, that from the presentation, the costumes, the make-up and the hair, to the performances of the complex and entertaining routines created by such amazing coaches and the backstage support of so many—often dads are backstage—calisthenics is a family sport with clubs all over South Australia and Australia. There is always one near you. I urge all members to go and find their local calisthenics club. For every competitor on stage, there is a family of people supporting them in the audience. It is a wonderful opportunity to see a minority sport.

I say they are minority sports because sports like cricket and football need no assistance. Calisthenics, of course, has made the Royalty Theatre its home, and they have been penalised over

the years because they bought the Royalty Theatre, and it has meant they have not been able to access any grants. I do urge the Premier to give some thought to the plans and the letters we have written asking him to make sure this medium-sized theatre remains part of the Adelaide arts scene. It is great to have Her Majesty's fully back on deck, but it is really important, too, to keep those middle-sized theatres.

FRINGE MOUNT GAMBIER

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (16:02): I rise to talk about Fringe Mount Gambier. I would like to give some big credit and thanks to the team behind Mount Gambier's Fringe festival today. In 2020, just 12 months ago, they were forced to cancel the festival with less than a week's notice obviously due to the pandemic. It was devastating for the team; however, they vowed to return in 2021—and that they have.

Big events take months and sometimes years to organise, so the ongoing uncertainty was something they really had to consider in the planning phase, whether in fact this year was going to go ahead at all and how it would be structured with COVID restrictions and people's close contact. They obviously had to think about border closures, lockdowns and a new ticketing system and basically had to redesign the festival from the ground up, taking into account the ever-changing world we live in.

They came up with a new format to showcase events and artists via the FringeIN, FringeOUT and FringeUP formats. This way, audiences could experience Fringe in different ways, heading out to see events at different venues, tuning in to see live-streamed events and also taking part in the festival by decorating their houses and businesses. During the 10 days of the festival, there were more than 60 events planned across 20 venues. The opening weekend was last weekend and it was a huge success, to see the confidence returning to the events and hospitality scene after the year that was 2020.

There is a reason we have been called the Festival State for years. Events and festivals are a vital part of South Australia's culture. Not only do they provide some fun and vibrancy to regional communities but they also showcase our state's world-class food and wine offerings and our strong arts and sports culture. They provide a reason for people to travel to the host town and provide a huge boost to local economies.

For the last three years, the Mount Gambier Fringe has benefited from a major funding commitment from the state government, through Arts South Australia. That ends this year, and today I asked the Premier in question time about ongoing funding so that this event can occur with some certainty. What would be very devastating is for the organising committee to wander off, find other interests, and the uncertainty of funding to be the catalyst for this year being the last Fringe Mount Gambier.

The Marshall Liberal government has put an extra \$1 million in regional events during this year through the 2021-22 Regional Event Fund. As our community recovers from the pandemic, the Fringe is bringing some much-needed life back to the hospitality and entertainment industries, which have been devastated by COVID. It is hugely important to ensure that these events continue in regional and rural communities and for our state government to show their support financially for them to be sustainable.

I would like to congratulate Louise Adams, Talie Teakle, Shylie Barry and Tammy Flier on bringing us this year's Fringe Mount Gambier and all the hard work that they have put in during the previous 12 months to get Mount Gambier ready. It really is a showcase, when streets are blocked off and Jens Hotel commandeers an entire corner of Mount Gambier. With 60 different events, there is something for everybody.

An act I saw a couple of years ago, but she was back this year, is Elise. Elise has been blind since the age of two and she is a comedian. I saw her act a couple of years ago. It is outstanding for someone who lives in Robe who has been trained in the arts to come out and do a performance. That was on the back of the member for Mawson getting up and doing a comedy act at the South Aussie Hotel. That might sound easy, this but it does take a lot of guts to get up in front of a large crowd when you are a politician and perhaps not that funny. He certainly turned it on and did a great job. I give credit to the member for Mawson for his input into Fringe Mount Gambier. I wish the festival a very bright and successful future.

*Bills***LANDSCAPE SOUTH AUSTRALIA (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:08): I will continue my remarks. I touched on open delivery and some of the open channels and open waterways in the Eastern States. As I was saying, the sealed delivery systems in South Australia are world class. We continue to look to our Eastern States to get with the program. I think it is pertinent that I should say that in some of the warmer climates—the Riverland climate, Riverina Sunraysia and some of those irrigation or food producing areas—those open waterways lose about two metres of water a year. We are often ridiculed for having our large water spaces at the lower end of the river.

We must remember that in South Australia we are the delta of the Murray-Darling Basin. From Euston down is shallow waters. We have high evaporation, but we also have a lot of open space and a lot of open environmental assets. Yes, there are high losses, but that is part of a river system. I would like to think that, while we are implementing a Murray-Darling Basin Plan, sadly we are not seeing on-farm efficiency money on the table now. The commonwealth government has taken that away.

We now have to reflect on how we can make gains and savings with off farm, how we can make savings and gains with environmental works and measures that will contribute a significant amount of money because by and large these environmental assets are going unaccounted. There are large numbers of waterways that should be improved, and there are ways. Whether we put automation on the barrages or whether we have the connection out of Lake Albert into the Coorong, these are ways that we can create environmental flow and reduce salinity. Again, it is making our environment a better working environment with an economic river running right through the centre of it.

It is also important to understand some of the new measures that have been put in place due to having all the states' ministers sitting around a table and dealing with some of the accusations that have been slung around. Mud continues to fly high and fast, with the states pointing the finger at one another, but for a long, long time we have seen lack of accountability in harvesting water in some of those faraway places in Queensland, in New South Wales and to a lesser degree in Victoria.

Flood plain harvesting is one of the absolute worst pieces of management we can see in our land. Some of that flood plain harvesting is done, and it looks very innocent when you are driving along a road and it has a little levee bank either side, but it is there for a reason: it is there to divert water off the flood plains and into their catchment areas, but those catchment areas are unregulated waterways.

What happens is that, when those creeks and rivers reach a certain height, they can then harvest that water. They harvest the water and put it into their turkey dams. Once they have it in their turkey dams, they can then use it for irrigation and food production. When they have diverted all that water, we are not seeing any of it come down south into the southern basin. That is why we are seeing significant water reductions on the Darling. We are seeing significant water reductions into a lot of those catchments and into the tributaries that then flow off into the Murray.

I think we need to have a much clearer picture of exactly how that is done. Satellite imagery is playing a big part in holding to account a lot of those harvesters, irrigators and farmers in that high country or in that top end of the basin. They can now even measure the depth of water with satellite imagery. I think it is important that we continue to do that. Every water diverter in the country should have an electric mag meter.

Gone should be the days when water is allocated to a sparse area of land and it is taken as a given. In today's world, that is not how it should be. We know that some of those perpetrators are irrigating two crops per year and getting away with it. If everyone has a meter, everyone is accountable. If you cannot measure it, you cannot manage it, as some would say. It is also important to understand that the delivery systems right across the nation should also have their meters on that point of extraction out of the main channel.

For too long we have seen allocations of water distributed to those districts and they are not accounted for, they are not metered, until they get to the farm gate. In some cases, there are 100 or 150 kilometres of open channel as a delivery mechanism to get water to that farm, yet any loss of water in those channels goes unanswered. Whether it be to wet up the channel, whether it be seepage or whether it be just evaporation, no-one is accountable for that water because that water is diverted. Normally, if it is through a sluiceway or some form of mechanical pump to put water into those channels, it then travels a long way, so there is significant unaccountability in those instances.

If we get back to the basin plan and back to what this bill is all about, it is about accountability. It is about making sure that our food producers are accountable for their water. Since the basin plan has been introduced, we are seeing a large amount of water that has been converted out of production, efficiency gains and some buyback. Most of that has been handed over to the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder (CEWH), which has now called on all states to be compliant. If irrigators are diverting water that has not been accounted for, it is potentially the commonwealth environmental water that has been used for food production that is unaccounted.

We are now seeing quarterly accounting come into play. Since time began, people would have to reconcile their books on 1 July. Everyone was happy and those who did not reconcile their books received a penalty. Now we are seeing quarterly accounting, so every three months people have to have their meter read and have to have their books balanced. They are putting water into their account, onto their licence, and that allocation is then justified to be able to divert water into a farm to create food, drive an economy, create jobs and be part of a healthy, working river.

It is also important to note—I will use the Riverland as an example—the great work that has been undertaken since the inception of the negotiations around a basin plan. I am glad the deputy leader is here because for a long time there have been unanswered questions. It is all theory about how much water should be put back into the environmental waters for a healthy, working river. It is not about the quantity of water; it is about what is achieved with that quantity of water.

We need overbank flows. We need to water our wetlands. We need to make sure we have different stages of wetlands. Close to the river, we normally have what we call red gum forests. Then, behind the red gum forests, we have lignums and we have other native plants. Then, to the furthest extreme, we see our black boxes. Black box trees are very resilient. They can go years without a good watering. What we need is overbank flows that actually water these environmental assets.

What we are seeing in the Riverland is agreements with the commonwealth government, with the state government and with environmental organisations to be allocated water, to manage that environmental water, to water the trees, to water the environment, to make sure wetlands are healthy, to make sure that we have those assets that need water on an intermittent basis and to make sure that we continue to have healthy wetlands. These then support a healthy, working river and create great opportunities for people to come and visit and for people to go out and have a look at some of the great assets.

To do that, we need to put some structures in place. The Challa regulator is one and the Margaret Dowling is another, then Pike River and Katarapko. Every lock and every weir in South Australia has a bypass mechanism and has a creek network around it: Banrock at lock 3, we have a creek network at lock 2 and, of course, we have another little community right next to Blanchetown at lock 1. That is there supporting a healthy working river.

I support the bill. It has been highlighted that we need a healthy, working river, we need accountability and we need to make sure that every water user, whether they be commercial or environmental, is accountable. That is why it is so important that this bill gets through today.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Does the Deputy Premier wish to speak to this?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:18): I certainly am motivated by that powerful contribution to make a contribution on the Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020. I was reminded, when I reviewed this bill, of something that former Premier the Hon. Dean Brown said to me back in the 1990s. He said, 'The three biggest things I think your generation is going to face in the 21st century are obesity, mental health and water larceny.'

Interestingly, subsequent to that—and it stuck in my mind—we have had the sort of 10-year drought in South Australia. Starting from the base position of being the driest state in the driest

continent in the world, it is a double whammy, of course, if we are to experience a drought. Already a large part of our state relies on what I would call introduced water; that is, if there is not sufficient rain, if there is not sufficient underground water to be able to be generous with its use and application, only small parts of our state would have been able to survive, frankly, if it had not been for the distribution from the River Murray. For example, towns in the Deputy Speaker's electorate just would not exist without pipeline water.

We have to be accountable in our state in having responsible regulation and effective enforcement. It is very clear that in introducing the landscape miscellaneous bill to deal with a new regime of the assessment for the purposes of regulating and charging for water, and in particular penalising for where there has been a breach of compliance, is very critical, and we need to get it right, as well as the principal administrative amendments to bring the policies in line with the original policy intent of a new application.

I am advised that, in short, the main change is to provide clarity of interpretation regarding an accounting period for the purposes of declaring a penalty charge for unauthorised or unlawful water use, and will enable the government to implement the most appropriate compliance approaches across the state. This change will reflect the original policy intention of the act. A failure to make this legislative change may have implications in relation to the quarterly compliance arrangements within the River Murray prescribed water course, which commenced on 1 July 2019.

This amendment is necessary to apply, even retrospectively, to preserve those arrangements, which had previously been intended, but also to comply with our responsibilities to the protection of the water resource in question. I thank the minister for water and the environment—

Dr Close: Environment and water.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Sorry, environment and water. I am just thinking of his other role. It gets rather complicated. The member for Port Adelaide has been most helpful, thank you. This is a role which I think has changed in title many times even in the time I have been here. I remember we used to have a Minister for the River Murray. I think it was the Hon. Karlene Maywald actually. She was touted as being the first Minister for the River Murray, I think, and it was to take precedence over many other positions in the then Rann administration, much to the chagrin, I think, of other ministers who were not very happy about that at the time.

In any event, we were in a drought, and huge attention was given to how we might ensure the future prescription of water and the enforcement against any noncompliance and/or water larceny to be effective. The arrangements were put in place. They were not perfect. They needed to be changed, and that is what we are doing on this occasion.

I thank the Minister for Environment and Water for acknowledging the importance of the balance in this regard and introducing legislation to ensure that it occurs. I might mention that the only time I am aware of water larceny occurring as a stealing other than from our current resource was a case I had in my own electorate, which I reported to the then Premier, Premier Rann, and asked him about whether there was going to be any action taken. It related to a neighbour in an urban suburb within my electorate whose hose had gone under the fence and they were using their neighbour's tap to water their garden.

During the drought this was a fairly desperate stage. People were under restrictions. They had to water their garden within certain hours. They could only use a bucket on occasions and no sprinklers, etc., but this was a circumstance where they were clearly using their neighbour's water to water their own garden and there was quite a flurry of attention given to how this situation could be dealt with.

Clearly, the water that was being consumed was being charged to someone else who was therefore paying for the benefit of that water in the neighbouring property, so I think it is a classic case of water larceny. I think we need to be vigilant against it, whether it is in a domestic backyard or whether it is a significant draw against a valuable resource, such as the River Murray, and we need to be fair in its application.

I think we have set a good standard in South Australia as to the application of our water theft strategy in trying to make sure that we deter it from occurring and, where it does occur, that there is

an appropriate and measured response to it that is effective. Again, I thank the minister for bringing this to the attention of the house.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Dr Harvey): The member for Flinders.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:26): Thank you, Mr Acting Speaker. I appreciate you taking the chair while I make a contribution to the Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020. Of course, a big commitment from the Marshall Liberal government when coming to power was to revamp natural resources management in South Australia. The Minister for Environment and Water's introduction of the Landscape South Australia Bill was significant legislation. It took a long time to draft. It made some significant changes to natural resources management, both within the administration and practically on the ground, throughout the state. I think it has been a good result and people have welcomed the changes.

Of course, the structure of our boards has changed slightly within natural resources management areas. I have to declare an interest here. For a short time—one session at least—I served on the Eyre Peninsula Natural Resources Management Board, and enjoyed that immensely. We are moving towards elections now for part of the board membership and that was part of our commitment. Certainly, from my interaction with the current board on Eyre Peninsula, they seem to be doing a particularly good job.

What this particular bill looks to do is make some amendments to the way water is managed within that Landscape South Australia Act. The Landscape South Australia Act itself, as well as being the framework for the entire natural resources management structure in the state, is the framework for the management of the state's water resources.

As we heard through a number of contributions thus far, South Australia is considered a leader in water management and, as part of this, a leader in water compliance and enforcement. Recent advice has identified a potential anomaly within the current act that may limit the ability to adapt the period in which compliance action can be taken for any unauthorised or unlawful water use. This, for example, may have implications on our government's increased focus on compliance within the River Murray prescribed watercourse that commenced in reality on 1 July 2019. We have heard our minister and also other members talk about the importance of compliance.

I have to say that I always listen with interest to the member for Chaffey—always, in fact—but particularly when he is talking about water because, as a former irrigator, he understands full well the importance of compliance and the importance of the sustainability of the resource within the River Murray. I will talk more fully about our resources here in South Australia as we go on.

We intend to make two minor administrative amendments to bring the act in line with its original intent. The main change will provide clarity of interpretation regarding an accounting period for the purposes of declaring a penalty charge for the unauthorised or unlawful water use and enable the government to implement the most appropriate compliance approaches across the state. This change will reflect the original intention of the act. A failure on our part to make this legislative change may have implications for the government's quarterly compliance arrangements within the River Murray prescribed watercourse.

The amendment, which will retrospectively be applied to the start of the current water year, will not only preserve the quarterly compliance arrangements for the River Murray and the state's reputation with other Murray-Darling Basin jurisdictions but it will also enable the government to implement more appropriate compliance approaches for the unauthorised or unlawful water use across the state to better suit the respective water resources and how they operate.

Of course, it is critical, as just one state jurisdiction as part of a broader River Murray basin and catchment distribution system—and as we know only too well we are at the bottom end of the River Murray and very little of the River Murray catchment is within South Australia, but of course its delivery into the Southern Ocean is through South Australia—that we are able to argue our case effectively against the Eastern States, those states with catchment and water flows, and also set an example with these particular arrangements.

The bill will also remove schedule 4 and section 10 of the act, which has not commenced and made redundant through the new Landscape South Australia (Water Register) Regulations 2020, which provide for the state's new contemporary water register, giving customers increased lending

opportunities against their water assets. So it is a critical amendment that allows equity to be realised and the best use of assets and finances for businesses to operate and/or expand their businesses.

This will be consistent with South Australia's longstanding commitment to water compliance and response to the Murray-Darling Basin Royal Commission. Quarterly compliance was introduced in the South Australian River Murray Prescribed Watercourse in 2019-20. South Australian water users are renowned for doing the right thing, and we need to ensure that we continue with that and are seen to be continuing with that. We have been particular about remaining within our available water allocation at all times, as required by the Landscape South Australia Act and former NRM Act.

We sometimes forget that the biggest allocation of all goes to SA Water, and they in turn distribute the resource not just to metropolitan Adelaide but to vast areas of this quite dry state. The Deputy Premier, the member for Bragg, made the point that some of our inland towns in South Australia simply would not exist without this reticulated supply. But, at the same time, we have also seen our irrigators here in South Australia, primarily in the Riverland but through the Mallee and other areas as well, really modernise their irrigation systems so that water is used efficiently, effectively and without losses.

Significantly, there is also a lot of water distributed for stock and domestic purposes from the River Murray, all those sheep in the beautiful sheep country of the Mid North and the even better sheep country of the Murray Mallee, although sometimes I know that is drawn from underground, and our farming and agribusinesses are reliant on this as well.

The bill proposes a minor yet essential amendment that will ensure we maintain our strong reputation as a leader in water compliance across the Murray-Darling Basin and at the broader national level. This proposed amendment reflects the intention of the current Landscape South Australia Act and the former NRM Act by enabling compliance action be undertaken within a time frame that best suits the retrospective water resource without any doubt.

In the South Australian portion of the River Murray, this amendment will help ensure that water can be reliably delivered to all water users, including the environment. A portion of the river flow is quarantined for environmental flows, and that will ensure that we are able to best deliver environmental water as intended, manage delivery constraints, inhibit market manipulation and respond to drought conditions, especially if conditions similar to the Millennium Drought were to be revisited.

In her contribution, the member for Bragg reminded us that the member for Chaffey at the time, the Hon. Karlene Maywald, was the first ever Minister for the River Murray. That position was effectively created at the height of what has become known as the Millennium Drought way back in 2002. Of course, slowly but surely conditions improved, and at this current point in time we are seeing reasonable river flows thanks particularly to good rains in all the Eastern States—Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria—that recharge our rivers and ultimately lead to good flows here in South Australia.

But we can never be complacent about these things because the next drought could be just around the corner, as could the next flood. We live in a highly variable climate and, by my rough calculations, the River Murray tends to see flooding flows about every 10 or 11 years, which probably means that we are due again sometime soon. Who knows? We cannot predict these things. As a long-time primary producer, I have never held much store in long-range weather forecasts but, anyway, that was garnered over time.

The one thing I did learn and have learned over 40 years in agricultural production is that every season is different. That is the one take-home message: just when you think you have got it sorted, you get thrown a curly one. Our landscapes underpin our communities, our economy, our wellbeing and our way of life, which is why we all have the responsibility to protect and manage our state's landscapes and water for the enjoyment of all South Australians.

The Department for Environment and Water works in partnership with the eight regional Landscape South Australia boards, which are responsible for administering the act and, as a result of the Landscape South Australia Act this parliament passed a little while ago now, a new entity known as Green Adelaide also brings an integrated approach to managing Adelaide's urban environment.

The key priority of the landscape boards is to support local communities and landowners to be directly responsible for sustainably managing their region's landscapes, with an emphasis on land and water management, pest, animal and plant control, and biodiversity—always challenging tasks. Communication, and the fact that these boards are an active part of our community and readily available to the community, is a really important part of this model. It will include providing greater funding and partnership opportunities with local community organisations to deliver on-ground works and projects.

I would like to take a moment, as I have on numerous occasions prior to this, to talk about the water situation on Eyre Peninsula. Given that the bill we are considering now makes changes to the way water is managed in South Australia, I think it is important to give a local perspective as well. Of course, the previous member for Flinders, Liz Penfold, who held the seat from 1993 to 2010, also spoke much about water supply on Eyre Peninsula.

A lot of our inland areas in this state were not settled until relatively late because of the lack of a reliable water supply. It was highlighted on Eyre Peninsula right back when Matthew Flinders first charted the coastline in South Australia. He stopped off at Port Lincoln, or what became known as Port Lincoln, to refresh his water supplies and found it particularly difficult to source a potable supply of water. He eventually did so and was able to continue on.

Port Lincoln was touted as one of the possible sites for the new state capital, but quite wisely it was decided against, primarily because of the lack of water. A settlement that was to grow into the capital of a colony and ultimately a state needed a water supply, so we saw the settlement on Eyre Peninsula hug the coast, particularly over the West Coast where underground water was available. The inland was not settled until the railway began to be built in 1907, ultimately reaching the top end, both on eastern Eyre Peninsula and the far west in Penong and Buckleboo in the 1920s.

What settlers found was mallee country that was admirably suited to the growing of wheat, but it had very little surface water and any underground water they might have found was of poor quality. Following hot on the heels of the development of the railway was the development of the Tod River Reservoir and distribution scheme. A reservoir was built, essentially by men with shovels and horses dragging sledges, and it captured the waters that were within the Koppio Hills and based around the Tod Reservoir.

A pipe distribution system was constructed which, after being pumped to the top of Knott's Hill adjacent to the Tod Reservoir, gravitated north. I am not sure if that is possible, but anyway it did. It gravitated north, up the map as far as Ceduna, and at the time it was the longest gravitational water reticulation scheme in the world.

I only have a few minutes left, so I will rush along. It was an extraordinary engineering feat. By the time we got to the postwar years of the late 1940s and early 1950s, it was obvious that the Tod Reservoir was not going to be able to keep up with the demand of Eyre Peninsula. Of course, the population was increasing at that stage, industry was developing, sheep numbers were increasing, towns were growing, all those things.

There are a number of shallow underground basins to the west and south of Port Lincoln. They began to be tapped into. Some beautiful water was found. It was high in calcium, but it was certainly good quality, and that supplemented the reticulated supply on Eyre Peninsula. At the same time or within a few years, the Poldia Basin west of Lock and east of Elliston and the Robinson Basin at Streaky Bay were also tapped into. Those basins ultimately collapsed. There is an ongoing debate as to whether that was through overextraction or the lack of recharge through drier seasons. Some might call it climate change. Regardless of that, it does not really matter, those particular basins are not available as a source anymore.

We were hooked into the River Murray as a supply source in the early 2000s. The latest information I have is that the River Murray supplies as much as 25 per cent of Eyre Peninsula's water, coming from Iron Knob down to Lock and then heading west. A significant improvement that has brought about is an improvement in the water quality. There are not the calcium issues in the far west of the state that there once were.

The pressure remains on our southern basins through years of lower recharge, not that our extraction or demand is as high as it once was. It is about eight gigalitres in total a year, not counting

that which is used in Whyalla. I am essentially talking about the agricultural areas of Eyre Peninsula. It is about eight gegalitres a year which is significantly less than it once was.

This government and Minister Speirs have announced a commitment to build a desalination plant on Eyre Peninsula. I, for one, welcome this. It is finally looking like it might come about. I wholeheartedly support the building of a desal plant. Obviously, there will be environmental issues to consider and there will be native title considerations as well, but ultimately we cannot have a significant area of the state running out of water, one of our major regional towns running out of water or all that productive wheat belt country on Eyre Peninsula running short of water.

The plan, as I understand it, is for the desal plant to provide about four gegalitres of water per year. That essentially is 50 per cent of our current usage. It is not ever intended to be a replacement for the underground supply, but it will certainly supplement that. That is a good thing. Once again, it will probably improve the quality of the water that is delivered across Eyre Peninsula. It will also allow a reduction in extraction from our underground basins and enable the preservation of the existing resource. All of us here in this place who are on a quest for sustainability, and I as a farmer and land manager who has been involved with Landcare, Streamcare and NRM, know how critically important that is.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:46): I rise to speak to the Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020. Obviously, issues of water significantly affect the seat of Hammond, being at the bottom of the Murray-Darling Basin. Before I go on, my wife previously worked for natural resources management, a few years ago now, as an environmental scientist.

What we are looking at here are vital amendments to work with the new process of quarterly accounting that has come in recently in 2019-20 as a new way of managing allocations across the board for landholders throughout South Australia. This is to get a better management plan in managing people's allocations through the season instead of doing some form of tidy up at the end of the season and trying to tie that in with carryover water and that kind of thing.

It has been difficult for some growers to get their heads around this. I have farmed for a while myself. Sometimes you hate change, but in the water game, especially in the last few years since the Millennium Drought of the mid-2000s—it really started hitting in 2006—we have really had to take notice, with the Murray-Darling Basin Plan right across the basin, whether it is through Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria or South Australia, of how we manage our water.

To say it was challenging in the period 2006 to 2010 would have to be the understatement of the century or the millennium, seeing as it was the Millennium Drought in that period. There was that now infamous meeting—not just famous but infamous, I think—that John Howard called on Melbourne Cup Day in 2006. I only came into this place on 18 March 2006, so it has been just short of 15 years now. The meeting took place between Prime Minister Howard and the states, their water ministers and Premiers, to say, 'We have a significant problem.'

I can say as a dryland farmer at Coomandook that 2006 was a significantly dry year in dryland farming terms as well. As the member for Flinders just indicated, when you have the rains they are welcome, and that happened recently up in the northern reaches of the basin in Queensland, New South Wales, even down through Victoria, and there has been a little bit of rain in South Australia, but most of the inflows have come from the Eastern States.

It was a difficult, difficult time. I will certainly never forget that time and how difficult it was. I was privileged to be the shadow parliamentary secretary for the River Murray. I think that came on in about 2007, and soon after that, I think it might have been in 2008—someone will correct me somewhere down the track—I became the shadow minister for the River Murray, and it was a pretty tough gig. I was seeking some answers for my electorate because the government of the day, with the water minister at the time, the former member for Chaffey, Karlene Maywald, were going to instigate some pretty draconian measures, especially with regard to the impact on my electorate.

As flows literally dried up and the rains did not come, the River Murray dropped about two metres. There were significant issues at the bottom of my electorate. The interesting thing was that in my first term I represented Strathalbyn, Langhorne Creek, Clayton and Milang, so getting down very close to the mouth of the River Murray. Just outside was the town of Goolwa, which did not

come in until the redistribution in 2010. That was extremely significant because I was fighting for the freshwater recovery.

From the history I have read about the River Murray, I believe it has been predominantly fresh 95 per cent of the time. And, yes, it is true: it has become quite dry. I have seen the photos of the Riverland where people had Sunday picnics on the bed of the river in certain places. I remember, during the Millennium Drought, we were up towards Swan Reach and landing helicopters on the riverbed—not on the bank, on the bed. I do not think I bothered, but you could have walked directly across the river. You would have become a little bit wet in spots, obviously, and in one instance this had a major impact on getting houseboats and tourist vessels through, let alone ski boats and that kind of thing.

One of the issues with the river level dropping was that a lot of my houseboat operators operate in my electorate up around Mannum, a bit further north and all the way up the river. My boundary then went somewhere north of Nildottie. There was a significant impact below Lot 1 at Blanchetown where the water level could be managed. That was where the former government decided to build a weir at Wellington and to hell with the mouth of the River Murray. I did not agree with that and I dug my toes in. I can tell you that I was not sure where that argument would end.

As the member for Flinders indicated, you do not know when it is going to rain, and I did not know, but we were there for at least 3½, nearly four years, getting this outcome. I was on the local group, having monthly meetings, working out the processes that could happen. The government decided they wanted to build a weir out of stones at Wellington. It would have been a sinking structure that sat on the riverbed soils that have washed all the way down from Queensland, and it would have progressively sunk and needed more stone year by year. Some suggested it might have sunk about a metre a year.

Just as a matter for history's sake, when people were building the barrages at Goolwa and surrounding areas through to Tauwitchere, heading back towards Meningie, they put at least two piles together, maybe three, and just drove them in near the Wellington Lodge property and they just disappeared into that silt.

There was going to be a structure built way back then in the 1930s or 1940s for water management, but I am pleased that there was not a structure there because it would have been used by some as a management tool to cut off flows further south. It was nasty. We had acid sulfate soils and we had the lakes drying up. I remember going out on four-wheel motorbikes on Lake Albert with a fisher family down Meningie way across a dry lake bed. You would go out on Tauwitchere barrage and basically look out towards open bare country and the water was way, way away in the distance. It was a terrible time.

It was certainly very challenging coming into a new area like Goolwa in the 2010 election. The place was just enveloped in dust a lot of the time with any wind, because there was some water there heading through Goolwa under the Hindmarsh Island bridge and out towards the mouth, but not a lot. It was very much a lightning rod issue for everyone. There were different points of view, especially from some people in the Eastern States.

I do not really like getting into the Eastern States and South Australia argument, but I think you have to give a little bit of context around it because it is one basin and it needs to be managed as one basin. I know the states have management under the Murray-Darling Basin Plan, but obviously the federal government has a lot of management on top of that. People were peddling all sorts of myths about how it was never fresh, it was this and that, and how much evaporation came off Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert. Most of these numbers were fabricated or highly exaggerated.

I just thought, 'You've got to stand up for something,' and this was something that needed to be fought for because essentially half my electorate was going to be taken away from the opportunity to have not just environmental flows but vital flows to keep the River Murray fresh. I would hate to think what would have happened if that Wellington weir had been built, because I believe the powers that be right across the country would have just said, 'We'll just write off the mouth.' Well, guess what? Rivers die from the bottom up and, if that had happened, the squeeze would slowly go on right throughout the rest of South Australia.

There are three levels of water in the basin: environmental water, irrigation water and critical human needs water. There was nothing more essential during that Millennium Drought than the fact

that Adelaide needed critical human needs water. You may think that is a strange thing to say about a city needing about 130 gigalitres a year as their allocation. Obviously, a lot of it was being pumped from the river. There were decisions being made around a desalination plant. We had a plan to build one of about 50 gigalitres per annum capacity, but there was one built for 100 gigalitres per annum and has never fired right up. I always thought the 50 was going to be big enough, but that is all history now.

The context of having Adelaide on the end of the river as critical human needs water was absolutely vital in the discussion that all the shadow ministers, being National Party members and Liberal Party members, had in New South Wales one day. We flew in in the morning: Mitch Williams as the shadow minister for water and me as the shadow minister for the River Murray. I cannot remember which seat John Cobb had, but he was based in Cobar, New South Wales. He was the federal shadow for water at the time and a really lovely man. I must catch up with him one day. I have not seen him for a long time. He came over our way and we entertained him and looked after him and gave him our views on how the River Murray should be managed.

We were sitting at this meeting with all the shadow ministers, all men at the table—not that that matters, but it is just who was there. I think Queensland was sitting opposite me, with Victoria next to them. New South Wales was there, with Mitch next to me, and John Cobb was sitting next to Mitch. As the federal shadow minister, John started the conversation by making a point (this was the very first comment of the meeting), saying, 'I think we need to wean Adelaide off the river.'

That immediately rang alarm bells in my head. I raised my hand and said, 'Hang on, John, before we go any further', and, good on him, he asked, 'Well, what's your view?' I said that I thought that could be a problem and that we should change the language to, 'We should ease Adelaide's reliance on the River Murray.' I said, 'It may not be when one of you fine gentlemen are sitting around this table, but what could happen if we say that we will wean Adelaide off the River Murray is that the other states will forget about environmental water and forget about production water for South Australia.'

I said at that meeting that a wall would be built at the Victorian border and no water would get past. I tell you what, when you talk about this interstate discussion around water, I saw enough half smiles and almost nods to know that I was on the money. That critical human need was the magnet to make sure we got water down the river, notwithstanding that we need the production water and the environmental water as well to make sure we get the right outcomes for the whole river system.

I was very proud to get through our party room, under the leader Iain Evans, that we would go against the building of the Wellington weir. Thankfully, that never happened. It got so close that there was compulsory acquisition of the roadways on either side: the Withers' property at Pomanda Point on one side and Wellington Lodge, the MacFarlane property, on the other side. They were tough negotiations, but in the end the compulsory acquisition (it might have been negotiated through, but I will have to check that) was right there amongst it in the debate because the government were determined to build the weir.

I must say that I went into the 2010 election with more than a hint of nervousness because plenty of people at Goolwa, and one or two councillors who will remain unnamed, saw me at meetings and events and said to me, 'What are you doing to our water?' It was in the media and a lot of people wanted barriers put up and wanted to float on anything. In fact, one bloke on the radio said he would float on raspberry cordial if he could just to get their boats—and their boats are very important to them in the Goolwa area. Bunds were put in at Narrung, Currency Creek and Clayton, and to this day not all those bunds have been pulled out of the river system and they have silted up those areas a bit.

I went into that election thinking, 'I have upset the houseboat owners, I have upset the flood plain dairy farmers at Murray Bridge, I have upset the new community of Goolwa. Well, that was a lovely one term in parliament.' Anyway, something must have gone right because I was re-elected and my margin went up 7 per cent, but I have not managed to get back there, so I was pleased to make that stand. In hindsight, it was the right thing to do because we have the right outcomes.

As much as the northern basin is the smaller amount of water that comes into the system—I think it is only about 300-plus gigalitres a year allocated if it is there—we have seen those dry times in the Darling River, with plenty of that portrayed on social media and on the television. The McBride properties up there, Robert McBride—what is his property, Nick?

Mr McBride: Tolarno.

Mr PEDERICK: Tolarno, up there on the Darling. We have seen fish kills, and in some way it is reflective of the dire conditions that happened at our end of the river. We went into the 2010 election and everything was dry, but then in September there was nothing better than to see that muddy water coming out of the Darling system, out of the northern basin, to refresh the river and basically save our bacon. It was such a pleasure. The River Murray can be dirty enough as it is, with all the carp in it, but that was just gold. It was just amazing to see the recovery. The rains kept coming in the southern basin, down through the Murrumbidgee and the top end of the Murray and we got that relief.

That story just explains why we have to manage the river appropriately. We have to get away from this carping about whether there is theft or alleged theft in other states, or where there is overuse here and people need to get on board with the quarterly accounting. You need to get on board because we have to manage it. Yes, we do manage it through the states, but we do have to manage it as one basin for the good for all, and get away from some of the petty arguments between the states, because if that happens the plan will fall to bits.

I am a full supporter that producers get on board. I am glad to see this legislation coming into being. May it progress through the parliament quickly and our growers get used to quarterly accounting because basically they will have to.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (17:06): I rise to make a contribution on this very important bill, the Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill introduced by the Minister for Environment and Water, and say that we are starting to see the first changes as we have switched from the NRM system to now this new landscape act and how that is starting to roll out in our regional communities.

It is a hot topic of contention, especially in the Barossa, where we have switched away from being part of the Adelaide Mount Lofty Ranges NRM board to now being part of a sort of Barossa/Yorke/Mid North type of landscape board. We have a fantastic representative on that board, Sarah Barrett, who very much represents the Barossa's interests as well as the broader interests. She is someone I know well as a great Angastonian, and I think she does a fantastic job, bringing a good balance of practical environmentalism coupled with how we are going to actually improve the landscape so that it can work as a working, agrarian landscape in harmony with the natural environment.

Can I say, though, like previous speakers, that water is a big issue in my community and never more so than at the moment. We have seen a couple of below average yielding years in the Barossa in terms of its wine harvest and wine grape harvest, and especially we have seen very little rainfall and very little run-off from any rainfall in the Eden Valley catchment area. It is an issue that is urgent and it is an issue that the government is seeking to take leadership on at the moment. I want to use this opportunity to flesh that out a little bit for those constituents who want to know where this is up to and what work has been progressed in this regard.

The Barossa has traditionally been a dry-grown area, as well as having limited groundwater supply for irrigation in and around the Barossa and the Eden valleys, and that very much contained the supply of wine grapes into the market. We did have a situation in the 1990s where we were starting to see increased salinity from the extraction and use of the groundwater and underwater sources.

At that time, a whole number of people—and I am sure that my predecessor, Ivan Venning, would have made many a speech in this chamber on this topic—and a group of grapegrowers got together to help push for one of the first and certainly the most successful third-party access water irrigation schemes in South Australia.

There is quite a story that gets told about how then Premier John Olsen had to push SA Water to come together with those local growers to develop a system that would deliver Murray water into the Barossa. That system has evolved since 2000 to where it is today—a system that now

delivers 11 gigalitres worth of water into the Barossa system and that now represents up to 70 per cent of all water that gets used for irrigation purposes in the Barossa.

If you think about the iconic brand—the globally recognised brand—that the Barossa is, so much of that is now built off the success of Barossa Infrastructure Limited, a scheme that was privately funded and is privately owned by growers in the Barossa who have third-party access to SA Water's pipes, especially the Mannum to Adelaide pipeline, and the storage at Warren Reservoir, which at the moment is being opened up for greater recreational activities as we speak. In fact, I think next month starts a whole host of new activities in that area.

After some controversy early in the establishment of the scheme around whether we would see a flood of cheap grapes come into the Barossa, the Barossa community has accepted that this has been a way for us not to improve yields necessarily but to improve quality and underpin the best shiraz that is grown anywhere in the world.

But we do have an issue at the moment where, although that water source is pretty reliable, there are years where the Barossa does not get full allocation. Indeed, we are subject to all of the same constraints and the same allocations that other members of the basin are subject to, so in some years temporary water does need to be purchased to help top up that allocation, save and except when it is not available, and certainly there is a price that needs to be paid to get it delivered.

That scheme is phenomenally successful, but there is an opportunity at the moment to be able to get even higher security water into the Barossa, and by the Barossa I mean the Barossa Valley as well as Eden Valley. As I said earlier, Eden Valley has had a couple of very dry years, which has created quite an urgent situation for grapegrowers and some of the most iconic vineyards in Australia, such as the Hill of Grace vineyard. Low rainfalls have meant that vineyard owners across Eden Valley have had to take water from standpipes in Eden Valley to help keep their crops alive. Certainly, seeing those historic vines suffer is something that we need to address not only from an historical standpoint but also from an economic one.

I want to thank the federal government, as well as the Barossa Council, for the work they are doing at the moment to upgrade those standpipes at Springton, Eden Valley and Mount Pleasant to help improve access in the short term for those farmers who need to access that stock. This is not only grapegrowers but also livestock producers in Eden Valley. At the moment, they can take up to 1,000 litres of water and they pay full tote odds on the SA Water potable water price for that water. It is expensive water, but it is necessary to keep livestock and these very historic and famous vines alive.

There is an opportunity at the moment that the government is seeking to grapple with. The government and I, as a local member of parliament, are seeking to progress it with the greatest degree of urgency and that is to bring a new supply of treated water out from Bolivar, up through the pipeline to Two Wells and Korunye, and bring new water to the Barossa that is fit for purpose and can help to augment, if not potentially offset, some of the Murray water that is brought to the Barossa Valley to grow grapes.

Barossa shiraz and Eden Valley shiraz are two of the most high-value horticultural crops across Australia. The average price paid for Eden Valley shiraz at the moment is perhaps the highest average grape price in Australia. That shows that there is demand for this product and what we need to do is try to help unlock that economic value by providing water that will help to underpin the health of the vines and also improve the quality of the grapes that get produced there. At the moment, the primary industries department, in conjunction with Treasury and Finance, is going through the process of looking at a structure and a model for how we can bring that water out to the Barossa.

We also have SA Water undertaking some work at the moment to understand what capacity there is in the Mount Pleasant to Adelaide pipeline, as well as helping to define what the capital cost would be for that project, and essentially some further reverse osmosis desalination, I assume, somewhere around Two Wells/Korunye with a pipeline that then runs to the Barossa and, we would expect, hooks up with the existing Barossa Infrastructure Limited infrastructure so that we can help deliver, as cost effectively as possible, a water solution to the Barossa.

I know there is a lot of frustration in the local community regarding the time that these things take. I can certainly appreciate that frustration, especially for Eden Valley farmers and grapegrowers

who have suffered for the last few years—their need is urgent—and for Barossa grapegrowers, even in a year such as last year, when more water could have been used to help underpin yields and help improve the crops and help improve the situation for some stressed vines across the Barossa Valley.

It is something that we are progressing, but we also know that Barossa Infrastructure themselves are very heavily involved in helping to bring this to fruition. I have to say that, as a local MP, I have absolutely no skin in the game in getting this water delivered, save and except that I know it is something that is going to improve the economic future of the broader Barossa for generations to come. The opportunity to have not only pretty good water security coming out of the Murray but also climate independent, 100 per cent secure water coming out of Bolivar year on year is a fantastic opportunity.

Behind the scenes I am doing everything I can, working with Barossa Infrastructure, working with grapegrowers in the Barossa Grape and Wine Association, working with ministers and SA Water, as well as PIRSA and DTF to help try to bring this together. However, I do think that there is quite a bit of work that needs to be done to get to a solution that is viable for grapegrowers and also viable for the government to support.

Certainly, in my community there is a lot of talk about getting access to federal government funds to help underpin this project and the potential for state government funds to underpin this project. Fundamentally, I believe that this is a commercial project that needs to be, to the greatest extent possible, commercial in its application. I think that that is possible, but what it needs is the support of all parties to come together and coalesce around a single solution.

In my mind, there are two priorities here. The first priority is to make sure that the Barossa Valley is able to get the water it needs to help augment and support its growth but also to underpin better average yields for its grapegrowers, and also to make sure that Eden Valley is part of the solution. Many Eden Valley grapegrowers have come to me a bit worried that they would be left out of the particular solution. That is certainly not the view of the government and it is certainly not my view as the local MP. In fact, as the climate does change, more and more Eden Valley is going to become an important component of Barossa shiraz and we need to make sure that we have the crop there to be able to support that underpinning and that growth.

I think what we need to realise here is that when we sell wine around the world it takes a lot of bums on seats on aeroplanes to get winemakers overseas to sell our fabulous product to the world. That takes time and effort and it takes a lot of hard work. Especially the amount of time, for instance, that was taken to build up the Chinese market, phenomenally successful though it was in the end in the pipeline for the broader Barossa for a long period of time.

Our export markets into the US have ebbed and flowed as have our export markets into Europe. All of those markets get built over time and what is frustrating for wine businesses is when they create those markets and then not have the product behind them, after they have done all that hard marketing effort, to be able to supply product consistently and that is something that is holding the Barossa back.

So the fact that we had smaller vintages, especially in 2018, 2019 and 2020, and all that marketing effort that goes on around the globe, not having the product to deliver on that promise is something that holds us back. The opportunity to have new water come in that is climate independent, that is 100 per cent secure, that is fit for purpose in its nutrient levels, its salinity and a whole host of other requirements gives us the opportunity to deliver on the promise that our Barossa winemakers and marketing people make overseas, and it will help to create jobs in the Barossa.

Some of those early forecasts suggest that there are hundreds and hundreds, in fact, potentially up to \$300 million worth of new economic activity that could be underpinned by this, and I think it will help cement the Barossa as a place that can deliver the highest quality white and red wines around the globe.

It comes at a time when we are seeing some change in Europe, especially as their climate is changing. In famous regions like Burgundy, we have seen that the way in which their vintages operate is changing, especially with more fussy grapes like pinot noir. There is potential opportunity in the future that, as their climate changes and they need to adapt and potentially suffer from climate change, we are able to be ahead of the curve in adapting to climate change so that we can take advantage of those new opportunities in global markets.

I want to assure my community that this is a project that is of the highest priority for me. I have 12 months left in this job and helping to deliver this project is perhaps the highest priority that I have. It is going to be difficult and it is going to require the patience and compromise of all parties involved, but the potential opportunity is so great that I think that will bring everybody to the table in an honest, earnest and good faith way to help deliver a solution.

I would like to commend this bill to the house. I would like to commend bringing new water to the Barossa to this house, and I look forward to helping as soon as we humanly can to bring this project to fruition so that we can deliver more of what is globally recognised here in South Australia as perhaps the best red wine in the world delivered to more consumers, delivering more jobs and prosperity for South Australians.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (17:21): I stand to support the new Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020 and commend the minister and the member for Black, David Speirs, for his efforts in looking at this consistent approach to managing our water resources right across the state.

In regard to MacKillop, my hometown electorate, we are right on the end of the River Murray system, we are dependent upon all water users playing their part in preserving the water and the river for a River Murray outlet, and all that is surrounded by what is the bottom end of the River Murray system. Without compliance across all the states, starting off in Queensland, New South Wales, Victoria and then obviously South Australia, we really do not have a Murray Mouth and we will not have a bottom estuarine system that is sustainable or, perhaps in other words, completely damaged without a good management system in place.

South Australia set a very early standard. All through the seventies, I believe, we brought in early management and a licence system for our water users. We were the first of all the states to licence water use and monitor water use. We have also been given probably one of the smallest shares of the whole Murray-Darling water system of all the states. The argument was, 'We are only getting the tail end and we don't provide any catchment to that system.' However, as we all know when we run out of water—like through the Millennium Drought, which is one of the reasons for looking at this—when the system dies, it dies from the bottom up first and, as a state in the Murray system, we suffer the most on the bottom end of the system rather than the top end.

We also took the longest to recover. It was not instant relief. I believe we are still seeing the results of the Millennium Drought in the southern lagoon, and perhaps even a bit in the northern lagoon system on the Coorong, where we have some really huge salinity levels. We have seen species of fish that have not returned and we are still trying to lower the water salinity levels in the southern lagoon left over from the Millennium Drought.

I was very privileged to be part of a business that had a citrus farm up between Loxton and Renmark on the Pike Creek. The Pike Creek was a little sensitive tributary that always sat around 300 to 400 milligrams of salt more than the main flow of the River Murray system itself because it was a backwater. It highlighted to me why the River Murray system needed very close and careful management, because when you have salinity levels getting up over 1,000 milligrams per litre then there are certain consequences for those sort of salt levels.

This is one of the reasons I think that the water system and the sustainable management of the whole River Murray system from Queensland all the way to South Australia are so important. The next point about that is, if it is so important, how do you police it? How do we manage it? What are the repercussions? As we are rightly seeing now, agriculture in Australia is flourishing. Primary produce sometimes is at record prices, particularly for some of the proteins. Dairy is on the recovery and the like.

I can tell you now that the citrus industry last year had some very good prices. We never saw those prices while we were part of a citrus farm on Pike Creek, as I explained, because we sold in 2015. But the prices that are now being received are even better than when I last saw them and I know that the returns per hectare would even be more advantageous for those who have invested in the horticulture and citrus industry.

This goes in hand with why the minister needs to have a strong system of management and also a system of repercussions, let's say, for those who wish to rot the system, maybe misuse the

system, maybe think it is not a valued system that should be appreciated for all it is. That then leads to a sense of opportunity by some community players. I think the amendments that have been proposed in this landscape bill will be important to make sure that society absolutely values the water and that the users respect the system.

In contrast, as we saw in an ABC report looking into water use, particularly in New South Wales and Queensland, we saw large water users with meters that were not working. Perhaps they were not even in place. There was a suggestion that there were water cowboys on the system abusing the whole river system and its opportunities that were there. This is going to happen if the water has a high value and high return for some of these commodities that it can be used on—for instance, rice, cotton and other types of horticultural crops like citrus or vines.

The other crop that has come up recently, which has had a small downturn recently, is the almond industry which has seen massive plantings of almonds. This is because of the high returns on almonds. They got to nearly \$8 a kilo. They have seen the price soften recently. But this all goes well for making sure that, firstly, the water is there to support these valuable crops and, secondly, that it is not being misused. If it is, what is the deterrent for those who potentially think the laws are weak or that there is an opportunity to misuse the system?

I am very much a believer that South Australia has played its key part in managing the system in its neck of the woods. We probably have led Australia in the allocation and licensing of water and then the management of that system through meters and the monitoring of those meters and recording it to make sure everyone plays their part.

Again, I will highlight the fact that the rest of Australia on the Murray-Darling system has probably been watching and saying, 'We need to tidy up our act. Water is valuable.' It is not necessarily that we are going to have the water and wet years to keep the Murray-Darling system flowing as we would like it every year. As we saw during the Millennium Drought, from memory, we saw water go to over \$1,000 a megalitre on a lease basis in 2006-08.

We then saw it recover and go down to about \$70, even \$40, per year for lease water once the floods came. That tells you the difference, the fluctuations and the opportunities that are there with the water and what we have to be prepared for. So it is an inconsistent system and we need to make sure that that system is being well looked after.

Coming back to my electorate of MacKillop, we also use Murray water. It is piped to towns like Coonalpyn, Tintinara and Keith, and also little towns like Meningie and Salt Creek rely on the Tailem Bend filtration system.

Mr Pederick: And Coomandook.

Mr McBRIDE: And Coomandook in the member for Hammond's home area, his home town and school. The Murray plays a very important role in making sure our water is managed and looked after.

I also know that the Limestone Coast and the underground water system down there is fully prescribed, in the sense that there is no wells area that is not prescribed. It is also metered and managed, and it has a policing system in place or penalties for those who want to fall behind the law rather than stay in front of it. This is another reason why we need good laws that are transparent, that are out there and obvious and that are not hidden—in other words, making sure that the community is fully aware and that the recourses are substantial enough to be a deterrent for those who think the system is there to be rorted.

In regard to water in my region, we are seeing that all the water is being taken up wherever it can be, and there is not a lot of idle water on the Limestone Coast, certainly not as much as there used to be. This is based on the high return for commodity prices now. I can tell you that a lot of centre pivots are going in to grow grass for what used to be mainly dairy, but we are now seeing it to fatten beef and also lamb. That is because those two commodities, beef and lamb, are at nearly record prices. People can afford to spend \$1 per megalitre or a lot on diesel and infrastructure to grow grass to put kilos on and then obviously sell afterwards.

It is also important that we look after this water—and obviously we have some dry years and some wet years—because when we have perennial plantings of crops we want them to be able to survive the dry years. To look after crops like vineyards, oranges, citrus, almonds and even the likes

of pistachios, any perennial crop that needs water to be reliable, consistent and to get through even the driest of years, we are going to need the best of management systems in place.

Without further ado, I commend the bill. I thank the minister for his changes and amendments. I wish all water users all the best in their management and the opportunities the water resources of South Australia bring to our agricultural fraternity.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (17:31): I want to take a brief moment to thank so many of my colleagues for making a contribution on the Landscape South Australia (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2020. The extent and eclectic nature of the contributions certainly demonstrated how important water is to all aspects of life in all areas of our great state.

As I have mentioned a number of times in relation to this bill, it is highly administrative in nature. It seeks to make a small tweak to the Landscape South Australia Act in order to ensure that a compliance regime around water use can be appropriately administered in the 21st century. I would again like to thank my colleagues for their contributions. I thank the opposition for their support, and I commend this bill to the House of Assembly.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (17:33): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

CORONERS (INQUESTS AND PRIVILEGE) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill with the amendments indicated by the following schedule, to which amendments the Legislative Council desires the concurrence of the House of Assembly:

No. 1. Clause 4, page 2, after line 14—Insert:

- (2) Section 3—after subsection (2) insert:
- (3) For the purposes of this Act, a reference to the circumstances of an event may be taken to include matters related to or arising out of the event or its aftermath.

No. 2. New clause, page 2, after line 14—After clause 4 insert:

4A—Amendment of section 13—Jurisdiction of Court

Section 13—after its present contents (now to be designated as subsection (1)) insert:

- (2) In ascertaining the cause or circumstances of an event, the Coroner's Court is to promote the public interest in open justice which may include, without limitation—
 - (a) the public identification of a person, public sector agency or other organisation involved in the event, in particular in circumstances where it appears that such a person, agency or organisation caused or contributed to a death; or
 - (b) requiring a person, public sector agency or other organisation to provide information about and explain their action or inaction in the circumstances of the event; or
 - (c) assessing, subject to this Act, the accountability and responsibility of a person, public sector agency or other organisation involved in the event.

No. 3. New clause, page 2, after line 14—After clause 4 insert:

4B—Insertion of section 20A

After section 20 insert:

20A—Right of appearance for nominated representative of families

- (1) This section applies to proceedings before the Coroner's Court relating to the death or disappearance of a person.
- (2) Without limiting any other provision of this Act, the nominated representative of the family of a person to whom proceedings to which this section applies is entitled to appear in those proceedings and may examine and cross-examine any witness testifying in the proceedings.
- (3) The reasonable legal costs of the nominated representative may be the subject of an application for legal assistance under the Legal Services Commission Act 1977 which is to be determined in accordance with that Act.
- (4) For the purposes of this section, a reference to the nominated representative of a family will be taken to be a reference to a legal practitioner—
 - (a) engaged by or on behalf of the family to represent them in particular proceedings; and
 - (b) nominated, in accordance with any rules of the Court, by the family as their nominated representative.
- (5) In this section—

Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person means a person who—

- (a) is a descendant of the indigenous inhabitants of Australia or the Torres Strait Islands; and
- (b) regards themselves as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander or, if they are a child, is regarded as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander by at least 1 of their parents;

adult means a person of or over the age of 18;

domestic partner means a person who is a domestic partner within the meaning of the Family Relationships Act 1975, whether declared as such under that Act or not;

family, in relation to a person, means—

- (a) the person's senior next of kin; and
- (b) in relation to an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person, includes any person held to be related to the person according to Aboriginal kinship rules, or Torres Strait Islander kinship rules, as the case may require;

parent of a child includes a guardian of the child;

senior next of kin for a deceased person or person who has disappeared means—

- (a) the spouse or domestic partner of the person (and if the person had more than 1 spouse or domestic partner, the person's most recent spouse or domestic partner);
- (b) if the person did not have a spouse or domestic partner or if they are not available—any adult child of the person;
- (c) if the person did not have a spouse, domestic partner or adult child or if they are not available—a parent of the person;
- (d) if the person did not have a spouse, domestic partner, adult child or living parent or if they are not available—any adult brother or sister of the person;
- (e) if the person did not have a spouse, domestic partner, adult child, living parent

or adult brother or sister or if they are not available—

- (i) any person who is named as an executor in the person's will; or
- (ii) any person who was the person's legal personal representative immediately before the person's death or disappearance;

spouse—a person is the spouse of another if they are legally married.

No. 4. New clause, page 6, after line 10—After clause 7 insert:

8—Amendment of section 25—Findings on inquests

- (1) Section 25(2)—delete subsection (2) and substitute:
 - (2) The Court may add to its findings any recommendation that, in the opinion of the Court—
 - (a) might prevent, or reduce the likelihood of, a recurrence of an event similar to the event that was the subject of the inquest; or
 - (b) relates to a matter arising from the inquest, including (but not limited to) matters concerning—
 - (i) the quality of care, treatment and supervision of the dead person prior to death; and
 - (ii) public health or safety; and
 - (iii) the administration of justice,
 and is, in the circumstances, an appropriate matter on which to make a recommendation.
- (2) Section 25(4)(a)—after 'Attorney-General' insert:
and any relevant Minister other than the Attorney-General
- (3) Section 25(4)(b)(i)—delete subparagraph (i)
- (4) Section 25(5)—delete subsection (5) and substitute:
- (5) Each relevant Minister must, within 8 sitting days of the expiration of 6 months after receipt of a copy of a recommendation resulting from an inquest—
 - (a) cause a report to be laid before each House of Parliament—
 - (i) giving details of any action taken or proposed to be taken in consequence of the recommendation; or
 - (ii) if no action has been taken or is proposed to be taken—giving reasons for not taking action or proposing to take action; and
 - (b) forward a copy of the report to the State Coroner.
- (6) The State Coroner may, at any time after the provision of a report under subsection (5), request a supplementary report to be prepared by the Minister that addresses any matter that the State Coroner considers necessary arising out of the report.
- (7) If the State Coroner makes a request under subsection (6), the Minister to whom the request was made must, within 8 sitting days of the expiration of 6 months after receiving the request—
 - (a) cause a supplementary report to be laid before each House of Parliament addressing the matters requested to be addressed by the State Coroner; and
 - (b) forward a copy of the supplementary report to the State Coroner.
- (8) In this section—

relevant Minister, in relation to findings and recommendations of the Court, means—

- (a) if a recommendation is directed to a Minister, or to an agency or other instrumentality of the Crown, as a result of the inquest—the Minister to whom, or the Minister responsible for the agency or other instrumentality of the Crown to which, the recommendation is directed; or
- (b) in any other case—the Attorney-General.

No. 5. New clause, page 6, after line 10—After clause 7 insert:

9—Insertion of section 37A

After section 37 insert:

37A—Release of records to family when no inquest held

- (1) Subject to this section, the State Coroner must, unless the State Coroner is satisfied that it is not in the interests of justice to do so, on application by the family of a person the subject of an event in relation to which the State Coroner determines an inquest is not to be held under this Act or an earlier enactment (whether the determination was made before or after the commencement of this section), provide to the applicant a copy of all records held by the State Coroner in respect of the event.
- (2) An application may only be made under subsection (1) in respect of an event in relation to which the State Coroner determines an inquest is not to be held—
 - (a) if the event is a reportable death—after the expiration of 20 years following the making of a finding as to the cause of death or a finding that the death was due to undetermined natural causes; or
 - (b) in any other case—after the expiration of 20 years following the determination that an inquest is not to be held in relation to the event.
- (3) The ability of a person to make an application under this section does not derogate from the ability of the person to make an application under section 37.
- (4) For the avoidance of doubt, records that may be provided under subsection (1) include the following:
 - (a) material that was not taken or received in open court;
 - (b) a photograph, slide, film, video tape, audio tape or other form of recording from which a visual image or sound can be produced;
 - (c) material of a class that is prescribed by the regulations pursuant to section 37(2)(d).
- (5) Material that has been suppressed from publication under this Act or any other Act (subject to that other Act) may only be provided under this section if the State Coroner is satisfied that it is in the interests of justice to do so.
- (6) The State Coroner may provide a copy of records under this section subject to any condition the State Coroner considers appropriate, including a condition limiting the publication or use of the records.
- (7) If a copy of a record to be released under this section identifies an individual, the State Coroner may redact or otherwise modify the copy of the record to the extent necessary to remove the identity of the individual from the copy if satisfied that the interests of justice require it in the circumstances of the particular case.
- (8) The State Coroner may not charge a fee in relation to—
 - (a) an application for the provision of copies of records under this section; or

(b) the provision of copies of records under this section.

(9) In this section—

Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person means a person who—

- (a) is a descendant of the indigenous inhabitants of Australia or the Torres Strait Islands; and
- (b) regards themselves as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander or, if they are a child, is regarded as Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander by at least 1 of their parents;

adult means a person of or over the age of 18;

domestic partner means a person who is a domestic partner within the meaning of the Family Relationships Act 1975, whether declared as such under that Act or not;

earlier enactment means—

- (a) the Coroners Act 1975; or
- (b) the Coroners Act 1935; or
- (c) any other Act or law of this State providing for the holding of an inquest into the death or disappearance of a person;

family, in relation to a person, means—

- (a) the person's senior next of kin; and
- (b) in relation to an Aboriginal or Torres Strait Islander person, includes any person held to be related to the person according to Aboriginal kinship rules, or Torres Strait Islander kinship rules, as the case may require;

parent of a child includes a guardian of the child;

senior next of kin for a person the subject of an event in relation to which the State Coroner determines an inquest is not to be held means—

- (a) the spouse or domestic partner of the person (and if the person had more than 1 spouse or domestic partner, the person's most recent spouse or domestic partner);
- (b) if the person did not have a spouse or domestic partner or if they are not available—any adult child of the person;
- (c) if the person did not have a spouse, domestic partner or adult child or if they are not available—a parent of the person;
- (d) if the person did not have a spouse, domestic partner, adult child or living parent or if they are not available—any adult brother or sister of the person;
- (e) if the person did not have a spouse, domestic partner, adult child, living parent or adult brother or sister or if they are not available—
 - (i) any person who is named as an executor in the person's will; or
 - (ii) any person who was the person's legal personal representative immediately before the event in relation to which the State Coroner determines an inquest is not to be held;

spouse—a person is the spouse of another if they are legally married.

Consideration in committee.

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

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

In respect of the five amendments before us from the Legislative Council on the Coroners (Inquest and Privilege) Amendment Bill 2020, I indicate that the government will accept the amendments. They incorporate provisions by the Hon. Connie Bonaros in her attempt to support the accessibility of family members to inquest records, essentially after a 20-year period, arising out of inquests.

Whilst I am very pleased that the Coroner has exercised his discretion I think responsibly in respect of the access to records of family members in the past, perhaps this will not have any other work to do other than what is currently the position that that has been noted.

The Coroner did alert me to one item, suggesting that of the family members, the senior next of kin definition—for example, where it is a spouse or a domestic partner, and then it goes down in order then to an adult child of the person, etc.—if the spouse is still alive but perhaps has dementia, then it would not immediately allow the next party (that is, the adult child) to then apply. In any event, he has exercised his discretion in relation to the management of these matters, and in one case at least that is the situation that has arisen, and he has allowed them to inspect. So in some ways this might actually add to some impediment, but there is still sufficient discretion for him to act and he will no doubt do that accordingly.

The second matter relates to the opportunity for representation and the right of family members of the deceased, the subject of an inquest, to question and cross-examine witnesses. Again, this is a matter which is qualified in this amendment, in particular indicating that it does not limit any other provision of the act, which sets out the basis upon which a person, any person, might apply to participate in the proceedings. In any event, we thank the other place for their consideration of the bill and agreement. Otherwise, with these amendments, which the government accepts, I seek the passage of the bill.

Motion carried.

At 17:39 the house adjourned until Wednesday 17 March 2021 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***CONTAINER DEPOSIT SCHEME**

397 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3 February 2021). In relation to the review of the Container Deposit Scheme:

- (a) What is the timing of the review of CDL?
- (b) Will wine bottles be subject to a deposit?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

A discussion paper will be released for consultation in the first half of this year which will present options for modernising the CDS.

LANDSCAPE PRIORITIES FUND

398 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3 February 2021). In relation to the Landscape Priorities Fund:

- (a) Has this fund been established?
- (b) How will the accounts of this fund be reported?
- (c) Will each regional landscape board have their own account, or will their funds be pooled in the Landscapes Administration Fund?
- (d) Why does the Landscapes Priorities Fund not appear in the budget papers?
- (e) How will the Landscapes Priorities Fund be reported?
- (f) What reporting does the state government propose, so that the public can understand the basis of transfers of funds between the accounts of regional landscapes boards, the Landscapes Administration Fund and the Landscapes Priorities Fund?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I can advise:

(a) On 23 December 2020, I wrote to the chairs of the regional landscape boards advising that I had officially launched the Landscape Priorities Fund for 2020-21. The letter included an invitation for the landscape boards to submit funding applications

The money available from the fund for 2020-21 totals approximately \$4.2 million and is sourced from designated levy contributions made by the Green Adelaide Board which were gazetted on 14 January 2021.

- (b) The accounts for the Landscape Priorities Fund will be reported in a number of public documents:
- as part of the Department for Environment and Water (DEW) annual report
 - reported in the annual report of the Auditor-General, under the Administered Items of DEW
 - the Landscape Priorities Fund will also appear as a line in DEW administered items in future budget papers.

Landscape board budgets and expenditure associated with funds derived from the Landscape Priorities Fund will be detailed in the future business plans and annual reports that are prepared by the landscape boards.

(c) Each landscape board has its own deposit account established with the Treasurer. Only the landscape and water levies are paid through the Landscape Administration Fund. All other funding that the landscape boards receive is paid directly into their accounts including any funding that may be received from the Landscape Priorities Fund and from external sources (eg commonwealth funding for the National Landcare Program).

(d) The current source of funding for the Landscape Priorities Fund is a designated levy contribution made by the Green Adelaide Board on an annual basis. The designated levy contribution had not been gazetted at the time the budget papers were being prepared. A budget had not therefore been established for inclusion in the budget papers. The Landscape Priorities Fund will appear as a line in DEW administered items in future budget papers.

(e) The Landscape Priorities Fund will be reported as part of the DEW annual report and will also appear in DEW administered items financial statements published in the annual report of the Auditor General. Future budget papers will also include the Landscape Priorities Fund as a line in DEW administered items.

(f) The DEW administered items financial statements will disclose payments in and out of the Landscape Administration Fund and the Landscape Priorities Fund. The annual financial statements of each landscape board will also detail the funding received from both funds. Similar information will be presented as part of landscape board annual reports.

LANDSCAPE ADMINISTRATION FUND

399 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3 February 2021). In relation to the Landscapes Administration Fund:

- (a) Are each of the regional landscapes boards responsible for all of the funds they have collected from councils?
- (b) In what circumstances will money held in the Landscapes Administration Fund (or the accounts of individual regional landscapes boards) be allocated other than through the decisions of regional landscapes boards?
- (c) Who makes these decisions, upon what criteria and where will the reasons for making each such decision reported?
- (d) Do the allocations on page 173 of Budget Paper No. 4, Vol. 2 for the Landscapes Administration Fund include any component for reimbursing the costs incurred by councils incurred in collecting landscapes levies in their respective council areas? If not, where in the 2020 budget papers are these payments represented?
- (e) Will the government reimburse the full costs incurred by councils in collecting the landscapes levy, or will some of this cost be left to ratepayers to fund?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I can advise:

(a) The landscape boards are responsible for the funds that they collect from councils. The contributions made by constituent councils as part of any levy imposed by a landscape board is paid directly to the Landscape Administration Fund and then transferred to the relevant board accounts.

(b) The Landscape South Australia Act 2019 (the act) provides me as the relevant minister with the authority to apply any part of the Landscape Administration Fund for a range of purposes including, among other things, making payments to regional landscape boards or for any other purposes to further the objects of the act or to support the operation or administration of the act. The regional landscape boards determine how funding from the Landscape Administration Fund is to be spent through the development of their annual business plans.

(c) The act provides me as the relevant minister with the authority to approve any deductions made from the Landscape Administration Fund prior to disbursements of funds to the landscape boards after consultation with the Treasurer. The only currently approved deduction from the fund is associated with water planning and management charges which are authorised by the Treasurer in accordance with section 89 (2) of the act.

(d) The budget papers do not include any component for reimbursing the costs incurred by councils in the collection of the landscape levies. Those payments are the responsibility of the landscape boards. The costs associated with the levy collection process are identified in the landscape board business plans which do not form part of the budget papers.

(e) The landscape boards are responsible for managing council collection costs and are liable to pay each constituent council an amount determined in accordance with regulations. Section 70 of the act and associated regulation 14 of the Landscape South Australia (General) Regulations 2020 make provisions for landscape boards to reimburse councils for costs incurred in complying with the above requirements.

LIMESTONE COAST

400 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3 February 2021). Have there been any grants or investigations into biomass or bioenergy in the Limestone Coast area granted by Green Industries SA?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

Green Industries SA (GISA) has provided grants towards projects related to feasibility of biomass / bioenergy in the South-East region of South Australia.

PASTORAL LANDS BILL

401 Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (3 February 2021). In relation to the draft Pastoral Lands Bill:

- (a) Will you commit to make all departmental submissions public before legislation is introduced to the parliament?
- (b) Given the concerns raised by the Native Vegetation Council regarding the process of changing land tenure from a pastoral lease to conservation purposes, and the importance of conservation within the pastoral estate, will you consider providing a simple process within the new bill to provide approval for conservation as the dominant purpose of lease without having to change land tenure?
- (c) When will the up-to-the-minute satellite monitoring regime that has been proposed to replace stock maximums under the new bill be ready to be used?
- (d) How much money has been allocated to the development and roll out of the proposed new satellite monitoring regime for pastoral leases?

(e) Have you begun work on the thresholds that will be used to enforce the proposed new satellite monitoring regime? Will you commit to releasing these details before the bill is introduced to parliament?

(f) How many FTEs have been allocated to monitoring and compliance under the Pastoral Lands Management and Conservation Act in each of the past five years?

(g) How much money has been spent on monitoring and compliance under the Pastoral Lands Management and Conservation Act in each of the past five years?

(h) Is there an intention to increase funding and staff allocations for monitoring and compliance if the current regime based on stock maximums and is replaced it with the proposed satellite monitoring regime?

(i) Apart from calling for submissions, what formal consultation has occurred with Indigenous representatives in the development of the draft pastoral bill?

(j) Apart from calling for submissions, what formal consultation has occurred with conservation representatives in the development of the draft pastoral bill?

(k) Has the minister or the department received any advice, including from the Valuer-General, on the implications of increasing pastoral lease terms from 42 to 100 years on the value of these leases? If so, what was this advice and who provided it?

(l) Has the minister or the department received any advice on the implications of increasing pastoral lease terms from 42 to 100 years on native title rights? If so, what was this advice and who provided it?

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):

- (a) Yes.
- (b) Feedback raised during consultation is being considered.
- (c) The timing will be determined by the pastoral board.
- (d) The state government allocated 3.17 FTEs over three years to develop the monitoring system.
- (e) This is a matter for the pastoral board to determine.
- (f) The same resources as under the former labor government.
- (g) The primary cost of administering compliance activities is built into the pastoral unit budget.
- (h) The government is not proposing to increase lessee charges to pay for additional public servants.
- (i) Significant consultation and direct contact has occurred with Aboriginal representatives, including native title holders and Aboriginal organisations who hold pastoral leases.
- (j) Conservation organisations who hold pastoral leases were individually contacted and there has been significant consultation with conservation stakeholders, including a meeting with the minister.
- (k) Any legal advice sought on the bill is legally privileged and not for disclosure.
- (l) Any legal advice sought on the bill is legally privileged and not for disclosure.

SA WATER

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (2 February 2021).

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

SA Water has not changed its supply of water to the owners of the Dry Creek salt fields to allow diluted brine to be discharged at Bolivar.

NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 February 2021).

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

The current income budget figures for Hills and Fleurieu, Green Adelaide, and Northern and Yorke landscape boards, under the new boundaries, are as follows:

Current Budget 2020-21			
Landscape Board	Land Levies \$'000	Water Levies \$'000	Total Levies \$'000
Hills & Fleurieu	5,032	2,162	7,194
Green Adelaide	28,633	145	28,778
Northern & Yorke	5,523	366	5,889

ZERO COST ENERGY FUTURE EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 February 2021).

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water): I have been advised:

Answer: \$0 spend was made prior to the tabling of the Public Works Committee report on 21 March 2019.

LEGISLATIVE COMPLIANCE FRAMEWORK

In reply to **the Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay)** (4 February 2021).

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development):

I am willing to provide the Legislative Compliance Policy Final Version (GO P 002) upon written request.