

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 27 October 2021

The **SPEAKER (Hon. D.R. Cregan)** took the chair at 10:30 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.

Bills

HOLIDAYS (CHRISTMAS DAY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (10:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Holidays Act 1910. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee) (10:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

This period of the calendar year is usually a time when we look forward to the festive season. We look forward to the festive season based around that traditional Christian religious holiday of Christmas. It has been a time that our community has looked forward to celebrating with family, with friends, with loved ones, when we know we will have some time away from our usual daily commitments to spend with those who are most important to us in our lives.

Of course, this is also usually the time when towards the end of October some of us think that we have at least two clear months to start worrying about Christmas shopping, and that enables us to leave it to the last moment. Nonetheless, it is a time when all of us should have the comfort of knowing that we will have a break from our normal commitments.

That is a bit different this year because we have the unusual circumstance—not unprecedented but unusual—where the actual Christmas Day falls on Saturday. It means that the normal benefit that would accrue to most South Australians of having a public holiday on Christmas Day when we can be free from going to work or, for those who still need to go to work, being entitled to receive appropriate rewards in the form of penalty rates, etc., necessarily will not translate. It is this anomaly which has been the focus of a growing industrial campaign from a lot of employee representatives in our community, particularly those who are required to work despite it being either Christmas Day or a day close to Christmas.

If Christmas Day will not attract a usual public holiday because it happens to fall on a Saturday, then of course the appropriate thing would be to declare it a public holiday day as it is, in fact, a public holiday—to declare the Saturday a public holiday. Par for the course, you would think—makes sense. Everybody can see the logic in that. Everybody can see the reasonableness and the fairness in that, but that is not the approach the Marshall Liberal government is taking.

The Marshall Liberal government is taking the approach that you would expect from the Liberal Party of South Australia; that is, to prioritise the financial returns of the employers against the reasonable benefits of employees. It is, of course, entirely reasonable that employers who must engage staff in order to operate on a Christmas Day public holiday should pay appropriate penalty rates, whether that happens to fall on exactly the 25th or on the next logical day for that public holiday which, in the context of this year, happens to be the Monday the 27th. But that is not the approach here.

Of course, it is par for the course for the current Minister for Industrial Relations, the Treasurer in the other place, Rob Lucas, and it is par for the course from the current Premier, the member for Dunstan, to seek to make sure that those workers who are required to work on these sorts of days do not get the benefit of penalty rates. We have seen the approach they have taken

with attempting to deregulate shop trading hours, and now they take this same sort of scorched earth approach to one of the most sacred times of the year.

Well, that is outrageous. Whether they are hospital workers, whether they are public transport workers, whether they are retail workers, whether they are workers in other industries that must operate on a Christmas Day public holiday, they deserve the appropriate penalty rates. Why would we not give that to them? The community agrees with the plight of these workers. The only people who seem to disagree are those elected members of parliament who identify as members of the Liberal Party of South Australia—the dwindling number that it seems to be. It is an extraordinary situation where those opposite feel that workers should not be entitled to those penalty rates at Christmas time.

Do we expect those opposite to be working on those days? Well, the vast majority of them will not be; that is true. They will be taking the opportunity to put their feet up and enjoy time away from work or enjoy time with those most important to them. They will be getting the benefit of the festive season that the rest of the community would normally expect, but they will not be providing a reasonable and appropriate additional benefit, a recognition of what it means to have to work on a public holiday in the festive period.

That is why this bill is entirely appropriate and necessary for the parliament to support: a small change to fix up this anomaly of how our calendar falls in this particular year, and that is when Christmas Day falls on a Saturday it should be a public holiday so that workers working on that day, in those relevant industries, attract the appropriate penalty rates. It is fair and reasonable.

For those opposite to maintain the position that those workers who have to work on that day do not deserve penalty rates is absolutely outrageous, and the people in their communities know exactly what they stand for when they oppose this measure. The comeback from those opposite is that 11 years ago the calendar happened to fall in a similar way and nothing was done by a former state government then. That is because at that time there were the appropriate awards and regimes in place to ensure that those workers were appropriately compensated.

The member for Chaffey is fired up about this, of course. He loves looking people in the eye in his community of Chaffey and explaining to them why they do not deserve penalty rates on an appropriate public holiday in the festive season. That is a matter for him to explain to those people working in medical services or in retail services or in hospitality services why they do not deserve that. If that is his particular view, that is fine.

Like we will be across the rest of South Australia, we will be letting constituents of those Liberal members of parliament know that their representatives in this place do not believe that those workers are worth standing up for. That is the view of those Liberal MPs who do not support this measure. I cannot imagine having to look a retail worker or a hospitality worker or a health worker in the eye and say to them that they are not worth standing up for.

The member for Chaffey might not like it and if he does not like it, well, he can join with us and he can support this important piece of legislation; he can do the right thing by those workers in his community. He can stand side by side with those retail workers, with those hospitality workers and with those healthcare workers, rather than taking a position that effectively denigrates their contribution to our community, if that is how he feels.

Of course, that is not how he feels; that is not how he feels at all. He does not think that this is worth supporting and that is why he is getting hot under the collar, because his constituents are going to see the whites of his eyes when it comes to how he stands on this matter. He does not believe that they are worth more, on that particular day, on a public holiday, and that they should not have to be remunerated any further for giving up this important time with their families, with their friends and with their loved ones in order to do that essential work. I find that an absolutely scandalous position. The truth is there is no justification for the position that those opposite take—no justification whatsoever.

So while those opposite, presumably on what will be a nice warm day, click clack out of their houses in their board shorts and their thongs, down to the IGA to get a loaf of bread and maybe some milk and some orange juice so that they can continue on with their nice break over the festive season, as they are standing at the supermarket checkout, presumably they will be looking at

someone aged 15 and upwards, looking them in the eye and thinking, 'I'm glad you're not getting a penalty rate on this Monday because I don't think it's worth you being remunerated any more than you would otherwise get paid on any other day of the year that does not attract penalty rates.'

Then they will click clack out of that supermarket, they will go over to the bottle-o maybe, they will buy a bottle of wine or a sixpack of beer, they will be looking that worker in the eye as they complete their transaction and I presume the same thought will be going through their head as well: 'You're not worth a penalty rate either.' That is what those opposite will be thinking: 'You're not worth the penalty rates either.'

God forbid that any misfortune should befall any of us and that somebody might need to be attended to by a health worker over the festive period, but presumably if one of them does themselves an injury or something worse and they are being attended by a health worker, as they are being attended, maybe bandaged up, even laid down on a gurney and pushed into the back of an ambulance, they will thinking (should they be conscious), 'You're not worth the penalty rates either.' That will be the view of those opposite.

Well, I and the people on this side of the parliament take the opposite view. Those people who have to spend time away from their families and loved ones, who have to work during the festive period, who do not get the advantage of the regular Christmas Day public holiday because it falls on a Saturday, should be compensated for having to work in the festive period. That is entirely appropriate.

I know that on those days, should I come across somebody who is engaged in work on that day, that I will be able to look them in the eye and think, 'I did my best for you. I realise the sacrifice that you're making personally, that your family is making and that you're making on behalf of our community in order to show up to work.' I will be able to look them in the eye, as will those members of the Labor Party, and say, 'I did my best for you. I recognise the service that you are doing for the community and I think you should be appropriately compensated.'

What it comes down to basically is the two-facedness of those opposite who continue to enjoy the benefits in their own lives that the union movement has provided to them over the last 130 years. They continue to enjoy all those benefits, yet they stand against that same movement for any further improvement to the lives or working conditions or entitlements that workers continue to desire.

They will enjoy their holidays, as I am sure they enjoy their weekends, as I am sure they enjoy their superannuation and their Medicare benefits and the safety net. They enjoy a safe workplace—well, except I guess in the current context in here at times—and they will continue to enjoy all those other benefits that the union movement has provided them, yet they will continue to turn their backs on workers and their representatives when their support is so needed.

I look forward to the debate on this matter. I look forward to looking into the whites of the eyes of those members opposite about how they choose to support or turn their back on workers in their own communities. I certainly look forward to participating in the public campaign to remind constituents about how those members opposite chose to vote on this important matter.

Debate adjourned on motion of Dr Harvey.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (STRATA SCHEMES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 13 October 2021.)

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (10:50): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Strata Schemes) Bill 2021 and indicate to the house, and in particular to the member for Waite, that whilst I thought, when he was presenting this bill, it might have some merit and be able to remedy some ill, he did not ultimately identify any ill that needed to be remedied. I have taken advice on the matter as to how we currently manage the strata schemes and indicate that, on the basis that it is not a matter which at this stage needs to be considered in the affirmative, the government will be opposing the bill.

I thank the member for Waite for bringing to our attention all the matters that need to be reviewed from time to time in relation to how we structure the rules around people who cohabit in the same place—not always in the same dwelling. They need to be able to resolve these matters. We have community titles, we have strata titles and we have legislation to cover these matters incorporated in the Community Titles Act 1996 and the Strata Titles Act 1988.

Essentially, this bill is to remove the requirement for an owner of a strata area or a community strata area, where there are only two in the lot, to comply with the need to ordinarily agree to structural building on common property. The closest thing we otherwise have in the community is the rules that are probably the bane of most MPs' lives, and that is under the Fences Act and disputes between neighbours and how they might determine, through a notice procedure, what kind of fencing should be between their boundaries and when it needs an upgrade and the like.

At the moment, under the Strata Titles Act, unless a particular strata plan indicates otherwise, the boundary of a unit is the internal surface of the walls, floors and ceilings, and in most strata corporations the roof, guttering, external walls and foundations are common property. Internal walls are the owner's responsibility. The unit holders, where there are only two units, own the structure and therefore can legally contract with a builder, etc., to undertake structural building work/improvements and then own the improved property comprising the two units.

Under section 29 of the Strata Titles Act, a unit building may not be altered without special resolution of the unit holders. A special resolution requires that not more than 25 per cent of the owners vote at a properly convened meeting of the corporation. For a two-unit group, both owners must agree to achieve a special resolution. As described in the second reading, the intent of the bill is to remove effectively the veto power of the neighbour or the second owner for the external work/improvements proposed.

Because of these long-established positions, a person who has bought into a strata group of units, even where there are only two, has the expectation that the exterior appearance and structure of what is essentially a jointly owned building of two units will not be altered without their agreement. Notwithstanding the usual planning controls on such work, it would be a significant change to owners' rights to suddenly take away their joint decision-making power over the jointly owned property. Further, the default position is that the opposing owner, as part of the strata corporation, would become jointly liable financially for the second improved unit, including for maintenance, increased insurance premiums, etc.

Service infrastructure is often shared in strata groups, such as shared water, sewerage and electricity lines and meters. These jointly owned infrastructure and supporting easements for the right of access, etc., will likely need to be interfered with if building work is undertaken on one side of the building comprising the two units.

Questions then arise about the potential liabilities arising from that and the impact on the enjoyment of the other unit. South Australia, like other jurisdictions, does sensibly exempt two-lot schemes from several of the requirements in the legislation relating to operating sinking funds and other financial management requirements. They are not the subject of the bill, but I think it is important to note that our principal legislation does acknowledge that a two-unit facility may have different obligations from multi-lots.

Informal and preliminary search indicates that no other Australian jurisdiction provides for an owner in a two-lot scheme to undertake structural improvements on a lot without the agreement of the owner of the other unit. Discussions with the peak industry body, Strata Community Australia (SA), indicate that they were not consulted prior to the introduction of the bill and hold similar reservations about the liability for works to common property as well as potential impacts to property valuations.

As acknowledged by the member for Waite, there is provision in the STA for the owner to apply to the Magistrates Court for relief if an owner claims that a decision of the corporation—effectively the other owner in this scenario—is unreasonable or where a dispute arises between the two owners. Of course, court action can be costly; that is acknowledged. It is preferable, obviously, to be able to deal with the matter, but we also need to take into account the rights of the dissenting owner to enable them to be properly taken into account.

From time to time, this question is raised about whether these sorts of disputes should be dealt with in SACAT's jurisdiction. Property matters have remained with the Magistrates Court. There is a determination which even prohibits SACAT dealing with it, from a residential tenancy point of view, where the landlord might be an interstate party. We do have to really fit in within the rules that we have. I am happy to work with the member for Waite on any further ideas that he might have in this regard, but I am unable to support this bill, but otherwise invite him to continue the discussion further.

Ms MICHAELS (Enfield) (10:57): I rise to make a contribution on the Statutes Amendment (Strata Schemes) Bill and indicate I am the lead speaker for the opposition on this. I commend the member for Waite and I understand there are certain constituents in his community who have had to face the issue of having two-strata or community lots and this concept of the power of veto preventing any building or construction work on one title.

I understand that frustration. I also understand there may be concerns in relation to, for example, if someone wanted to paint their house bright pink, what that would do to their neighbouring property. I propose to move an amendment, which I will talk through at a later point in the committee stage. What I think is a reasonable compromise is to support the member for Waite's bill on the basis that an amendment is put through so that if planning or building approval is required under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act, there is that oversight and the Planning and Design Code will come in.

In that case, I think the power of veto should be removed. If it is something like painting, which would not otherwise require planning approval, then I think the power of veto should stay to prevent any devaluing of property from someone doing something that does not require planning and development approval. On that basis, as we move through the stages of this bill, that is the position that we will take on this side of the chamber. Again, I commend the member for taking this up on behalf of his constituents and look forward to the progress of the bill.

Mr DULUK (Waite) (10:58): I thank the Attorney for outlining the government's position and the member for Enfield for the opposition's position as well, and for outlining some proposed amendments, which I hope we can discuss in the committee stage. I want to respond to some of the remarks from the Attorney. These proposed amendments will only, of course, relate to the situation where the power of veto will not apply, once a proposal has received appropriate planning approval and council approval.

This does not allow in a two-unit strata corporation for one unit holder in that strata corporation to make any substantial changes to the outside of the strata that they see fit. It will only be any changes that have, of course, appropriate council permissions, and that can simply be an amendment to a carport or a second-storey balcony, which may need strata approval per se, but one strata owner is in disagreement with that. It really looks at a way of removing any vexatious neighbourly dispute.

I appreciate that there will be some changes to strata property that do not need council approval, and I think that those mitigating factors are foreshadowed in some of the amendments proposed by the member for Enfield. I thank both the government and the opposition for their contributions, and I move that this bill be read a second time.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): While we are sorting out some of these amendments, are there questions on clause 1, the title?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I would ask the mover of the bill, the member for Waite, whether he has made any inquiry with any stakeholder in relation to the matter since he has introduced the bill and, if so, what was their position?

Mr DULUK: No, I have not. This is very much a constituent-led issue and to that, obviously, some of the stakeholders who would normally be involved with this have not had the opportunity to

do so. As I have often found the case with other private member's bills that I have brought forward in engaging some of the government stakeholders to seek their position, a response being received is very tardy and is quite often received after any private member's bill is debated or even passed in this place.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I am not quite sure I understood that answer, but I would have to say that with government bills that come to this house it is the usual practice that people are consulted, including the stakeholders. It is the usual practice and the practice of this government to continue to do that.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Pederick): Order!

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: My question is: having constituents in your area who may be at the end of a vexatious neighbour who is not prepared to agree to the psychedelic painting of the person who has complained to you, have you had any complaints from others who say, 'I'm offended by people who want to do something that is patently inconsistent with the area,' and therefore there is a dispute?

Have you had any complaints from those where they have been the subject of, for example, a Magistrates Court determination if they have been unhappy with that, because I am assuming that your boundary does not go through the middle of the two units?

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Attorney: I think that was more of a statement than a question. No, I have not had any determination or any constituents put to me a situation of a magistrate's determination. As most members know, some interest that I take in this house is consumer protection law, and I think that is evident in this bill before us and in some of the other legislation I have brought to this place.

Where there are some anomalies I think in our consumer protection laws—and stratas are an example, and insurance and crash repairers are probably another good example—where we can look to fix what I think are some anomalies in legislation, I think we should as a parliament, and ultimately that is up to the parliament to decide.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If it is consumer protection, I therefore assume that it is the consumer protection of the person who wants to be able to do something without consent of their neighbour and not the consumer protection of the person who is objecting to it. My next question, though, is: have you had any constituents complain to you that they have had to go to the Magistrates Court to have this issue resolved?

Mr DULUK: Not specifically.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I ask the mover of the bill, the member for Waite: what is the nature of alterations or additions that your constituents have raised with you where consent has been unreasonably withheld from the other party?

Mr DULUK: Attorney, in relation to your question, I think as you know, constituents come to all their members with a range of issues, some specific, some general. What my proposed amendment to the Community Titles Act and the Strata Titles Act looks to do is create a fairer situation. For example, if you are a resident in a strata corporation with three unit holders, the legislation rightly says that you need two out of three unit holders to agree to any changes required under the act, which means that no one unit holder has an absolute power of veto over any other resident in that same strata unit.

Of course, where you only have two unit holders in a strata corporation, effectively one unit holder has a 100 per cent power of veto over that other unit holder. All this basic amendment seeks to do is take away that power of veto only in the circumstance once any proposed changes have council approval. This is not looking at two neighbours just blatantly saying, 'I don't support the changes that you want to make to your balcony looking out east,' for example. That might be an

example. Council approval needs to be sought and it needs to be granted, and of course with any council process as well there naturally is a complete ability for anyone to object in that council approval process for building works.

This is not looking to blatantly take away one person's right to stop a project or to approve a project. Council approval will still need to be sought and, as most members are aware, most councils are pretty difficult to deal with when it comes to building processes. We are not looking for an abrogation of responsibility for decision-making. We are just saying that where council approves for a project to occur on a strata unit where there are only two parties that power of veto does not apply.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: If you cannot identify for the benefit of this any alteration or addition that has been complained of, let's consider the hypothetical that has been put by the member for Enfield, that is, somebody wants to have the front area painted bright pink and proceeds to do so. In the absence of this bill, they would need to get the permission of the other party to do so. They do not need council permission to actually paint the area. Do you think that that is a matter that they should be able to proceed to do without obtaining the consent of the other party?

Mr DULUK: I suppose this bill does not propose to understand that hypothetical question. My amendments only relate to the position where you need to have council approval. In a position where you do not need to have council approval, the current status quo of the legislation applies.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: Do you have any idea at this stage what the prescribed work will incorporate?

Mr DULUK: Of course, it is any prescribed work that would need council approval to add to someone's property.

Clause passed.

Clause 3.

Ms MICHAELS: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Michaels-1]—

Page 2, line 16 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)]—After '2 lots' insert:

if the work is approved development under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*

Amendment No 2 [Michaels-1]—

Page 2, lines 17 to 18 [clause 3(1), inserted subsection (1b)]—Delete 'on a lot in a strata scheme consisting only of 2 lots' and substitute 'referred to in subsection (1a)(b)'

The second amendment is consequential on the first one, and I think this clarifies the situation that has just been the subject of the conversation between the Attorney and the member for Waite. It is to clarify that the power of veto will be abolished in respect of work that is subject to an approved development under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act. Where there is council approval, which is what the member for Waite was discussing, the power of veto would no longer apply. If it is not subject to council approval, as the Attorney was stating—the pink house—the power of veto would remain in place to stop any devaluation of neighbouring property. That is my first amendment, and the second amendment is consequential on that.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: I do not have any questions of the mover of the motion, but I will indicate that I agree that this substantially improves the bill in the sense of its application. At the very least, this is to be able to cover what has already had an assessment, essentially, whether it is by the local council or another authorised authority; it may be SCAP, for example. In any event, there is some assessment being undertaken. I think that is a significant improvement.

Again, given this matter has just been raised today, we will have to have a look at that and consider in another place whether we agree to the bill generally with this improvement and with the relevant stakeholders. Naturally, we will need to do that. But I do not disagree with the member for Enfield's amendment, providing an improvement. Whether it is adequate to deal with the weaknesses otherwise of the bill we have yet to see.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clause 4.

Ms MICHAELS: I move:

Amendment No 3 [Michaels-1]—

Page 3, line 8 [clause 4(1), inserted subsection (1a)(b)]—After '2 units' insert:

if the work is approved development under the *Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016*

Amendment No 4 [Michaels-1]—

Page 3, lines 9 to 10 [clause 4(1), inserted subsection (1b)]—Delete 'on a unit in a strata scheme consisting only of 2 units' and substitute 'referred to in subsection (1a)(b)'

These are consequential on the first amendment and introduce the concept that work that will not be subject to a veto must be subject to approved development and approval under the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act.

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN: For the same reasons, in relation to amendments Nos 3 and 4 being presented by the member for Enfield, I accept that this obviously narrows the application of the bill in relation to two-unit landholdings and, for the same reasons, I indicate that we will consider that between the houses.

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

Mr DULUK (Waite) (11:16): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

The house divided on the third reading:

Ayes 22
Noes 22
Majority 0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E.
Duluk, S. (teller)
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Chapman, V.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Gee, J.P.

Tarzia, V.A.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 ayes and 22 noes, the votes being equal, I give my casting vote for the ayes. The motion therefore passes in the affirmative.

Third reading thus carried; bill passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

Mr BROWN (Playford) (11:22): I move:

That Private Members Business, Bills, Orders of the Day, have precedence over Private Members Business, Other Motions, until the completion of consideration of Order of the Day No. 3.

The SPEAKER: Until the completion of Order of the Day No. 3?

Mr BROWN: Yes.

The house divided on the motion:

Ayes	22
Noes	22
Majority	0

AYES

Bedford, F.E.
Bignell, L.W.K.
Brown, M.E. (teller)
Duluk, S.
Koutsantonis, A.
Mullighan, S.C.
Picton, C.J.
Wortley, D.

Bell, T.S.
Boyer, B.I.
Close, S.E.
Hildyard, K.A.
Malinauskas, P.
Odenwalder, L.K.
Stinson, J.M.

Bettison, Z.L.
Brock, G.G.
Cook, N.F.
Hughes, E.J.
Michaels, A.
Piccolo, A.
Szakacs, J.K.

NOES

Basham, D.K.B.
Ellis, F.J.
Knoll, S.K.
McBride, N.
Pederick, A.S.
Sanderson, R.
Treloar, P.A.
Wingard, C.L.

Chapman, V.A.
Gardner, J.A.W.
Luethen, P.
Murray, S.
Pisoni, D.G.
Speirs, D.J.
van Holst Pellekaan, D.C.

Cowdrey, M.J.
Harvey, R.M. (teller)
Marshall, S.S.
Patterson, S.J.R.
Power, C.
Teague, J.B.
Whetstone, T.J.

PAIRS

Gee, J.P.

Tarzia, V.A.

The SPEAKER: There being 22 ayes and 22 noes, the votes being equal, I give my casting vote to the ayes.

Motion thus carried.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I am seeking some clarification. It is my understanding that when a vote of the house is tied on a procedural motion and the proposal is to proceed against normal practice, when that vote is tied the Speaker will—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will hear out the point of order. If there is a point of order to the point of order, then I will hear the point of order to the point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will hear the point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: I did not say it was a point of order: I said I was seeking clarification.

The SPEAKER: Leader of Government Business, there does appear to be a point of order to my left, which would take precedence over your seeking of clarification.

Mr BROWN: Sir, the point of order I raise is that I do not think this is a legitimate use of the house's time at all. Also, I draw your attention to the standing orders which allow the house to make its own orders to decide whether precedence is given to private members' motions or bills.

The SPEAKER: I am also concerned that the contribution that may be about to be made is also a reflection on the vote of the house, which of course is quite clearly contrary to standing orders.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Leader of Government Business, as I understand the thrust of the submission, it does appear to be a point of clarification that is reflecting on a vote of the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sir, if I am able to finish, please: no, it is not actually. My point of clarification is that it is standard practice, as I understand it, that when there is a tied vote on a procedural matter the Speaker casts his or her vote—

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, Leader of Government Business, this does very clearly appear to be a reflection on the vote of the house.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, sir, it is actually about your vote, not the house's vote.

The SPEAKER: Yes, well, I am sorry to say that any vote in this place is a vote of the house. Any vote of the house is a vote of this place. I make my ruling and I will turn to additional business. Thank you, Leader of Government Business.

Bills

COORONG ENVIRONMENTAL TRUST BILL

Second Reading

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (11:31): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I rise to introduce the Coorong Environmental Trust Bill 2019, which establishes the Coorong Environmental Trust. This important piece of legislation aims to find a solution to common problems in the Coorong and Lower Lakes. It will drive the restoration of flows and ecological stability as well as encourage sustainability.

The Coorong Environmental Trust Bill 2019 was introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC on 3 April 2019. It was announced jointly by the Greens, the Minister for Environment and Water, the shadow minister and SA-Best at the Goolwa wharf on 30 March 2019. All parties present indicated their support for the model and for the trust.

This bill has gone through a select committee process. The final report of the committee found that the bill 'is an appropriate measure and recommends that it be passed'. The bill passed the Legislative Council with unanimous support and only one amendment to increase the number of directors required for a quorum.

The bill advocates for an independent board consisting of members who represent organisations with a professional, financial, physical or legal commitment to the ecological wellbeing of the Coorong. The trust will be independent from state government to encourage and empower the local and scientific communities to manage the Lower Lakes and Coorong the best way they know. State government will still be provided with reports and information from the trust to inform ongoing decision-making. The role of the trust will include:

- creating and maintaining a repository for all environmental data and research outcomes;
- preparing an annual State of our Estuary report;
- preparing, adopting and maintaining a set of rules relating to the membership, management and operation of the trust;
- providing independent, impartial scientific advice on the state of the Coorong to stakeholders;
- providing guidance for future environmental research;
- monitoring and documenting environmental flow outcomes;
- coordinating and implementing a comprehensive water quality monitoring program;
- independently assessing proposed solutions to ecological challenges;
- establishing a fundraising committee and a wetland science committee to enable the trust to carry out its functions with financial independence; and
- performing and carrying out functions assigned by regulators.

The Coorong Environmental Trust Bill is based on the Renmark Irrigation Trust. Using a trust model such as this to look after a river, wetland or estuary, is not unprecedented and has proven effective in the past; Peel-Harvey Catchment Council, the Derwent Estuary Program, the Environmental Water Trust, Estuary Care Foundation SA and the Avon-Heathcote Estuary Ihtai Trust are just a few examples. All these trust collectives have enabled greater outcomes for their estuary for equal or less overall resource input from each of these stakeholders.

The Coorong is a national treasure located at the end of the River Murray and stretching 200 kilometres from Encounter Bay to Lacepede Bay. Establishing this trust will put science back at the heart of decision-making and ensure quality, long-term monitoring, data collection and research. The proposed membership of the trust ensures all community voices are heard and will provide reliable and unbiased information to all stakeholders. More importantly, the trust will be able to attract private funding for the preservation and restoration of the wetlands.

I would also like to acknowledge the minister's department, which has worked alongside me over the last couple of weeks to come to a good landing point with this Coorong Environmental Trust Bill. I flag there will be two amendments, which have been agreed to. I look forward to the speedy passage of this bill through the parliament.

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:36): I rise to indicate that this side of parliament supports the bill and has done for a long time. Indeed, it is a bill with the year 2019 on its front cover. I remember going down to Goolwa in about March 2019. The minister was there, I was there and a number of people who care deeply about the fate of the Coorong were also there. I certainly indicated our support at that time, and I thought I also heard the minister supporting it at the time, although that appears not to be necessarily as certain now.

The bill has gone through quite a rigorous process, having gone through a parliamentary committee and having been through the other house, where there were no dissenting voices. We can see this is a bill that has taken a long time to get here, that has had careful consideration, and is therefore worthy of our support. I commend the member for Mount Gambier for his decision to take it up.

The bill tries to address the very complex environmental issues that exist within the Coorong—not only the complexity of the way the water does and does not work and how the environment is being affected by that but also the numerous interests that care deeply about the Coorong and want to see both the science properly invested in and remedial or supportive works undertaken to help protect the environment. The trust attempts to create a mechanism within legislation to have a vehicle for that level of concern, and a willingness to invest to be captured and directed appropriately.

I will not speak any further, as I am aware that we are moving into time that would otherwise be considering private members' motions. I think this bill has had an enormous amount of

consideration in the other place and in a committee and therefore simply indicate that we will be voting in favour of the bill.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (11:39): I rise to make a contribution on the bill before us today, the Coorong Environmental Trust Bill, introduced in the upper house by the Hon. Tammy Franks and passed in that chamber recently.

I believe that this legislation is poor legislation. I believe it is not legislation which is either required or necessary. There is a huge amount of work happening around the Coorong, historic amounts of work, in terms of scientific research, investigation, and potentially infrastructure solutions and conservation solutions to the challenges that the Coorong inevitably faces as a result of flows being reduced very significantly over generations of irrigation and extraction from the Murray-Darling Basin reducing the natural capacity of that incredibly important, Ramsar-listed wetland to sustain natural life.

We know that during the Millennium Drought the Coorong and the Lower Lakes were under very significant environmental stress. One of the reasons that I have fought so hard to take the politics out of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and keep all states at the table is that that plan is working. That plan is delivering for the Coorong, it is delivering for the Lower Lakes, it is delivering for the rivers environment, it is delivering for the economic interests that found their way around the river and are sustained by the water from the river. It also, of course, is delivering for the people of Adelaide who rely on the health of the Murray-Darling Basin for critical human needs as well.

I was delighted in the months after becoming minister to be able to secure a \$70 million contribution towards an initiative that we have titled Project Coorong, which is advised by a body of people who come together on a regular basis to work out how we are going to sustain the Coorong into the future. That body of people that advises or drives and sets the vision for Project Coorong is called the Coorong Partnership. It is chaired by the Hon. Dean Brown, former Premier of South Australia, and has people from the fishing community, the conservation community—the traditional owners are represented in that body—people who are undertaking tourism initiatives in and around the region and representatives from the local councils in that district as well.

The Coorong Partnership has been an incredibly valuable group of people. They have been able to work through the various scientific proposals and then put those forward to the federal government to get approval for funding from that \$70 million that I was able to secure through the ministerial council project. They have been able to shortlist potential major infrastructure projects which could be used to manufacture better environmental outcomes for the Coorong.

They have been able to work up projects around refuge wetlands which would give birdlife, particularly those shorebirds and waders that use the Coorong as part of that incredibly important international flyway. They go down to the Coorong, also the International Bird Sanctuary and other parts of South Australia, they feed up and they become healthy before they head off on their migration up to the Northern Hemisphere, particularly areas around Russia, before making that incredible journey back. It is one of the great wonders of the natural world.

We are getting those refuge wetlands in place in places like Tolderol, areas like Waltowa, and looking at work around potentially Lake Hawdon, potentially Lake George further to the south—an area I visited with the member for MacKillop fairly recently in which we have been able to put some further money from the Limestone Coast Landscape Board into investigating ways to strengthen the natural resilience of that important wetland and recreational asset as well.

So there is a huge amount of work happening in the Coorong—historic levels. It had its struggles during the drought. Its relative health is that it is doing alright at the moment, but we want to strengthen its resilience. We want it to benefit from the environmental water that is delivered through the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. While progress with that plan is all too slow, day by day it is moving towards its goals and it is delivering water for the environment, for the Coorong and for the Lower Lakes.

The existence of the Coorong Partnership fulfils many of the goals I believe the Coorong Environmental Trust Bill is seeking to do, so it is my view, a view that I have reached as a consequence of discussions with the Coorong Partnership and its members, as a consequence of

discussions with people in the local community and as a consequence of discussions with officials in my department, that this is superfluous legislation. That is just the long and the short of it.

Ideologically, I believe we should not be creating superfluous legislation that puts more levels of bureaucracy in the way of outcomes on the ground. I know there are schools of thought and ideological movements that seek to put more bureaucracy in the way of action on the ground. I want less. With the Coorong Partnership, chaired by Dean Brown, and with such a dynamic group of people around the table, driving forward outcomes for the Coorong, helping us spend that \$70 million on science, research and practical activities on the ground, I believe that we have got our house in order with regard to this. That is the position I have reached.

Notwithstanding that, I know there are a couple of amendments that are being discussed, which will hopefully create a more workable model should this Coorong Environmental Trust Bill pass this house. I hope that if they do pass they will be considered favourably in the Legislative Council, if and when this bill returns to that place.

The Coorong means an incredible amount to many people in this state. It is a vitally important wetland. That is why it has Ramsar listing. It means a lot to the local members who represent it: the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development, the member for Hammond, the member for MacKillop. I hope they will be able to make a contribution on this, given the importance of this place and the corresponding importance, potentially, of this bill, if it gets up, hopefully in an amended version. I mention the member for Chaffey as well, with his particular interests in the river and the health of the Coorong.

The debate on this bill should not be truncated. It should not be rushed. There needs to be an opportunity for members who have that stake in that landscape to make a contribution, to consider these amendments and, if it is the will of this house to pass this bill, to pass it in a way that makes it slightly more workable that will not get in the way of the vital scientific work, which is already underway, and that will not become a bureaucratic blockage to the practical action on the ground.

That is my real worry: that this bill in its current form will threaten the great work that has been advanced by the Coorong Partnership, an independent advisory body, and that it will threaten the practical outcomes for our natural world that are being advanced as we speak in that Ramsar-listed wetland. So I would urge members here to consider the amendments that are being worked up between myself and the member for Mount Gambier to get this bill in a place where it can actually improve and enhance the health of the Coorong, rather than become a barrier to its health.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:48): I rise to speak to this Coorong Environmental Trust Bill and concur with the words of the minister in regard to this: we do not want superfluous legislation. I commend Minister Speirs and his department for the work they have been doing, working in partnership with the Coorong Partnership group, with former Premier Dean Brown as chair, and looking at the different options in regard to making sure that, especially with the southern lagoon of the Coorong, that highly salinated section of the Coorong can be freshened up.

I know from talking to locals and what has happened over time that sediments from as far away as Queensland have flowed down through the river system and slowly added sediments to the lakes, to the Coorong area, especially to the narrow points like Parnka Point, where the northern lagoon and the southern lagoon connect, and this has really restricted the flow into the southern lagoon.

I know that certainly the Coorong Partnership group are doing a lot of investigatory work on how to freshen up the southern lagoon because it is necessary to look at these things. I know they are looking at dredging. They were looking at redirecting more of the South-East flows towards the Coorong. Several years ago, there was also the interconnector that was budgeted at about \$20 million, I believe, from Lake Albert to the northern lagoon to allow a freshwater flow to run from Lake Albert into that northern lagoon.

I am not a scientist, but in my mind that would be something that should be moved forward. In fact, I think it should be done, as long as the environmental impact studies stack up under the rules of a Ramsar site and the Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act (EPBC Act) of the federal government. I think that would be beneficial in a range of ways, including keeping Lake Albert fresh.

The issue we saw during the Millennium Drought was that the lakes dried up and there was a catastrophe in the lower end of the river. We saw the river drop two metres and Goolwa become a dust bowl. It was very, very tragic. While I am talking about the Millennium Drought, one thing I will give the Greens—and I do not agree with the Greens very often at all—is that they are consistent, and you cannot give the same credit to the Labor Party. The Labor Party seem to have an epiphany that all of a sudden they are interested in the health of the River Murray and the Coorong.

Members interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: No. I was here as the local member for the lower reaches of the river below Blanchetown during the Millennium Drought. In fact, I was the shadow parliamentary secretary and then the shadow minister for the River Murray, working alongside my good friend the former member for MacKillop, the shadow minister for water at the time, and the party in advocating for a freshwater recovery for the lakes and Coorong. We worked hard and we managed to push that along and thankfully that is where we got to in the end.

However, this was after the environmental vandalism of the Labor Party of this state in seeking to build a weir at Wellington, which would have just destroyed the lower end of the river. About half my electorate below Wellington would have been destroyed and turned into a salty marshland and not be the freshwater situation that has been there for well and truly a millennium, since the lakes and Coorong have been in existence.

It goes beyond belief that the Labor Party have had an epiphany and all of a sudden think, 'Yes, this is a great thing. We will look after the Coorong.' Where were they 15 years ago? Where were they 14 years ago? Where were they 13 years ago? Where were they 12 years ago? They were in here and everywhere advocating for the demise of the Coorong and the Lower Lakes.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Absolutely. It was a totally destructive situation, where they would have built a \$200 million weir at Wellington, which would have sunk a metre a year by the way, and it would have cleaned out all the rocks in the Upper South-East and probably the Lower South-East over time. It got that tetchy, if that is the word, with negotiations with the owners of the properties on either side of where the river flows into Lake Alexandrina just south of Wellington between Wellington Lodge and Nalpa Station that the minister at the time, the former member for Chaffey, Karlene Maywald, almost went to compulsory acquisition.

I attended the Public Works Committee when the roadworks were authorised to be made—which were made and the approach works for those roads were all built so that that Wellington weir could be built.

Mr Whetstone: Through Wellington Lodge.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, through Wellington Lodge and through Nalpa Station, much to the disgust of those owners. Not only that, we saw several bunds put in down at the bottom end, at Currency Creek at Clayton, and thousands and thousands of tonnes of dirt put into the system.

So we have the Labor opposition, who when they were in government just wanted to destroy the bottom of the river. As I said, at least the Greens are consistent, I will give them that. I had this conversation with the former MLC the Hon. Mark Parnell, that if construction had started on the Wellington weir we probably would have been chained to the same bulldozer, and that would have been something to see, I can tell you.

We have been consistent on this side, and the local members have been consistent, in advocating for the health of the River Murray. Whether it is the member for Chaffey, me, the member for MacKillop, the member for Finniss, everyone wants to see the right outcome, but we do not need duplication. We need to make sure that we can maximise the Murray-Darling Basin Plan where thousands of gegalitres of water are being delivered back to the system.

From my tours of the southern Murray-Darling Basin and the northern Murray-Darling Basin, I certainly believe that so much work can be done in modernising and efficiencies. In fact, I am confident that the uplift of the 450 gegalitres could be found in modernising irrigation systems across the basin. We have been champions at modernising irrigation in this state since the 1960s, and we

have been consistent in doing more work in modernising irrigation efficiencies—not just by managing the small number of channels we have but by putting in line channels—and in the way in which irrigation is delivered to vines and trees, all for the sake of maximising water use efficiency.

I fully applaud the actions being taken by the department, the minister and the Coorong Partnership. Their work should go on unimpeded in making sure that we get the right outcome for not just the Coorong but the Lower Lakes. I certainly believe that the interconnector between Lake Albert and the northern lagoon should be built pending scientific investigation because it would save some of the flushing action, where people try to dilute the salt in Lake Albert with hundreds of gegalitres of water, trying to get it in and out of the neck at Narrung. So let's make sure we get the right outcome.

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (11:59): Can I first thank the member for Mount Gambier for getting us here today and supporting my seat of MacKillop, and certainly a national treasure in the Coorong National Park and the lakes, in what I hope will be a very good outcome from hereon in that works not only as an independent voice—that is, the Coorong trust—but also with government and the departments for better outcomes than where we have landed today.

It is clearly highlighted by my local constituents that the Coorong has had nearly \$400 million spent on it since about 2005 and very little has changed. The outcomes have not changed and the problems certainly have not gone away. Yes, we are addressing them and, yes, there have been some changes, but I believe there should be a whole lot more for the \$400 million.

The gist of what I understand about this Coorong trust and its opportunities is that it is a private trust. It is a trust that will collect community sentiment right across Australia, perhaps even the world, if willing, which they will be able to support—in a financial means, maybe even a scientific means, maybe in physical means—the outcomes of what the Coorong represents today, perhaps what the Coorong should represent in the next 50 to 100 years.

No doubt, without stepping away from the concerns we have as a state, being on the bottom end of Australia's largest river, what we receive are the leftovers. I can see by the science, the way the last 20 years have panned out and the fact that, in terms of the 450 gegalitres talked about—perhaps promised in some shape or fashion but not yet delivered—we are dealing with the leftovers and a smaller amount of water rather than a greater quantity of water. I think the Coorong trust will play a very valuable part in finding solutions to what will be a diminishing supply of water, perhaps even just by the mere fact that we are going through climate change, as it is suggested, and drier periods, greater evaporation and a greater use and will for the water.

We also hear on the grapevine that Queensland, New South Wales and Victoria have very little regard for our river mouth and our lakes. They consider it perhaps even a wastage for the amount of freshwater that goes down through and beyond Tailem Bend into the lakes to keep the mouth open and those lakes fresh, that that water could be better utilised everywhere else. One of the things that I think gets lost in that transcript and verbal description is the fact that the Murray does require environmental flows not only so that it has an environmental aspect to it but also because it needs to be flushed of the hundreds of tonnes of salt that finds its way into the river system and needs to find an outlet somewhere. Natural reflows create a solution to that problem.

We know there are some very important communities, and tourism developments are proposed for the Coorong. There are five major structures and ideas that have been bandied around, not all of which will come to fruition, but I just want to list a couple of them. We already know that one has been put in place. It is working very well at this stage and has had its greatest flows through the outlet at Salt Creek on the southern REFLOWS drain, putting freshwater into the southern lagoon.

We also know that there is talk about a Lake Albert interconnector into the northern lagoon, taking freshwater out of Lake Albert, which assists in the lake in its freshness and, not only that, but also puts as much freshwater into the most southern part of the Coorong, as we can into the northern lagoon, trying to get more freshwater into those northern lagoons to reduce salinity.

There is also talk about making the barrages electronic, trying to maximise tides and wind direction, trying to take as much freshwater as possible into the Coorong. There are a couple of others, including widening the narrows between the southern and northern lagoons and also perhaps a consideration of opening into the sea, where they are bringing in sea water or taking the Coorong water out. Either way, there are many investigations going on.

One of the things that was highlighted by the supporters of this trust bill is that there is a lot of talk, there is a lot of science, but very little action. If we have a private Coorong bill like this, with private players and major investment, through philanthropy, into the Coorong trust bill, working together with government, working together with the department and environmentalists, it would almost be like a three-tiered pronged approach, and maybe we will see some better outcomes than what we have today. That is why I am very supportive of this bill.

I share the concerns of the minister. This is new territory. This perhaps shines a light on not being able to move things in a way that the department might fight comfortable. I appreciate that, but if outcomes are what this government, the community of South Australia and the stakeholders in the Coorong area want, who want to belong to this Coorong trust, then I think this is a good reason to move forward.

A very big thankyou to Gary Hera Singh, a professional fisher-cum-baker at Meningie. He is a very big supporter of the Coorong trust. Thank you to Glen and Tracey Hill, also fishers on the Coorong and the lakes and supporters of the Coorong trust. The River Lakes and Coorong Action Group are behind this proposal and want to support this Coorong trust. A big thankyou to two people I have dealt with very closely: Faith Coleman and Mark-Ken Sawers. They have been strong advocates for this. They have pushed very hard. They are looking for some good outcomes. They want to see the Coorong flourish. I am hoping that with this Coorong trust bill, working together with the government and the department, we can see some great outcomes. I support the motion.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:04): I, too, would like to rise and make a contribution to the Coorong Environmental Trust Bill. I stand here today somewhat frustrated that we again see another advocacy group wanting to be formed to deal with what has been the elephant in the room within the Murray-Darling Basin for a very long time.

My involvement has been with the agri-politics, the water politics with the River Murray and particularly with the issue we are talking about today within what is commonly known as the delta of the Murray-Darling Basin. The delta is the shallow, large water expanses we encounter here in South Australia as basically the recipient of flows that come into our state and how we maximise those flows, how we continue to support a healthy environment, but also how we, again, support economy that comes away from a healthy, working river.

We all know that a healthy, working river is the best outcome we can have as a community, as a state and as the beneficiaries of what is one of the great water bodies in the world. It is a culmination of storages and unregulated streams that come into what we see here in South Australia, which is the River Murray, and the flows that are brought together by a number of tributaries. As we well know here in South Australia, we rely on flows out of the Darling and we rely on flows into the River Murray, which is the main channel that comes into our state.

Along the way, we have seen a significant amount of political interference with the running of the Murray-Darling Basin, which once was the Murray-Darling Basin commission. That body was set up to manage and also help regulate the Murray-Darling system and was then changed over to an authority. We have had many experts along the way who have made contributions to the way that those two governing bodies have been administered and run.

I want to touch on the frustration I have that we again are now seeing another body wanting to be set up. It really does come down to duplication with what we currently already have with the Friends of the Coorong. There is a group chaired by the Hon. Dean Brown AO, who is doing an outstanding job. Only Tuesday morning, I had a briefing, as did other members of the government, to better understand what is currently on the table, the way that the Coorong and the Lower Lakes will work more efficiently.

For the Murray-Darling Basin Plan to be developed and brought to fruition, many of us would understand that 3,200 ggalitres is the number that has been put on the table and it is a target. It is an achievement that what we need is better flows, we need overbank flows, but we also need those environmental purges of water to come down our river when we are not seeing natural flows and natural flood events so that we can purge salinity out into the ocean and we can purge some of that silting we see. Also, we need those flows to push some of the unwanted pests, weeds and the constraints we currently encounter.

Along the way, the Lower Lakes have been declared a Ramsar site, and through the Millennium Drought we used the Ramsar connotation with the need for more flows, more water. Sadly, when we have a drought and there are not those bodies of water, we need practical action and under a previous government we continued to see what was political interference with what I call progressive action in better managing the river system to the detriment of a large part of community along the way. Not only was it irrigators who had to give up their water and the environment that also had to give up its water but there was also a level of political interference that saw not much happen.

The previous state Labor government continued to use their levers to gain points to the detriment of irrigation communities and to the detriment of the environment. Anything below Lock 1 is basically connected to the Lower Lakes and connected to the Coorong, as well as a small amount of input from the reflows program out of the South-East, and what we saw were some tree planting programs that amounted to nothing. We saw some bunds put in place to try to hold water back in that final reach of the River Murray, which is below Lock 1, down to Narrung to the barrages and then ultimately to the mouth.

Yes, we saw dredging at the mouth to try to give some relief through a reduction in salinity, but, sadly, when we saw river and lake levels go below a point of sustainability, we saw those acid sulphate soils emerge. We saw toxic blooms that not only had an impact on the environment and wildlife but had a toxic effect on those river communities.

I must say that the level of concern was felt by many, but it became state versus state. South Australia sent an SOS to its neighbouring states that we needed to work together. We needed to come together and put solutions on the table. Sadly, there were a few unsubstantiated opinions about the solution—whether it was a saltwater solution or whether it was a freshwater solution. Those arguments are still being had today.

If we look back to yesteryear, before we saw the management of the river system with locks and weirs, regulators in our wetlands, it was a free-flowing unregulated system. If you look in the history books, you will see dry spots in the river, people walking across the river and riverboats high and dry—that is what an unregulated river system is.

Today, in that highly managed environment what we are seeing is a level of greed. To its credit, South Australia, then under Premier Steele Hall, decided to strike an agreement with the other states in capping South Australia's take. Back in 1969, we capped it at 1,850 gegalitres and that drove efficiencies here in South Australia. That drove our water users, our environment and our irrigation communities to be better at what we did, to drive efficiencies to do more with the same amount of water, while those upstream continued to take.

Nowadays, we see state governments looking after their own political interests and looking after their own constituency to the detriment of the environment. What this trust will potentially do is again clog up what I would call the progression needed to better manage our river system here in South Australia. We know we have previously looked to irrigators and their communities to find on-farm efficiency programs to put more water back into the environment. The target of 3,200 is almost met, bar the 450 in the southern connected system, but it took 100 years to get us into the situation we are in.

It is not going to be fixed overnight. It will not be fixed in one year. Potentially, it will not be fixed in 10 years. The basin plan has been running for almost 10 years and we continue to see progress, but while we have a continuation of political interference wanting to set up more trusts, more meetings and more committees, we are not getting progress, so I urge everyone in this chamber to look at practical solutions.

We know that there is a five-point plan on the table. We know that there are off-farm efficiency measures that are looking to be put in place. We know there are proposals there to be supported with commonwealth government funding, and I urge everyone in this place to look at a solution-based approach—not more bureaucracy, not more red tape, not more stalling, because South Australia is at the bottom end of the river and we need action and we do not need more political interference.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (12:14): I also rise to make a brief contribution. The Coorong is such an important asset of South Australia. We have seen, particularly during those drought years, the stress it was put under, and I certainly very much have strong memories of that time. The member for Chaffey talked

about the bunds being put in place: the bund at the Narrows at Narrung, the bund at Clayton Bay, another one on the Finniss River and another one on Currency Creek. Those earthen mounds that were put in place to stop the water flows going between those natural creeks and the lower River Murray itself certainly were damaging at the time.

We saw particularly the damage the one at the Narrows did long term in allowing those natural water flows to be re-established after the bund was removed, which was also problematic. The water flows rely on the south-easterly winds to push those waters back out to keep down the salinity levels. To put a bund in that environment was a real challenge for the natural systems in getting back to being able to operate in an appropriate way.

I certainly remember, as a passionate person in that region during those very low water environments, going down and, outside the Gawler Aquatic Club, out to the jetty and standing underneath it, which meant there was about two metres of water missing from that point immediately out the front of the Goolwa Aquatic Club. Cricket games were held out on sandbars that were exposed. The pressure that was put on the system was enormous. Likewise, the Coorong itself effectively was cut off from Goolwa by boat. You could not get out there to go in and see the Coorong itself.

In my electorate, there are some great business operators: the Veenstras have been passionate River Murray boat builders and tourism operators for many years. Three generations have been operating in Goolwa, and they have done a fantastic job. The *Spirit of the Coorong* is the boat they currently take down into the Coorong region to enjoy that environment. I have done that tour several times. It is an amazing opportunity to go down and enjoy that local environment, to see what is down there, to see the natural birdlife, to walk across the sand dunes to the sea, to go cockling and then take the cockles back to the boat, where they cook them for you. To enjoy the cockles you have caught yourself just moments earlier is a great part of that experience in the area.

I have had connections there for many years. I certainly remember going down there in my really early youth, probably when I was about eight or 10, with friends in boats to enjoy that lovely natural life, to have a look at the birdlife. The birdlife that exists there is incredible. Anyone who really wants to see the Coorong at its best needs to look at either of the *Storm Boy* movies—the one made in the 1970s or the one made much more recently. Their portrayal of that area highlights how important and sensitive that region is.

I have a great desire to see this area prosper, but I am not sure that this trust, as another level of bureaucracy being put in place, is the right way to go. We need to make sure we do not oversystemise the whole management of this system, and we allow action to be taken with due consideration and make sure that we do not make the mistakes of putting in bunds as a quick-fix option. We need to think long term in this space, and we need to make sure we get this right.

It is pleasing that we are seeing the federal government commit the funds to address some of the problems here in the Coorong going forward, but we need to get the solutions right. We need to work out what can be done between the north and south lagoons to make sure that we get the flows right so we do not get the hypersaline salt in the regions.

This is something all South Australians I believe are passionate about. They need to understand there is lots of interest there. Governments certainly are very keen to make this right, whether it be state governments, local governments or the federal government. I think it is a very important thing that we consider going forward and that we make sure we address this in the appropriate way. I have seen the birdlife at the Coorong, the number of pelicans that can be seen down there at times. It is an amazing part of the world. There are birds that you will see down there that you just will not see anywhere else because of the isolation and the natural environment.

We also see the challenges that have been going on for many years. I certainly remember as a child the challenges of the mouth closing off and having to be dredged. I remember the photo of it being effectively reopened by a front-end loader literally just digging a channel through to try to get the water to flow back out to sea. Luckily, they were able to re-establish that. They were concerned that it could have breached other points rather than that natural point of where it had been for many years.

The Coorong is very much a living system. It is something we need to continue to work with, and I very much respect both the state and federal governments in what they are doing to address this. I will continue to support the focus that needs to be there and make sure that we are able to enjoy that environment through trips like the *Spirit of the Coorong*. It is a great tourist asset, it is a great natural asset and I very much want to see the Coorong survive.

Mr TEAGUE (Heysen) (12:22): I will be brief and look forward to participating in the course of the committee debate. The observations that I will make are in the nature of the importance in this space if we are to go down this path of maintaining a very close and productive connection between what private initiatives might otherwise be applied and the important role of government in this space, both state and federal.

The bill that we have before us reads very much like the constitution of a private organisation, and that is all very well. I just observe that it is unusual for the parliament in this modern day and age to be going down the path of establishing by legislation what might otherwise be very productively established as a private initiative.

I focus on clause 20 and the functions and powers of the trust; that will be the matter of some debate in the committee. I am also concerned to highlight without debating them the importance of amendments that would bring home the connection between the important role of the minister and, in turn, the Department for Environment and Water in this space, so that we do not end up going down a path where a body such as this might find itself in competition with the state for funds, including from the commonwealth, to achieve ends that they ought be pursuing jointly. I share, in that sense, the sentiments of the member for MacKillop about promoting private contribution. It ought not be done by way of competition with governments in this space.

I otherwise take the opportunity, as the member for Chaffey has observed, to recognise the tremendous work that has been done by the Coorong Partnership, led by the Hon. Dean Brown AO among many others, and indicate that like all South Australians, the Coorong is at our hearts, and that is from *Storm Boy* to Professor Paton to those day-to-day experiences that we all have. We all have the Coorong's best interests at heart. Legislating in this space should be directly toward achieving improvement, and so I look forward to contributing to the committee debate.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:25): I thank all members who have made a contribution to this bill, as well as the Hon. Tammy Franks in the other house for drafting it and getting it past the Legislative Council. I look forward to its speedy passage through a committee stage and hopefully we will get it done very shortly.

Bill read a second time.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I would like to inform members of the house that this bill establishes the Coorong Environmental Trust and provides for the administration of the trust. It has been received from the Legislative Council and restored in this house. The bill passed the council after it had been referred to a select committee for inquiry and report.

While the bill shows elements of being hybrid in nature, in that its object is to establish and promote the interests of the body corporate, the Legislative Council did not consider the bill as a hybrid bill but instead referred it to a committee out of an abundance of caution. While the bill does create a benefit to a local body, it is marginal as to whether it can be deemed hybrid. I rule the bill as not being hybrid and therefore there is no requirement for the bill to be referred to a select committee pursuant to the standing orders.

I note the Legislative Council has already sent this bill to a committee; however, the house can determine for itself if it wishes to refer the bill to a select committee. I will leave that to the house and, with no-one seeking the call, I expect that the house now is looking to go into committee.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clause 1.

The CHAIR: Thank you for your patience, members. The house is in committee on the Coorong Environmental Trust Bill 2019. The bill has been moved by the member for Mount Gambier. Are there any questions or contributions relating to clause 1?

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I move:

Page 3, line 2, after the word 'operation' insert the word 'within'.

This amendment focuses on the commencement to create a situation where the words under the heading 'Commencement' read, 'This Act will come into operation within 3 months after the day on which it is assented to by the Governor.'

The CHAIR: You are moving to insert the word 'within'. Does anyone wish to ask questions of the minister in relation to this amendment?

Amendment carried; clause as amended carried.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I move:

Page 3—

line 32, after the word 'established' insert the words—

to raise and administer philanthropic funds to support the ecological wellbeing of the Coorong.

after line 36, insert the words—

The Minister will approve an initial set of rules relating to the membership, management and operations of the Trust.

Thereafter, the Trust will maintain the rules of the Trust.

The Trust must publish any variations it makes to the rules of the Trust in its Annual Report.

The Crown does not incur any liability for the Trusts/all costs associated with the Trust are to be met by the Trust.

The CHAIR: We are just getting detail of those amendments. My understanding, minister, is that you have moved amendments Nos 2 and 3 standing in your name to clause 4?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Yes, clause 4, amendment No. 2. That is what I have moved.

The CHAIR: We have two amendments relating to this clause.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I went through them all.

The CHAIR: You have moved amendment No. 2. Are there any questions of the minister on his amendments?

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Clauses 5 to 9 passed.

Clause 10.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I move:

Part 3, clause 10, page 6, lines 6 and 7—Delete subclause (1) and insert in lieu thereof:

10—Board of management

(1) The Minister will appoint an initial board of management of the Trust to carry out the day to day operations of the Trust and manage its general affairs. Thereafter, 2 voting members will be appointed by the Minister.

Amendment carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 25) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:36): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Motions

NATIONAL APOLOGY TO VICTIMS AND SURVIVORS OF INSTITUTIONAL CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (12:37): I move:

That this house—

- (a) acknowledges the National Apology to Victims and Survivors of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse is held on 22 October 2021;
- (b) acknowledges the lasting trauma and damage caused to the victims and survivors of institutional child sex abuse, as well as their families and all those affected by abuse; and
- (c) acknowledges the federal and state Liberal governments for their commitment and progress to provide justice to those who have suffered abuse and their action to prevent future harm to children.

This motion recognises 22 October as the third anniversary of the National Apology for Victims and Survivors of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse. I have a dream that together we will create the safest state for children to grow up in. This is critical because every child has an essence and a gift for the world, and each child deserves to realise that gift and a full future.

On 21 October 2021 the Morrison government announced that the Blue Knot Foundation, along with its key partners, the Australian Childhood Foundation and the Healing Foundation, would establish and deliver the National Centre for the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse. This action is a direct response to a recommendation from the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse.

The national centre will shine a national lens on preventing child sexual abuse, improve outcomes for survivors and increase awareness and understanding of the impacts of abuse. The Minister for Families and Social Services, Anne Ruston, said:

Although we cannot take away the pain and suffering that many Australians have experienced, delivering the National Centre is one more critical step to alleviate further traumatisation of those living with the legacy of past child sexual abuse.

The Blue Knot Foundation will draw on the expertise of businesses, the sector, and the invaluable knowledge of victims and survivors to inform improved primary prevention, secondary support and tertiary intervention.

I welcome the news that the national centre is expected to be established by the end of 2021. I thank the minister, Anne Ruston, who has led this outcome. I thank her for her ongoing fight to ensure that survivors receive the redress they deserve.

In South Australia, the national apology three years ago coincided with the day that the Marshall Liberal government implemented new, improved child safety legislation for South Australia. South Australia's new child protection legislation formally embeds the voice of the child into everything we do in South Australia. This was an important step, given the royal commission's finding that children who experience sexual abuse face significant barriers to seeking help. We need to provide pathways and education enabling children to speak up if they are unsafe. I thank the Minister for Child Protection for successfully implementing this change.

We teach children today not to run with scissors, we teach them how to swim, we teach children to be sun safe, we teach children how to cross the road safely, and now we must commit to teaching children how to keep safe from sexual predators. One in five children will be sexually abused and over 90 per cent by someone they know and trust. This is outrageous. We should not be letting this happen. This is why I am obsessed with more effectively teaching the Keeping Safe curriculum in every school in South Australia. Every child deserves to have the knowledge and language to speak up when someone abuses them, and they need to have the resources in place so that they will be heard.

Today, I am going to share the voice of one more survivor to ensure every person who listens to me speak can feel with compassion the impact of this crime and understand why child sexual abuse must stop. The survivor story I wish to share today is about a very gentle, caring, brave and unyielding child sexual abuse survivor, Brian Cherrie. I am inspired by Brian. Brian has given me permission to share part of his statement to the royal commission into institutional child sexual abuse. Brian's statement:

I was born in Western Australia and I pieced together some of my early childhood when I was in my fifties. I now know that my mother was a struggling single working parent. I believe my father didn't have much to do with me.

I was privately adopted when I was 2 years old. We moved to Victoria when I was about seven years old.

My adoptive mother was physically and emotionally abusive and ran me down at every opportunity.

My adoptive father was also sadistically cruel and used to frequently physically assault me.

At 10 years of age, I was left at the Children's Court and admitted to the care of the Children's Welfare Department in Melbourne as an 'uncontrollable child' and made a Ward of the State.

At the age of eleven I was placed in the Box Hill Boys' Home which was run by the Salvation Army.

The sexual assaults occurred regularly over a period of time. I can't recall exactly how many times I was assaulted or the exact period during which I was assaulted.

I recalled that I had also suffered abuse by another staff member of the Salvation Army Box Hill Boys' Home who was known to me as Black Willie but whose real name I believe to be Bill Willemsen. I had previously not recalled this incident. Willemsen molested me whilst I was in the 'treatment room'.

Black Willie was also an employee of the Salvation Army.

He worked in the Home looking after the boys. He was also given the 'rank' of Sergeant.

I remember that the Box Hill Boys' Home was full of violence and I remember always being cold and hungry.

When I was 17 or 18, I attempted suicide by taking pills and attempting to jump from a second storey balcony in a block of flats where I lived in Prahran.

I was treated at the Alfred Hospital. The doctors saved my life. I believe this suicide attempt was directly related to my childhood sexual abuse.

I had had a difficult childhood both before and after the Box Hill Boys' Home but the sexual abuse had damaged me in ways I can't describe.

As a young man I felt that I carried a terrible guilty secret. I was scared that people would find out.

I worried that people would think it was my fault. I didn't feel that I could tell anyone, not even the doctors who had saved my life. I was scared that they would think less of me if they knew that I had been the victim of sexual abuse.

I was scared that they might think that I would do the same thing to another child.

I was ashamed of myself—that this had happened to me.

I had no doubt that they would have blamed me in some way for the abuse.

I didn't think anyone would understand how completely I was in the control of the monsters who were meant to 'care' for me. I still feel scarred for life.

Thank you, Brian. Today, Brian runs a Facebook support group for about 2,800 members, many of them survivors, and helps them work out how to get redress. Today, he is still fighting every day for survivors' rights. Brian told me yesterday that after 56 years he has been told he is receiving a payout for his suffering, hopefully in a week's time. I do ask: why is this process taking so long for survivors?

The National Redress Scheme was developed in response to the recommendations by the commonwealth Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse and allows for those who have experienced abuse to apply for redress. It began on 1 July 2018 and will run for 10 years, so applications can be made anytime before 30 June 2027.

I got involved in politics because I was horrified and appalled at South Australia's long list of actionless inquiries and reviews with regard to child protection under the 16 years of Labor. These reviews include the Layton review, the Select Committee on Families SA, the Mullighan Children in State Care Commission of Inquiry, the Mullighan APY lands inquiry, the Debelle inquiry, the Hyde

review, the Chloe Valentine coronial inquest, the Nyland report and the national Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse in 2017.

Our Marshall Liberal government are focused on actions not words and not just inquiries. Sexual abuse is not a historical problem. We only need to look at the recent reports of wilful blindness and destruction of records reported to take place in Tasmania. In South Australia, since March 2018 the Marshall Liberal government have provided stronger working with children checks and mandated notification laws to include religious confessions. We are creating stronger child-safe environments and improving experiences in out-of-home care, delivering on strategies to further grow the number of placements for children in family-based care and providing additional funding for early intervention policy and programs.

I am proud that the Marshall Liberal government introduced a range of reforms on 21 August. Our new legislation addresses a number of issues highlighted by the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. I thank the Attorney-General for these key reforms proposed, which include:

- a new offence of failing to protect a child from sexual abuse in an institutional context or in out-of-home care where there is knowledge of a substantial risk;
- requiring audiovisual recordings of interviews with victims of sexual abuse which may alleviate the need for them to attend court;
- making it less confronting for victim/survivors to give evidence in court by allowing child sexual abuse victims and domestic abuse victims to give evidence in pre-trial hearings without a defendant present; and
- clarifying that confessional privilege cannot be relied upon in either criminal or civil proceedings relating to child sexual abuse.

These reforms aim to better protect our children and punish those who will turn a blind eye to these unforgivable crimes. I have a dream that together in this place we will create the safest state for children to grow up in.

If you have listened and you need support, please call 1800RESPECT on 1800 737 732 or Kids Helpline on 1800 55 1800. I am here for you too.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (12:48): First of all, thank you very much to the member for King for her words, for her commitment to this issue, and also thank you to the person who so courageously shared their story. In rising, I indicate that I will move an amendment, which I will detail in the course of my discussion.

I rise today to speak to this motion and in doing so I wholeheartedly acknowledge the anniversary of the National Apology to Victims and Survivors of Institutional Child Sexual Abuse, which was marked again last week on 22 October. In doing so, I acknowledge and offer my deep gratitude to former Prime Minister the Hon. Julia Gillard for her exemplary leadership and her courage—leadership and courage that saw her drive the establishment of the Royal Commission into Institutional Responses to Child Sexual Abuse. This then led to recommendations about actions to better protect children and the initial step of this important national apology.

In speaking about this anniversary, above all else I acknowledge those extraordinary, brave survivors, their families and the many groups and organisations supporting them and advocating for change. I say that I am so sorry for the pain, the trauma and the horror you experienced that in so many circumstances continues to impact your lives, and state again that I will do anything within my power to prevent harm towards children.

Preventing harm against children is indeed every parliamentarian's and every person's responsibility, and any action, acknowledgement or motion should reflect that through the demonstration of bipartisanship in the words contained in and thoughts behind any such motion in this parliament. Instead, we have a government that seems to be using this opportunity, regardless of the topic, to ingratiate themselves when, in reality, the record shows that this government has failed in various crucial aspects of child protection. I move an amendment to this motion to take partisanship out of its content. I move as follows:

After the word 'the' in paragraph (a), insert the words 'anniversary of the'

In paragraph (c), remove the word 'the' and replace it with the word 'successive' and remove the word 'Liberal'

Insert new paragraph—

(d) commits to doing all that it can to prevent and end the abuse of children.

I urge those opposite to support this amendment and, by doing so, demonstrate their commitment to together acknowledging the apology to those brave survivors, so many of whom continue to deal with pain and trauma.

In thinking about this motion today my mind and my heart went to all survivors and those who have passed who dealt with horrific abuse. Amongst those survivors is the incredible Australian of the Year, Grace Tame. When I heard her speech on becoming Australian of the Year, and every single one of the many times I have read and heard her words since, I have been inspired to continue to do what I can to ensure that the voices of survivors are heard. In that speech Grace said, amongst other inspiring words:

This year and beyond my focus is on empowering survivors and education as a primary means of prevention. It starts with conversation...

Lived experience informs structural and social change. When we share, we heal.

Yes, discussion of child sexual abuse is uncomfortable. But nothing is more uncomfortable than the abuse itself. So let us redirect this discomfort to where it belongs: at the feet of perpetrators of these crimes.

Together we can redefine what it means to be a survivor. Together we can end child sexual abuse; survivors be proud, our voices are changing history...

When I first reported, I was shamed and ridiculed by some. But now my truth is helping to reconnect us...

I remember him saying, 'Don't tell anybody.' I remember him saying, 'Don't make a sound.'

Well hear me now. Using my voice, amongst a growing chorus of voices that will not be silenced.

Let's make some noise, Australia.

Brilliant words from a brilliant, brave woman, words we must heed. If we are to live up to our promises in this place to do whatever we can to prevent childhood sexual abuse we must listen to survivors and we must do whatever we can to empower their voices.

I was utterly dismayed this week to learn that Prime Minister Scott Morrison is not. Just in the last few days, in an interview with the ABC it was revealed that Grace Tame, this trailblazing leader who is changing our national conversation, is not aware of nor involved at all in the drafting of the National Strategy to Prevent Child Sexual Abuse. It is a travesty that the Australian of the Year's courageous, articulate, strong calls to hear us have been ignored by the Prime Minister of this country. It is shameful that this state government also refuses to act to fix the growing child protection crisis in South Australia.

This motion importantly, crucially, recognises past and lasting trauma and damage and acknowledges the apology to victims and survivors of institutional child sexual abuse. It must also acknowledge the amount of work that is still needing to be done to ensure harm towards children is prevented. Every South Australian child deserves to be safe, cared for, supported and empowered to physically, mentally, emotionally and socially thrive.

I feel sad every single day that this government is letting down the most vulnerable children. How can this government prevent harm when we see a minister not knowing that children in care were living with paedophiles, were abused, raped and pregnant? This same minister was described by Judge Rice in his damning report as having overseen significant failure.

This significant failure was shown again just last week when our South Australian community was once again saddened to hear another example of the minister failing to protect a child in her care from being targeted online through a dating app, transported to a predator's house and sexually abused. An Adelaide court shockingly heard last week that 39-year-old Richard Squires, who was charged with the horrific offence, organised for the 16 year old, who was under guardianship, to be transported to his house. In a statement written by the 16 year old, which was read to court, the child indicated, 'I feel the world is not a safe place for minors.'

It is shameful that under the watch of the government harm against children is not prevented. We must ensure that children, whether in the care of the minister or not, in institutional settings or not, online or not, are always protected. We cannot allow a minister who has a record of not even being aware of children in her care being groomed online and abused to continue to have responsibility for the protection of South Australia's most vulnerable children.

This is the same minister who is currently overseeing record numbers of children in care, including skyrocketing numbers of Aboriginal children in care; a staffing crisis in residential care homes; upset and frustration from carers, families, workers and organisations; and the stalling of the Children and Young People (Safety) (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill.

In moving this amendment to the motion, I am requesting the mover to remove the self-aggrandising reference within it. The reality is that on every single indicator this government is not progressing action to prevent future harm to children. More than 10,000 child protection cases that may have needed further investigation closed without any follow-up or action in the past 10 months. The Department for Child Protection received approximately 31,800 reports from July 2020 to April 2021, but we understand did not follow up on 10,460—or around 33 per cent—of them.

The Guardian for Children and Young People's call to this government to fund a visitor program for children in residential care has been ignored and, whilst the member for King is absolutely right that apologies are a crucial part of the healing process, it is the subsequent actions that are also of crucial importance to survivors. Whilst the recent announcement of a National Centre for the Prevention of Child Sexual Abuse is welcome, it fulfils a promise made three years ago and unfortunately comes on the back of the troubled implementation—

Time expired.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (12:58): I rise to speak on this motion in support of the existing motion. I would just like to state how offensive and deeply disturbing the remarks made by the member for Reynell are—personal attacks, completely ignoring Labor's record. How many front pages did we have under the Labor government, with Jay Weatherill even just recently in InDaily admitting he got it wrong? He got it wrong very badly. Shannon McCool was employed by the former Labor government despite the red flags that showed up on his psychometric testing. When complaints made against him were ignored—

Mr Boyer interjecting:

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

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The former Labor government has a shameful, shameful record on child protection, which is why the Liberal government—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —have appointed the first ever dedicated Minister for Child Protection.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We are making significant changes to the child protection system, and I take great offence at the words of the member for Reynell. I think it is an absolute disgrace.

Ms HILDYARD: On a point of order—

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: On one hand, she wants bipartisanship and then she unloads a load of rubbish—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister will now seek leave to continue her remarks.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Reynell, you had a point of order?

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, 125. I certainly take great offence to the comments from the member for Unley, which I heard as, 'You're all paedophiles.'

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Well, I did not hear that, member for Reynell.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: I didn't say that. I didn't say it.

Ms HILDYARD: As I said, that is what I heard. If there is something else, clarify.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes.

The Hon. D.G. Pisoni: I can't respond to something I didn't say.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Unley is saying that he did not say that. I must admit there was a lot of banter right across the chamber, which is out of order of course, when I was trying to listen to the Minister for Child Protection, who has just as much right to speak to this motion as the member for Reynell, the member for King or any other member. Given that it is 1 o'clock, and the member for Unley is saying that he did not say what was alleged to have been said, and I certainly did not hear it, I think we might just leave it at that.

Sitting suspended 13:01 until 14:00.

Petitions

DOG AND CAT MANAGEMENT ACT

Dr CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Deputy Leader of the Opposition): Presented a petition signed by 3,649 residents of South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to review and amend the Dog and Cat Management Act 1995 to require cats to be contained to their owner's property and give local councils power to enforce cat containment.

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

Environment and Water, Department for—

Report on the operation of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 (South Australia)

Report on the review of the Climate Change and Greenhouse Emissions Reduction Act 2007 (South Australia)

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (14:04): I bring up the 47th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Mr TRELOAR: I bring up the 48th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received and read.

*Question Time***DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING**

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:06): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier received a report from the Doherty Institute regarding the modelling around COVID in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:06): I thank the Leader of the Opposition for his question and his interest in the modelling. As I was saying yesterday, there was information and a model that were presented to the national cabinet from the Doherty Institute—

Mr Malinauskas: South Australian.

The SPEAKER: Premier, you have the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir—and that was received by the national cabinet. The Doherty Institute works with a number of people—academics, leading medical clinicians, epidemiologists around the country—to compile that advice to the national cabinet. In addition to that, here in South Australia we worked with a number of people who are part of that overall Doherty Institute modelling that went to the national cabinet. They provided supplementary advice to us here in South Australia and that has been already received. There is more work which is being done, and we look forward to receiving that final information.

What I can tell the house is that we will be releasing in a consolidated format the advice that we have received. Some of it, of course, is information that's provided to the national cabinet, so that hasn't been released. We need to work out what can be released there, but certainly from our perspective in South Australia we have received advice, and there is more advice coming to inform our road map out of the situation that we have here in South Australia.

We are satisfied with the information that was received that we could move to the removal of the restrictions on the interstate borders or the state borders, our state borders, as of 23 November, when we believe we will hit that full vaccination for 80 per cent of our population 16 and over. We do still want to receive this additional information which will better inform what public health social measures and also what test, trace, isolate and quarantine regime we put in place as we get closer to the 90 per cent.

That is the information that we are relying on. As Professor Spurrier said yesterday, she is very happy to consolidate that information to the best of our ability in terms of releasing information. As I said, there are two sets of information; one is from the Doherty Institute to the national cabinet, and we are privy to that information, but of course it's not our duty to release that information. That will be a matter for the national cabinet, and the national cabinet is meeting next Friday afternoon. Then in addition to that people from the Doherty Institute—not the Doherty Institute itself but people who have been involved in the past in providing input to the Doherty Institute analysis—have done a separate investigation for us in South Australia.

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:09): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier read the second set of information provided to the state government from the people producing it from the Doherty Institute?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:10): I am happy to answer this question from the Leader of the Opposition, but I don't think he was listening very carefully. There was one set of information which went from the Doherty Institute to the national cabinet. There are two sets that have gone to us. The Leader of the Opposition asked whether I have read the second set but, as I just pointed out, it hasn't been received yet, so it was very difficult for me to receive and read the second set of information.

I only said in the last two minutes that the first set has been received here in South Australia, the second set is pending and, no, I haven't read that second set preceding it actually being finalised.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:10): Has the Premier received any modelling from the Doherty Institute itself or anyone who has produced it from the Doherty Institute? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: On numerous occasions throughout the course of the last month the Premier has indicated that the road map will be dependent upon the Doherty modelling research produced specifically for South Australia, yet in the Premier's previous answer he said that he is yet to receive the modelling from the Doherty Institute specific to South Australia.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:11): I don't know why the Leader of the Opposition is struggling with this. Let's go through it for the third time so far this question time.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Pay attention. My advice is: pay attention—

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —because it would be really embarrassing if I had to explain this to you four times.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am confident you are paying attention and you don't need the instruction of the Premier to do so.

The SPEAKER: Member for Lee, the Premier can continue. I am confident that those comments were not directed at me.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: You are quite right, sir: I'm sure you are paying attention. As you would know, sir, there are three pieces of information that I have spoken about. The first piece was from the Doherty Institute, led by Dr Jodie McVernon, which has gone to the national cabinet. I have then—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Tick, he's got that one! There is a second piece of information that has been received from people who have provided in the past advice to the Doherty Institute to the South Australian government. That has been received. The second piece of information coming from them has not been received, so I haven't actually read the second set because it hasn't been received.

As I have said in a lot of detail over the course of the questions I have had in this chamber over the last two question times—and I do appreciate some questions finally being asked about this subject matter; I very much appreciate it—we have a set of advice that has given us confidence to open those state borders on 23 November, but we also have requested additional information as to what our public health social measures and our test, trace, isolate and quarantine methodology should be as we move through to the next phase, which is when we get to 90 per cent of those double-vaccinated 12 years and over.

This is the situation that exists at the moment: three sets of advice and, as I said yesterday and repeat again today, Professor Nicola Spurrier, the Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia, is happy to consolidate some of that advice and make it—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I am not going to respond to interjections, but I will just reiterate the point that some of that advice is not to the South Australian government, so it would not be appropriate—I think that you would appreciate that, sir—for the South Australian government to say, 'Well, here's the advice that went to the national cabinet.' That's a decision of the national cabinet. It meets next Friday. It's possible that that advice will be provided at that time but, certainly, what I can confirm to this house is—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't think this started, this four minutes.

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the Premier some latitude. I think he is coming to the end of his answer. The Premier has the call.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I don't think it was on.

The SPEAKER: Leader, in any event, I am going to allow the Premier some latitude.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: So, the national cabinet will consider these matters. But, as I said, Professor Nicola Spurrier, our Chief Public Health Officer in South Australia, has made it very clear that she will release modelling. We do want to make sure that the people of South Australia understand the situation that exists as we lift those state borders. We will be letting the Delta variant into South Australia, but we are going to do it only when it is safe to do so. The modelling that has been received suggests that at 80 per cent it will be safe to do that.

That's the advice that has been received at the national cabinet and, of course, it has been corroborated by advice that we have received independently here in South Australia. There may be some who don't trust that. I heard earlier today comments from the opposition: what have we got to hide? It is as if there is something that was being hidden from the people of South Australia. I think I have now given—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —a full and perfect explanation, and it's a pity those opposite want to constantly undermine the great public health advice that we have had here in South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The Premier's time has expired.

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:15): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier read the South Australian-specific modelling that Professor Spurrier said this morning had been received yesterday? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Professor Spurrier said, quote:

We have more detailed Doherty...modelling now. It uses the same model as the original Doherty model but what it's done is put in South Australian data...

Has the Premier read that modelling?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16): Yes.

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Given the Premier has read the modelling, why won't he release that to the people of South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:16): I refer the leader to my previous answers on this topic.

The SPEAKER: The member for Elder has the call.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

MUSIC INDUSTRY

Mrs POWER (Elder) (14:16): My question is to the Minister for Innovation and Skills. Can the minister please update the house about how the Marshall Liberal government is supporting live music businesses in light of the impacts of COVID-19?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI (Unley—Minister for Innovation and Skills) (14:17): I thank the member for Elder not just for her love of the finer things in life but for her interest of course in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: —the live music sector here in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: In recognition of the significant impacts of COVID-19 restrictions on the live music industry, the Marshall government has announced a new \$3 million Live Music Support Program. The program is designed to assist music businesses with the costs associated with preparing to host and deliver live music once borders reopen and restrictions are eased. It is targeted at our state's dedicated live music venues, professional touring artists, their crew and event promoters.

Through a competitive funding process, eligible live businesses will be able to apply for grants ranging from \$50,000 to \$300,000. The live music support package will provide up to \$300,000 for eligible dedicated live music venues and music industry event promoters, if they can demonstrate a decline in income compared with pre COVID-19, and up to \$50,000 for eligible South Australian-based professional touring contemporary music artists if they are in the same situation.

More details on the package will be available on the Arts South Australia and Music Development Office websites very soon. This program will enable the states live music industry to be ready to host live music once again, ensuring the home of Australia's only designated UNESCO City of Music is ready to amp up post pandemic. The program is part of a new \$7 million support package for the arts and live music sector announced by the Premier just this week.

In addition to this, my department's Music Development Office will also open the November round of the project support grants. This will provide grants of up to \$15,000 for artists and music businesses to develop creative IP and foster business opportunities here in South Australia and beyond. Of course, we are very keen to see our young musicians in particular have a great start back after the lockdowns that we have all experienced. Of course, a total of \$200,000 is available in this round.

Applications for both programs open this Friday 29 October, and these programs add a further \$3.2 million in funding to the previous \$3.2 million that has already been provided to the South Australian music industry. That is \$6.4 million since the pandemic began.

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Premier. Does the Premier commit to the entirety of the Doherty Institute modelling being released without any redactions? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: This morning, the Chief Public Health Officer, Professor Nicola Spurrier, said on ABC radio that 'there won't be anything hidden' when the modelling is released.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): I refer the leader to my previous answers.

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:20): My question is to the Premier. Why won't the Premier simply commit to fully releasing all of the Doherty modelling that pertains specifically to the South Australian circumstance?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:20): I've got no idea why the Leader of the Opposition doesn't listen to any of the answers that have been provided. I think I have well and truly covered it, and I just refer the Leader of the Opposition to those questions. I have answered that specific question. The reason why that would be completely inappropriate is because the model, of course, is the national cabinet's model, not the South Australian government's.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: No matter how loudly the Leader of the Opposition shouts, my answer is going to be the same.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: What are you hiding?

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

DOHERTY INSTITUTE MODELLING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): My question is to the Premier. Why won't the Premier commit to publicly releasing the modelling that pertains specifically to South Australia that was previously referenced by the Premier himself, which he has been in receipt of and read personally?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:21): I refer the leader to my previous answer.

TARGETED LEAD ABATEMENT PROGRAM

Mr COWDREY (Colton) (14:21): My question is to the member for Stuart, the Minister for Energy and Mining. Can the minister please update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is investing in Port Pirie to provide a safer and stronger community?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:21): I thank the member for Colton for this very important question. I know that he cares about his community in the electorate of Colton and he cares about the Housing SA tenants in his electorate, as we all do across government in Port Pirie. Port Pirie, as people would know, is challenged with decades and decades of lead pollution and our government is determined—absolutely determined—for the people of Port Pirie to make a very significant dent: short, medium and long-term improvements.

As the landlord essentially of the Housing SA properties, our government has identified 43 Housing SA properties in Port Pirie with children under five years old, and people would all know that lead in the air can lead to lead in blood, and lead in blood in infants is a very serious thing indeed. We are determined to address that, so we have allocated \$2.5 million, as the landlord, to essentially support the tenants in these 43 homes to help clean up and improve their homes. We know that those tenants have been doing a very good job and doing the very best that they can, but they need some extra help, and we are doing that for them.

We are helping with ways to reduce the dust inside and outside of their homes. We are helping with regard to the sealing of doors and windows and things like that so that dust doesn't get into their house and helping with things like replacing carpet with linoleum so the flooring holds less dust and is easier to clean. We are absolutely determined that we will achieve far better results for the people of Port Pirie through the TLAP program and other measures like this than the previous government did.

We have done this in 13 of the 43 houses already, and we have already seen reductions in the results for testing for lead in infants' blood. There can be absolutely nothing more important that

our government can look at than caring for the health and wellbeing of infants throughout the state, and we take this responsibility very seriously. We have announced already that the former 2IC of the environmental protection agency is now living in Port Pirie, has bought a house in Port Pirie and is working on leading this work on the ground.

We have announced already that the council and local community members will have a voice in the TLAP program in a way that they never have before. We have announced an additional 10 years of funding in partnership with the Nyrstar company for this work. The current funding runs out in 2024. While we are determined and already delivering results now, we know that this work needs to continue, so there is an extra 10 years of funding. We have also agreed with the company that any unspent funds in any year will be rolled over, another significant improvement on the previous government's work in this area. We are doing a lot to make sure that the TLAP program is more effective than it has ever been before.

Let me be very clear: I know that the member for Frome and the previous government had good intentions when they put this program together but, unfortunately—very unfortunately for the people of Port Pirie—the results have not materialised in the way that they said they would, when they said, for example, that lead would be a thing of the past.

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

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the minister is not answering the substance of the question. He is now debating the answer and he is attempting to take responsibility for other people's actions. He has no responsibility for the house, the member for Frome or any previous government policy.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I bring the minister to the substance of the question. There is a short time remaining for the answer.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: We are making it very clear that we are getting better results through better intent, through better funding, through better proactivity than the previous government ever did on this issue, and it is working already. We know that this is an issue that will be providing results in the short, medium and long term. There are things we can do already, and we are doing them. There are things that we are working on now which will deal with decades and decades of lead legacy in Port Pirie. We are determined to fix this. We are going to fix it. We are doing a much better job than the previous government.

TARGETED LEAD ABATEMENT PROGRAM

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (14:26): I have a supplementary question. Minister, I welcome the \$2½ million. It's a bit strange that that wasn't offered previously. However, one of the questions I need to understand is—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: —with the sealing of the rooms, etc., which is terrific, are you looking at assisting those households with watering their lawns and gardens to actually reduce the lead even further?

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (14:26): Thank you very much for that question. Yes, I agree with the member for Frome that it's a terrible shame that these sorts of programs were not offered previously. It is absolutely shameful that the previous government and the TLAP program that the previous government, including the member Frome, instituted did not do those things. With regard to outdoor areas, yes, absolutely we are doing it. I am very pleased to have some more time to explain some of the other things that we are doing.

For example, on Friday last week I visited a house in Port Pirie with a fantastic young family. This program provided a brand-new pergola over the backdoor play area immediately outside the back of that house. We had new artificial turf on the ground immediately outside the house so that

there wouldn't be dust coming up from what was previously essentially a dust and weed sort of garden according to the person who lived there.

That artificial turf has been extended outside the pergola area so that there is a very large play area for the people who live in this house and, importantly, the young boy who lives in this house to be able to use. The front garden and the rest of the back garden have been completely refurbished, with a top layer of dust and weeds taken away and gravel put down so that less and less dust is able to come up and get into the air around the house and, importantly, not get into the house.

One of the very important things that we are doing with this project is that every one of the 43 houses gets its own tailored upgrade. This is not a cookie-cutter approach. Every single house gets looked at: what would be best for this house, what would be best for that house. For example, I mentioned the replacement of carpet with linoleum. This particular house did not have carpet, so we didn't replace it as it already had linoleum. But what was evident was that the area where the child and the mother played outside the back door was a real risk site, so we changed that for them.

In another house it might well be gardening, watering and greening in the front or back garden. This particular home had quite a significant array of pot plants in the undercover pergola area near the back door, so that was already being taken care of. But in another house it might well be that reticulation, watering and greening—exactly the types of things that the member for Frome is clearly disappointed were not achieved when the previous government had the opportunity to do all these things. We are doing these things.

Let me be very clear: there is also more to come. We have more good news to come on this program. I am very pleased that those opposite are listening to this information, that they are not interrupting, because this is some of the most important work that we could be doing. It would not matter whether it were in the CBD of Adelaide, in suburban Adelaide, in Port Lincoln, in Mount Gambier, in Port Pirie or Oodnadatta: this is some of the most important work that any government could be doing on behalf of families and young people.

We know that Port Pirie and the surrounding region is an absolutely outstanding part of our state—fantastic people, a fantastic regional centre, fantastic tourism opportunities, a fantastic surrounding regional agricultural area—and we are determined, absolutely determined, that this important part of our state gets every opportunity to break away from well over 100 years of legacy pollution.

This is work we are doing to fix what happened 130 years ago, 100 years ago, 50 years ago—and, yes, we are also fixing things that were not done over the previous 16 years before we came into government.

The SPEAKER: The member for Ramsay is warned.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier publicly release the ambulance ramping statistics for the months of August and September, or is he keeping that secret too?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31): I am not sure if they have been compiled, but I'm happy to make an inquiry with regard to those. I think they are published from time to time, and I'm happy to make that inquiry.

COVID-19 HOSPITAL RESPONSE

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:31): My question is to the Premier. Is the Premier making judgements about the preparedness of our hospital system without any knowledge of the ramping statistics we currently have here in South Australia?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:31): I thank the leader for his question. On the contrary, we have been paying a huge amount of attention to making sure—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Thank you very much, sir. As I was saying, we have been paying a huge amount of attention to what we need to have in place to be COVID-ready as we lift those borders. We have already announced a \$123 million COVID-ready package, which is supplying additional capacity to hospital beds in South Australia, around 400 beds. Some of those are in our hospitals, our own hospitals and health facilities, and some of them are in the private sector. Of course, some of them are created by moving patients who are currently in a hospital bed to an out-of-hospital care environment in their own property.

We have also committed to taking on the graduating nurse cohort from this year—which I understand is about 1,200 people—which will take the additional doctors, nurses, paramedics and midwives in South Australia to an additional 1,600 or so health professionals in South Australia. In addition to that, as you would be more than aware, sir, we are spending a huge amount of money upgrading our hospital facilities in South Australia, in particular our emergency department capacity and capability.

They were left in a parlous state by the previous government. We are addressing that with very significant funding, with more than \$1 billion going into—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee is warned.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are putting very significant additional capacity and capability into our health system in South Australia. Currently, we have a capital budget in excess of \$1 billion. As you would be aware, sir, we have also moved the budget for Health from \$5.8 billion per year when we came into government to a massive \$7.4 billion in the current budget—very significant increases in resources going into the operations, the capital budget and of course preparing—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: We are making sure we are COVID-ready in South Australia with a massive \$123 million investment in our hospitals. Of course, the number one thing that can be done in South Australia is to get vaccinated, and we are doing extraordinarily well in South Australia. In the last three or four weeks, I think we have had—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Premier, please ignore the interjections. The member for Lee is warned for a second time.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, we have been very pleased that the people of South Australia have presented themselves for vaccination. We've currently got I think more than 100,000 doses administered for each week over the last three or four weeks. This is very important. It is a shared responsibility. Yes, of course the government needs to put resources into place, but we are working with the people of South Australia, who are getting vaccinated in record numbers in South Australia. South Australians are doing their part.

That's why we know that on 23 November we get to a position where we will have additional resources into our health system and we will also have the vaccination rate at that 80 per cent double-vaccinated for those 16 and over, and that's when the evidence suggests that we should be easing those borders.

We come at it from a very different position from other jurisdictions. Some jurisdictions, of course, have higher level daily numbers at the moment, so they already have a seeded situation. We don't have that seeded situation. We have had COVID come into our state, but we have been very fortunate. Working with the people of South Australia, we have been able to make sure that doesn't translate into a cluster or community transmission, so we do start from a different position. We've got to make sure that we are ready and that's why we have made this very, very significant investment.

AMBULANCE RAMPING

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:35): My question is to the Premier. Has the Premier been briefed that the week before last was the worst in the history of the state on ambulance ramping?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:35): As we have answered in this parliament before, there are some big fluctuations in presentation.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, member for Kaurana!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I said, there are some huge fluctuations in terms of presentation rates here in South Australia and right around the country. We have seen this in other jurisdictions as well. We know that many of our GPs are not taking patients with respiratory symptoms at the moment; this is exacerbating the presentation rate at emergency departments across the country. We also know that there is a greater acuity of care.

I don't have any specific details with regard to the times that the members opposite have identified. I am happy to go back and have a look at that, but you are right: there are surges, there are changes in demand, and that's why we are doing everything we can to expand that overall capacity in our emergency departments.

I am very proud that our government is implementing a very large number of capacity upgrades to our emergency departments: in total, nine emergency departments in metropolitan Adelaide and in the peri-urban areas are being upgraded at the moment. The first of those, the Flinders Medical Centre, is already completed. It has always been the busiest emergency department in South Australia. Those opposite had their chance to adjust it. They didn't build it anywhere near where they should.

We have proof positive because one of the things that I do read from time to time, because I get a bit of time on my hands, is *On Being a Minister: Behind the Mask* by John Hill. He wasn't actually referring to a surgical mask for COVID purposes. I am not sure what mask he was referring to actually. The reality was that he gave us a very candid insight into many issues of the former government, of the administration of health. We know that the current member for Kaurana was one of his principal advisers, but he doesn't mention that too much anymore now he's been promoted to being the shadow minister for health. What could go wrong?

Anyway, one of the things that does happen in this book is we get a very clear insight into the failures of the development of the Flinders Medical Centre and, in particular, the emergency department—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Kaurana is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —where it was specifically designed for patients waiting to go in there to be on the ramp. That was the design that those opposite put in place. Of course, we have now made this the largest—

The Hon. S.C. Mullighan: I thought you said it was a national problem. Get your excuse right.

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: —emergency department in South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: But of course—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Malinauskas: How's your ramping going?

The SPEAKER: Leader!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, we are very significantly increasing the capacity of our hospital—

Mr PICTON: Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: Premier, there is a point of order. A point of order has been raised.

Mr PICTON: Debate, sir. There was a very specific question: was this the worst ramping that the state has ever seen, a week and a half ago?

The SPEAKER: I will give the Premier some latitude because he is the Premier, but I do remind the Premier of standing order 98.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, there are big fluctuations in terms of demand at the moment—not just in terms of the presentation rate but of course the acuity of care and the length of stay for many of the patients. This is why we have announced our \$123 million COVID-ready package, which will give us a very significant increase in the overall bed capacity in our hospitals in time for when those COVID cases needing hospitalisation come to South Australia.

Now, of course, they are not going to come in on day one. It's not as if we lift the border on 23 November and will have a significant number of people going into hospitals on 24 November. But we should expect that there will be a higher level of cases and some of those will translate into a need for hospitalisation. We have taken all of that into consideration in framing our package, our COVID-ready \$123 million package, so that we can be ready for when that occurs.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENTS

Mr MALINAUSKAS (Croydon—Leader of the Opposition) (14:40): My question is to the Premier. I thank the Premier for his earlier answer referencing presentations. Will the Premier release data regarding emergency department presentations, or will it go aside like ambulance ramping statistics and the modelling?

The SPEAKER: Was there a point of order? Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Sir, unacceptable argument—standing order 97. I ask you to rule the question out of order.

The SPEAKER: I am going to give the leader an opportunity to rephrase the question.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier release the presentation statistics to our emergency departments and hospitals that he previously referenced in his prior answer?

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (14:40): I don't have any statistics on hand.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I was relying on a verbal briefing. I meet with the health minister several times per week. We have a dedicated meeting every Tuesday morning. That has been information that has been provided to me. It is also information that I have gathered from attending the national—

Mr Brown interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: It's also information, of course, that I have gathered from being a member of the national cabinet—a great honour and privilege to serve on the national cabinet during this pandemic. The issues that confront us here in South Australia are commonplace right across the country at the moment—

Mr Malinauskas: Well, release the numbers to verify it.

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader is called to order. Interjections will cease. The Premier has the call.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: As I was saying, there is a very significant issue right around the country at the moment. I think the reasons for that are pretty obvious. There are greater level presentations. There is a higher level acuity of care and there are longer bed stays at the moment. This is one of the reasons why we have made—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The leader has put his question. The answer is being given.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: That's why, of course, we have put in place a \$123 million package to make sure that we can be as prepared as possible. We haven't been sitting on our hands since coming to government. We are very significantly increasing the expenditure which goes into the operating budget for SA Health and the capital budget.

As I was saying only a few moments ago, we are putting more beds ready for when those expected numbers come to South Australia. I just draw the house's attention to some of those beds going into our own facilities at the Modbury Hospital, at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and at the Repat. It begs the question, sir: what was the Labor Party doing with the Modbury Hospital, the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and the Repat?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: Downgrade, downgrade, close. Imagine, sir, if they were in charge during this pandemic!

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order. Member for West Torrens.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, sir: standing order 98 means the Premier can't debate the answer. He began to debate the answer then much like a session at karaoke.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for West Torrens. I have allowed the Premier some latitude. I do draw his attention to standing order 98 and bring him back to the substance of the question.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: So, because of that demand, we are putting more beds into the system; 46—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The exchange between the leader and the Premier needs to cease. The leader is putting his question, has put his question, the Premier is answering.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: To be clear, sir, there is no exchange. I am being yelled at. I am directing all of my answers through you, sir, so an exchange would require me to respond to these completely unsatisfactory and unparliamentary interferences, which are disorderly and which I wouldn't do. I am directing all of my answers to you, sir, and providing you with the necessary information that you require. One of the things that we do know is, under our COVID-ready plan, we are putting 46 new beds into the Modbury Hospital, 38 new beds at the Hampstead Rehabilitation Centre and nine at the Repat.

The SPEAKER: Point of order. Premier, there is a point of order. The leader on a point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Point of order, sir: debate. The question was not about the former Labor government's investment in Modbury Hospital. The question was very clearly—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I will hear out the point of order.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Can I finish the point of order, sir?

The SPEAKER: Leader.

Mr MALINAUSKAS: Thank you, Mr Speaker. We wouldn't want to respond to yelling across the chamber. The question was very specific. It was asking the Premier to release data around presentations to our emergency departments. Will the Premier release it or not? The question wasn't about the former Labor government's investment of \$90 million plus in Modbury Hospital.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is reasonably persuasive. Premier, can I draw your attention again to standing order 98. I appreciate that your answer so far has been wideranging.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL: I refer the leader to my answer two questions ago.

SPORTING INFRASTRUCTURE

Ms LUETHEN (King) (14:45): My question is to the Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing. Can the minister inform the house how the Marshall Liberal government has cemented South Australia's position as a premier destination for major sporting events through investment in the sports community across the state?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: standing order 97, questions are not to involve argument or comments. That question involves a lot of argument and comment.

The SPEAKER: Standing order 97 states:

Such questions not to involve argument

In putting any such question, a Member may not offer argument or opinion, nor may a Member offer any facts except by leave of the House...

It seems to me, member for King, there was an opinion expressed in the question. I will give you an opportunity to rephrase.

Ms LUETHEN: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can the minister update the house on the initiatives led by the Marshall Liberal government to position South Australia as a premium destination for major sporting events?

The SPEAKER: I am going to allow the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (14:46): I thank the member for King for her question and note how hardworking she is in her community, especially when it comes to sporting endeavours and building what matters for the people of South Australia.

As you would know, sir, we have an unprecedented record of investment in sporting infrastructure here in South Australia, across all levels, and it does continue to cement our place as a leader, a premier sporting destination amongst the cities in the nation when it comes to sporting events. Already we have seen a number of events secured here when we have invested money in infrastructure that actually delivers great outcomes for South Australia.

Our \$50 million plus investment in Memorial Drive is just one example. We invested \$10 million in the roof on Memorial Drive—the cover over that. Of course, that got us the Adelaide International Tennis event and drew some of the world's best men and women players back to Adelaide, which we hadn't seen for generations. It was a wonderful event. That led, of course, to another \$44 million investment in the upgrade that we can see right now over at Memorial Drive.

I was there on the weekend, in fact, with Lleyton Hewitt having a look at how that development is coming along. He was over the moon. Of course, Lleyton is a doyen, an icon of South Australian tennis. I was lucky enough to have a hit with him and he was very kind to me and he was suitably impressed, not with my tennis but with the development, and he wished it had happened a long, long time ago.

He knows that we didn't have a venue in metropolitan Adelaide with a roof on it up until we put the roof on the main court at Memorial Drive. We are putting a roof on the show court as well and this is going to allow us to unearth our next Lleyton Hewitt or next Alicia Molik as well, so it is a great investment and it is delivering a decade of the Adelaide International here in South Australia.

Tennis is not the only place where we are making a splash. Of course, in the pool, the Olympians and the Paralympians are returning here to Adelaide, South Australia. We have followed

that up with two events coming to Adelaide: the Australian Swimming Championships and the Age Swimming Championships, again making our pool the home of swimming in the nation. Kyle Chalmers, the big fish, the big tuna, we love having him as part of South Australia. It actually is the Matt Cowdrey OAM pool, I might add—

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

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

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —which is very notable and we know the great work he did in that Paralympic scene. That pool is of course home to Kyle Chalmers, the big tuna, but it's actually attracting other athletes here. It is great to see a new South Australian, Meg Harris, basing herself out of the SASI program there. So that is absolutely outstanding.

This \$400 million investment that our government has made into sporting facilities in South Australia is actually filling my calendar. We are getting more and more events coming and we almost can't keep up. I recently had the privilege of joining the member for Black up at O'Halloran Hill at the new BMX facility that we are building—this is fantastic—the \$6 million Sam Willoughby BMX Facility, which is going to attract events here. Again, we are delivering what the people of South Australia want, so it is wonderful.

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

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

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I turn to soccer.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: There is plenty of noise on that side, but plenty of delivery on this side.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Mawson is warned.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It's all about delivering for the people of South Australia. Let's talk about soccer as well because we have put \$97 million into soccer since coming into government. Of course, the investment at Hindmarsh Stadium ahead of the Women's World Cup, that will be absolutely outstanding. It has been a long time since we have had an investment like this in that facility. Of course, that will put us on the stage where billions and billions of people—it is expected that more than one billion people will watch the Women's World Cup, and 22,000 fans are here, and again we are delivering for the people of South Australia.

But it is not only on that stage but also in the community. Our Sports Vouchers program, one they had no money for, we invested an extra \$100 per primary school-age child.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: We have expanded it up until year 8 and year 9, making sure we are developing those champions of the future and that they've got venues and destinations to play at right here in South Australia.

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

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:50): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. What responsibility do you personally take for any failure to keep children in care safe? With your leave, and that of the house, Mr Speaker, I will explain.

The SPEAKER: Leave is sought. Perhaps we will hear out the full question and then we will take the point of order. Leader of Government Business, it will only take a moment.

Leave granted.

The SPEAKER: Very well. Let's hear the end of the question and then I will come to you, Leader of Government Business.

Ms HILDYARD: In the report of the independent inquiry into reporting practices in the minister's department, Paul Rice QC states that there 'was a significant failure on the minister's part'.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: it has been ruled in this house many times that it is not allowable to make an argument and then seek leave and provide alleged facts or quotes or information like that when the allegation from the member was that the minister has failed to do this and that and the other.

The SPEAKER: Standing order 97, I have earlier reflected for the benefit of members, provides, 'In putting any such question, a Member may not offer argument or opinion,' and it goes on, of course, to illustrate the way in which leave might be sought. The member for Reynell, I will give you an opportunity to rephrase the question. It seems to me at first glance that there is a form of putting the question that may not stray under the standing orders.

Ms HILDYARD: Reframe?

The SPEAKER: Yes.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, do you personally take any responsibility when children in care are unsafe?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:52): I thank the member for her question. Obviously as minister, my role is to look at the policies and procedures and the failings of the former Labor government over 16 years and look at ways that we can improve the safety of children and young people.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has the call. The question has been asked and the minister has the call.

Mr Malinauskas interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, the leader!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I think there was a great article in InDaily in which Jay Weatherill himself said—let's quote from Jay Weatherill: 'There isn't a child protection system anywhere in the world—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated; there is a point of order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Standing order 98: the minister may not debate the answer but must answer the substance of the question. The minister is now debating the answer.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of Government Business, a point of order to the point of order.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: In answering the question, the minister actually started saying 'my responsibilities include' and is continuing on with her answer addressing the question.

The SPEAKER: The member for West Torrens, I see that the point you make may be persuasive. I am going to allow the minister to continue and I will be listening carefully to the answer.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As I was saying, I quote from the InDaily article where Jay Weatherill says, 'There isn't a child protection system anywhere in the world that's going to stop bad things happening.' My role as the minister is to make policies and procedures and to work with the department to work always in the best interests of our children. This government, on coming into government, has had a whole-of-government response and we need a whole-of-community response as well.

We looked at the failings of the former Labor government. We looked at all the inquiries, the inquests, the Coroner's reports and the royal commissions that all spoke of the toxic culture, the cover-up, the standover tactics and the fear-based culture that they had, and I have worked very hard with my department and its leadership to change that culture. In fact, I was in Mount Gambier on Friday speaking to a staff member—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —who had been in the department for over a decade and who came back two years ago after having a child. They had been under the Labor government, gone away, come back and said that they have seen a noticeable difference. There is better training, there are better policies, there are better procedures and the culture has improved.

I know from hearing on the ground firsthand from staff that the policies and procedures of this Liberal government are making significant changes to staff and significant changes to the children and young people in our care.

My responsibility is to continually improve what we are doing. There is no fail-safe way of protecting our children, as the former Premier and child protection minister, Jay Weatherill, has stated.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (14:55): My question again is to the Minister for Child Protection. Minister, how many children in care are using dating apps?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (14:55): We have a nationwide and a worldwide issue currently and that is e-safety. We are the first country in the world to have an eSafety Commissioner appointed by the federal government, which is to be commended, and there is a lot of work being done.

My department has been working with the eSafety Commissioner looking at different training and procedures. In fact, this morning, before parliament, I was at a round table into missing children, and one of the presentations was from the MacKillop Foundation, which will be rolling out extra training to all our staff. The program is called Power to Kids: Respecting Sexual Safety, which will be issued to all our residential care staff and which focuses on prevention and early intervention strategies to help children and young people at risk of experiencing harmful sexual behaviours, child exploitation and dating violence.

We all know too well, particularly even in this house, that predators will prey on our most vulnerable children—

The SPEAKER: Minister, there is a point of order.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: —and they will put themselves in roles of responsibility.

The SPEAKER: The member for Lee on a point of order.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The question was very specific about how many children in care are using dating apps.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If there is another contribution on the point of order, I am happy to hear it.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Standing order 98: debate. The contribution to date from the minister goes nowhere near the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: In fact, I had in mind an alternative. I had well heard the member for Lee. I appreciate very much the point of order being raised, but I had in mind that there may be a response from the Leader of Government Business.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The minister is talking specifically about a round table that she attended this morning, which included exactly this topic. So she is on topic and I seek that you allow her to continue.

The SPEAKER: The point of order is reasonably persuasive. I will continue to hear the minister, but I do draw the minister's attention to the standing orders.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: We have an e-safety procedure policy that all children and young people in care sign when they have a device that is given to them. If they have a phone, an iPad or a computer they sign an agreement, and part of that agreement states the rules and responsibilities and what they are allowed to do. Of course, when going on a dating app you must first be over 18, so it is illegal; they shouldn't be going on it anyway. But we do have a signed agreement; we do have a policy and procedure.

Again, mentioning my visit to Mount Gambier on Friday, the houses that I visited have their own internet rules, and the internet was available only between three and eight on a school day and three and 10 on a weekend—Friday, Saturday and Sunday.

Each individual house, depending on the needs of each individual child, just as a foster care home or a kinship carer home, will have their own specific rules, as do all parents have their own rules—

The SPEAKER: There is a point of order, minister. I will hear the point of the order from the member for Lee.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Once again, standing order 98. It was a very specific question about how many children in care were using dating apps.

The SPEAKER: I will draw the minister's attention to the standing order. There was some digression, but it is equally right to say that there was significant substance. The minister has the call.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Clearly, the opposition has no interest in what we are doing to keep children safe—

The SPEAKER: Minister, that is straying into debate, so I draw your attention to the question. It was substantial matters of substance that you are addressing, and I will bring you to those.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: This is pertinent to the answer because this is a worldwide issue. This is not just an issue being experienced by children in guardianship. All children, all parents around Australia, the world, are facing the same problem. Can the member for Reynell tell me how many children under 18 have dating apps on the phone for the whole of Australia? Is it even relevant?

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

The SPEAKER: Minister, there's a point of order. Member for Lee, I anticipate that you are going to draw my attention to the minister's rhetorical device. It was reasonably rhetorical, but I do see that the minister is making an attempt to answer the substance of the question. Are there other matters that you wish to draw to my attention?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: As Meatloaf would say, 'You took the words right out of my mouth,' sir.

The SPEAKER: The minister has the call.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I have completed my answer, thank you. They are clearly not listening.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:00): My question is to the Minister for Child Protection. Minister, was a teen in your care targeted on a dating app, driven to a predator's house and sexually abused? With your leave, and that of the house, I will explain, Mr Speaker.

Leave granted.

Ms HILDYARD: On 19 October 2021, a court heard details that a 16-year-old child in state care was lured from their place of residence through an online dating app and sexually abused by Richard Ian Squires.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:01): I have nothing to add that's not already been on the record.

CHILD PROTECTION

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:01): My question is again to the Minister for Child Protection. When was the minister first advised about the rape of a 16-year-old boy in state care by Richard Ian Squires?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON (Adelaide—Minister for Child Protection) (15:01): I see that you are getting your questions from the same journalist that sent through the exact same questions earlier today. As this house is well aware, we have recently instigated a significant incident reporting unit which reports regularly. I have regular updates with my CE and executive team and I am advised on a regular basis in a timely manner. I was fully briefed of this case in a timely manner.

KANGAROO ISLAND COVID VACCINATIONS

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson) (15:02): My question is to the Premier. Are residents on Kangaroo Island forced to catch a ferry, costing more than \$200, to get their second dose of COVID-19 vaccine? With your leave, and the leave of the house, I will explain.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The Kangaroo Island vaccination clinic was closed several weeks ago, and around 300 people haven't had their second COVID jabs and are now forced to do a 300-kilometre round trip to Victor Harbor.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:02): I thank the member for Mawson for his question. I am very happy to follow that up. I think we did have a pop-up clinic there at one point in time. That hasn't been in place for some weeks now, but I am very happy to follow up that question. We are trying to provide as many different options for people, especially those people who are in more remote parts of our state. Kangaroo Island is a specific case where, of course, there is a ferry trip required or an air flight required to get to and from that island, so I expect that we should have arrangements in place to satisfy those people.

It's our intention to get as many people vaccinated as quickly as possible, so I am happy to follow up that issue. I know that the people within SA Health who are responsible have been doing an outstanding job in many very remote parts of our state, including using the Royal Flying Doctor Service to go in and conduct the vaccinations. We have also been working with the commonwealth with regard to a rollout using both GPs and pharmacies, but not in every location do we have a GP willing to participate in this or have the facilities or the capacity to do it. Similarly, sometimes it's not ideal for the local pharmacy.

It is important that we provide easy access for people right around our state. We are committed to opening up our state borders when we achieve 80 per cent double-vaccinated for our 16 and over population, but we also don't want to have wide variations between LGAs. We have said—although we haven't set a specific threshold for each of those LGAs as a minimum threshold—we don't want to have, for example, a situation where one LGA is at 25 per cent, another one is at 95 per cent and it averages out overall across the state at 80 per cent. There needs to be a base level of equity, and that means that people need to have access to those vaccination doses.

There have been doses available on Kangaroo Island. I know that from people who have told me about it. It worked very well. I don't have any information on the current status, but I am happy to take that question and follow it up.

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop has been patiently waiting.

AGRICULTURE INDUSTRY

Mr McBRIDE (MacKillop) (15:05): My question is to the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister update the house on how the Marshall Liberal government is keeping the state's economy strong through investments in new agricultural opportunities?

The SPEAKER: Before the minister answers, I just draw his attention to the time, and crossbench questions are fast approaching.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:05): I would like to thank the member for his important question and recognise his region for their commitment to agriculture and their commitment to the state. I think it's important to recognise there is an increased demand for protein worldwide. Whether it be plant or animal based, there is a huge increase in demand for protein. There is a real opportunity here in South Australia for us to get in particularly the space where plant protein is a key opportunity. We are seeing a significant increase in the population that's going down the vegetarian or vegan path, but we are also seeing that worldwide there are many demands in this space.

Australia has been an exporter of pulses and other protein-based plants for many years. We have just not been a commodity exporter. We have decided that it's important that we look into what we can do on value-adding in that space, so we have made a commitment of \$2 million towards the Adelaide University's Waite Campus, where we have set up a plant-based protein incubator. As was described to me when I was down there recently, we will be able to take plants from the kilo volume in the experimental kitchen up to about a thousand kilos before it then becomes commercial.

This enables businesses to test their products to see whether they are a viable option. This is a great initiative to enable the industry to actually grow and use this facility to take the risk of developing these products. Conscious of the time, I will leave the answer there.

BLACKWOOD COMMUNITY RECREATION CENTRE

Mr DULUK (Waite) (15:07): My question is to the Minister for Education. Minister, what actions is the Department for Education taking to support the continuation of the Blackwood rec centre with their ongoing battle with the City of Mitcham? Sir, with your leave, and that of the house, I will further explain.

Leave granted.

Mr DULUK: Minister, I wrote to you on 15 June and 2 September this year outlining the difficulties between the board of the rec centre and the City of Mitcham with their ongoing leasing arrangement. I want to thank you for working with myself and the community on this important issue, but can you please outline to the house what you are doing to support these negotiations and when the community can expect the new subleasing arrangements to be finalised?

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:08): I thank the member for the question, and I note that he has asked about this issue in the house on a prior occasion. I note the colour with which he has put the question. I am not sure I sign up to the words 'battle' or 'difficulties', but certainly there is an unresolved issue between the council and the Department for Education and the recreation centre's community group that runs it.

I have had some correspondence since this matter was last raised in the house from council, putting forward their point of view, and I was pleased that that correspondence came into the Department for Education. I think it might potentially assist with the chamber and the community to share my response, which I understand is now being discussed between council and the department, and I feel there is an atmosphere of positivity to come to a resolution. At any rate, the position that I put on behalf of the department and on behalf of the government was to the mayor. I wrote to her to say:

Thank you for your correspondence regarding the lease arrangements for the Blackwood Community Recreation Centre.

As you have highlighted, the Centre is a well patronised and valued facility within the local community and while it serves a dual purpose to provide recreation facilities to Blackwood High School, the predominant use of the facility is as a community recreation centre.

The provision of community recreation facilities is the core business of local government and this is reflected in the City of Mitcham's role as the head lessee. While I am supportive of the Blackwood Community Recreation Association continuing to operate the centre, I am of the view that council should remain party to the lease arrangements.

I note that council staff met with officers from the Department for Education earlier in the year and discussed the potential for responsibility for structural maintenance of the Centre to be shared between the council and the Department, with the Department's contribution reflective of the level of use by the school.

I then invited council officers to contact a person in the department to progress those discussions. My understanding is that there is a meeting that will be taking place either today or at some stage this week between officers of council and officers of my department. Obviously, the Blackwood High School does make use of the building, which is indeed part of our facilities and Department for Education owned. Its main purpose is to provide community recreation facilities, which is ultimately a council responsibility first.

Consequently, I am optimistic that, understanding those two principles, a sensible solution can be found to ensure that the community in the Blackwood area and beyond who use that facility are able to have a positive outcome, where all parties can be satisfied that it is also a fair outcome. I am optimistic that we will reach that goal. I thank the member for raising the question and I thank councillors and council for engaging positively with us in this discussion, and I look forward to hopefully a positive outcome in the not too distant future.

ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:11): My question is to the Minister for Environment and Water. Will the minister seek the expertise and assistance of the Australian Marine Wildlife Research and Rescue organisation and give that organisation the opportunity to be responsible to care for and protect dolphins in the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary before the dolphins require an autopsy?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:11): No, I will rely on the advice of the National Parks and Wildlife Service, the South Australian Museum and the associated stakeholders that they refer to.

ADELAIDE DOLPHIN SANCTUARY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12): Supplementary question, again, to the Minister for Environment and Water: does that mean the minister doesn't want to hear any of the information available to him from this group who have been working in the Dolphin Sanctuary for many years?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS (Black—Minister for Environment and Water) (15:12): They are a stakeholder. Over the years, I have met with Aaron Machado, who is involved there. I will have to—similar to my answers yesterday—always refer to the expertise of people in the National Parks and Wildlife Service, officers like Mr Jon Emmett who have put their lives into creating and managing the Adelaide Dolphin Sanctuary, a great asset for our state, and that's where my advice will continue to come from.

REGIONAL HOSPITALS

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:13): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier update the house or advise the house if there have been any plans or investigations to identify whether our regional hospitals and medical services are adequately able to cope with any increase in services that may be required for the opening of the borders of South Australia? With your leave, and that of the house, sir, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I am sure that other regional people have these same concerns and so far we have done everything right. To get into hospitals in Port Pirie and Port Augusta or see someone in the medical fraternity, you sometimes have to wait four or five hours at an A&E; secondly, to see your doctor sometimes takes four or five weeks. I am looking to see if there are any risk assessments and/or any investigations or plans to ensure that we have adequate services and resources out there in the regions.

The Hon. S.S. MARSHALL (Dunstan—Premier) (15:14): I can certainly reassure the house and the people in regional South Australia that we have done the adequate work to make sure that we have an appropriate model of care ready for when we open our state borders. I provided a great level of detail in answer to a very similar question yesterday from the member for Mount Gambier, but I am happy to go through it again today. We don't envisage that the country hospitals will be the place where we are actually treating people with COVID.

In some instances, they may come into a local regional hospital, but ultimately the three hospitals that will be dealing with COVID-positive patients in South Australia will be the Royal Adelaide Hospital, the Flinders Medical Centre and the Women's and Children's Hospital.

Whilst we don't expect very many children to go into the Women's and Children's Hospital, because of the very low acuity for young people who contract this disease, we do expect there will be some numbers at the Royal Adelaide Hospital and the Flinders Medical Centre.

Regarding the split between the two, I am advised that at the Flinders Medical Centre there will be a focus on pregnant women who might be COVID positive—again, a very small cohort—but it will be the Royal Adelaide Hospital, with its superior facilities in terms of infection control, that will be doing the lion's share of the work with COVID-positive patients.

Some states have already said they will take everybody in this state who is COVID positive into one of their hospitals. We haven't done that in South Australia. What we have done to date is take people into the Tom's Court Hotel. This has been an appropriate place to house all the COVID-positive patients to date, with those requiring further treatment to go into the Royal Adelaide Hospital. There has been very little transfer over the last 19 months because of the low numbers we have had in South Australia.

Going forward, we won't be moving every person in the state who is COVID positive into the Tom's Court Hotel. We will be adopting a different model that is very similar to the model that exists in the COVID states at the moment, like New South Wales and Victoria, where the vast majority of people who are COVID positive are at home. If they need to be hospitalised, then they will move them. That means we need to have effective methodologies in place to monitor the symptoms of those people who will be living with COVID.

This is one of the reasons we are encouraging every single person in South Australia to get vaccinated. The very best defence for South Australians against the Delta variant is to get vaccinated. The likelihood of contracting the disease once you have been fully vaccinated—two shots—is significantly lower. It's not impossible, but it is significantly lower than if you have not been vaccinated.

You would have heard today that the Prime Minister has also announced there will be a third jab available. This is advice that has now been received by the commonwealth and made public immediately, that a third dose will be available. The time frame for that hasn't been determined, but I'm sure that will be on the agenda for the national cabinet next Friday.

I can assure the people of regional South Australia that we will be taking every precaution. One of the things we have done is put a very significantly larger number of beds in the total system in South Australia to allow for the potential beds that will be taken up with people who are required to be hospitalised. Similarly, the same situation exists for those people who ultimately need to go into ICU and onto a ventilator.

What we do know is that there are very improved methods of care. For people who are diagnosed with COVID-19, we are seeing much better recovery rates at the moment in our hospitals. I expect that with every week, every month, that goes by we will continue to learn about this disease so that we won't see the escalation that has been a hallmark of the disease to date.

AGRICULTURAL SECTOR EMPLOYMENT

Mr ELLIS (Narungga) (15:18): My question is for the Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development. Can the minister please endeavour to seek the expeditious passage of essential harvest workers over the border so that they can participate in the upcoming harvest? With your leave, sir, and that of the house, I will explain further.

Leave granted.

Mr ELLIS: There are a number of outstanding cross-border passes on the Narungga office books, and harvest has already kicked off on the YP. Those workers are needed as soon as possible.

The Hon. D.K.B. BASHAM (Finniss—Minister for Primary Industries and Regional Development) (15:18): I thank the member for his very important question. As we head into harvest, workforce is a critical issue and not just for the grain industry. As we head into the fruit picking season up in the Riverland, as well, we certainly need people to pick our fruit.

Essential workers in agriculture have been given the opportunity to be given priority to come into South Australia from places like Victoria and New South Wales, with the border restrictions. We

have been working with Health SA as well as the Department of Primary Industries and Regions to make sure we get people in when required.

There has been a process shift where those who require an agriculture exemption to bring in—that has been shifted across to PIRSA to actually process, to effectively make sure their applications are getting assessed in a timely manner. We have been working with electoral offices to make sure that we get people in under those circumstances. I am more than happy to work with the member for Narungga's staff to make sure that we get those applications to front of mind, to make sure that those workers can get in.

We have a wonderful grain sector out there and we have an amazing harvest on our doorstep at the moment. As the member for Narungga said, the season has started, we are seeing crops being harvested, so we do need those workers in.

We have also done other work where we have enabled accommodation to be set up at grain silos, so there have been some planning approvals to allow temporary accommodation to be set there to allow those workers to have somewhere to reside out in the regions if we can't get those dedicated workers from across the border.

It certainly is important. There are skill sets that we do need to bring in from time to time, particularly in servicing equipment, whether it be harvesters or hay machinery. There has been a circumstance recently where there was a farmer down in the South-East on a Sunday afternoon. His crew arrived at the border to come over the next day and make silage. We were able to respond to that and get them access immediately to get them over so that the silage contractor could start work the following day.

It's important to know that there are these opportunities for workers to come in for those agricultural purposes. It is so important for our economy that we make sure that we do get these crops harvested in a timely manner.

I very much just ask the member for Narungga to please supply the details of those particular issues that he has within his electorate. We will work through those to make sure that those people are able to come in and do the work that is required to deliver the harvest so that the economy of South Australia is underpinned again by agriculture.

The SPEAKER: The question before the Chair is that the house note grievances, but before we depart I might note that this is the second consecutive day that no member has departed under 137A.

Grievance Debate

CHILDREN IN STATE CARE

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (15:21): As has been the case on several occasions in this place, I rise with a heavy heart: heavy because, again, one of the most vulnerable children in our state, a child in the care of this government, has been sexually abused by a predator.

South Australians were utterly shocked and saddened last year when they learned that two 13-year-old girls in care had been abused by paedophiles; one of them subsequently became pregnant and one, we understand, was pregnant when abused—13-year-old children. They are 13-year-old children whom the minister has the ultimate responsibility to keep safe. They are horrific cases which the minister was utterly unaware of until they were reported in the media.

With sadness and shock, South Australians learned last week that another child in care has now tragically been sexually abused, that another child was not safe. The minister has said repeatedly in this place that she does not talk about individual cases. She has also spoken endlessly about government programs that it is, frankly, difficult to get a handle on what they actually are. What she never, ever speaks of is her responsibility in all of this mess.

Our questions today were not about the intricate details of what this child had to endure. Our questions were clear. What they focused on is what children in care, their families and indeed all South Australians deserve to know and that is: how on earth another vulnerable teen in care was abused, what is the minister doing to prevent this, what systems are failing when a child in care can be driven to a predator's house and raped after being targeted on dating app Grindr.

What our community also deserves to know goes to what Judge Rice detailed in his report following the minister's handling of those horrendous cases of two 13-year-old girls in care who were sexually abused by paedophiles, and that is: what responsibility the minister personally takes for what Judge Rice described as her 'significant failure' in relation to those two cases.

Our community are so tired of these horrendous cases of abuse happening. They are also utterly, utterly tired of refusals to answer, the refusal to front media, the shifting of blame, the ongoing protection racket that sees this minister try to avoid scrutiny time after time. Today, she again attempted to evade giving clear answers, including on exactly when she knew about this latest terrible case. One must ask: was it when she was informed again by media? She evaded questions on how many children in care are on dating apps.

When terrible things happen on your watch, you have to front up, answer questions and make changes to ensure that horrific incidents of abuse do not happen again. You have to take responsibility and, to do that, you have to feel that responsibility and act in a way that shows you feel that responsibility and that you will relentlessly examine the systems and ask the questions to ensure that change is actually made.

This minister just does not seem to do that, nor does she seem to take responsibility for the skyrocketing increase in the number of children in care, the staffing crisis in the Department for Child Protection, the alarming levels of unanswered calls to the Child Abuse Report Line, her failure to heed the Guardian for Children and Young People's repeated warning that children in care are at ongoing risk of sexual exploitation and abuse and to heed her calls for a properly funded community visitor scheme for children in care.

What has happened to this child is so very sad. Reading about the effect on him was heartbreaking. It is past time for this minister to step up and take responsibility, and she can start by indicating that she will take responsibility by explaining to South Australians whether, given her track record, she was even aware of this horrific case, what measures she has put in place to protect children in care and why on earth this has happened again given her repeated assurances earlier this year that measures had been put in place.

As I have said before, and as I will keep saying, if the minister is going to take children into care, her highest responsibility is to keep them safe. Tragically, this is yet another example of her failing to do so.

EDUCATION POLICY

The Hon. J.A.W. GARDNER (Morialta—Minister for Education) (15:27): I am really pleased to have the opportunity to address the house briefly this afternoon. I was encouraged last week to hear the Leader of the Opposition, the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and even the member for Wright taking the stage to talk about education policy because it is, as members of this house would be all too aware, something that the opposition has not talked about much over the last four years.

I am encouraged that they have entered the fray, and I just thought that now that we have had a couple of days to read the detail of their policy, it was worth providing some advice to the opposition on how they could improve it, if they do indeed wish to enhance teacher standards and enhance the outcomes for children and young people here in South Australia.

There have been a number of commitments. Some of them have had a financial allocation put by the opposition; some of those may be accurate, some of them may not be. Some of them, indeed, rather than attempting to come up with a detailed policy have deferred instead to the idea of a royal commission to come up with the policy that will achieve the outcome the Labor Party has decided is valuable.

But I genuinely want to be constructive and assist the Deputy Leader of the Opposition and the member for Wright in their endeavours to provide policy advice to the Leader of the Opposition who, for the first time on radio, was talking about some of the issues related to education over the last week or so that has been so absent from the field up until now.

The first area, of course, and this was a very significant piece of rhetoric, was in relation to the position of principals in their staffing. This was something that was put out as a significant change

in the Labor Party's approach. It was something that Leader of the Opposition said would make the AEU very unhappy. We welcomed the rhetoric from the opposition that, after 16 long years in government and 3½ years in opposition with a different point of view, they now saw the principal as an important person in the running of the school through the management of staff in a way that we have been arguing for a long time.

However, the detail is where the opposition's policy falls over. Much was made of their claim that they are proposing to reduce the staff management process for performance issues from 10 months to six weeks. In the detail of their policy, available for all to see, they identify the current process as too slow, but many of their assumptions are unfortunately not true.

The process that took years under previous administrations (and I congratulate Tony Harrison, Rick Persse and the deputy leader) had started to come down a little bit under their term and has indeed come down dramatically in recent years, to the point where, far from being a 10-month process the opposition is proposing to abbreviate to six weeks before the chief executive has a look at a process, it is now 7.5 weeks for an average case, unless there is a specific circumstance, unless a teacher takes leave, sick leave, for which we now ask for sick certificates, unless the teacher uses their WorkCover entitlement.

If the opposition are proposing to deny teachers the opportunity to take leave if they are sick, or indeed to take WorkCover if they are entitled to it, then let them say that, but otherwise all they have done is propose to abbreviate a process that for a standard case would take 7½ weeks. They are promising to do it in six weeks—good luck to them.

The second part of that principal autonomy piece was the idea that principals would be able to hire the teachers they wanted. The Leader of the Opposition's title was all about how principals will choose staff, not head office. I put to the house that there are two reasons why principals have suggestions or assistance in choosing their staff. I also note that the department has actually already under our government delegated authority to principals to make teaching appointments at their sites. That is something that we have done.

The remaining aspects are whether the principal is going to be influenced by the AEU representative on a selection panel or a promotional panel. In the parliament, the Labor Party has voted against our attempts to remove that AEU influence from the principal's selection on promotional panels in the EB agreement. In the EB arguments, discussions and negotiations the department and the government were having with the AEU several years ago, we endeavoured to remove them from the selection panels as well. The Labor's Party's response was to see the red flags marching, see the abusive posters about members of the government and join them, put on the red shirts, sing the Johnny Farnham songs and continue the argument against principals having that flexibility.

The second reason why principals have assistance from the department is when we are giving teachers who have a permanency, an entitlement to go to a school. We have made that process easier. We have given principals much more selection but, unless the AEU is proposing to remove people's industrial entitlements, the ALP should stop pretending that they are actually giving principals more flexibility with their proposal because they are not.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Mr BOYER (Wright) (15:32): I thought that now we are so close to the state election I would take this opportunity today to give residents of the north-eastern suburbs an update on where we are at in terms of the transition of the thousands of properties on the CWMS system to the SA Water network. Let's start with the things that we can agree on here.

The Community Wastewater Management System, as it is known, is past its use-by date. It is dysfunctional. Yes, it should have been fixed years and years ago, it is inconvenient for the 4,700 customers who are still stuck on that system in the north-eastern suburbs, it is becoming more expensive every year and it affects property prices.

When I talk to people who live outside the north-eastern metropolitan area in Adelaide, they are always shocked to hear that we still have people in inner suburban areas on a septic tank system. They are shocked that in 2021, 60 years after many of these properties were first developed and first built, they are still reliant on a septic tank for their waste. What many people do not know is that lots of those residents who remain stuck on the CWMS system, who bought those properties in the seventies or the eighties, were actually never even told that they were on a septic system.

In fact, the most incredible thing here is that many of these people did not actually learn that their house had a septic tank until it overflowed. It was not until their septic tank overflowed into their front yard or their backyard and they called the council to say, 'We don't know what's happening with our wastewater system here,' that the council came out and said, 'That's because you're on a septic tank system and every 10 years or so it actually needs to be pumped and emptied.'

There are some 800 CWMS properties in the seat of Wright, and I can tell you that some of the conversations I have had with those residents about the problems they have experienced over the many years they have still been on the system would make the hairs on the back of your neck stand up.

Problems include effluent flowing backwards up through the property, regular excavation of the garden to unearth the septic tank so it can be pumped out and removed from the site, and even cases, and I have heard many of these, where residents have sought the approval of council to build something in their backyard—it might be a swimming pool, for instance, or an extension to the home—and have been given incorrect advice about where the CWMS easement actually lies.

This means, of course, that when we get to the transition path there are going to be people who have to have these home extensions, swimming pools and garden features moved so that the septic tank can be accessed through absolutely no fault of their own whatsoever. This brings me to the point I want to make about just how much these residents have been through. Not only are they burdened with an archaic and dilapidated wastewater management system but they are paying more and more for the privilege of being on it every year.

The service fee last year was about \$650. This year, it is \$725 and is going to go up and up from hereon in. We have said that enough is enough. If we are going to fix this, we need to fix it properly. It needs to be done in a way that does not further penalise these residents who have already been penalised for so many years by being stuck on this outdated system. By penalise, of course, I mean both financially and in terms of how long they have to wait for the transition. That is exactly what the Liberal government plan is going to do.

It is going to punish CWMS customers financially because the Liberals' plan relies on a financial contribution from the City of Tea Tree Gully. Should the council have transitioned properties off the CWMS earlier? Absolutely. We can all agree on that. But this notion from the current government that they are giving the council their comeuppance by asking for a financial contribution for the transition now is completely fanciful because the council does not have the money. Those are the cold hard facts of the situation.

I am not defending council for not taking action, but the truth of it is that if the government pursues this financial contribution it is just going to be passed onto the ratepayers because council is going to be forced to either raise their rates, and that is only if ESCOSA lets them do that and pass it onto the entire rates base, or borrow money, which inevitably shows up in future rate rises anyway. That is why the Malinauskas Labor team has committed to not penalising CWMS customers.

Our \$92 million plan will mean the full transition of the 4,700 properties that are still on the CWMS system without any cost to the residents. Not only that but, because Labor has gone out there and has actually done the hard yards, knocked on doors and spoken to residents, we know that many of them are fearful about what damage will be done to their front and backyards when this transition starts. We know that residents who have spent years and years beautifying their homes do not want them irreparably damaged by these transition works.

For that reason, Labor will make sure there is funding for remediation works so that properties are left in a fit state once the transition works are complete. This is what CWMS customers deserve and this is what Labor will deliver if we form government in March.

GIBSON ELECTORATE

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD (Gibson—Minister for Infrastructure and Transport, Minister for Recreation, Sport and Racing) (15:37): I cannot say enough about how privileged I feel to represent such a diverse electorate full of supportive community groups, friendly local businesses and amazing individuals in the seat of Gibson. The Friends of Minda Dunes is one of those fantastic

local volunteer groups. The friends last week celebrated their second anniversary of caring for the dunes at North Brighton.

Each week, they weed, plant vegetation and collect rubbish. They protect important coastal vegetation, with the dunes containing some of the last remnant dune vegetation along the coast. Since the Minda Coastal Park path opened in October 2019, and it was a pleasure to be there for that, the Friends of Minda Dunes spent almost 2,000 hours caring for the dunes last year alone. They planted 2,000 coastal shrubs and bushes, and this year they have added many more.

While the friends are made up of too many volunteers to mention here, I want to acknowledge a few individuals who are out there each week, including volunteer coordinator Lindy Lawson, Terry Bruun, Kaye Trezise, Ian and Marilyn Worsfold and Wendy and David Trudgen. The local community owes a massive thanks to the Friends of Minda Dunes for their weekly efforts. I am pleased to add that the friends successfully applied for a grant of \$47,000 earlier this year from Green Adelaide.

This funding will support the friends to undergo further education on coastal care, put up plant identification signs, involve contractors in weed removal projects and, of course, plant more vegetation in the area. We love the work these volunteers are doing. I congratulate the Friends of Minda Dunes on their second anniversary and wish them all the best for the future.

Last week, I hosted a community forum for residents in Oaklands Park featuring key speakers from Rail Care and Junction Australia. My team and I put together this forum to tell people about the great local volunteering initiative and to provide information on the state government's exciting housing project, Oaklands Green. It was a pleasure to have John and Pam Culshaw in attendance. John and Pam live in Oaklands Park and volunteer with Rail Care, donating their time to care and spruce up the Oaklands Railway Station. Around the state, Rail Care volunteers like John and Pam are hard at work on train stations making them more attractive places, and they do a wonderful job.

Representatives from Junction Australia shared details about the exciting things that are happening with the Oaklands Green project. The \$135 million renewal project at Oaklands Park will deliver 665 homes, including 250 social housing properties while also creating new, affordable and private housing opportunities. The project will also create a greener and shadier place to live, upgraded reserves and improved walking access to local amenities. I want to thank the following residents who stuck around and shared their passion for our local area: Rod Spragg, Tony Jarman, Michael Kohler, Janet Rose and Lyn and Daniel Staltari. Your presence and input on the night were greatly appreciated.

As we approach the warm weather of the summer, I want to acknowledge a few of the small businesses in my electorate that have been operating day after day throughout this year, offering a service to the community and responding to various impacts of trading during the pandemic. I host community catch-ups at different local cafes in my electorate each month, and I want to thank the owners and staff who have gone above and beyond to accommodate these monthly catch-ups. A massive thank you to Kathy Chet from 101 Cafe, Lucy Drazetic from Café Finnis, Tim Harper from Banks & Brown, Ben and Penny Wallbridge from Somerton Kiosk, James Edward from Kushu Cafe and Chris Walsh from Lampshade Cafe.

Each of these cafes has provided a steady flow of coffee, good food and a great space to chat with local residents. That is one of the great things about cafes: they bring people to together in our community. They do more than just provide a business: they actually provide a community service. The feedback I have received from these conversations has helped me to better represent my local electorate, and thanks to each of these cafes for offering the space.

Moving onto another local business, Thats Dancing is a dance studio in Warradale that celebrated its 25th anniversary this year. Thats Dancing was started by studio director, Renee Post. In fact, my girls went to Thats Dancing with Miss Renee. They do an outstanding job, and I want to thank her for all the great work she has done across the time and again congratulate Thats Dancing on 25 years of success.

Brighton Tackle and Bait is another local business that does a great job, especially on social media, and they have been around for some 40 years. They have a great selection of products and, being by the water, of course, their advice is greatly appreciated by the locals. I give a big shout-out

to Peter Whiting (better known as Fish), store manager, Riccardo Vozzo and Greg Irving. Between these guys, they have stacks of experience and they are happy to share it with the local community. Get online and follow them because you can get your tips there. Thank you to all those in our community for the great work they do.

Parliamentary Procedure

UNANSWERED QUESTIONS

Mr PICTON (Kurna) (15:42): Point of order, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Kurna on a point the order.

Mr PICTON: I rise on a point of order in relation to a breach of the standing and sessional orders in relation to unanswered questions that were taken on notice by the Hon. Stephen Wade, the Minister for Health and Wellbeing, during estimates on 30 July, which is some 89 days ago. The minister took on notice a series of questions that have remained unanswered. I am wondering whether you might be able to follow up to see whether those questions can be answered.

The SPEAKER: I will take that point of order under advisement and return to the house.

Grievance Debate

GILES ELECTORATE

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:43): I rise today to talk about Liberty Primary Metals Australia and its debt restructure, or at least partly talk about that. Earlier in October, it was announced that it was a relatively straightforward debt restructure for Liberty Primary Metals Australia. That was good news for the community of Whyalla because under the umbrella of Liberty Primary Metals sit the Whyalla Steelworks and also the Tahmoor metallurgical coalmine in the Eastern States, in New South Wales.

To see the debt restructured was seen by my community, and seen rightly, as a positive. Some people were gushing about this. I was not one of the people gushing about this. Given that it was a step in the right direction, we have yet to see a whole range of other steps that need to take place to ultimately sustain the future of steelmaking in our state. Irrespective of ownership, it has been my consistent message in my community that we have the potential to make steel in Whyalla for generations to come.

We are more than aware in my community that in the Middleback Ranges there is a vast resource when it comes to magnetite, which is the raw material for steelmaking in Whyalla. Even though it is not a JORC reserve, we know that there is at least 600 million tonnes of magnetite in the Middleback Ranges—potentially up to a billion tonnes on our doorstep—with infrastructure in place which enables us to make steel for generations to come and also to potentially have an export industry based on magnetite.

The community has a strong future, but we all know that there needs to be investment in modernising the steelworks, just as there was investment at Nyrstar in Port Pirie to modernise the plant. Something similar needs to happen in Whyalla. It makes sense to have not just the magnetite resource but the incredibly abundant energy resources in my part of the world.

It was good to see BHP just the other day sign up to an offtake arrangement with the wind and solar farm that is close to being completed at the Port Augusta Renewable Energy Park. I noticed that the minister waxed lyrical about this project the other day, now that he has stepped in. Once again, it is one of those projects that started under a Labor government; in fact, nearly all of the 60 per cent, that we are rightly proud of when it comes to renewables in this state, had its genesis during the term of a Labor government and our visionary approach to the use of renewables.

One of the things about Whyalla, though, is that we do make steel but we need to diversify our economy. The comparative advantages in Whyalla and near Whyalla, when it comes to hydrogen production, green hydrogen production and green ammonia production, stand right out. I notice at the moment that when the federal government talk about hydrogen in South Australia they refer to Eyre Peninsula. They should not dilute the effort. There is nothing at Cape Hardy. Cape Hardy has been spoken about for years now. Let's concentrate, let's get the critical mass, let's get the resource sharing happening in Whyalla.

The long-term future of the steelworks could be dependent upon producing commercial scale hydrogen. We have an export facility already there, at Whyalla, when it comes probably not the export of hydrogen in the near future but certainly taking the production of hydrogen one step further to the production of green ammonia that can be readily exported from Whyalla, at the moment, to Port Bonython.

There are two harbours at Whyalla: outer harbour and inner harbour. That is a prime location for the expansion of import and export in our state and region. Whyalla is the largest regional community based on mining and resource processing and it has enormous opportunities if the vision, the Playfordesque-type vision, is there.

COMMUNITY WASTEWATER MANAGEMENT SYSTEM

Dr HARVEY (Newland) (15:48): I rise this afternoon to speak about an incredibly important issue for my community and what we are doing to fix it. As a government, we will transfer all households in the Tea Tree Gully council's community wastewater management system to SA Water sewerage at no cost to the household.

After decades of inaction by previous governments and the council, following our election in 2018 we listened to the concerns of the community on this issue. We developed a plan to transition properties, and now we are actually transferring properties and delivering the solution. We are not just talking about it; we are doing it, and we are doing it for each and every one of the more than 4,700 properties on the system at no cost to them.

Earlier this year, we connected the first property to the new sewer main line along Glenere Drive and completed connecting all properties along that street. I can tell you that those residents who live along there are absolutely thrilled and incredibly pleased with the result not only because their sewerage costs have gone down by hundreds of dollars every year, not only because now they have a modern and reliable sewerage service, but because of the manner in which SA Water and its staff engaged with them directly on the work, particularly when it came to the on-property works, the works that were actually being done on their property.

The level of engagement between SA Water and residents is incredibly important, given how complex this project is and the fact that every single household will be different. It is not unusual when I am out doorknocking or holding street-corner meetings for residents to ask very specific questions about what will happen on their property, and I can assure all of them that SA Water will be conducting onsite inspections with residents and working through with them exactly how the plan will be rolled out, what it will mean for them and also, importantly, what will be done to reinstate anything that has been disturbed as part of the project.

In more great news, earlier this week works along Dawson Drive in Modbury have now commenced. SA Water will be installing 870 metres of new sewer main pipes along Dawson Drive, Angus Court and North East Road, between Kelly Road and Dawson Drive. Households will be connected to the new sewer main line in coming weeks, delivering more affordable and reliable sewerage services to even more households in the north-east.

Following the pilot works, the major works component of this project is scheduled across three stages, prioritised and based on a range of criteria—the most important being essentially where those areas are performing the worst, those areas that break down the most and are in fact currently the most expensive areas for the council to maintain. In fact, the council have identified a number of locations at a particular risk of collapse if works are not completed in the not too distant future. I would urge counsel to move as quickly as possible to accept the transition plan so that we can get on with this project so that all residents in the north-east have access to the sewerage services they expect and deserve.

It has unfortunately been the case, though, that there has been some scaremongering from the Labor Party on this project, which is quite disappointing given their inaction on this issue over 16 years of government. They actually have a chance to do something about it. What I cannot be any clearer about is that every single household on the Tea Tree Gully Council's CWMS will be transferred to SA Water—every single property. Whether they are scheduled for stage 1, stage 2 or stage 3, we have committed to transfer every property. I also cannot be any clearer that we are committed to undertaking this work at no cost to the household.

A good addition to this project, which I think would be fantastic for the council to be involved in, would be to see streetscaping works and greening projects to follow after the SA Water work has occurred, breathing life into some of the streets that have received very little investment like that for many years. In fact, council staff have told me that they have often not invested in streetscaping and greening works in some of these streets, with the expectation that at some point in the future an upgrade to the CWMS would occur. So I think this would be a great project to essentially provide those residents in the area with something that they have actually already paid for.

I would certainly also say that there is no justification for council to increase rates. Households have already paid enough and it is quite illogical for a project funded by the state government to then somehow justify increasing rates. We are getting on with the job of fixing the CWMS, transferring all properties to modern, affordable and reliable sewerage at no cost to the household.

PINK'S MITRE 10

The Hon. G.G. BROCK (Frome) (15:53): Pink's Mitre 10 is a long-established family owned business operation. Currently controlled by a sixth generation family member, it has undergone many changes since its humble beginnings. In 1855, Thomas Pink Sr came to Clare from Crystal Brook. After spending a short time in Clare he moved his family to Burra, but returned in 1861. He commenced business as a carpenter and, soon after, his son Thomas Pink Jr expanded the business to include a chaff mill, which supplied produce and hardware to the district and operated as a grain agency.

After the death of Thomas Pink Jr in 1930, his sons Frank and Charles carried on the flourishing business until 1939, when Charles sold his interest to Frank. The firm then took on the trading name of F. Pink and Sons Pty Ltd, which remained until the late 1980s. Under the management of Frank Pink, the business continued to grow and a large clientele was built up from farmers and graziers in the nearby districts and vast pastoral leases in the north and the east. This situation continues today, with customers coming from all over the state.

Frank Pink died in 1946 at the age of 62, and his sons Geoff and Ron continued the operation and the store. Under Geoff and Ron, the business continued to grow and in 1952 a new premises was built on the site now occupied by Jim Best Ford. In 1969, Ron sold his interest to Geoff, who then continued as manager until 1971 when his son Wayne took over. Wayne's first year at the helm proved to be a baptism of fire, literally, when on 10 June disaster struck and the business was burnt to the ground.

Fortunately, the old premises were still intact and after many hours of hard work and a lot of help from the local townspeople the business was back trading within weeks. Not long after a new store was opened, now the site of Mid North sports store, which concentrated on general hardware, whilst the old premises remained trading as a grain and bulk hardware store. This situation continued until the early 1980s when Geoff Pink retired and the bulk side of the business was closed down.

Initially, the new store traded under the Homestead Hardware banner; however, in 1974 Wayne made the decision to join the new South Australian Mitre 10 group. This decision led to a long and successful partnership together with Pink's Mitre 10, currently the oldest member in South Australia. In 1974, disaster struck again with heavy rains causing the banks of the Hutt River to swell and flood most of the businesses in the township of Clare, including Pink's. Once again, Wayne and his staff rallied together and in a short time it was business as usual.

From 1974 until 1986, the store continued to grow, at which point Wayne's eldest son Greg joined the business. About this time they also dropped the familiar name of F. Pink & Sons and adopted the name Pink's Mitre 10, now synonymous with the store. In 1988, Wayne's second son Nicholas also joined the business and at the time there were major changes looming once again. November 1988 saw the beginning of a new era, with Pink's Mitre 10 opening a new store on the site of the old Foodland supermarket.

There was much fanfare, with this being the first flagship store for Mitre 10 (South Australia), which at the time was the pinnacle of the Mitre 10 group. The opening was a gala event with in-store broadcasting by the local radio station, marching girls, Father Christmas and more. In 2005, the store

was due for a sprucing up again and Greg and Nicholas managed the arduous task of converting the store to a new concept of Mitre 10.

After months of hard work, changing the format and turning the store upside down while still trading, another relaunch celebration took place in October 2005. Following the Mitre 10 requirements, the store was updated to the current blue and white livery in 2012. In 2013, Nicholas sold his interest to Greg who, with his wife Melanie (or Mel), has continued on with the business. Pink's Mitre 10 is a longstanding family-owned business now in its 16th decade of trading.

Over the years, it has experienced its fair share of pleasure and pain. The company has had a long association with Mitre 10, and Wayne has held many positions with the group, most notably chairman from 1988 to 1992, and Greg now continues that tradition as a member of the South Australian Marketing Action Committee (SAMAC). The business has won many awards over many years, with many nominations in between, something of which they are very proud.

Their long history and a successful present all augers well for a bright and prosperous future. I have to compliment the Pink family. It is a fantastic and brilliant family. They are very family orientated and have also been very good for not only Clare but the surrounding areas. I wish them well and am looking forward to a long association for many years to come.

MURIEL MATTERS

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:58): Tomorrow is 28 October, a date I remember because it is the 113th anniversary of the Grille protest by the celebrated South Australian suffragist Muriel Matters in the House of Commons, part of Westminster, the mother of all parliaments.

On that night 113 years ago, there were to be several protests in and around the parliamentary precinct because the people had been lobbying their MPs and trying to convince them they needed equal franchise, the right to vote on the same terms for everybody in the country, for about 50 years by the time 1908 had come around.

In that year, the Pankhurst Women's Social and Political Union were only asking for votes on the same terms as men: that is, rich property-owning or tertiary-educated men. This disenfranchisement of women who could satisfy these criteria, as well as all working men and women, was a very sad state of affairs.

This distinction was to drive an irrevocable wedge between members of the Pankhurst family—Mrs Emmeline Pankhurst and her oldest daughter, Christabel, who was a lawyer, as was her deceased father—as they felt they would only be successful if they settled for what had already been put in place for the men of the country in those positions. They opposed the views of the other two daughters and siblings, Sylvia and Adela Pankhurst, who wanted an ambit claim, that of all men and all women being able to enjoy voting privileges, making the UK a fully fledged democracy.

Enter Muriel Matters, a South Australian woman and part of the newly formed Women's Freedom League, to which Sylvia had strong links, and a woman who had already voted twice before she left her birthplace. Muriel was selected by the Women's Freedom League for this particular protest because of her experience not only in voting but also because of her years of elocution training and professional acting, which made her a perfect public speaker.

Along with her friends—co-chainer Helen Fox and Violet Tillard, who was in charge of the proclamation banner listing the demands of the women of England—Muriel managed to be escorted into the Ladies' Gallery located high above the floor of the House of Commons Speaker's chair in the chamber. Just after the resumption of business in the house after dinner, Muriel and Helen each chained themselves to a section of one of the 18 parts of the grille.

We are very lucky in South Australia to have a section of that grille on display here in our Centre Hall, a tangible reminder of the links between our state, arguably the first place in the world to extend dual franchise rights to its female population—that is, the right to vote and the right to stand for election—and the woman who arguably became the first woman to speak in the House of Commons.

This first was recognised because, to remove Muriel from the section of the grille to which she was chained, the attendants had to unscrew the grille to remove her from the gallery whilst still chained to the grille. This technically put her on the floor of the house, and this was recorded by newspapers, so it must be true.

Why is all this relevant to the 21st century and, in particular, our participatory democracy? Well, it is because our democracy is valuable and it is a fragile thing. The value of the vote cannot be underestimated or undermined because it is at the heart of how people direct their MP. This, along with the importance of activism, has been recognised by the introduction of the Muriel Matters Award in all high schools in this state, an award to foster activism established on an initiative of our immediate past Speaker Teague.

Through his efforts, and the assistance of education minister Gardner and Susan Cameron, who is a director of curriculum, a committee of high-powered people led by Malcolm McInerney was put in place to investigate how this award might be put into all our high schools. They came together, and their efforts will see each of the approximately 300 sites in this state—public schools, private schools and independent schools—focus on identifying young people who are striving to make our state, and therefore the world, a better place, thus fulfilling one of Muriel's long-held ambitions.

I am really excited to see something like this begin in our state because it is only through activating our young people that we will see their interest grow in our voting system. We have three elections due in this state in the next little while—federal, state and local government elections. The question also arises about the difference between compulsory and voluntary voting. As we know, state and federal governments are compulsory, which is a very hard word, but I think something that is really important—while our participation in local government elections, because it is voluntary, is much lower.

In commending and recommending all members to have a look at the grille tomorrow sometime, remember the struggle of the woman born in South Australia who put us on the UK map.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Florey. It was a most interesting contribution. I also acknowledge your efforts to ensure the establishment of the Muriel Matters Award and I acknowledge, too, the efforts of Speaker Teague and the Minister for Education in respect of that important matter.

Parliamentary Procedure

SITTINGS AND BUSINESS

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:03): I move:

That the sitting of the house be extended beyond 6pm to complete the investigation of the Auditor-General's report as scheduled.

Motion carried.

Personal Explanation

TARGETED LEAD ABATEMENT PROGRAM

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart—Minister for Energy and Mining) (16:04): I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. D.C. VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: In question time today, when talking about the TLAP program, I said that we had already completed the cleaning of 13 houses. I need to correct the record: it is actually five houses.

Bills

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (ABUSIVE BEHAVIOUR) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:04): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935 and to make related amendments to the Evidence Act 1929. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:04): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, the Government is pleased to introduce the Criminal Law Consolidation (Abusive Behaviour) Amendment Bill 2021.

The Bill creates new offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act to criminalise coercive, controlling and abusive behaviours in the context of intimate partner relationships. This will address an aspect of domestic violence that has previously not been covered within existing criminal offences.

Coercive control is an insidious form of domestic violence that involves tactics of emotional and mental abuse which undermine the victim's autonomy and sense of identity. It can manifest itself in acts such as isolating a person from their friends and family, controlling what a person can wear, when they can sleep, what they can eat and when they can leave the house. It can involve tracking a person's movements and using technology to keep them under surveillance.

Research has shown a clear connection between coercive control and domestic homicide. This came to national attention following the murder of Hannah Clarke and her 3 young children by her ex-partner in Queensland in early 2020. Coercive control legislation has existed in the United Kingdom since 2015.

Across Australia there is growing momentum to consider coercive control offences. These must work hand in hand with non-legislative reforms including public awareness and education campaigns, training for responding professionals and agencies and an encouragement of victims of abuse to seek help.

The South Australian government is committed to the implementation of these non-legislative reforms. For this reason, the usual rule that a Bill will automatically commence 2 years after being enacted has been disappplied in Clause 2 of the Bill.

Turning now to the provisions of the Bill. The Bill inserts two new offences in the Criminal Law Consolidation Act.

Proposed new section 20B(1) creates an offence of engaging in abusive behaviour where a person has been, or is, in a relationship with another person.

The first offence is made more serious with a higher maximum penalty if the behaviour involves a child. This offence will apply if:

- one or more of the acts of abuse consist of, or include behaviour or a threat to engage in behaviour, that is directed at a child; or
- The person makes use of a child, or threatens to make use of a child, in 1 or more of the acts of abuse comprising the abusive behaviour; or
- a child sees or hears one or more of the acts of abuse comprising the abusive behaviour.

This offence recognises the importance of deterring the use of children as part of abuse tactics, and the need to prevent the harm caused to children, and society in general, by exposing children to this type of conduct.

Engaging in abusive behaviour involving a child will have a maximum penalty of imprisonment for 7 years, making it a major indictable offence.

Proposed new section 20B(2) contains an offence of engaging in abusive behaviour where a child is not present or involved in any way. This offence will have a maximum penalty of imprisonment for 5 years.

I will turn to some of the key definitions contained in the Bill in Clause 12. These provide important context in considering how the offences operate.

As set out previously, the offence applies where the offender is, or has been, in a relationship with the victim. For the purposes of the offences, two people are in a relationship if:

- they are married to each other; or
- they are domestic partners; or
- they are in some form of intimate personal relationship in which their lives are interrelated and the actions of one affects the other. This would capture, for example, a boyfriend / girlfriend scenario where the parties do not reside together.

The offences require three or more acts of abuse to have been committed. An act of abuse can be committed either intentionally or recklessly.

An act of abuse is committed intentionally if the person intends by their conduct to cause harm to the other person.

An act of abuse is committed recklessly if the person is aware of a substantial risk that the conduct could cause harm to the other person and engages in the conduct despite the risk and without adequate justification. It will be assumed the defendant did not have adequate justification for their behaviour, unless they prove otherwise.

The term 'act of abuse' includes a wide variety of conduct, much of which is not currently criminalised. It is the criminalisation of these acts of abuse which is such a significant step forward in the deterrence of this form of domestic violence.

Some of the type of conduct captured by the definition of 'acts of abuse' are

- behaviour which is humiliating or degrading;
- isolating the person from friends or family;
- tracking or monitoring the person's movements, activities or communications;
- denying the person financial, social or personal autonomy;
- denying access to food, clothing, sleep and medication; and
- withholding financial support.

As I have already said, the acts of abuse require either an intention to cause harm or a recklessness as to whether harm could be caused. The term 'harm' also has a broad definition and includes emotional or psychological harm whether temporary or permanent.

Schedule 1 of the Bill contains complementary amendments to the *Evidence Act 1929* so that the new abusive behaviour offences are included in the definition of 'serious offences against the person'. This will mean that a range of provisions within the Evidence Act designed to support vulnerable witnesses will be available to victims of the new offences, providing them with additional supports throughout the court process.

Mr Speaker, this Bill aims to reduce the occurrence of domestic violence in our community by the criminalisation of coercive control. It is part of wider reforms supported by the Marshall Liberal Government to address domestic and family violence.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935

4—Substitution of heading

This clause makes a consequential amendment to the heading of Part 3 Division 7AA of the principal Act.

5—Insertion of sections 20B and 20C

This clause inserts sections 20B and 20C into the principal Act as follows:

20B—Abusive behaviour

This clause creates an offence for a person to engage in abusive behaviour in relation to a person with whom the offender is, or was, in a relationship.

If the behaviour involves or is witnessed by a child, the maximum penalty is 7 years imprisonment, and in other cases is 5 years imprisonment.

The clause defines key terms used in the offence and makes provision for alternative verdicts in specified circumstances.

Consistent with section 5B of the principal Act, the clause places the onus of proving that adequate justification for the relevant behaviour existed on the defendant.

20C—Review of section 20B

This clause requires the Minister to cause a review of the operation of new section 20B to be conducted and a report on the review to be prepared and submitted to the Minister. That report is to be laid before Parliament.

Schedule 1—Related amendment to *Evidence Act 1929*

1—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

This clause amends section 4 of the principal Act to add an offence against new section 20B of the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* to paragraph (d) of the definition of *serious offence against the person*.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

COURTS ADMINISTRATION (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL*Introduction and First Reading*

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:05): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Courts Administration Act 1993. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government) (16:06): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to have the second reading explanation and explanation of clauses inserted in *Hansard* without my reading them.

Leave granted.

Mr Speaker, on 17 November 2020 the Statutory Authorities Review Committee tabled its report on the inquiry into the State Courts Administration Council—Sheriff's Office.

The Committee made seven recommendations in its report. I tabled my response to the recommendations on 17 March 2021.

The Courts Administration (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2021 (Bill) implements three of the recommendations in the report. A further amendment has been incorporated into the Bill. The Bill:

- repeals of section 21B(4b) of the *Courts Administration Act 1993* (Courts Administration Act)
- provides for the appointment of up to two additional non-judicial members of the State Courts Administration Council
- prescribes additional information to be included in the Courts Administration Authority's annual report, and
- clarifies the mechanism for appointing the State Courts Administrator.

In its report, the Statutory Authorities Review Committee recommended the repeal of section 21B(4b) of the Courts Administration Act, in order to allow the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to monitor and report on the Courts Administration Authority's observance of the Public Sector Code of Conduct and principles.

Section 14(1)(c) and (f) of the *Public Sector Act 2009* (Public Sector Act) enables the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to monitor and report on observance of the public sector principles, code of conduct and employment determinations, and provide advice on and conduct reviews of public sector employment or industrial relations matters respectively. Section 21B(4b) of Courts Administration Act currently prohibits the Commissioner from exercising functions under section 14(1)(c) or (f) of the Public Sector Act in relation to the staff of the Council.

Repealing section 21B(4b), as recommended, allows the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment to monitor and report on the observance of public sector principles and code of conduct by the Courts Administration Authority. This will mean that, with the passage of this Bill, staff in the Courts Administration Authority can be reassured that an independent body has oversight into employment practices within the organisation.

The Statutory Authorities Review Committee also noted that the annual report produced by the Courts Administration Authority did not provide adequate information about important aspects of its operation. In particular, the Committee found that there was a lack of detail on workers' compensation and occupational health, welfare and safety information, and no mention of the work or achievements of the Sheriff's Office for the financial year. The Committee also noted the lack of training and human resources information, and the absence of a dedicated section for each division, as was previously provided in the annual reports of the former Courts Services Department.

Mr Speaker, in my response to the report, I committed to amending the Courts Administration Act to set out more comprehensive annual reporting requirements for the CAA to provide greater detail about important aspects of its operation, such as information on workers' compensation and occupational health, welfare and safety information, training and human resources information, and a dedicated section from each division. This is achieved by clause 10 of the Bill, which proposes to insert new section 23A in the Courts Administration Act. The amendment also specifies that the annual report must include a report from the Sheriff on the operations of the Sheriff and security officers.

This amendment will assist the Courts Administration Authority to comply with its annual reporting obligations and provide greater transparency and accountability with respect to its operations.

The Statutory Authorities Review Committee also recommended that the Courts Administration Act be amended to provide for the appointment and funding for up to two non-judicial members of the State Courts Administration Council with extensive expertise in human resources management, finance or administration.

The Bill amends section 7 of the Courts Administration Act to provide for the appointment of two non-judicial members of the Council by the Governor, with the concurrence of the Council.

A further amendment has been included in the Bill in order to clarify the role of the Council in relation to the appointment of the State Courts Administrator, which is an appointment made by the Governor. The amendments provide that the appointments is by the Governor on the recommendation of the Council, and that dismissal of the Administrator is by the Governor with the concurrence of the Council.

This Bill introduces important changes to the Courts Administration Act that will help to improve consistency and fairness with respect to the Courts Administration Authority's employment practices, and provide greater transparency and accountability in relation to its operations.

EXPLANATION OF CLAUSES

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of Courts Administration Act 1993

4—Amendment of section 7—Composition of the Council

This clause amends section 7 of the principal Act to allow an additional 2 members, having extensive experience in human resources management, finance or public administration, to be appointed to the Council, and makes related procedural provisions.

5—Amendment of section 9—Procedures of the Council

This clause makes a consequential amendment to section 9 of the principal Act.

6—Repeal of section 13

This clause repeals section 13 of the principal Act.

7—Amendment of section 14—Council to provide reports to Attorney-General

This clause deletes 'further' from section 14 of the principal Act to clarify the operation of the section.

8—Amendment of section 16—State Courts Administrator

This clause amends section 16 of the principal Act to require the recommendation of the Council in relation to the appointment of the State Courts Administrator.

9—Amendment of section 21B—Application of Public Sector Act and Superannuation Act

This clause repeals section 21B(4b) of the principal Act.

10—Insertion of Part 4A

This clause inserts new Part 4A into the principal Act, providing for annual reporting by the State Courts Administrator.

Schedule 1—Transitional provision

1—Annual report

This clause makes a transitional provision applying new section 23A in relation to the whole of the financial year in which clause 10 of this measure comes into operation.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. A. Koutsantonis.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 26 October 2021.)

The CHAIR: Welcome to the committee on the examination of the Auditor-General's annual report. We are examining the Minister for Innovation and Skills for the next half an hour. I remind members that the committee is in normal session. Any questions have to be asked by members on their feet and all questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2020-21 report and Agency Statements for the year ending 2021. Welcome, Minister for Innovation and Skills, and I invite questions.

Mr BOYER: Minister, can I direct you to the first page, page 340, second dot point under significant events and transactions, which speaks about your commitment to create 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships over the four years from 2018 to 2022. I ask: how many of those 20,800 have been created?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am advised that as of the end of the financial year, we had 43,000 commencements. That was between July 2018 and June 2021, demonstrating our steady progress to increase apprenticeship and traineeship activities above historic declines, despite the impact of COVID-19 on our economy.

At the end of April 2021, South Australia reported our progress under the Skilling South Australia fund partnership agreement. South Australia received 100 per cent of the year 3, the 2021 funding available, or \$21 million under the National Partnership Agreement resulting from this activity. The total revenue available for 2021-22 under the National Partnership Agreement is \$8.5 million.

Mr BOYER: In relation to that answer, just to confirm and clarify the 43,000 figure that you gave, you have created 43,000 new apprenticeships and traineeships over the four years from 2018 to 2022; is that correct?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: That was three years. Just to understand the national agreement, the national agreement is based on a number of measures, apprenticeships and traineeships. Pre-apprenticeships are included in that number. This has always been the case. When the announcement was made before the election, it was a policy that was designed in conjunction with an understanding of how the national partnership works and what the outcome would be. It is all based on the baseline on the total number of apprenticeships, traineeships and pre-apprenticeships.

But it should also be understood that all these are measured on the NCVER figures that come out, not necessarily in a single table, but they are measured in the NCVER figures that come out. Of course, that total number over 60,000 in that four-year period was a ramp-up, and I think it is fair to say that the ramp-up has gone extremely well. That 43,000 figure at the end of June is the result of a ramp-up from a standing start when we came to office.

As you would recall, member for Wright, we inherited the worst drop-off in completions in the country, so before we could start climbing that ladder of repair we had to dig ourselves out of a ditch that was dug by the previous government. It is quite extraordinary, if you look at the latest NCVER figures, where we were able to compare the last four years of the previous government, a more than 48 per cent decline in apprenticeships and traineeships in the first three years from March 2018 to March 2021—

The CHAIR: There is a point of order, minister. Just take a seat, please.

Mr BOYER: Point of order: standing order 98. The minister is debating the question and now giving us a history lesson on things that happened in the past. The question was a very straightforward one about whether or not his figure of 43,000 new apprenticeships was at the same parameters as the 20,800 that he committed to in 2018 I think it was.

The CHAIR: Yes. Thank you, member for Wright. Of course, I remind all members that today's examination relates to the 2021 audit period. Minister, you are getting to the nub of the question?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I just get excited about the growth that we have had, sir, over that three-year period.

The CHAIR: I can see that.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I need to be restrained sometimes, so I thank you for your help and assistance in doing that. Yes, there has been no change in where the measure was set and what we have achieved. I think that no matter how you look at it—and I know the member for Wright looks desperately for negative news when new figures come out in this space. But it does not matter how you look at it—

The CHAIR: There is another point of order.

Mr BOYER: Reflecting on another member of the house, Chair. I take offence to the assertion from the member for Unley, the minister, that I look for negative news when figures come out.

The CHAIR: Yes, you have taken offence at that. Indeed. So, minister, the member for Wright has taken offence to your comment that he looks for negative news. The easiest solution is for you to withdraw that comment.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I withdraw that comment, sir, and I wait for the positive news to come out next time there are results that are—

The CHAIR: Let's put a positive spin on the afternoon.

Mr BOYER: Still on that second dot point, under significant events and transactions, and referring to your previous answer or answers, were you saying that pre-apprenticeships are included in the 20,800 target figure?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Yes, the baseline was made up of pre-apprenticeships, apprenticeships and traineeships and the figures, the 43,000, is also the number of pre-apprenticeships, apprenticeships and traineeships. It relates to around about a 50 per cent increase over that four-year period. I was very pleased to see that the latest NCVET figures, relating to apprenticeships and traineeships alone, were a 51.5 per cent increase over a three-year period.

We are certainly very pleased with the way the reforms have worked—reforms that were not supported by those opposite, of course, but reforms that are working—and the partnership that we have with the non-government sector, with industry and with TAFE in delivering these apprenticeships and traineeships.

It is also terrific to learn from the latest NCVET figures that came out in March, which relate to 2021, that TAFE in South Australia is leading the nation when it comes to commencements of apprenticeships and traineeships. I think that is evidence of the commitment that this government has to work with all providers and strengthen all providers and ensure that we deliver quality training relevant to industry. That is the key to the outcomes that we have been achieving.

We do not have a one size fits all. This is what used to happen and it has happened for years in the skills training area, where businesses had to basically adopt their own business models in order to qualify to receive funding, which was mainly for the off-the-job training provisions. Through our Skilling South Australia program, we have been able to bespoke design to date, I think, over 200 different programs to suit those individual businesses and industries. We have removed barriers, we have brought enablers in and, for the first time as far as I am aware, there has been support from government for on-the-job training.

Remember, apprenticeships are a combination of on-the-job and off-the-job training. So, in order to support those apprenticeships, we are supportive of the classroom training that apprentices receive and we are also supporting the employers for delivering that on-the-job training. One of the successes we have had in now leading the nation when it comes to improvements in completions is our pre-apprenticeship training.

The CHAIR: There is a point of order.

Mr BOYER: Standing order 98. I gave the minister plenty of time before standing. This could not be further from the question that I asked. This is now just a monologue about the days gone by and has nothing to do with the question that I asked.

The CHAIR: I do not know that I agree that it is a monologue about the days gone by. The question related to page 340, significant events and transactions, and to my mind at least the minister was talking about significant events. Perhaps we will draw this one to a close, minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member himself actually referred to pre-apprenticeships in his question and so I was just about to talk about the importance of pre-apprenticeships in ensuring that we reduce the number of dropouts that happen in training, whether they be traineeships or whether they be apprenticeships, and how we have used the pre-apprenticeship program to get better outcomes: better outcomes for employers and better outcomes for those apprentices and trainees. The first thing is that the pre-apprenticeship enables the apprentice or the applicant, if you like, to make the decision as to whether they want to do this job.

The CHAIR: There is another point of order. I sense the member for Wright is keen to get on with his next question and I will give him the call to ask that next question.

Mr BOYER: Minister, on the same second dot point—and I have gone back to look at the media releases that you put out when you first announced the commitment for 20,800 new apprenticeships and traineeships—I still cannot find anywhere where you said that it had anything to do with pre-apprenticeships. Do you stand by your statement that the parameters since 2018 when you announced this program are unchanged, or have you started counting pre-apprenticeships once you started to fail to meet your target?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: First of all, I want that comment withdrawn.

The CHAIR: Because the question contained an assumption that could be taken as argument. I think we will let it go through to the keeper. You answer the question about pre-apprenticeships.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Obviously I need some latitude to respond to the outrageous allegations that we are failing on our commitment.

The CHAIR: Yes.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: We are delivering on our commitment. Our commitment was based around apprenticeships and pre-apprenticeships and that is what we are delivering, and the vast majority of what we are delivering is apprenticeships. If the member had the patience to actually listen to me, he might learn something about how valuable pre-apprenticeships are.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You want to hear what people say about you when you visit them. You want to hear what they say about your lack of interest in this area.

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You want to hear what they say.

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The CHAIR: Order!

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: You are only interested in doing what you need to do to get elected. That is what you tell them. I have heard them.

The CHAIR: Order, members!

Members interjecting:

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have heard them.

The CHAIR: Minister!

Mr Boyer interjecting:

The CHAIR: The member for Wright is called to order. Minister, just take a seat for a moment, please. I would like to say something. It does not worry me in the least really how much banter occurs across the chamber because it is actually eating into this very valuable half-hour that the opposition have for questions and the minister has for answers, so let's make the most of that opportunity.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: As I was saying, the pre-apprenticeships, apprenticeships and traineeships are part of the baseline and so of course they are part of the target. Overwhelmingly, the numbers are numbers of apprenticeships and you can see that from the NCVET figures. There is about a six-month lag in the NCVET figures that come out. As I said earlier, the 60,700 traineeships and apprenticeships over that period relate to about a 50 per cent increase on the baseline. Just looking at apprenticeships and traineeships alone, the latest NCVET figures have seen an increase of 51.5 per cent over the last three years, so from March 2018 to March 2021, a 51.5 per cent increase.

As I said, we always said there was going to be a ramp-up. This is a big year this year. This is where we will see a big number of apprentices. We have 3,000 more employers taking on apprentices for the first time—3,000 employers in South Australia who did not take on apprentices under the previous government but who have taken on apprentices because of the support they have received from a significant policy change that was delivered by the Marshall government.

I thank the department for implementing a brand-new policy change. These were the same public servants, of course, who were taking their instructions from the previous government, acting on their policy that saw a 66 per cent decline over six years in commencements for apprenticeships and traineeships. They are a professional team and they have responded to the new policy that has been delivered by the Marshall government to get these extraordinary results that we are getting here in South Australia.

Mr BOYER: Minister, if I could take you to page 344, under Impact of COVID-19, the first dot point says it was around \$16.6 million, I think, for extra COVID-19 support with the commencement of JobTrainer and a state government grant, but it looks like only \$11.8 million was spent. What has happened to the other \$4.8 million?

The CHAIR: Just for clarity, member for Wright, the commonwealth funding by my reading was \$13.8 million, in this copy at least: 'Commonwealth funding of \$13.8 million' and 'DIS advised it had spent \$11.8 million'.

Mr BOYER: Sorry, you are correct; so the difference is \$2 million.

The CHAIR: Yes, \$2 million.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The member for Wright was I think incorrect there in his first figure of over \$16 million; \$13.8 million is what the Auditor-General's Report actually says. The \$11.8 million obviously accounts for the fact that there is a lag. My understanding is that the federal government pays in arrears. The unspent expenditure is carried over to the next year.

This was a standing start, of course, and this money was received, I think, in the budget in October. That is when that money was announced, and so it gives you some idea just how quickly we got out into the marketplace with that space.

I think that the exciting thing about JobTrainer is the fact that it has given so many South Australians an ability to have very, very low fee training to get them into areas that have skill shortages. For example, the vocational education and training sector we know does play a crucial role in supporting South Australia's future growth and prosperity, and of course our economic recovery from COVID-19, and I remind the member that we are still in that process.

JobTrainer provides access to low fee training places to school leavers, young people and jobseekers. Since October 2000, South Australia has recorded nearly 14,000 low fee JobTrainer enrolments. You can see that we are certainly meeting the targets the funding was aiming at. We have seen strong uptake in health and social care courses, and this is important, of course, because health is the first fastest growing sector here in South Australia.

The top three JobTrainer enrolments are for short courses in the infection control skill set, which is very important, of course, and entry into care roles, and individual support. People also can then move into fully funded qualifications in Certificate III in Individual Support, Certificate III in Early Childhood Education and Care and Diploma of Nursing. These are the top three in that space.

South Australia's implementation of JobTrainer has also included co-designing projects for business, group training organisations and industry. I was pleased recently to launch the KIK Innovation 42 Adelaide JobTrainer Project focused on software coding. This program uses—

The CHAIR: Minister, there is a point of order.

Mr BOYER: Standing order 98, again, Chair. My question was about how much of the \$13.8 million had been spent or not spent.

The CHAIR: Yes, that was your question, indeed, because we came up with a shortfall of \$2 million. The minister, I think, has addressed that in his answer.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I have addressed that in my answer, but of course it is important that the member understands what the government has been doing with that money, because it has been delivering exceptional results for getting people into jobs.

We do have a low unemployment rate here in South Australia at 5.1 per cent, which is the lowest we have had in 12 years. Also, the youth unemployment rate is now 8½ per cent lower than it was at the beginning of the year, because people have been able to access the skills that industry needs in order to employ them to fill those skills gaps, and JobTrainer has played a role in doing that.

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

The CHAIR: Member for Mawson, did you have a question?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: No. I just said that there are all these people turning up to the workplace with no idea what they are doing because they have had terrible training by this fellow.

The CHAIR: I will take that as a comment.

Mr BOYER: Minister, I am still on page 344 and the third dot point under Impact of COVID-19 about the funding of \$2.9 million. What are the priority sectors that are listed there in that third dot point?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: South Australian businesses continue to support training in full qualifications, as can be seen through the continuing uptake of apprenticeship and traineeship commencements in South Australia. Alongside qualifications, South Australian businesses have expressed an interest to have shorter, bespoke courses and training pathways that are formally recognised to meet emergency industry skills needs. This type of training is referred to microcredentialling.

Microcredentials can provide a responsive and innovative way to address an industry recognised skills gap that cannot be met through current nationally accredited training systems. This is a worldwide phenomenon. It also is being pursued by other jurisdictions in Australia. Microcredentials can be utilised to support people to adapt to changing job roles or workplaces. I think the latest statistics I have seen are that someone entering the workforce today could end up with 12 different careers before they retire. This is where microcredentials ensure they have the skills their employer needs or the skills to start their own business.

The CHAIR: So I have another 10 to go, minister.

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Transitioning to a new industry will support pathways between the school, vocational education, higher education sectors and provide a pathway to accredited courses.

Mr BOYER: Point of order, sir.

The CHAIR: Minister, there is a point of order from the member for Wright.

Mr BOYER: I am sorry, but we have only half an hour.

The CHAIR: Yes, I understand that.

Mr BOYER: If the minister cannot even sustain half an hour of questioning his own portfolio without filibustering, it is sad, really sad.

The CHAIR: As other ministers have done in this place, they have given—

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I ask that it is withdrawn.

The CHAIR: No, I am going to deem it a very fulsome answer in fact. Other ministers have done exactly the same. But I do take your point, member for Wright. You have eight minutes to go. You have the call for the next question, member for Enfield.

Ms MICHAELS: May I take the minister's attention to the second dot point on page 344 on the impact of COVID, which refers to the \$5 million one-off funding from the Business and Jobs Support Fund, which I assume relates to the SME Business Advisory Services Program. When I asked the minister in estimates about that program, he stated that it was designed to be open until 17 May but attracted such significant interest that it closed early in February. However, now we see in the Auditor-General's Report only \$2.7 million of that has been spent as at 30 June 2021. Is it the minister's intention to reopen that program, or is there an explanation as to why that full amount has not yet been spent?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I thought the member for Enfield had had some business experience. The facts are that the money has been allocated. It is a partnership between the business and the adviser. We are not in the business of telling people how to run their businesses. These grants were delivered in response to the need for businesses to consider using the current circumstances to review their businesses and see how they might need to—and I use this word that has come out of COVID-19—'pivot'.

Some of the services that were most requested were business planning, marketing, transformation of business and operating models, business futureproofing, IT and e-commerce. There is nothing about scaling down. Nobody wanted help to scale down their business. This is all the type of stuff you do when you want to expand your business. These grants have been allocated and the businesses are working through them. Obviously, work is being done. Whether they have been billed by the consultants is entirely an arrangement between the business and the consultant. My understanding is that we pay in arrears once the work is done.

Some of this consulting can take quite some time. This is up to \$10,000 worth of consulting: \$5,000 from the government and \$5,000 from the business that is applied for the grant. A number of consulting businesses or businesses that provide these services made expressions of interest to be providers, to be approved, to be used by the companies that receive these grants. I am very pleased with how quickly we got this money out and available and how quickly the offers were taken up when people saw the opportunity to improve their businesses.

I know from being in business myself for 22 years that you can procrastinate about these things. Sometimes, something like this comes along and it makes you decide, 'Yes, I will do it now. No more time to procrastinate. Let's get this done.' I have every confidence that the grants that have been awarded will be used.

Ms MICHAELS: On the same dot point—because I am very well aware of how businesses operate, particularly in professional services sectors—I am well aware that from February until the end of June \$10,000 would be very easily well spent, so I am quite concerned that only half of that has been allocated to 30 June. What investigations are you taking to ensure the rest of the amounts are actually used in the way they are supposed to be used?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: The transactions do take some time to evaluate. We want to make sure that people have value, so the department continues to evaluate completed projects under the program, with the expected long-term outcomes for business to demonstrate transformations implemented based on the advice received; sustainability; growth, measured 12 months after the program ends; an increase in dialogue and business understanding of transformation and what that means for their business; involve culture and innovation in South Australia; and small business.

I think the member is getting a little bit concerned about a process that is working and a process that is being closely monitored. Do not forget that everybody agrees to the terms and conditions when they apply for these grants. They know that there is a process of evaluation and

they know that that takes some time. The consultants know that they might not be paid all the money when they feel it is due because it is a government process. They know that, and consequently there are up to 12 months in which the work is evaluated.

Ms MICHAELS: You referred to a report being undertaken on those outcomes you just listed. When will that report be made publicly available, minister?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I am not sure that it will be publicly available, but I will take some advice on that, and if I am able to bring something back I will.

Ms MICHAELS: So you do not think it is of benefit for taxpayers to know whether these programs are actually beneficial and provide any benefits to SMEs?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: I refer to my previous answer.

Ms MICHAELS: Can you advise how many SMEs have applied for and benefited from this program?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: There were 954 applications received for the program seeking funding of \$6.773 million, with 684 applicants approved for the value of \$5,033,399. They are the total numbers there for you. Obviously, just because you apply for something does not mean you qualify.

Ms MICHAELS: Can the minister advise that, if he does not make any reports available on the outcomes of this program, internally what measures would be taken by the department to assess the success or failure of the program?

The Hon. D.G. PISONI: Due processes have been in place for quite a period of time in which these matters are handled, and nothing will change from that process.

The CHAIR: The time of the examination of the Minister for Innovation and Skills has expired. We move now to the examination of the Minister for Child Protection. Welcome to the Minister for Child Protection, to your advisers and the member for Reynell, who will be leading the questioning.

I remind members that the committee is in normal session and, as a result, questions need to be asked and answered by members on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's Report 2021.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you, Mr Chair, and thank you very much to the DCP staff who are here. I refer to the annual report, Part C, page 64, the section titled Audit Findings, particularly the comments in the report that 33 per cent of performance development plans are overdue and that performance development plans are not being completed on time for new employees. Why are performance development plans not being completed on time for new employees?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I thank the member for her question. As stated, they found that, as at 1 December 2020, 33 per cent of the performance development plans were overdue. DCP advised us that it recently procured a system to improve and streamline the performance of the development process and initiate a communication strategy to improve the PDP completion rates. DCP is continually improving its human resources practices and systems, including the use and reporting of performance development plans.

The PDP completion rates continue to improve and, as at 30 September 2021, 74 per cent of staff had a current PDP. The department's recent procurement of the performance management system (PMS) will also improve and streamline the PDP process. Following a planned pilot phase, full implementation of the PMS is expected to be finalised by the end of December 2021.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, is 33 per cent of performance development plans being overdue acceptable to you?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Firstly, it is important to note that it is actually a recording issue rather than—as at 30 September, 74 per cent of staff have a current PDP, and that is why we are implementing a new system, so that it can be recorded more accurately.

Ms HILDYARD: I guess as a supplementary question, is the fact that 26 per cent of staff do not have a performance development plan acceptable to you?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I am advised that it is unlikely ever to be at 100 per cent because there are people who would be on maternity leave or secondment or placement in other areas. However, that is why we are getting a new system—to make sure that it is as accurate as possible, but it would not be anticipated ever to be at 100 per cent.

Ms HILDYARD: Do you agree that these delays in ensuring that all departmental staff have a performance plan in place poses risks to the safety of vulnerable children?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The Auditor-General did not make any findings about safety or any comments. Certainly he did not acknowledge that there was any issue around safety. One of the things my department, and this government since coming into government, has been doing is focus on filling the long-held vacancies that were there. There were over 273 vacancies in the department when we came to office. We have reduced that to less than 60. I feel there are far more safety issues from understaffing and putting staff under pressure than there are by a few people not having a performance development review.

Ms HILDYARD: I understand what the Auditor-General said in his report. Minister, do you think that the number of staff without performance development plans poses a risk to children's safety?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Firstly, it does not mean that the staff do not have a plan: it is just not an up-to-date, current plan. This is regarding their training and development, so I believe there would not be any risk.

Ms HILDYARD: Was the staff member, or were the staff members, with responsibility for the 16-year-old boy who was, tragically, recently sexually assaulted, one of the staff members with an outstanding performance development plan or a plan that was not up to date?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As I have said in this chamber many times, I will not be commenting on individual cases, and I will not be using the old Labor tactic of pointing fingers at staff and singling them out. What I can say is that we were very confident that the staff acted appropriately and in a timely manner. The police were notified, an arrest was made very quickly, and staff acted in accordance with policies and procedures.

Ms HILDYARD: A supplementary: exactly when were you notified of that sexual assault?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As I have answered in the house, and although it is not relevant to this report, I was notified in a timely manner and was thoroughly briefed.

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, that really was a question for question time.

Ms HILDYARD: It was a supplementary too, yes.

The CHAIR: We are dealing with the Auditor-General's Report. You have the call.

Ms HILDYARD: I refer to the annual report, page 66, Part C, Audit Findings, foster carer reviews. Why are foster carer reviews not being completed on time?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: It is important to note that all the reviews for foster carers are undertaken by the foster care agencies, as has been done for many, many years under the former government and under this government. This is really a reporting issue. These are not the actual figures, but the amount that was reported to our department. Some of them may have been delayed—but certainly not 51 per cent.

It is regarding reporting issues with the C3MS program. These adjustments to the reporting system are expected to be finalised by 31 October 2021 and a new cleansed report should be produced. I am advised that currently there is only one foster care review outstanding, and that is due to the carer living interstate.

Ms HILDYARD: What questions have you asked about why only 51 per cent of foster carer reviews were submitted and processed as of July 2021, and when did you ask those questions?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As the Auditor-General states himself, DCP informed us that a new report is not accurate, as it includes carers who are no longer active or are complex in nature

and require follow-up. We noted this makes it difficult to follow up and monitor foster carer reviews to ensure they are completed in a timely manner.

It is also important to note that most, if not all, foster care agencies have time periods—some of them visit fortnightly, some of them visit the carers monthly, but they have regular contact so if there were any issues or any issues to follow up they are in regular contact. We do not rely just on an annual review.

Also, to note is that DCP has completed a review of our processes for family-based carer reviews, which includes foster carer reviews, and DCP's policy governance committee approved and published DCP's carer reviews for family-based carers procedure on 17 June 2021. The procedure review resulted in a change in the requirement of frequency of carer reviews from annual to two-yearly, with a list of circumstances that will trigger a carer review sooner than two years.

This change reflects DCP's assessment of relative risk, streamlines resources to focus on circumstances that increase risk and introduces a consistent review cycle and process for all types of family-based carers.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, in their 2019-20 report, the Auditor-General noted that reports of reviews were inaccurate and that a new reporting process would be in place by October 2020. What went wrong?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As noted in the report, we have put new reporting processes in place. We found inaccuracies with those and they are being amended—and it is just upgrading and fixing that reporting methodology. It is not that the reviews did not take place; it is that they were not being recorded.

We are making changes to that and, as I said, there is only one that is outstanding due to that person living interstate. Now the reporting will go to every two years because they are seen as very low risk, given that there is monthly contact with carers.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, do you think that the delay with the new reporting process is good enough?

The CHAIR: Member for Reynell, is this still in relation to foster carers?

Ms HILDYARD: Yes.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I do believe that it is important to have timely reporting, and that is why we are continuing to upgrade that reporting process. The main thing is the safety and wellbeing of the children. We already have monthly meetings—the foster-care agencies are required to sight and visit the homes that the foster carer children live in on a monthly basis, so this was considered low risk, hence that it is now going to be reported on every two years.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, how have you ensured that complex reviews that require follow-up are being completed if the reporting process is not accurate?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: While DCP is working to finalise its own mechanism for consolidated reporting on foster carer reviews, it has used compliance reporting from each contracted NGO to ensure legislative requirements are being met. In other words, we ask each individual foster care agency to report how many of the reviews have been provided. It is a manual recording system and that is why we are working to have a better system.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, can you guarantee that no child is at risk as a result of these delays and poor processes?

The CHAIR: So, member for Reynell, this is in the same vein as your previous line of questioning?

Ms HILDYARD: Yes, I have a few more on this.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As the Auditor-General states himself, we believe these reviews are important mechanisms to identify and address financial, training and support needs of carers. So these reports are not about the risk to the child or the wellbeing of the child. Unlike the case reviews that were below 20 per cent under the Labor government, we have got those up into the nineties. They were not even reported on. That is important for the safety of a child. This is about

the financial and training and support needs—which are important, definitely—but not as important as the case reviews that were not undertaken by the former government.

Ms HILDYARD: A supplementary just to clarify: are you saying there is no risk whatsoever to children as a result of those delays and poor processes?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The purpose of these reviews is as a mechanism to identify and address the financial, training and support needs of the carers.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, could you please provide the house with the current foster carer review data, including how many are in progress, how many were completed on time and how many current reviews are overdue?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As I have stated just before, all but one have been undertaken. So all reviews are up to date and completed, except for one and that is because the carers live interstate.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, do foster carer reviews include a review into a household's mobile telephone policy?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: As part of the licensing of agencies to be foster care agencies, they are required to have policies on eSafety and phones and mobile phones, so that is part of the responsibility of the NGO sector.

Ms HILDYARD: On what specific date will the issue of only 51 per cent of foster carer reviews being completed and submitted to DCP be fixed?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: The reporting is being amended and, as I have stated a couple of times now, all but one have been undertaken. So all reviews of foster carers have been undertaken, except for the one who lives interstate.

Ms HILDYARD: Is the report wrong? Are you saying the report of the Auditor-General is incorrect?

The CHAIR: No, the report was to—

Ms HILDYARD: No, sir, I am asking—

The CHAIR: This is my thought on it: the report finishes at 30 June and there has been a period of four months since then, so I guess that has given the opportunity for—

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Correct. Not only was the 51 per cent, yes, the figure that was reported but it was not the figure that was actually completed because of the reporting issues with the system we are fixing. Then I think it was 74 per cent were completed at the end of September—that could have been another area, but we do know that as of now, today, which is after 30 June, there is only one foster carer review that is outstanding.

Ms HILDYARD: Just to clarify and then I will move on, minister, are you saying that the Auditor-General is incorrect in their report when they state that only 51 per cent of foster carer reviews had been completed and submitted to DCP as at July 2021 or the time of reporting?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: There were two parts to that: it is reviewed and submitted. So 51 per cent was the total that was both reviewed and submitted, because of the issues with the reporting system, but far more than 51 per cent was actually reviewed; they were just not submitted. The Auditor-General is correct, but what we are saying is that far more than was reported were actually completed reviews and now, a few months later, all but one have been completed.

Ms HILDYARD: I will move onto the annual report, Part C, pages 66 and 67 (it goes across the two pages) and the audit findings in relation to the KPIs of service providers. Minister, how is it appropriate and safe for children in care to rely on notes that may be inaccurate?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Could you please give further clarification where it says that reports are inaccurate?

Ms HILDYARD: The Auditor-General's Report has highlighted that there is no mechanism to monitor the KPIs of service providers. In the absence of a mechanism, DCP uses reports from its case management system, which the report notes, 'may not be accurate', and that is a direct quote.

The CHAIR: Yes, I have it. It is the second paragraph down on page 67, minister.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: From the Auditor-General's Report—I will not read out your question—the Auditor-General's Department has reviewed the controls DCP has over the carer reviews. In the 2019-20 year, the Auditor-General's Department reported that there was no mechanism for monitoring the KPI to ensure service providers are meeting it. At that time, the department advised that reporting for this KPI was in development and would probably be in place by 30 June 2021. On 11 August, the Auditor-General issued a management letter outlining audit findings that requested comments on any other matters requiring action.

Since then, we have been working with the sector to create the new KPIs and DCP reporting on foster carer reviews. The KPI reporting will begin in quarter 2 with reconciliation of service provider data to follow over the subsequent three months. That is how we will have the up-to-date data.

Ms HILDYARD: I guess this is a supplementary, but it also goes to the substance of what is in the Auditor-General's Report. How did you then assess the performance of service providers if, as the Auditor-General notes and you have just explained, there was no mechanism to monitor if they are meeting their KPIs?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Previously, we relied on self-reporting, so the agencies would report on their own KPIs, and we also had quarterly meetings where there would be follow-up and discussion about those KPIs.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, how can you know that there is no risk posed to children in care as a result of what the Auditor-General describes as inaccurate notes?

The CHAIR: The Auditor-General does not describe them as inaccurate. He is suggesting they may not be accurate. There is a difference.

Ms HILDYARD: Notes that may not be accurate.

The CHAIR: That may not be accurate.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: Thank you for your assistance, Mr Chair.

The CHAIR: My pleasure, member for West Torrens, as you know.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: To be clear, the KPIs were being self-reported. Yes, perhaps there could possibly be inaccuracies in that procedure. However, the other safeguards are quarterly meetings in person with the department and, as well, the caseworkers for each child visit the home on a regular basis to check on the child and the foster care agencies also visit monthly, some of them even fortnightly, to check on the welfare of both the child and the carers, so we believe there are many safeguards. This is just purely about the reporting, not really about the safety of the child.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, what personal responsibility do you take for the issue of what the Auditor-General has described as notes possibly not being accurate and the failure to have KPIs for service providers? What responsibility do you take, minister? Not what your departmental officials take but what responsibility do you take for those failures?

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: Firstly, the Auditor-General made no high-risk findings and the foster care agencies are very reputable NGO agencies, and I have every faith in their ability to manage their contracts and their staff. They are the ones who go out and visit our homes, as well as our caseworkers, and we have quarterly meetings with them as well, so I have every confidence that they are doing a good job.

Ms HILDYARD: I now refer to the annual report Part C, page 70, titled Child Protection Services. Minister, why have DCP expenses not risen at a rate commensurate with the growth of children in care, and what role does a lack of expenditure on services and supports for children in care play in children being out late at night, unsafe and uncared for?

The CHAIR: It is a broad-ranging question, minister, with a minute to go.

The Hon. R. SANDERSON: I will start with the first question. From page 70 that you are referencing, over the last five years the number of children in care has risen by 33 per cent or 1,162 children, whereas Child Protection Services expenses have risen by 2 per cent or \$7 million.

Firstly, I would state that in the last three years under this government there has been an average increase of just over 7 per cent of children coming into care, whereas during the last three years of the Labor government it was around 9 per cent. We are stemming the increase in growth of children coming into care. We are doing that by investing in intensive family support services, family group conferencing and many, many other areas.

Coming into government, we did extensive contract reform. We are now paying only for the services that we receive. We are not doing block funding like the former government did. We are getting better value for our money and better outcomes for our children. Many of our services are serviced by a panel so that we can get the right services for the right child.

The CHAIR: The time allotted for the examination of the Minister for Child Protection has expired. I thank the minister, the member for Reynell and the advisers.

We now move to the Minister for Infrastructure. Welcome, minister, and welcome to your advisers also. Welcome to the member for West Torrens, who I assume will be taking the lead on this. Before I give you the call, I am going to remind members—even though this is old news to you—that the committee is in normal session and that questions need to be asked and answered by members on their feet. All questions must be directly referenced to the Auditor-General's 2021 report.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer the minister to Part C of the Agency Audit Reports, page 310. On the first page appears a total of 2,024 full-time equivalents, I imagine in the Department for Infrastructure and Transport. My first question is: how many of those are capitalised within capital programs within the agency?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have that breakdown, but I will take that question on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Given that the minister is taking that question on notice, I do note that employee benefits make up 9 per cent of the total \$2 billion worth of expenses; is that correct? Does that include wages?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Where are you referring to, sorry?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: There is a horizontal bar diagram on page 310 listing expenses equalling \$2 billion and income is \$2.8 billion. There is 24 per cent from appropriation, 26 per cent in fees and charges, 29 per cent from commonwealth and 21 per cent from other. Below it is expenses: employee benefits, 9 per cent. I am assuming that employee benefits is not just superannuation; it is also wages and/or salaries? Yes?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, that is correct.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: And the amount? That does not include superannuation?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: It does not include superannuation?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am happy to wait and run the calculator through, if that works, or I can take it on notice and get the figure. If someone comes up with the figure before we are done, I will come back to you, but otherwise I will take that on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: My next question goes to significant events and transactions on the same page, page 310. It says contracts were assigned to replace previously internally provided services of heavy rail, starting 31 January. How many DIT or former DPTI employees for the audit period are still working for Keolis Downer on secondment?

The CHAIR: Just for my benefit, member for West Torrens, is that at 30 June?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The audit period.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Just to clarify, there are no employees working for Keolis Downer. They are made available. I am told that number fluctuates from time to time. Of course, they are made available on a fully cost recovered basis.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Can I have the number for the audit period?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: For the entire period or for a point in time?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: For the entire period.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will see if I can get that figure for you. To come back to the question you asked before, the salaries and wages figure for 2021, excluding super, is just over \$136 million.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You can take this on notice if you like: are those expenses capitalised within capital programs within the Department for Infrastructure and Transport? Are they capitalised across all projects, or are they assigned to particular projects?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told it comes across in two manners: some are directly charged, some are indirectly charged. It depends on the work the employee is doing and the project, accordingly. It falls into two categories: either direct or indirect.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you please take on notice for me and give me a break down? I am not interested in the contractors employed by DIT; I am talking about full-time equivalents who are public officers, who are employed by the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, who are assigned to capital programs, who are having their expenses capitalised within those projects. If it is a north-south corridor project, if it is a Hahndorf project, or whatever project it might be, how many employees within DPTI in total, in 2024, that you have for the audit period? How many of those are assigned to infrastructure projects?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: And being paid within the project? Is that what you are saying?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes. If I can move on, within the same page 310 under expenses, employee benefits, for the audit period what was the total amount paid to Mr Fergus Gammie?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed Mr Gammie is not an employee. He is a contractor, so he does not appear in that column.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Within the supplies and services section—46 per cent of your expenses—what amount was paid to Mr Fergus Gammie for the audit period?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have that figure at hand, so I will take the question on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Minister, do you have on hand the total amount paid to Mr Peter Andrews for the audit period?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have that figure available.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer to the same reference, again, page 310. Mr Andrew Ockenden is assigned what role within the Department for Infrastructure and Transport?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Executive Director, Public Affairs.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Within the audit period, who assigned Mr Ockenden for the preparation of incoming briefs for the opposition?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Who did—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Who within the Department for Infrastructure and Transport assigned Mr Ockenden the role of preparing incoming briefs at every election during the caretaker period? Incoming briefs are prepared, colloquially known as blue books and red books. I understand the opposition has been informed that Mr Ockenden will be playing the role of preparing, within the Department for Infrastructure and Transport, the incoming briefs for the opposition if we are successful at the election. I am just asking who within the department has assigned him that role?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: The detail I have at hand is that the different agencies prepare their different agency briefs, and it is all collated. Ultimately, it is signed off by the CE.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The opposition received a note from the government, from the department, I imagine, or it could have been from Cabinet Office, informing us that Mr Ockenden was our liaison point for the agency. I was just wondering who assigned him. If he is not assigned any particular position and the information we have is incorrect, I accept that. I refer you now to page 332 and Part C, halfway down the page: the cost of the substitution services associated with the Gawler line project. For the audit period, what has been the total cost of bus substitution services?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As you would be aware, bus substitution services are used for breakdowns, or whatever it might be along a line—on the Flinders line as well when that was being put in and when the Tonsley line was being extended. I do not have that figure at hand as far as the Gawler line is concerned but, as we have worked through that process, I am happy to have a look and if we can extract that figure I will return it to you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Two dash points below that is 'major infrastructure maintenance contracts expenditure increased by \$12 million', according to the Auditor-General. Minister, you told parliament that the outsourcing of road maintenance projects would lower costs to the agency. Here, the Auditor-General tells us that costs increased by \$12 million. Could you please explain the increase?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I have been informed, again through stimulus through COVID, we have injected a big body of work and dollars into maintenance and increased maintenance. We have increased that maintenance work that was done. From a road perspective, you would be aware that when we came into government we had a \$750 million road maintenance backlog, so we were very keen to, when and where possible, increase that maintenance work and put more in.

That was probably a key figure of what has been referred to here. The extent of that maintenance work and the extra maintenance work that was done and the figures I am happy to look into for you, but I know that because of the state of a lot of the infrastructure that we were left with, that maintenance work was needed and we had to inject extra funds into it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Your evidence to the house is that the outsourcing did give value for money but you increased the amount of road maintenance work being conducted and therefore there was an increase in total costs; is that correct?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Yes, that was one of the contributing factors.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I think I overheard 'transition costs'. What were those transition costs during the audit period, and could you break them down for us?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, I just said that that was one of the contributing factors.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Were there any transition costs moving from an in-house road maintenance service to an outsourced model?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will take that question on notice.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer you now to page 323 of Part C of the audit. We will start down the bottom. The Auditor-General said:

Our review also identified some areas where contract management processes could be improved. These included that DIT:

- had not documented processes to ensure that the performance monitoring statistics provided by contractors are accurate
- had not implemented processes to ensure that the heavy rail operator complies with legislation or regulations, could improve operator risk management monitoring and had not assessed the risk of non-compliant insurance policies.

They also noted that the Department for Infrastructure and Transport was not completely prepared for the commencement of the heavy rail contract. The report states that these included:

- operator plans not being approved prior to the commencement of service delivery

- the contract management plan being approved three months after service delivery commenced
- some contract management positions were not filled.

They noted, particularly with the heavy rail services contract, a large volume of obligations and performance factors that needed to be managed. Earlier, the Auditor-General is complimentary of the process of the outsourcing, but it seems to me through their comments that there is a large part of the outsourcing that increased risk to the taxpayer and gave concern to the Auditor. Could you please tell the house who was responsible for not implementing those measures the Auditor-General has raised in his audit report?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To your point, I think it needs to be noted here that the Auditor does state:

We observed that DIT had established a sound contract governance framework for the contracts that includes—

documenting contract management, documenting detailed registers, appointing experienced—

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yes, I said that.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am just making sure that it is noted because he does point that out. Part of this as well was that the audit was done during the transition period, which we accept and the department accepts, and there was a work plan in place. At the time this was done, it was in that transition period. The department has been working on those areas to ensure that, as the work plan was outlined, those points were ticked off going forward.

I stress again the points that were made, the very positive points the Auditor-General made, about this process, understanding there is a transition period that was worked through during the time of this audit being done. He highlights those things that were done exceptionally well and things that needed to be worked on through that work plan during that 12-month time period.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I refer to page 325. After the first three dot points on that page it says:

In 2020-21 we reviewed the procurement of the heavy rail project director role. This role was specific to the procurement process for the heavy rail service contract. We focused on the nature and extent of documentation supporting the decision to apply a single-source procurement approach.

We found that the documentation supporting the decision to proceed with a single-source market approach could have been improved. Specifically, we noted that the acquisition plan:

- was approved one business day after the supplier submitted a quote

So they submit a quote and the next day it is approved. Further, the department:

- did not explain the urgency in applying a direct market approach—

but the Auditor accepts that this was the first time heavy rail had been outsourced and it was a major and complex procurement. Furthermore:

- provided limited information on the capabilities identified as necessary for the role

Interestingly, it says here that there was market research obtained 12 months before the decision. Then it goes on:

- did not identify—

that is, the department, including you, minister—

as a risk to be managed, the Chief Executive's past relationship with the service provider.

However, the Auditor-General does go on to say that he 'did not identify any actual conflict of interest in our audit of the procurement'. The Auditor-General's Report that has been tabled in this parliament details that; however, it does identify risks, and we are also dealing with perceived conflicts as well as actual conflicts. The first question I want to ask you is: who commissioned the market research 12 months before the decision was made to outsource heavy rail? Whose decision was that?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: This is before my time as minister, but I am told it was done to procure some bus contracts, for what it is worth. However, I do want to make the point you made—

as you read out your statements you lean on some words and you gloss over others—and again reiterate what the Auditor-General said:

We did not identify any actual conflict of interest in our audit of the procurement. Auditor-General's Report 9 of 2021 'Probity of the processes for the heavy rail service contract' provides further information.

You have waved documents around in here before, but I think it is really important that we note that point. The Auditor-General's Report makes it incredibly clear, from that report 9 of 2021. I encourage you all to read it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So your evidence to the committee is that the Auditor-General, in talking about the heavy rail contract, was actually referring to market research on bus contracts?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told it was market research on advisers for the project leadership on the retendering for the bus contracts. Again, and as I stated, that was something that was before I was minister.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I will just read out the opening paragraph again: 'In 2020-21 we reviewed the procurement of the heavy rail project director role.' Heavy rail. He continues: 'This role was specific to the procurement process for the heavy rail service contract.' Then he lists documentation regarding heavy rail, but your evidence here is that the Auditor-General is referencing market research regarding bus outsourcing, bus contract outsourcing, not heavy rail; is that correct?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As I am informed, this procurement process was from back when they went to secure the bus contracts and they sought to find someone to run the bus contract and were looking for a suitably qualified person. I am told that was the process that was used as a reference point for value for money for the train appointment.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: So market research on finding value for money for the outsourcing of bus contracts was used to identify the head of someone who could outsource heavy rail. I suppose that makes sense to someone. Minister, can I refer you to the Auditor-General's Report, Part A: Executive Summary, page 38. On page 38, it details in figure 3.6 investment in road infrastructure initiatives spend up to 30 June 2021.

Minister, road maintenance stimulus was allocated \$58 million. You spent only \$22 million of that. You allocated \$26 billion to be spent finalising Goodwood and Springbank roads and \$30 million for Golden Grove. Interestingly, with the new state school roadworks announced as part of, I think, a budget initiative, and I could be corrected, only \$2 million of \$20 million has been spent during the audit period.

Concerningly, with the critical road bridge maintenance stimulus package, of a \$20 million fund you have only spent a million; the Gorge Road and Silkes Road intersection upgrade, I am not sure of the timing on the project, so it could be completely appropriate, that project; and the Fleurieu Connections improvement package, which is the Main South Road and Victor Harbor Road package, I understand; and then Hahndorf. I will work backwards, starting with Hahndorf for my first question.

In your press release earlier this year, you say that you are beginning work on consultation about Hahndorf through design reference groups throughout that audit period. Has any of that money been spent at all on the Hahndorf project to improve traffic flows? Have you done any reference designs? Have you employed any consultants to do any work? Has any money out of the budget been spent?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that millions—I do not have the exact figure but it is in the millions—have been spent on this project. What I do need to point out, as you have run through the table there, and I appreciate that, is I have made this point but I think it is appropriate that I make it again. Since coming to government, of course, I mentioned the road maintenance backlog; that was a key figure that we have had to work on. But what we also had when we went to the cupboard was nothing from the previous government as far as projects that were planned out and ready to go.

So when we get a project—and this was one that the federal government was very keen to support and we agreed with that—we have to go back and do the work. It is a big body of work that

has to flow through when we are starting from scratch. That is why we have invested quite heavily in a number of planning projects and planning studies to make sure that we are filling the cupboard of projects to go forward.

I am very proud of the projects that we have picked up and we have gone to the community. We have consulted on three designs; they have given us feedback and we have elaborated on more. If you are going to run through them, I can do it for you if you like. The Fleurieu Connections package was one that your government had a little bit of money for in the forward estimates, and not all the money but most of it was in the out years from memory, and no real planning work was done. The planning work you had done was for more roundabouts. Of course, Labor put that roundabout at Aldinga that the community really do not like and it does not work for them.

We took the opportunity to say, 'Hang on, let's go back and actually do this planning work properly and get a really good outcome for that community.' We were fortunate enough to work with the federal government as well to get some more money to come in for the Victor Harbor Road and Main South Road and package that into the Fleurieu Connections package as is outlined there. I think the ultimate outcome for that has been a real win for that community because in that engagement we found out that, again, they did not want the roundabouts that Labor was going to deliver and that they would prefer grade separation.

So we have worked into our plans grade separation at Tatachilla Road and also where that roundabout is at Aldinga that the previous Labor government put in place. There is a whole heap of congestion around that area. We have also managed to have some money go across to Victor Harbor Road. This is one that the RAA has identified as needing improvement and investment because it had been neglected for such a long period of time, so we have invested in that one as well. That planning work has been done.

Yes, we had to make sure we got that right. Yes, we had to go and do that planning work because if you are just going off a whim, you are not going to get the estimates and the figures right and the magnitude right of what you are looking at. You are not going to get the plans and the designs right. We have done a lot of consultation with the community on that and we look forward to seeing that roll forward. Similarly, with the Gorge and Silkes intersection, I think that is getting close to being completed now, so that is going wonderfully well.

I can run through a number of the others for you, if you like, but it really does hinge on that planning work. I stress the point that when that is not done, you do not have that exact understanding of what is needed, what is required, what the best solution is going to be, and you cannot engage with the community on that. That is what we have done right the way through with all these projects. They have provided great stimulus to those communities. We are going to be delivering and building what really matters to those communities and delivering great pieces of infrastructure for them as well.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Could you please give me a breakdown on notice of how much you have actually spent on the Hahndorf traffic improvements, because the Auditor-General says that as of 30 June you have spent nothing? In your evidence to the parliament just now, you said you had spent millions. I am assuming that those millions are from 1 July until now, so that is a lot of procurement in a very short period of time. I look forward to you providing that for us.

Could I also ask you, before I hand over to my colleague the shadow minister for sport and recreation, in terms of work on the north-south corridor and the tunnel, the first southern tunnel, how much was expended in this audit period on works for the tunnel: design, reference, consultants, soil sampling, the works?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I will have to take that one about the tunnels on notice. But again it is a huge project for South Australia. It is the infrastructure piece. Again, you have been involved. You were transport minister at one stage. I can only presume you looked at this piece of the project and thought, 'This is a bit too hard. Let's go for the easy bits and let's leave the hard bit until the end.' I can appreciate that. This is a tough bit, and you know that, and I know that in your explorations of this project you were looking at doing the open-cut motorway through this section and you parked the tunnel idea. It was a bit too hard. The potential was for you to be delivering a chasm through that community, really through our capital city, which would have segregated those two communities.

That is why we have gone with the hybrid+ model, of course, the two tunnels there with the link in between. We know this is the best solution. We have gone through a big process to land on this and we are working through that now. The reference design will be completed by the end of the year, as I have made really clear on a number of occasions. As we know, certain sections of the reference design will be going to the community to tell them that.

Reports that have come back to me—again, you may have been the minister or involved at the time of the Gallipoli Underpass; no doubt you were in this place—and people have said that one of the frustrations was that they were told their house was going to be acquired and then it was not, and they said that was really disconcerting and disheartening. I know that it would not have been done on purpose. You would not have done that on purpose. But that is what you want to avoid in these processes. That is the step process that we have gone through and we have engaged with the community all the way along.

This is the final piece in the puzzle. It will link that 78-kilometre stretch, the last 10.5 kilometres. It is taking out 21 traffic lights, as you know. It will save 24 minutes of travel time for people and really will give the full benefit of what has been invested thus far. We are very excited about that.

Back to the Hahndorf traffic improvements, I am told there was money invested in that from a planning point of view that did not come from that bucket of money; it came from a planning bucket of money. There was some work done and invested before that 30 June time frame, but since then a lot more money has been spent on that project, as it has right across the board. The figure is \$8.8 billion that we are spending on road transport and rail infrastructure here in South Australia.

Our infrastructure spend is \$17.9 billion. I see the twinkle in your eye because you know that is a record amount of investment spent on infrastructure here in South Australia. We are really proud of that. It is really important. It is putting jobs on the ground, some 19,000 jobs, with that investment here. It is people in hard hats, people in fluoro vests, and it is putting money on the table of South Australians. We are rolling those projects out and delivering the infrastructure that South Australia needs, and I know the industry is really excited by it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The new definition of passive-aggressive, sir.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I learnt from you.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I am not passive: I am aggressive.

Members interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Let's get back to it.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I only have a few more questions and then we will get on to sport and recreation. Referring to Part C, page 310, expenses, supplies and services, if the minister could take on notice any legal indemnities paid to any DIT staff for any legal action as a result of harassment or bullying accusations, as a result of any referrals—

The Hon. C.L. Wingard interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I have not finished my question yet—from ICAC or the Ombudsman's inquiry, any legal representation afforded to them, paid for by the department and any resources allocated in providing documents and information to the ICAC or the Ombudsman for the audit period. If you could take that on notice and I will hand over to my colleague the shadow minister.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): I will give the minister an opportunity to provide an answer to the question, if he wishes.

Ms HILDYARD: Thank you very much to the chief executive and other staff members from the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. I will refer in entirety to the financial report for the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing. The financial statement is the only reference to recreation, sport and racing. Other shadow ministers have asked questions in relation to the financial statements. It is the audited financial statements.

There is no reference to recreation, sport and racing in the Auditor-General's Report. They are all contained in the financial statement. I just wanted to make that clear. I will indicate which page

of the statement I am referring to as we proceed. First, in relation to 9.3. dot point 4, page 27, minister, can you please explain the nature of the pending legal action with a building manufacturer?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you for that. I am informed that it is a class action, and we are one of many that are making a claim for damages as part of a bigger class action.

Ms HILDYARD: Does the legal action with a building manufacturer relate to a particular sporting premises entity?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am told it is potentially a couple of venues but, again, it is part of the bigger class action, so it is a collective, if you like. The government have a number of agencies that are acting in this class action; we are one of those.

Ms HILDYARD: Which venues?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have them at hand. I am happy to take that on notice.

Ms HILDYARD: I am moving back to page 1. Can you please explain the increase in appropriation under income on page 1 of the Office for Recreation, Sport and Racing's financial report: in 2020, it was \$82,228,000, and in 2021 it is \$152,062,000?

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The ACTING SPEAKER (Mr Cowdrey): While the minister consults, on behalf of the parliament today I would like to welcome to the public gallery the Wilderness School SRC for 2022 and also the head of boarding, Ms Rosie Broderick, who are guests of the member for Flinders. Welcome.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

Debate resumed.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: That was a good observation because it is quite a big jump. You have noticed that it went from \$82 million to \$152 million. I am told that it is on the back of our significant infrastructure spend in sport. I think you would be aware that we have invested heavily. Of course, when we came to government we invested \$10 million in Memorial Drive to put the roof on and another \$44 million for the upgrade of that stadium, which has brought back the Adelaide International. We had the Day at the Drive last year, which has been a huge success, so that was a wonderful investment. Also, the show court has a roof on it. That is one of those infrastructure investments that are part of this.

We have also invested in Hindmarsh Stadium. That stadium had not been invested in for a long period of time and we needed to do that to get the Women's World Cup. We are really proud of the fact that we have done that and that we have those games coming here as well. The State Sports Park and the State Centre for Football at Gepps Cross is a huge investment of \$25 million, potentially more. I will check that figure for you. There is investment in that piece of infrastructure as well. The basketball project at Wayville is another part of that investment.

Then there have been the grants to the community sports, so it is that elite level as well as the grassroots and community level. The list of projects is fantastic. In fact, I think we have almost completed the Hackham one, which I know is in and around your area. Christies received some money recently for that new centre square pitch for their cricketers, in particular their women cricketers that I know they are trying to strengthen.

I can give you an even bigger breakdown of our grassroots program. We have sports voucher subsidies that are part of it as well. There is some investment in the Thebarton Oval, Gifford Hill. We have invested in the racing industry, and we are getting great returns from that, growing jobs. There is the Active Club Program and a number of other programs. It has been incredibly successful. We are really proud of that. It is the biggest investment in sport that the state has ever seen, and the team is doing a great job delivering it.

Ms HILDYARD: I also welcome the young women from Wilderness, and I have a question that might be of interest to them. Minister, what message do you think was sent to girls and women when the state government initially refused to participate in the bid for the Women's World Cup?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: What page are you referring to?

Ms HILDYARD: The same as I said before, page 1.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am really proud of our bid there. What we did—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Member for Reynell!

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Please don't be rude.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Member for Reynell, questions have been asked in silence. The minister can provide his answer in silence.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: When we put our bid in, a few things had to wrap around that. We had to have a certain capacity for our stadium. Hindmarsh Stadium, as I just pointed out, had been neglected for a long period of time when Labor were in government, and it was not up to scratch to be able to be put forward to a bid. We made a commitment: 'We will put a bid in and we will wrap around the improvement of infrastructure there.'

One thing I note—and I am interested in your take on this—is there are only two lots of change rooms. There were no change rooms so that you could have women and men play there at the same time, which is always a real problem with Hindmarsh Stadium. Quite frankly, I cannot believe it was neglected for so long. That was the investment we made, and we have done this right across the state and I am really proud of this. We know that with community sport and elite level sport—

Ms Hildyard interjecting:

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: —sorry, if I can finish—is that you want to have unisex change rooms. You want to have change rooms so that ideally you have four at any one venue, and that means you can just alternate the change rooms. If you have two men's teams playing, followed by two women's teams, followed by two more women's teams, the guys will move out and the girls will play. The next girls' game will come in and move into those change rooms. So it is really important to make sure you are investing in that infrastructure that can get more people playing.

We proudly did that at Hindmarsh Stadium. We have upgraded that facility and the works are going on now. The change rooms there will be at a standard whereby we can have women in those change rooms and we can alternate and play back-to-back games, guys and girls. We can utilise that facility. It will be a ripping facility for the Women's World Cup. It fits in with their bid.

Ms HILDYARD: The question was: what message do you think was sent to girls and women when the state government refused to participate in the bid for the Women's World Cup?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Member for Reynell, this is a committee—

Ms HILDYARD: The question was not answered.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): It is not governed by the same standing orders that govern question time.

Ms HILDYARD: The last Chair said that it was, sorry.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): I am just being guided by the Clerk.

Ms HILDYARD: I thought it was.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): I would also make the point for future reference and for future questions that questions need to be constrained to the year of the audit period. It is rather unusual, I think, given the changes in the Auditor-General's reporting, that we do not have

recommendations or commentary given by the Auditor-General in regard to not so much a particular department but a group within government.

This is rather more wideranging than usual, that we are effectively examining a budget financial statement, as opposed to recommendations from the Auditor-General. I will be quite generous in terms of the questions that are asked, but if they can be constrained at least to that audit period it would be much appreciated. The minister is entitled to answer as he wishes and, if he has not, he can continue.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Thank you, Chair. I appreciate that leniency. Out of the goodness of my heart, I am happy to understand that there was not that much in the Auditor-General's Report. In fact, the Office for Rec and Sport was not included in the Auditor-General's Report, so I understand the leniency you are affording here to go down this path to have a look at these financial statements.

To the question more so, it goes back to the significant infrastructure increase spend that we have. I think the figure that we have tallied now, as far as infrastructure spend is concerned, is \$97 million into soccer we have invested since coming into government, which I am really proud of. That is about making those facilities so that we can get more people playing. It focuses very much on families—which are boys, girls, men, women—and having those facilities so everyone can use the asset. There is no point having female change rooms that sit over here that only females use because, if they are playing an away game, that facility is not being used.

The sporting industry has come on that journey and made sure that we have facilities that can be used by everyone and everyone is benefiting from them. With that, we made that investment into Hindmarsh Stadium so that we could get the Women's World Cup here, and I am really pleased that we were successful in that. We are having the Women's World Cup here in South Australia, and it is going to be a great event. I remember standing with Jenna McCormick when that announcement was made and how overjoyed she was. A couple of young Adelaide United women's players who are coming through the ranks had excitement on their faces because of the opportunity this is going to create.

One of the big selling points, too, with the bid committee was the facilities and the investment we are making into soccer (or football) here in Australia. They were really excited by that. Equally, they were excited by what our city offers and the support we are going to give. I think it is a great indication of the investment we are making into sport and getting really great outcomes for South Australia. I am very proud of it.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, still on page 1, how much of the grant funding went to community sporting organisations and peak bodies, therefore excluding councils and private organisations?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I do not have a breakdown of that, but I am not sure why we would be excluding councils. For example, in your local area, the Hackham club I spoke about before was a partnership with council. I am pretty sure we put in half a million and they put in half a million, or maybe even a little bit more, to upgrade those facilities for that footy club. I am told it has a really developing women's football program, which is great.

Those investments go into council projects, and that is a big part of our grants program. To make sure that you understand the process that we went through as far as our grants program was concerned, it was very much partnering with council. That is a really important piece to us, whereby councils put some skin in the game, we put some skin in the game, sometimes the clubs as well put skin in the game and sometimes the sporting organisations are involved as well. That gives us a really great outcome because we are getting the benefit for everyone.

A lot of our investments are partnered with councils. I am not sure why we would not include that in the overarching involvement of what we were doing here and the overarching commitment to what we have done here as a government. I have mentioned some of those bigger projects, but regarding those smaller ones at grassroots level, I know I have been at Henley Beach footy club with you, Chair, and your local footy club and local sports clubs. They are right across the board.

I was at Croydon Kings the other day, and a great piece of infrastructure is happening there. At the Women's Memorial Playing Fields, I think we have invested \$8.9 million or thereabouts there. Again, it is a great facility. Some of those are council-owned assets, and we are happy to partner with councils. Some of them are government-owned assets as well, but we are happy to partner with anyone who is going to improve the infrastructure for sporting communities in our state.

Ms HILDYARD: Are councils, in your view, classified as sporting organisations for the purpose of directing funding to them—not partnering with them, to them?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: Again, if you go to most community areas—for example, Walkerville footy club, my local footy club, Brighton footy club, Marion footy club, Mitchell Park footy club—

Ms Hildyard: That's not the question.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: But the point is they are owned by councils, so, yes, they are running sporting organisations. They own sporting infrastructure, so, yes, we want to partner with them and, yes, we will give money to them to build that sporting infrastructure. It is really important for our state.

I am not sure why you are downplaying councils' involvement in these pieces of infrastructure. They do an incredible job owning, running and maintaining soccer clubs, netball courts right across South Australia. Yes, councils have a heavy involvement in sport in our state. They probably own 90 per cent of the sporting infrastructure in South Australia, so I think it is really important that we partner with them and support them.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, on the same page, have any state sporting organisations directly advised you personally that they have had to cut jobs as a result of your direction of grant expenditure in the Partnerships Program?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: No, not from my recollection.

Ms HILDYARD: Minister, moving to page 16, will you increase the ceiling on the Active Club Program grants listed on page 16 to their pre COVID-19 levels?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: As a background to that, what we did when we did our grants review, the old Active Club Program had some facilities funding and some programs funding as well. What we found from the sporting sector when we did the grants review was that was really confusing. In fact, the feedback was there were a number of avenues to get grant funding. What they were finding was they were doing an application for one round of grant funding, they would be unsuccessful and they would have to go away and do another application for the next round and then another application. They ended up doing three applications and not being successful but investing a lot of time.

What we did was actually move the facilities funding, if you like. We put that all into the CRSFP and added to the fund for grassroots and those programs as well. So we had three funds all going at once. We got them to put in one application, and then they would be funnelled into the program that best suited their application. The department would work with different organisations as they were putting in their applications to make sure they were only doing the one application and not wasting time doing three or four or five.

We kept Active Club just for those programs last year. We actually reprofiled it a little bit, and we got some more money from the Treasurer, which was a great bonus—it is always good to get more money from the Treasurer—and we put that into increasing the Active Club fund as far as a reboot round, because we know that on the back of COVID a lot of the volunteers involved in sporting organisations just went way over and above. You would have seen them, no doubt out in your community as well, buying hand sanitiser, cones to keep people safely distanced, etc., washing balls and all this sort of stuff. It was a really bizarre time in sport going through COVID, as it has been in other areas as well.

We did that reboot round so that clubs could actually get a cash injection. It was a bit of a thank you to all the volunteers who had done so much work and also to pay for some of those incidentals, in particular, that would help them cover the costs. Some clubs used it for things like iPads because they were doing Zoom meetings and that sort of thing. Again, we all know the world we were living in. That is how Active Club was in that reboot round, and we are keeping doing Active Club and it is actually open now but closes on 17 November. That is for programs there.

The other funds we have are for facilities, so again people can apply. There are slightly different sized grants and slightly different stipulations around the grants depending on how big

people want to apply and what size projects they want to go for. It is now really clear: programs and facilities through those three grant streams that we have and they then can apply for that and go into the right and appropriate grant program.

Ms WORTLEY: My question relates to 4.2 on page 16. Why was the coastal provider favoured over the experienced inland water provider for the VACSWIM program tender?

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: I am informed that your question actually is not relevant to this paper because this was under the old model. However, to answer your question, there was a competitive tender process that went out. Whenever you are doing these things, you are looking to get the best outcome and the best bang for buck for taxpayer money. People were invited to put their best tender forward. The department, going through the correct probity processes, made a decision on the best provider for this service to get the best value for money for the South Australian public and also the best outcomes, and the appropriate person was selected and awarded the contract.

Ms WORTLEY: Minister, my question was actually: why was a coastal provider selected over an experienced inland water provider? Just to add to that, can you guarantee that all the positions wanting to be filled will be filled in relation to that, and was consideration given to our multicultural communities, many who come from landlocked countries, and that we are now looking, I understand, at three year olds as well? I am just wondering what consideration was given and why a coastal provider was selected over an experienced inland water provider for swimming lessons.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: To reiterate the point, it was a competitive tender process, so it was put out to tender, people applied and put their applications forward. It was assessed and the best provider, with an extensive background in water safety and delivering programs across all communities, was given the contract. Again, when you are spending taxpayer money you want to make sure that you have a robust and competitive tender process and that everyone can actually make an application.

I understand that the people who did apply all felt that the process was a very fair process. Sometimes someone is successful in a tender process and sometimes someone else is not. On this occasion, the successful tenderer was awarded the contract and they are rolling out that contract now, from all my understanding, to a very satisfactory level.

In fact, we have great uptake of VACSWIM again. We know it is a bit of a South Australian iconic institution. People love our VACSWIM program. We encourage people to get involved in VACSWIM, and we are reaching out to as many communities as possible right across the state. In fact, I was involved in VACSWIM when I was a kid and I know how important it is. Having people learn water safety, wherever it is, is vitally important, be it inland waterways or the beach, wherever you swim in our state, and we are lucky enough to have so many options to be able to pick from. Again, the successful tenderer won the contract.

Ms WORTLEY: Minister, you still have not answered my question. Why was one selected over another? What did the one have that the other did not have, given that we are talking about swimming lessons right through? We are also addressing it for very young three year olds now, I understand—even though previously I understand that the inland water provider provided a separate program—and also our multicultural communities. We have young people going out to the beaches coming from landlocked countries.

The Hon. C.L. WINGARD: With respect, I think I did answer your question, in that it was a competitive tender process. I do not get my fingers on a competitive tender process. That is outlined by the department, and there are probity pathways they have to go through to make sure that we put a tender out there. People apply against the tender and then they are evaluated. Again, I do not do the valuation; the department does that and there are processes they go through.

The successful tenderer was, of course, Surf Life Saving South Australia, who have a huge background in multicultural programs, and they do an absolutely outstanding job in this area. The process was very thorough, but I do not have the details on the steps of those processes. It is not my place to be involved in that nitty-gritty; again, the department does that. The department looks after that and they do a great job with that. The process went through, and both parties said it was a very good process. Unfortunately, one tenderer is successful at the end of the day, and we think that Surf Life Saving South Australia will do an outstanding job. They do a great job in our state when it comes to water safety, and they are now part of—

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Minister, time has expired. The clock hit zero a couple of minutes ago, so I will draw this session of examination in regard to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and Sport, Rec and Racing to an end. If advisers and the minister wish to depart the chamber, please go for it and we will invite the Minister for Environment and Water and his advisers to enter.

Dr CLOSE: If we start with Part C: Agency Audit Reports, page 118, there is a reference:

From 1 July 2020 under section 66 of the Landscape Act, land levies are now collected by the Landscape Administration Fund on behalf of...

The question is: how many councils have been reimbursed for the cost of collection and how much have they been reimbursed for? What is the process for councils to apply?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am not sure there is any specific commentary or observations in the Auditor-General's Report in relation to that matter. It is just a description of what has occurred. I will ask you, Chair, whether that is in scope.

Dr CLOSE: Just to be clear, the section I am referring to talks about the distribution of funds collected. There has been a discussion previously about funds being distributed to the councils that have done the collecting in order to reimburse them. I am wondering if that has happened.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Perhaps, deputy leader, you can provide me with a little bit more indication in terms of the reference.

Dr CLOSE: On page 118, the third dot point talks about the levies being collected. They are collected by councils. It talks about the collection of the levies and the distribution of the funds. My question is whether there has been any distribution of funds to councils for collecting the levies. If the minister does not want to answer then we will move on, but that is my reference.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Councils have to apply for that, for reimbursement. We do not believe any councils have done so to date.

Dr CLOSE: If I could just have some clarity about the process for applying, that would be useful.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Just simply, we were not anticipating questions on this because I deemed it to be outside the scope of the Auditor-General's observations, so I do not have those answers.

Dr CLOSE: May I ask for it to be taken on notice?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Just clarify exactly what the deputy leader wants to be taken on notice.

Dr CLOSE: Just what the process is.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I am happy to take it on notice. The process is legislative. I just cannot recall the section of the act, but I will provide that to the deputy leader.

Dr CLOSE: If we can move to page 124, about halfway through the page there is reference to \$2.2 million in expenses for the Kangaroo Island bushfire rebuild. What was the budget for that program in 2020-21?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The total budget for the Kangaroo Island rebuilding and reconstruction program, which extends from largely National Parks and Wildlife infrastructure in and around the Flinders Chase National Park, was \$45 million. I notice that this refers to heritage fencing. That was funding provided to the owners of pieces of privately owned land under heritage agreement who have been provided with support to reinstate fences for conservation purposes. It is a little outside the \$45 million in terms of what went towards the National Parks and Wildlife rebuild.

Dr CLOSE: Further down on that page, the paragraph starts, 'DEW's property, plant and equipment holdings are diverse.' It talks about land being valued at \$370 million comprising national, conservation and recreation parks and wilderness protection areas. What is the process for that valuation? To what extent does it take account of the degree of protection, or is that not relevant?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The way that that land is valued is it uses land use value, and conservation land has, unfortunately, in my opinion, quite a low land use. Our parks comprise approximately 21 per cent of the state. I think I am often quoted as saying if you added it all together it is about the size of the UK and for it only to be worth \$370 million is probably a bit of a shame. I am very aware that in some jurisdictions—not in Australia, but certainly UK and increasingly in the USA—they are starting to look at natural capital and that value.

It would be great to be able to value it as such in the future, which would probably see the value jump up significantly, but land which is heavily vegetated does not have a large alternative use pathway associated with it and, in a perverse sense, is probably further devalued by the fact that it is protected under the National Parks and Wildlife Act. That is the process. I am told that it is very revalued every six years or so.

In the Department for Environment and Water's financial statement, section 10.2 called 'Fair value', goes through this in some detail and quite boring detail, actually. The deputy leader might like to have a bit of a look at it. I had not until now, but it is perhaps something we could work up a better policy on if we could get the bean counters to agree to it.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Value is in the eye of the beholder, as it seems.

Dr CLOSE: Page 128 talks about the effects of COVID-19. The last dot point says that DEW's ability to deliver this part of its mandate—being building and maintaining physical assets—has not been materially affected by COVID-19. I recall from the budget that the Kangaroo Island rebuilding projects are substantially behind. I am wondering whether COVID-19 affected those specifically or whether in fact there are other explanations.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: There is no doubt that, despite the Auditor-General's findings there in a general sense, the operations and the asset maintenance construction of the department have not been impacted in a broad sense. There have been exacerbated impacts—Kangaroo Island in particular, being an island, having particular challenges in terms of access, transportation, where construction costs have been driven up.

With Kangaroo Island, there has also been a fairly detailed engagement process to get community groups. There is a very active conservation movement in Kangaroo Island which is very valuable. We have had the program Reimagine Kangaroo Island, which in itself was delayed by COVID due to the cancellation of engagement stations and things like that.

COVID-19 would have contributed to an extent to delays with the rebuild over there, but I suspect that the most significant delays have been down to just making sure we get the product right—more particularly with Flinders Chase, the decision to move the visitor centre out of Flinders Chase National Park and the American River site and create a gateway site there.

It is the right thing to do and will build resilience into the asset base there. It will create a much more significant entry point to the iconic sites in the west end, but negotiating that access to the private land, which is now Crown land held under the Crown control of the environment minister as that gateway site leading into Flinders Chase, definitely delayed that. Again, perhaps there was some delay due to COVID, but I would suggest probably more so it was just getting the right decision and landing it.

Dr CLOSE: I am happy to now move to SA Water, thank you. We are now up to page 469, and that is the first page of SA Water. There is a reference just over halfway down to the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme. How much of the available water from the NAIS has been contracted?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I do note that there are no specific observations or comments about the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme, and I think the estimates process would allow a general questioning through this. However, I would like to seek your ruling on whether, given there are no specific comments or observations with regard to this scheme in the Auditor-General's Report, that line of questioning is appropriate.

Dr CLOSE: Do you want me to point out what I am referring to?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): If you could point it out. Sorry, you said 169 and it was 469, but I got there.

Dr CLOSE: It is 469. Sorry, did I say the wrong number?

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): It is quite okay.

Dr CLOSE: It is down about here. It says, 'Work continued on the Northern Adelaide Irrigation Scheme (\$155.6 million project budget),' and I would like to know how it is going with contracting the water. I think that is sufficient reference.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Minister, I think the question is entirely in order.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I would beg to differ, Mr Chair, because you could say that, with the heading of the paper being SA Water, you could ask any question about any aspect of SA Water. We will agree to disagree and I will be generous at the moment, but I think we need to get a good grasp of how this process should work in the future. I understand that three gigalitres have been contracted to date.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): To be fair, on reflection, an update on a reference to work continuing I think is well and truly in order, minister.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: We will agree to disagree.

Dr CLOSE: I think you have to agree with the Chair. That is how this process works. Just above that is the number of FTEs, being 1,556. That is 43 fewer FTEs than the previous year. Can I have an explanation for that difference?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I will have to take that one on notice. I was under the impression we had increased the FTE count and our overall spend obviously with the capital program, being quite large in SA Water, but I will take that one on notice.

Dr CLOSE: I refer to page 479, pipe bursts data, and the number of pipe bursts over the last five years. Can the minister give an explanation for the pipe burst on the Port River Expressway in September?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Can I just clarify the date of that. Was it September 2020 or September 2021?

Dr CLOSE: It was 2021.

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: I have to say, Mr Chair, that is outside the scope.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): I am very happy to draw that one outside the scope of the audit period. If the burst was after June 30, I am very happy to make that ruling.

Dr CLOSE: I am always happy to seek information, but if it is not forthcoming that is absolutely fine. On page 472, going backwards a little bit, at the top it talks about the negotiations for Adelaide service delivery contracts and that the documentation could have been improved, 'while noting the extensive negotiation planning that occurred'. In that negotiation planning that occurred, was safeguarding the number of jobs included as part of what would be required from the negotiation?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The phraseology used in the reports may not have been as specific as safeguarding jobs, but certainly the employment of South Australians, the assessment and support of the existing workforce, including subcontractors, would certainly have been taken into consideration as part of the decision making and assessment.

Dr CLOSE: Back to page 470, the other audit findings, one of which relates to that documentation, but there are another three as well: is the minister satisfied that those audit findings have been addressed adequately?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The chief executive advises me that actions have been implemented for all of these, and in a discussion earlier today, in fact, we had a conversation about risk management more broadly in preparation for this hearing on SA Water. I am pleased to say that since Mr Ryan came on board as chief executive, the renewed board from the last couple of years has really had a very significant look at not just these audit findings but risk management and audit findings more broadly over recent years and has undertaken a whole range of controls and implemented new processes across the corporation. I have a high degree of confidence that these

audit findings and others in historic years have been followed up and appropriate controls put in place.

Dr CLOSE: I will move to EPA now. Thanks, SA Water. On page 115, there is a chart at the top that demonstrates the income and then the expenses and the net result in a line. The income obviously has gone up substantially, 2019-20 and 2020-21. Did the income over the 2020-21 financial year go up more than had been expected, given that more waste was sent to landfill than previously had been anticipated and, if so, by how much?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The deputy leader is correct that the income did go up beyond budget, and that was significantly in part to do with the increase in waste production. We attribute that to a couple of things: more people at home clearing things out, undertaking gardening and other projects that might not otherwise have occurred, and also the strong construction sector in that financial year off the back of COVID, with more renovations and demolitions definitely resulting in more construction waste being generated. That has also fed through to the overall increase in income being beyond what was previously anticipated.

Dr CLOSE: My question was: by how much was that additional over what was expected?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: The figure was previously mentioned by the deputy leader. Around 40,000 tonnes more waste was generated, and that would have resulted in between \$15 million and \$16 million more in terms of the levy take.

Dr CLOSE: On the previous page, 114, there is a reference to the writing off of a fairly large individual debt. How much was that and, without breaching confidentiality, which you may not be able to do, is it possible to describe the circumstances under which the decision was taken to write that off, or the justification for it?

The Hon. D.J. SPEIRS: Sorry, I just had to clarify the situation. There was a landfill organisation which the EPA deemed should have paid more than it did in a particular levy. That went to court, and the EPA had essentially booked that they should have received X dollars. The court negotiated an outcome, which was less than X dollars, and as a consequence the difference was written off. There was still a settlement through the courts process, but not what was initially hoped for by the EPA.

Dr CLOSE: I am going to give you a grace of 15 seconds and finish there.

The ACTING CHAIR (Mr Cowdrey): Very good. Given that time is very close to expiring, the minister's time in regard to the examination of the Minister for Environment and Water has concluded. The committee has further considered the Auditor-General's Report 2020-21 and completed the examination of ministers on matters contained therein.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

At 18:49 the house adjourned until Thursday 28 October 2021 at 11:00.

*Answers to Questions***RETURN TO COUNTRY PROGRAM**

782 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (22 September 2021). With regard to the Return to Country program:

- (a) Who is responsible for the program in the Adelaide CBD?
- (b) How many people have been connected to this program and returned since 1 July 2021?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The Towards Home Alliance offers Return to Country services in the Adelaide CBD.

In addition, the Department of Human Services (DHS) has advised that Baptist Care delivers the Safe Journeys program to assist Aboriginal women return to country.

Together these services have supported a total of 30 clients for the period 1 July 2021 to 31 August 2021.

DISABILITY SERVICES STAFF

783 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (22 September 2021). What is the annual percentage and number of turnover of staff in state-run disability care for:

- (a) 2017-18?
- (b) 2018-19?
- (c) 2019-20?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

The average appropriate turnover for staff in state-run disability care between 2017-20 is 8.2 per cent.

DISABILITY SERVICES STAFF

784 Ms COOK (Hurtle Vale) (22 September 2021). How many trainees in state-run disability care for 2017-18, 2018-19, 2019-20 and 2020-21:

- (a) Started a traineeship?
- (b) Completed their traineeship with qualification?
- (c) Commenced employment within the state-run disability?
- (d) Had ongoing employment:
 - i. Casual—less than 5 shifts?
 - ii. Permanent—5-20 shifts per month for a minimum of 3 months?
 - iii. Permanent—5-20 shifts per month for more than 3-12 months?
 - iv. Remained employed at 5-20 shifts per month for more than 12 months?

The Hon. V.A. CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Local Government): The Minister for Human Services has provided the following advice:

Since coming into government, 41 trainees have started a traineeship, 39 in 2020-21. This compares to zero traineeships started under the previous Labor government in 2017-18. The majority of the 39 trainees commenced between April and June 2021. It takes approximately 12 months to complete a traineeship.