

## LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL

Tuesday, 14 February 2017

The **PRESIDENT (Hon. R.P. Wortley)** took the chair at 14:18 and read prayers.

**The PRESIDENT:** We acknowledge Aboriginal and Torres Strait Islander peoples as the traditional owners of this country throughout Australia, and their connection to the land and community. We pay our respects to them and their cultures, and to the elders both past and present.

I would like to welcome you all here. You all look refreshed. This year, hopefully, we will have a nice productive year.

### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **PAPERS**

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the President—

Reports, 2015-16—

Corporations—

Adelaide

Burnside

Holdfast Bay

Marion

Norwood Payneham and St Peters

Playford

Prospect

Salisbury

Unley

Whyalla

District Councils—

Adelaide Hills

Alexandrina

Coorong

Copper Coast

Gawler

Karoonda East Murray

Kingston

Light

Lower Eyre Peninsula

Loxton Waikerie

Mallala

Mid Murray

Peterborough

Port Pirie

Renmark Paringa

Roxby Downs

Tumby Bay

Wattle Range

Yankalilla

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter) on behalf of the Minister for Employment (Hon. K.J. Maher)—

Corporation By-laws—

Rural City of Murray Bridge—

No. 1—Permits and Penalties  
 No. 2—Local Government Land  
 No. 3—Roads  
 No. 4—Moveable Signs  
 No. 5—Dogs  
 Municipal Council By-laws—  
   Roxby Downs—  
     No. 8—Interim Cats  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
   Electricity Act 1996—Miscellaneous  
   Gas Act 1997—Miscellaneous  
   Mining Act 1971—Miscellaneous  
 StudyAdelaide Charter

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. I.K. Hunter)—

Regulations under the following Acts—  
   Animal Welfare Act 1985—  
     Companion Animals  
     Miscellaneous Amendment No. 2  
   Fisheries Management Act 2007—  
     Abalone Fisheries  
     Demerit Points—Pipi  
     Demerit Points—Vongole  
     Fish Processors—Vongole  
     General—Vongole  
     Lakes and Coorong Fishery—Vongole  
     Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Pippi  
     Marine Scalefish Fisheries—Vongole  
     Rock Lobster Fisheries—Vongole  
     Vessel Monitoring Scheme  
   Green Industries SA Act 2004—Revocation of Zero Waste  
   Health Care Act 2008—Reporting of Cancer  
   Local Nuisance and Litter Act 2016—  
     Amendment of Act Schedule 1  
     General  
   Natural Resources Management Act 2004—Financial Provisions Amendment  
   Wilderness Protection Act 1992—Nullarbor Wilderness Protection  
 TAFE SA Ministerial Charter

By the Minister for Police (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Reports, 2015-16—  
   Courts Administration Authority  
   Independent Gambling Authority  
   Legal Practitioners Disciplinary Tribunal  
   Legal Profession Conduct Commissioner  
   Listening and Surveillance Devices Act 1972  
   South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal  
   State Coroner  
 Dangerous Area Declarations under the Summary Offences Act 1953 for the period  
   1 October 2016 to 31 December 2016  
 Managing Risks in Stevedoring Code of Practice dated December 2016  
 New Route Service Licence—Adelaide—Port Augusta—Adelaide  
 Road Blocks Declaration under the Summary Offences Act 1953 for the period 1 October  
   2016 to 31 December 2016  
 Regulations under the following Acts—  
   Criminal Law (Forensic Procedures) Act 2007—Blood Testing for Diseases

Cross-border Justice Act 2009—Young Offenders  
Development Act 1993—  
    Low Impact Entertainment  
    Miscellaneous No 2  
    Residential Code  
District Court Act 1991—Fees No. 3  
Justices of the Peace Act 2005—Youth Court  
Magistrates Court Act 1991—Fees No. 3  
Motor Vehicles Act 1959—Miscellaneous No 3  
Recreation Grounds (Regulations) Act 1931—Central Oval  
Return to Work Act 2014—Guarantee  
Road Traffic Act 1961—  
    Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions No. 3  
    Ancillary and Miscellaneous Provisions No. 4  
    Light Vehicle Standards Amendment  
    Miscellaneous Amendment No. 2  
    Miscellaneous Amendment No. 3  
Supreme Court Act 1935—Fees No. 3  
Victims of Crime Act 2001—  
    Revocation of Criminal Injuries Compensation Regulations  
    Transitional  
Work Health and Safety Act 2012—Miscellaneous Amendment  
Rules of Court—  
    South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal—South Australian Civil and  
    Administrative Tribunal Act 2013—Amendment No. 2  
    Youth Court— Youth Court Act 1993—  
        Children's Protection  
        General  
        Young Offenders  
Rules under Acts—  
    Road Traffic Act 1961—Australian Road Rules

By the Minister for Correctional Services (Hon. P.B. Malinauskas)—

Parole Board of South Australia—Report, 2015-16

*Parliamentary Committees*

**CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE**

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (14:24):** I bring up the report of the committee, entitled 'Annual review of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee into public integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption 2015-16'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

*Ministerial Statement*

**CRYSTAL METHAMPHETAMINE TASK FORCE**

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (14:24):** I seek leave to make a ministerial statement regarding a crystal methamphetamine task force.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** Earlier this afternoon, the state government announced the appointment of a special task force to respond to the growing use of crystal methamphetamine (ice) in South Australia. Evidence indicates that ice use in South Australia has tripled in the past four years, with the latest wastewater testing showing 400 doses per week per 1,000 South Australians. The recent Australian Criminal Intelligence Illicit Drug Report shows that nationally the price of ice is

dropping and it is becoming more accessible. South Australia reported a 478 per cent increase in weight of drugs seized from 2013-14 to 2014-15, the greatest increase of any state or territory.

Methamphetamine related apprehensions by SAPOL almost doubled between 2009-10 and 2013-14, and the number of drivers testing positive for the drug nearly quadrupled over the same period. Ice is an insidious drug that attacks the central nervous system and is highly addictive. It poses far-reaching community safety and social consequences to the South Australian community. Ice users become addicted quickly to the drug and its use is associated with serious health conditions, including memory loss, aggression, psychotic behaviour and brain damage.

The effects on users are more extreme than any other street-level drug, with the dangers felt across the system, from law enforcement to health and child protection. The severity of impact calls for a different response to what has been successful in combating other illicit drugs. To do this, the government has established a crystal methamphetamine (ice) task force, which I will chair, with the support of my colleague in the other place, the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, the Hon. Leesa Vlahos MP.

Other members of the task force include SAPOL Assistant Commissioner, Ms Linda Fellows, retired judge of the District Court of South Australia, Mr Alan Moss, and senior representatives from Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia. The task force will conduct a 60-day community engagement and consider legislative changes to stymie the supply of drugs, prevention and treatment pathways for those affected, and increase community education on the dangers. The task force will also undertake a number of community engagements, both in the regional and metro areas, to give local community members who are grappling with the effects of ice the opportunity to be part of the solution.

The knowledge and experience of the experts within the task force, combined with community input, will result in a response that will see us begin to make headway in countering this epidemic. The task force will present their response to the Premier by the beginning of May to be considered ahead of the state budget.

#### *Parliamentary Procedure*

#### **ANSWERS TABLED**

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

#### *Question Time*

#### **RENEWABLE ENERGY**

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:32):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the Minister for Climate Change a question about South Australia's transition to renewable energy.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** Mr Lew Owens, in his capacity as Chairman of the Essential Services Commission of South Australia, gave evidence to the Environment, Resources and Development Committee's wind farm inquiry on 24 November 2003. I quote directly from Mr Owens' statement:

...as you start to increase the quantity of wind power coming into that system, up to 100 megawatts, 200 megawatts, or whatever, you start to cause this instability in the rest of the system where, for example, if we had 1,000 megawatts of wind energy coming in, most base load stations in South Australia would be required to shut down, and to then start them up again is a 10-hour operation. There becomes a physical limit to just how much of this wind energy, which can be at full capacity one hour and down to zero the next hour, you can actually fit into the system.

Some 14 years ago the Chairman of the Essential Services Commission gave an unequivocal and express warning to a parliamentary committee, no less, about the instability excess wind power would cause to our electrical system.

I point out that at that time the members of that committee were myself, and a couple of other members, but, more importantly, the Hon. Gail Gago—who went on to be the third most senior person

in the government, leader of the government in the council, and a senior member of the Labor cabinet table—and also Mr Tom Koutsantonis MP, member for West Torrens, who has gone on to have a distinguished career as Treasurer and energy minister, sitting some 10 years around the cabinet table. My questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister agree with the statement made by the former chairman of the Essential Services Commission?

2. As the minister considers Mr Owens' warning, can the minister explain why the government has repeatedly ignored independent expert advice about the instability that would be caused by its aggressive pursuit of wind energy?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:34):** I thank the honourable member for his most important question and for welcoming all members back to parliament this year. The first cab off the rank and the Liberals go back to 2003, back to a report from 2003. Then, they follow up with a charge to me of ignoring independent expert advice. Well, goodness gracious, 'independent expert advice'!

Let me quote from an article from *The Age*, under the heading 'PM told wind not to blame for blackout'. The article states:

Turnbull government statements blaming last year's South Australian blackout on its high renewable energy target ignored confidential Public Service advice stating it was not the cause.

The Hon. Mr Ridgway wants to talk about people ignoring expert advice: he has no further to look than his own Prime Minister, who ignored his own Public Service advice, contradicting everything the Prime Minister and his government ministers came out and said in subsequent days—his own Public Service expert advice ignored. Mr Mark Kenny, the author of *The Age* article, goes on:

With a febrile debate over renewable energy versus coal raging in Canberra, emails obtained under freedom of information laws are set to undermine the Coalition's energy messaging and shatter confidence in its call for investment certainty through sober debate and bipartisan policy solutions.

How can you believe that this government at a federal level would even consider bipartisan and sober debate when they ignore the expert advice of their own public servants?

The Hon. Mr Ridgway comes in here, dredging back to reports from 2003, trying to look for a hook, and all he has done is put his own Prime Minister on the hook for ignoring his own government Public Service advice about the cause of blackouts. So, let's not fool ourselves: not one power outage in South Australia has been caused by renewables.

Claims by the federal government and Steven Marshall, the Leader of the Opposition, the member for Dunstan in the other place, to the contrary are all false. The 28 September statewide blackout resulted from tornadoes ripping 23 transmission towers out of the ground. A picture paints a thousand words: you only have to look at that photograph to understand what was the cause of that blackout.

Here we have the Hon. David Ridgway, a man who has a pathological hatred of wind energy, dredging back to 2003, an old report, when he only has to go back to this month to see the reports of his own Prime Minister, his own federal government, totally ignoring advice that contradicted claims they were making in the public realm.

This is a man who has gone out of his way—the Prime Minister I am talking about here—to repudiate his previous positions on renewable energy. This is a man, the Prime Minister for Sydney Harbour mansions, who has instead said one thing to the Australian community right now, which is a complete reversal of his position of a few years ago when he was opposition leader, yet I am advised by another article in the *Australian Financial Review* that he has himself gone off and installed intermittent renewable energy, with battery backup, on his Point Piper pile.

So, one message for the community: one message that coal is good, that we are going back to the 1850s, but not for me as Prime Minister, I am going to invest in renewables myself because I still secretly believe what I fervently believed years ago when I was opposition leader but what I am

not allowed to say anymore because the right wing of the Liberal Party and the National Party won't let me say it.

Now we have, here in South Australia, the Leader of the Opposition, Mr Steven Marshall, member for Dunstan, having just said that he is going to abdicate all responsibility, should he be elected premier, and give it to Malcolm Turnbull and the federal government to set renewable energy targets. At the behest of the Liberal Party right wing, and the National Party that wags their tail, we have Steven Marshall, Leader of the Opposition, member for Dunstan, lining himself up with the climate change denying Barnaby Joyce, Deputy Prime Minister, as he fails to stand up for South Australia.

He is going to hand over all his powers, should he ever be elected as premier, to the federal government and say, 'Please, federal government, look after us; just in exactly the same way you looked after us on Holden; just in exactly the same way you looked after us when you were trying to sell us down the river on our Murray-Darling negotiations; just as you were going to sell us down the river in allocating the submarine build to Japanese off-the-shelf products.' That is what Steven Marshall was saying. That is his plan for South Australia: abdicate all responsibility of leadership, hand it up to the federal government and wash his hands of it like Pontius Pilate and say, 'It wasn't my fault; the Prime Minister did it.'

We see him coming out again this week with mixed messages, just like Malcolm Turnbull. Mixed messages about leaving nuclear on the table for energy generation; mixed messages about jettisoning the RET. Goodness gracious, he takes a phone call from Dan van Holst Pellekaan, the member for Stuart, who says, 'You can't take that position. I'll lose my seat up there in Port Augusta.' Then Mr Marshall again comes out and says, 'Well, okay, except for Solar Thermal at Port Augusta. Other than that, other renewables are off the table.'

This is an opposition that is spinning out of control. They are running around looking for an idea and trying to deal themselves into the game. All they can come up with is to say to the Prime Minister, 'Please take this problem away from us.' They do not deserve even the faintest consideration for leadership of this state.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY (Leader of the Opposition) (14:40):** I have a supplementary question. Can the minister actually address the question? It was about instability, not blackouts, and there was no mention of the federal government. The question was about your government, and ministers Gago and Koutsantonis sitting at the cabinet table after they were given a warning by an independent expert about instability, not blackouts.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:41):** The only instability we are seeing is in the Liberal Party at the moment. Cory Bernardi walking away from them and saying he is washing his hands of the Liberal Party, particularly in South Australia, because he can't have his common-sense views of the world accepted by his Liberal colleagues.

Again, members over there who have had all this time to go away and think up very important questions for the future of our state hark back to a 2003 report, trying to get the government on the hook. They ignore completely the evidence that has been blasted all over the national media about the federal Liberal government ignoring their own advice and creating a lie out there in the community—

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I have a point of order, Mr President. The minister is repeating himself with information that is not relevant to the question. I asked about instability warnings not about blackouts.

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Mr President, I went exactly to the point of instability—instability in the Liberal Party—and ignoring expert advice in the Liberal Party at the federal level. They have gone back to a 2003 report trying to get themselves back into the game. It is absolutely embarrassing for them, but we understand that they have absolutely no idea. What is their position: let's ban gas in

South Australia, let's ban gas in the South-East even though we have no transition plan whatsoever on how we get ourselves—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! This is question time, it is not a debate. Minister.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** The Liberal opposition has had more positions on energy, renewable energy and nuclear energy, coal-fired power stations and gas fracking than in the very popular—

**The Hon. T.A. Franks:** The *Kama Sutra*.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** That's right, that was what I was trying to clutch for. Thank you to the Hon. Tammy Franks, who advises me the appropriate volume I'm trying to refer to is the *Kama Sutra*. They have no plans whatsoever and yet they come out here with a different position every single day because they realise that the position they took yesterday is going to land them in the soup, somewhere. And here we have the Leader of the Opposition in this place harking back to a 2003 report.

The world has moved on. We can refer to all the evidence—totally ignored by the opposition—about the cost of coal and yet we have the Liberals at the national level and now the state Liberals being coerced into giving away any powers they might have (should they ever be elected in this state) on renewable energy. They are giving it up to the federal government, which now says that coal is good for us and it is going to be a long-term part of our energy solution, when the world knows exactly it is not.

'Why coal won't wash', an article in the *Financial Review*, stated:

Something rare happened this week: Federal ministers came bearing gifts of taxpayers' money to build 'clean coal' power plants and the intended beneficiaries—the power companies—gave them the bum's rush.

Matthew Warren, head of the Australian Energy Council, said this week even today's high efficiency, low emissions...coal plants are 'uninvestible' and none of his members—the largest power generators in the land—plans to build one.

Yet the Liberals are still hanging their hats and their hopes on coal for the future. They are not the future, they are the past, and that is why the South Australian community will never look to them for leadership when they abdicate their responsibility to the federal government.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The Hon. Ms Lensink.

#### ENERGY MARKET

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:45):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before directing a question to the Minister for Climate Change on the subject of South Australia's energy market.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Last week, the Premier made the breathtaking announcement that his government would 'intervene dramatically in the South Australian energy market' due to the continuous failure of his government on energy security. However—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** The members doth protest when I hit a nerve—clearly.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! Sit down for a second. The Hon. Ms Lensink has the right to expect to be able to ask a question without any interruption.

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** Except when I hit a nerve.

*The Hon. G.E. Gago interjecting:*

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK:** I haven't asked the question yet, but I understand Ms Gago is deeply anticipating what I might ask. I will continue. However, the breathtaking announcement of the

Premier was to just give an invitation to 'watch this space'. He also stated that a price on carbon, and again I quote, 'would completely change the market here, and would have avoided the events of the night,' which also follows his December 2016 call for a state-led emissions trading scheme, which is something the minister himself has openly advocated. My question for the minister is: is it still the government's position that it supports a state-led ETS?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:46):** Again, I thank the Hon. Michelle Lensink for at least coming into this place with a sensible question about a policy issue for a change and not going back to 2003, and giving me the—

*An honourable member interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** It may be a confused question, but it gives me the opportunity to talk about the issues and to educate the opposition a little bit on a very complicated policy area. It also gives me the opportunity to remind the chamber of what the state government has done so far. The government has announced—

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** The government has announced a range of policies to increase electricity supply and competition in the market, which is alluding to the question that the Hon. Michelle Lensink asked about the energy market. These include a 10-year contract for a procurement of government supply and to incentivise the entry of a new generator or a new competition into the market—sadly lacking—and we are also using a \$24 million grant—

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** You can hark back to the past, but you're in very dangerous territory, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, when you do that with the chap behind you right now responsible for the privatisation of the electricity system.

*The Hon. D.W. Ridgway interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** The man who privatised ETSA in South Australia back in the 1990s is sitting right behind you as, still, shadow treasurer of your party. How you haven't changed your spots. You haven't changed your spots one iota. You are the party of privatisation and you are responsible, and the man responsible is right behind you, smiling right now, smirking at his achievements—smirking at his achievements, and he is right behind you, the Hon. Mr Ridgway, and nothing has changed in the Liberal Party in South Australia.

As I said, we are also using a \$24 million grant program to partner with gas companies to extract more gas and supply it to local generators in order to put downward pressure on electricity prices. We have also announced a \$31 million program to invest in energy-saving technology for South Australian businesses. The government, through both the energy and the leaders' COAG, has for more than 12 months now been advocating for an emissions intensity scheme across the nation.

We have advocated consistently for a national approach; a rational, national approach argued for by the players in the energy market; a market-based approach, which is what an emissions intensity scheme would be. It is an industry-based scheme where heavy emitters buy credits off cleaner generators to offset their carbon emissions. It's a rational market-based approach. This will have the effect of lowering emissions while incentivising investment in new, cleaner and reliable generation to replace the coal-fired generation that is exiting the market.

*The Hon. R.I. Lucas interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** The Hon. Mr Lucas, sotto voce, across the chamber says, 'A new carbon tax.' It's not a tax. It's a trading system among generators. No government will be collecting a single dollar in revenue through this process, so how can you even portray it as that? The Liberals are not very strong on facts; they just want to talk about the 'vibe'. They don't deal with policy issues very well on that side of the chamber. In fact, I am advised that former prime minister Tony Abbott's direct action plan also contemplates the introduction of an EIS.



The government is also, as the Hon. Michelle Lensink alluded to, working on a package of dramatic interventions—without her dramatic persona put into it in the asking of the question—an electricity market designed to take back control of the state's power supply; to take back control for the people of South Australia the state's power supply, which the Liberal Party in this state privatised; trying to unpick the damage caused by the Hon. Mr Lucas and his Liberal Party of the 1990s through their privatisation of the electricity system in South Australia.

As I said before, the Liberals have nowhere to go on this. They have nowhere to hide. They are the culprits involved in how they privatised the system. They are the ones—the Hon. Mr Lucas particularly—who ditched the interconnector into New South Wales to try to drive a higher price for his privatisation. He is responsible for that; his government is responsible for that, and that is the system we have inherited.

I want to refer again to some of the local commentary. This one is taken from InDaily, in terms of the Liberal Party's announcement and plans. It begins:

The State Government, the Lord Mayor and environment groups—

No surprise there, I suppose—

have lined up to attack the Opposition's proposal to scrap South Australia's renewable energy target.

Opposition Leader Steven Marshall says he would move to scrap the state's renewable energy target (RET) in favour of relying on the national RET—

which was written down, of course, by the federal government not that long ago—

set by the Federal Government, if the Liberal Party wins next year's state election. Opposition leaders in Victoria and Queensland have made the same promise for their states.

Clearly, you can envision the phone call coming out of the PM's office to the state opposition leader, saying, 'Fall into line; fall into line with the federal Liberal Party's proposition here.' The article goes on to say:

South Australia's target—50 per cent of renewable energy by 2025—is 'aspirational' and not backed by direct funding.

What it is backed by is commonwealth government funding. The article continues:

By contrast, the national RET—23.5 per cent...is backed by federal funding for the most efficient renewable energy generators.

South Australia currently gets about 40 per cent of its power from renewables.

It goes on to quote a number of players, attacking the Liberals' short-sightedness in terms of energy policy. They don't have any energy policy, except to abdicate it to the commonwealth government. That's their plan; they are telling South Australians, 'If you elect us to government next March, in 2018, don't worry about energy. We're not going to have a policy. We're going to give it over to the federal government, and you know you can trust them.'

Just as you can trust them on Holden's, just as you can trust them on submarines being brought from Japan, until we stood up and fought for them. Just like you know they were going to sell us down the river for the old rusty Mazda on the River Murray deal, until we stood up and fought for South Australia's interests. That's what the Liberal Party has to offer: outsourcing leadership to Canberra. Well, we in South Australia won't stand for it. We will fight for South Australians' interests, and you will see what we come forward with very shortly.

## ENERGY MARKET

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (14:53):** Supplementary: is it still the government's position to support a state-led ETS?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:53):** I have already comprehensively answered that. I said we have consistently advocated for a national system as the most rational, the most efficient way of driving cleaner energy production in this country, and yet it falls on the deaf ears of a federal government which just wants to sell us more coal.

Why are they so in bed with coal interests? Where are their investments as a Liberal Party and a National Party? In the coal industry. Make them bring a lump of coal into parliament and try to persuade people that that is the future. I have a message for the Liberals and they will get this message next March: the people of South Australia don't support that. They know that renewables are the only way we will get through our electricity crisis in this state, and they know as well that if you elect a Marshall Liberal government next election they will have no policy on energy, because they will outsource it to the federal Liberal-National Coalition.

### ENERGY MARKET

**The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (14:54):** Supplementary: can the minister advise the chamber if the federal government's Chief Scientist, in a recent report to the federal government, supported an emissions trading scheme as the most efficient mechanism to actually address—

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:54):** It comes as no surprise that the state government takes its advice from the experts. It is not something in regard to a national emissions reduction program or an EIS that we actually come up with these ideas on our own. We actually go and talk to the experts in the industry and to our scientists, those like the Chief Scientist, who are in a position to give us governments advice.

Unsurprisingly, when we get that advice from experts, particularly when it matches up to the advice we are getting from industry as well, then we look at it and say, 'Yes, that seems pretty reasonable,' and we accept it. A market-based approach to an emissions intensity scheme is exactly what the industry, the science and our energy experts are telling us we need to have a rational market penetration of driving cleaner energy into the system.

It wasn't all that long ago that we had a federal government under prime minister Abbott who said he was going to axe the carbon tax and drive down electricity prices. How did that go for us? The Liberal government promised us, as long as the day is long, that they would be bringing down the price of electricity by axing the carbon tax, and it didn't work, again because they ignore their advice from experts.

I only have to hark back to the difference between this government, which takes on board advice from our experts, including the Chief Scientist, and that of the federal government. 'Revealed: government ignored advice on cause of blackouts'. This is the difference—

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** Here we go; we have heard this three times already.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** And you will hear it again. This is the difference between us: we take expert advice from scientists and energy market players, and we form our policies on the basis of good advice. On the other hand, you have the Turnbull federal government getting good advice from their own public servants and saying, 'No, take that away from me. I don't want to hear that good advice. We have already decided on our political objectives and facts are only getting in the way.' That's what the Liberals do, that's how they make policy, but it's not how we do it on this side.

### ENERGY MARKET

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (14:56):** Supplementary: is it true that the federal minister for Port Adelaide, Mr Mark Butler—is his statement true?

*Members interjecting:*

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** The federal member for Port Adelaide.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO:** Is his claim true that the highest price rises for electricity over the past decade occurred in the three states with the highest reliance on coal power and the lowest on renewables: New South Wales, Queensland and Victoria?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (14:57):** It is true—

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order! The minister has the floor.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** It is true, I think, that Mark Butler has received that advice. I have certainly seen that advice. I don't want to play politics with energy markets; that's something that the Liberal Party does in this state. That's what the Liberal Party does: they ignore the facts, they ignore the market, they ignore the experts, they set out their own political objectives and then cherry-pick what they can find to support their very flimsy articles or their positions. How flimsy is it? They go back to a 2003 report. That's how flimsy their policy position is: they have to go back to a 2003 report to cherry-pick something they think will support an argument, whereas the rest of Australia stands with us. We want rational, expert advice to be put in place to drive a national energy market.

We have the electricity generators in this country, for goodness sake, saying, 'We need a national energy policy. Please, Prime Minister, give us a consistent national energy policy.' The Australian Energy Council represents electricity generators. Its chief executive, Mr Matthew Warren, told InDaily:

...Australia's electricity sector needed billions of dollars of new investment—and that required nationally co-ordinated energy and climate policy.

'We operate in a national electricity market which benefits from a national approach to energy, he said.

'We think energy policy is most efficiently and effectively delivered at the national level, with the co-ordinated support and input of state and federal governments.

'State-based targets may be in part borne out of frustration at a lack of progress at the national level.'

This is the electricity generators begging the federal government to try to work with us and understanding why the states have frustration at the national government not involving itself in sorting out what is a national problem. And the article continues:

He added that the energy industry 'has always advocated for a market-based policy that targets emissions reduction, rather than backing any technology'.

What more can I say? This state government stands with our energy industry experts, our chief scientists, understanding that a market-based mechanism on emissions intensity will be the best, cheapest and most effective way of transitioning us to a clean, green electricity system which, by the way, is exactly what the federal government has signed us up to by signing the COP21 accords in December in Paris.

The federal government has set the policy objectives and has not given us any levers to actually get there. No wonder they have been creating this black hole in energy policy, which the states have been filling with the only way to get to Paris. The only way the federal government were able to meet the objectives they have signed in an international covenant is to actually join the states and adopt our energy emissions intensity scheme and our green energy targets.

#### **RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGET**

**The Hon. J.S. LEE (15:00):** My question is directed to the Minister for Climate Change. Does the minister believe that the Labor government's pursuit of a 50 per cent target of intermittent renewable energy is more important than the security of affordable and reliable energy for every South Australian household?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:01):** This is a fantastic example of the Liberal opposition farming out questions to their backbench and not requiring them to listen to the answers that have already been given to questions because I have already addressed the issue. I have already addressed the issue of the state-based targets and I have to say that it is

incredible to me that we have the Liberal opposition in this state believing that you can't have a reliable energy system that delivers safe, secure energy products to customers at a cheap price without having a national buy-in from the federal government in what is a national grid.

It is a national grid, yet we don't have a buy-in from the federal government. All they've got is a lump of coal. The Hon. Jing Lee can go back and say to her constituency, 'Our plan is to give you a lump of coal. That's all we've got.' In regard to a national grid, they say, 'Hands off the steering wheel,' as far as the Liberal opposition of South Australia is concerned because the Hon. Steven Marshall is going to be giving up any powers he has in setting state-based targets to the federal Liberal government, which has no interest in South Australia at any level whatsoever.

### RENEWABLE ENERGY INITIATIVES

**The Hon. G.E. GAGO (15:02):** My question is to the Minister for Climate Change. Will the minister inform the chamber about how helping to reduce emissions is helping to create jobs and new economic opportunities in South Australia?

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change) (15:02):** What a fantastic question from a fantastic member. This is the issue that the Liberals don't seem to understand, or if they do understand it, they take the Malcolm Turnbull approach of, 'Get that fact away from me because it is upsetting my position.' It is very timely because I have spoken in this place previously about the incredible opportunities that arise in terms of the global transition to a low-carbon economy and the opportunities it presents for our state.

As of December 2016, I am advised that we have seen an incredible \$7.1 billion invested in renewable energy projects in our state. They've gone quiet now, Mr President, because the facts are scaring them. \$7.1 billion has been invested in renewable energy projects locally in South Australia. Of course, as I said before, more than 40 per cent—that is, some \$3 billion worth of this investment—has been put into our regions because that is where a lot of the programs are installed. This means more jobs and greater economic opportunities right across our state, and our government is committed to provide certainty for business that requires that certainty for long-term investment because there is one thing we know business needs if they are to invest, and that is that certainty about long-term investment.

*The Hon. T.J. Stephens interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** And we've got the Hon. Terry Stephens over there doing his Abbott and Costello act—

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** Make sure you get my name right, because you're a disgrace.

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** —laughing out loud.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** Laughing at you, you joke.

**The PRESIDENT:** Go on.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** Well, he's a joke. Thank you. I've made my point.

**The PRESIDENT:** Have you finished?

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** I could keep going.

**The PRESIDENT:** Well, if you want to, if you want to waste question time.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** How do you stand up in this place and be proud of your state government's record?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** You won't know.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** You are appalling.

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** You won't be there.

**The Hon. T.J. Stephens:** You are appalling, and how proud are you? You've taken us to the bottom of the pile.

**The Hon. J.S.L. Dawkins:** Take charge, Mr President, get on with it.

**The PRESIDENT:** You've already used up two of your questions for today, so two of your questions will go to the crossbench. Minister, finish your answer.

*Members interjecting:*

**The PRESIDENT:** Order!

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** This side of the chamber, the Labor government at present, understands what business needs, not the Liberal opposition. If business relied on the Liberal opposition, they would be in a very sad state here. They need to know that the money they invest in these significant programs, which develop local jobs for South Australians, won't be undermined by arbitrary decisions by governments who seek to change policy just to score political points.

Woe betide any wind investor in South Australia investing in wind energy projects if the Hon. David Ridgway ever succeeds to the Treasury benches, because he has a pathological hatred of wind energy. The sovereign risk that that represents to our industries—the Hon. David Ridgway represents a massive sovereign risk to anyone who wants to invest billions of dollars into the state, and business knows about it. They are very scared about what might happen if the Liberal Party is ever elected to the Treasury benches in this place.

This was also highlighted, just yesterday, in a letter published by a group of 18 prominent Australian organisations, urging broad cross-party support for energy market reform. The letter stated:

The next stage of the Finkel Review should be an opportunity to explore these possibilities and develop a comprehensive and integrated suite of reforms. Policy should be implemented promptly with broad based political support.

The letter was co-signed by the Australian Aluminium Council, the Australian Conservation Foundation, the Australian Council of Social Services, the Australian Council of Trade Unions, the Australian Energy Council, the Australian Industry Group, the Australian Steel Institute, the Business Council of Australia, Cement Industry Federation, Chemistry in Australia, Clean Energy Council, Energy Efficiency Council, Energy Networks Australia, Energy Users Association of Australia, the Investor Group on Climate Change, St Vincent de Paul Society National Council, The Climate Institute and WWF Australia. This is a cross-section, if there ever was one, of Australian communities, businesses and NGOs all in strong agreement.

So, it was no surprise to read the outrage that was expressed from local government and business and environment groups when Steven Marshall, the Leader of the Opposition and member for Dunstan, announced that the state Liberals would abolish our Renewable Energy Target—50 per cent of supply by 2025—that they would undermine a \$7.1 billion and growing sector just to play political football. Let's just think about what this could mean for South Australians.

In 2015, \$329 billion was invested globally in renewable energy. That is a staggering figure. In 2015, \$329 billion was invested globally in renewable energy—a 431 per cent increase since 2005, I am advised. In China alone, renewable energy investment increased by 157 per cent in 2010 to just over \$100 billion in 2015.

**The Hon. R.I. Lucas:** And how much coal have they got?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** Those opposite, through both their words and their actions—the Hon. Mr Lucas is now saying, 'And how much coal have they got?' Their only answer over there is coal, that's all they have. Now those opposite are saying they don't care about these investment opportunities for South Australians; they don't think South Australia should continue to share in the

jobs of the global transition to renewable and sustainable energy. It is pretty hard to fathom that someone who believes they are the alternative premier can't stand up for billions worth of jobs and investment. That is what we are faced with: Steven Marshall, Leader of the Opposition, member for Dunstan, can't stand up and say, 'I want to attract those billions of dollars that are out there for investment for jobs and industry in South Australia.' He can't do it, because the Liberal Party right wing won't let him.

What do South Australians think about the Liberal Party's attempts to abandon renewable energy? The Adelaide City Council Lord Mayor, Martin Haese, said that it would be a crying shame if we were to stop that flow of investment or stop South Australia from getting its fair share. Mr Martin Haese added that South Australians deserve grid stability and that a diversity of energy sources and substantial investment in large-scale solar battery storage technology will counter the intermittent nature of wind and solar power. Even the Australian Energy Council said:

State-based targets may be...borne out of a frustration at the lack of progress at a national level.

Repower Port Augusta campaigner, Mr Dan Spencer, highlighted the severe drop in investment when the Abbott government walked away from the Renewable Energy Target. Spencer said:

We saw investment basically collapse when the Abbott Government announced the review of the [national] renewable energy target. We're only now...really seeing that pick up again.

Clean Energy Council Chief Executive, Mr Kane Thornton has said that without the state's RET:

...whenever we are going to have future investment in energy in Australia it is going to be in renewable energy.

It is as simple as this, the rest of the world is investing in renewable energy. We can either continue with our RET and harness the billions of dollars of the global investment that is waiting to find a home, or we can abolish the RET, which Steven Marshall, the member for Dunstan, the Liberal opposition leader, has said he wants to do, and watch the investment, that hard fought investment in our state, in our power infrastructure, fall away and flow somewhere else in the world, just like it did when prime minister Abbott and then Mr Turnbull threw the national target into doubt and created uncertainty for business who wanted to invest in this country.

The Australian Conservation Council has said that the South Australian opposition has 'shown that they're not ready to guide the state into the future.' That is polite, Mr President. I couldn't agree more, but I would have put it a little bit more firmly. Business couldn't agree more, but they would probably put it a bit more firmly when they talk to you privately, and the South Australian community couldn't agree more. This is just another example of why Steven Marshall, the member for Dunstan, the Leader of the Opposition, is not fit to lead this state. He fails to stand up for our state at every opportunity that is put in front of him. He has backed the big polluters in the coal lobby.

The South Australian Liberal Party has completely abrogated any sense of leadership and they are trying to outsource it to the federal government so they can avoid any particular policy decisions that might cause them some grief. This is the same federal government that has shown time and time again that it doesn't have our interests in South Australia at heart, the same federal government that tried to tear up the Murray Darling Basin Plan and is only now back on track because the Premier of this state fought, once again, to take it out of the hands of Barnaby Joyce and put it into COAG so the Prime Minister can directly involve himself in it. This is the same federal government—

**The Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS:** Point of order, sir: we have had an eight minute answer to a Dorothy Dixier question and we haven't yet got to a crossbench question. I ask you to draw the minister to a conclusion.

**The PRESIDENT:** Minister, can you come to a conclusion, very quickly?

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER:** I can indeed, Mr President, I have six paragraphs left. This is the same government that saw an almost 90 per cent fall in investment in renewable energy when they tried to remove the federal RET. This is the same government that it now turns out ignored expert advice that wind was not to blame for the September 28 blackout last year. Instead of listening to the experts and supporting South Australian jobs and investment, they jumped on the anti-renewable

bandwagon with great abandon. Mr Cory Bernardi, Pauline Hanson, Malcolm Turnbull and now Steven Marshall are all jumping up and down blaming renewable energy. What a fantastic team.

Doesn't that inspire you in terms of their leadership of the state? We need a government that can manage this imperfect electricity system and get a better outcome for South Australians. I am proud of what we've done for this state but there is much more that we want to do to make sure that we get a reliable electricity system for our state, a cheap electricity system for our state, a clean electricity system for our state, and we are prepared to help the federal government meet their international commitments, if it requires us keeping our RET. The state Liberals have clearly said that is out the window and they're not interested in it, and that will be a point of demarcation in 12 months' time.

### **BLACKOUT EMERGENCY PROCEDURES**

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:12):** I seek leave to make an explanation before asking questions of the Minister for Emergency Services regarding emergency procedures during blackouts in South Australia.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT:** As members of this chamber are acutely aware, there have been a number of power failures and blackouts throughout South Australia in the past four months. In some households, streets and suburbs it has taken up to five or more days to restore power. I raise this issue because there are three main issues that many of my constituents face surrounding the need for power to stay alive and functioning.

The first is power for life sustaining equipment. For example, people might be on a ventilator and may die without power if the backup battery fails or goes flat. The second is a need for power to operate disability and health related equipment. For example a person may use an electric bed or an electric hoist to get on and off the toilet and for other personal care or need to recharge an electric wheelchair.

Finally, there is a need for electricity to maintain the environment at a specific temperature to prevent health from getting worse or prevent hospitalisation. On 6 December I wrote to the Premier, and copied in the emergency services minister, regarding the events of 28 September and the impact on the disability community in particular, the concerns the Dignity Party has as a consequence of procedures that did not happen on the evening. On 14 December, the Premier acknowledged my letter, but as yet no response to my questions has been received. So, my questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister understand the specific needs of people with disability and health conditions during power failures and what is he doing to meet them as a particular priority?
2. Who is responsible for the Vulnerable Persons Register and how does a person get on this register so that supports may be put in place during a blackout?
3. What processes have been put in place so that there will be an Auslan interpreter and captions present at all relevant media conferences during emergency situations, including where there are traffic jams, limited mobile phone reception and other exceptional circumstances as we saw in the events of 28 September?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:14):** I thank the Hon. Ms Vincent for her questions, and let me acknowledge her ongoing advocacy for an important constituency and, I think, one that is always worthy of attention, particularly in light of any significant event, including like the one that occurred on 28 September last year.

Let me start at a higher level and refer to the fact that, post the 28 September event last year, the government did initiate the Burns review. The purpose of the Burns review was fundamentally to do an analysis of the way that emergency services conducted themselves generally on the front line, but also at a strategic level, in handling all the complex responses that are necessary whenever you have a significant weather event like the one that occurred on 28 September. The Hon. Ms Vincent has rightly pointed out that vulnerable members of our community are particularly at risk whenever

we have an event of that nature. It might not just be like the one that occurred on 28 September, but also in instances, for example, like bushfire.

The Burns review came back with 62 recommendations and the government is now thoroughly going through the process of responding to each of those 62 recommendations. I hope that in due course the government will be able to announce its response to those recommendations. I have been clear from the outset that a number of those recommendations do necessitate a budgetary response, and that will be dealt with through the framework within the state budget this year.

In terms of some of the specific questions that the Hon. Ms Vincent asked, the second question is around who is responsible for the Vulnerable Persons Register. I am happy to take that on notice. I will seek advice from the Minister for Disabilities in relation to that particular question, because I suspect that it is her responsibility. Nevertheless, I will take that on notice and get information back to her.

Regarding the Auslan interpreter, I know this is a subject that is of understandable concern to the Hon. Ms Vincent, and one I have spoken to a number of times in this chamber. On 25 June last year, a meeting of the State Emergency Management Committee discussed an amendment to the State Emergency Management Plan for the use of Auslan interpreters for declared emergencies, and it was endorsed.

The specific provision is 7.8, and it states that in addition to other matters of disseminating public information and warnings, the control agency is responsible to ensure that all live televised warnings, or major public information press conferences (e.g. attended by the Premier, state coordinator and/or the state controller), issues for declared emergencies are supported with the use of an accredited Auslan interpreter. In the event that securing an accredited Auslan interpreter would cause critical delay in the broadcasting of an urgent message to the community, the control agency will determine if the message should be broadcast without that support.

The government has established processes in place to provide contractual arrangements for the provision of Auslan translation services for emergency incidents relevant to the CFS, the SES and, of course, the MFS. While the agreed trigger for the use of Auslan interpreters is when a declaration is made by the control agency, emergency services organisers may also use them proactively if they deem it appropriate to do so. Of course, there have been examples of that taking place last year, being one of the busiest years on record, particularly for our State Emergency Services.

This government remains committed, as it reasonably should be—and I hope all parties would be supportive of this—to making sure that vulnerable people get access to the information they need in a timely way. As always, if there is room for improvement with a system, or if the Hon. Ms Vincent or a member of her constituency or anyone from the community thinks there is a failing, then, of course, I am happy to hear what those are and contemplate a response in due course. As it stands, I think the arrangements are appropriate and we are adhering to them.

#### **BLACKOUT EMERGENCY PROCEDURES**

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:19):** I have a couple of supplementary questions: first, if the Vulnerable Persons Register is the responsibility of the Minister for Disabilities in the other place, can it still cover people who may not have disabilities but may be susceptible for other reasons, such as age or health conditions?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:20):** As I articulated earlier, I am more than happy to take that question on notice. If it is not the Minister for Disabilities' responsibility, I am more than happy to get information back. I am happy to take that on notice and get the relevant information to the Hon. Ms Vincent.

#### **BLACKOUT EMERGENCY PROCEDURES**

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (15:20):** And a further supplementary: what procedures does the government have in place regarding the distribution of captioned and Auslan interpreted videos during times when television may not be an option, for example, distributing videos via social media?



**The Hon. P. Malinauskas:** Sorry, just say that again?

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT:** What processes are in place for when an emergency is declared, an Auslan interpreter and captions may be required, or preferred, but television may not be an option because the power is out? Does the government have a procedure for distributing those videos via social media, for example?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:20):** The official messages regarding emergency services come through ABC radio—that is our official broadcaster when it comes to emergency services messages. We always encourage members of the community, during an emergency, to listen to ABC radio on a battery-powered radio, as that is the primary source of information, and of course that would continue to be able to operate during the course of a blackout.

Social media continues to be a tool that emergency services use, but when it comes to other technologies we are also very active in using technology, like apps. The Alert SA app is an official broadcaster and is available to all South Australians to be downloaded. Those people who have access to social media, for instance (presumably they also would have access to a mobile phone or the internet), would be best advised to use the Alert SA service because it provides real-time updates and messages and people who are impaired in a hearing context would be able to use that service, and we would actively encourage it.

#### PRODUCTIVITY COMMISSION REPORT

**The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:22):** My question is to the Minister for Police. Can the minister inform the council as to how the South Australian government ranked in the recent Productivity Commission's report on government services?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:22):** I thank the Hon. Mr Kandelaars for his important question, and I also acknowledge his outstanding service to this chamber for a number of years and thank him for an important question. It is an important question, because I think the professionalism of our police force is fundamental in maintaining community confidence in what is an incredibly important service to the South Australian community.

It gives me great pride to be able to report that South Australia Police were regarded as the most professional police force in the nation, with new figures showing that 91.2 per cent of South Australians believe that police perform professionally—three percentage points higher than the national average. These statistics come from none other than the Productivity Commission. The Productivity Commission, of course, is quite separate and distinct, at arm's length from the state government, so these are robust, independent statistics that I am sure everyone in this chamber would applaud.

Ninety point four per cent of people reported feeling safe home alone at night, placing South Australia second in the nation, up from fifth the year prior and above the national average of 88.5 per cent. Again, South Australia has the highest number of operational police officers of all states per capita at 333 per 100,000 people. This is an incredible statistic. We have the highest number of operational police per capita compared with every other state in the country.

That statistic stands alone, independently tested by the Productivity Commission, and speaks to the fact that this government is genuinely committed to making sure we have police officers working on the front line, keeping the community safe, and it is delivering a dividend. This is a proud Labor government investment. Of course, we know that we are not resting on our laurels, hence the government's investment in the Recruit 313 effort, which is very much on track to be achieved by the middle of next year.

A visible police presence is undoubtedly contributing to South Australians feeling safe, a metric that I hope will only continue to grow as we see the police academy full of cadets as we set to honour our commitment to having the extra 313 police officers protecting South Australians. I am sure that this is no coincidence, with Labor having a long and proud history of supporting our state's police. It is a record that stands in stark contrast to those opposite who were around many moons ago when they occupied the Treasury benches.

Not only have we seen an increase in the police budget in every year of the Labor government, not only have we seen an increase in the number of officers on the front line, but those officers will also be equipped with better than ever before tools and technology needed by a 21<sup>st</sup> century police force. The results in the Report on Government Services speak to the level of commitment and professionalism with which the police conduct themselves. The support and investment provided by this government over the past 15 years is paying dividends and the community can have confidence in their police keeping them safe.

The men and women of SAPOL should be proud and be acknowledged for their professionalism and all the fine work they do to make this community as safe as it is. I continue to be regularly impressed when I have the opportunity to talk to those men and women who serve our community, and I look forward to being part of a government that continues to back them up by putting our money where our mouth is, putting in resources to ensure that they are able to do the job as best they possibly can.

### DRUG-RELATED SENTENCING

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (15:26):** I seek leave to make a brief explanation before asking the minister representing the Attorney-General a question about drug-related crime sentencing in South Australia.

Leave granted.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD:** In October 2012, the police found an estimated \$10 million worth of illicit drugs on a property with connection to a particular defendant, including more than 7.5 kilograms of raw and processed methamphetamine. The police also seized more than \$100,000 in cash and, allegedly, a firearm as well. That was back in 2012, but recently that case was heard in the District Court and one of the defendants in this particular case, who actually pleaded guilty to manufacturing a large commercial quantity of a controlled drug, was given a suspended sentence. This is just one of many similar sentences handed out in similar circumstances.

As a result of this a recent *Sunday Mail* poll that no doubt members would have seen late last year, found that 61.7 per cent of respondents felt that judges were 'out of touch with community values'. Moreover, 74.2 per cent believed that penalties were 'too lenient'. Reflecting upon this particular case and others, my questions to the minister are:

1. Does the minister agree that cases which involve serious criminal offending, particularly with respect to manufacturing a large commercial quantity of illicit substances, but result in very light sentences—indeed, suspended sentences in many cases—would cause the public to lose confidence in the criminal justice system, and what impact does the minister believe that would have on police force morale?
2. Will the government consider introducing further legislative guidance to assist the judiciary in handing down sentences that are more in line with contemporary community expectations?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:28):** I thank the Hon. Mr Hood for his important questions. The Hon. Mr Hood referred to a number of statistics in his questions that speak to community confidence in our criminal justice system. As I outlined in the prior question, South Australians having confidence around their own community safety can manifest itself in a number of ways, including their confidence with our enforcement agencies, particularly SAPOL, but we would like to see that replicated in their confidence in the criminal justice system altogether. Of course, the courts are an incredibly important component of that.

The questions were put to me in my capacity representing the Attorney-General in this place so there are components that I will take on notice and seek a response from the Attorney-General, but if I may indulge I would like to attempt to address a few of the issues, in my capacity as police minister, which the Hon. Mr Hood has referred to. Mr Hood, through his question, referred to a particular case that speaks to a drug seizure of methamphetamine. That speaks entirely to the issue and the concern that the government and I have regarding methamphetamine generally—a drug that is otherwise known and referred to as ice.

It would be naive to suggest that we have a full understanding of the picture and the problem at hand in regard to ice within our community. As I have been getting around, talking to front-line men and women working in the South Australian police force, it has astounded me how regularly and how consistently they raise the issue of ice as being all pervasive in them undertaking their front-line duties to keep our communities safe.

Ice is a genuine problem. I reflect on a story or a message that was conveyed to me by a very experienced police officer who was talking to me recently in a regional community. He conveyed to me that he had seen a number of drug crises enter the public consciousness during his time in SAPOL. He said he has seen it with marijuana; he has seen it come and go with speed; he has seen it come and go with cocaine; and he saw an epidemic of heroin and ecstasy. Drugs along these lines have come and gone, capturing the public's attention, but he said that never before has he seen a drug have the same impact that ice seems to be having within the community.

There are a number of reasons for that, once I started quizzing him why he said that. The first one is ease of access. Ice, on all accounts, appears to be relatively cheap to be able to produce and its proliferation within the drug marketplace has resulted in its relatively low price, which means that it is easy to access for many Australian citizens. This is not just a South Australian-centric issue but it is an issue for many Australians. So, there is an issue with price.

Secondly, there is an issue in terms of its relative addictiveness. So many drugs we know are highly addictive, and that brings with it a whole range of social consequences. Ice, apparently, results in a high that is unlike other drugs and results in a level of addiction which is profound, and it can result in quick addiction for those people who attempt to start to use it. So, there is the relative accessibility and there is the relative addiction, but then of course there are also the relative consequences of ice, which are so much more severe than other drugs.

We know that ice has an impact that results in extremely violent behaviour, with people becoming completely psychotic who might otherwise not react that way to another drug. So, this is an issue that we take incredibly seriously, hence my and the Premier's announcement earlier today that an ice task force is being convened. The government looks forward to bringing back a response as quickly as possible from that ice task force, with readily implementable measures, so that we can do as much as we can as quickly as we can with the levers that are available to a state government.

#### **DRUG-RELATED SENTENCING**

**The Hon. T.J. STEPHENS (15:33):** Supplementary question: minister, are you convinced that we are putting enough police resources into tackling drugs? Are there areas of policing that we could be directing towards the fight against drugs?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:33):** I thank the Hon. Terry Stephens for his question. Yes, I am satisfied that SAPOL are throwing a lot of resources at this issue. Obviously, I have a regular conversation with the police commissioner regarding a range of matters. I am not at liberty to go into all of those discussions, but this has been a topic of discussion on a regular basis. I believe that SAPOL understand and are very conscious of the severity of the issue and are seeking to respond accordingly.

Of course, police resources is one of the issues that we will be looking at during this task force that we are putting together. If there is ever a list of items that SAPOL say they need or an investment on behalf of the state government that they think would make a big difference for them to be able to have an impact on the front line, then that of course is taken into consideration.

SAPOL regularly conduct a number of operations. Many of them get public attention; many of them do not for genuine operational reasons, but this is something that the police, I believe, are taking seriously. Of course, being one of the best and most well-resourced police forces in the country, they are enabled to be able to do that.

### ADELAIDE WOMEN'S PRISON

**The Hon. G.A. KANDELAARS (15:34):** My question is to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the council as to how women are learning new skills and assisting in the construction of new accommodation at the Adelaide Women's Prison?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:35):** Again, I would like to thank the Hon. Mr Kandelaars for another outstanding question. I always acknowledge his outstanding contribution in this place. Earlier this month, I got to see firsthand the great work of one partnership between DCS and its partners in private enterprise, where offenders at Adelaide Women's Prison (AWP) are gaining construction qualifications through a hands-on project to upgrade the prison's main accommodation block.

Ten prisoners are working alongside Mossop Construction and Interiors and TAFE SA to upgrade accommodation facilities which have been largely untouched since the 1960s. The initiative aims to increase the future employment prospects of offenders, with the training and qualifications providing potential pathways into a range of roles within the construction industry.

Thirty-two women applied to be on the program and went through a rigorous assessment, including that the women had to be residing at the living skills unit (a regime-managed location based on good behaviour), be long-term sentence prisoners or remand prisoners, have negative drug tests, have a history of good behaviour for the last six months, and agree to the rules and responsibilities set out in the employment contract.

Ten women were then selected to participate in the project, which provides them with the opportunity to earn a nationally accredited qualification in building and construction and a White Card, which enables them to work on construction sites once released. We know that employment is a critical factor to the successful rehabilitation of offenders. It provides dignity, financial independence and a life away from crime.

The government set an ambitious target to reduce reoffending by 10 per cent by 2020, and increasing employment opportunities for ex-offenders is key to achieving this target. Employment opportunities were also a key recommendation of the Strategic Policy Panel, so it is very pleasing to see the department and its partners develop such programs that are readily translatable to employment pathways outside of the prison gate.

I had the enormous privilege of visiting these women in conjunction with Mossop Construction. Of course, the women who are in this program, we should remember, have done something wrong, hence they are in custody, but the effort and the act of trying to rehabilitate themselves in a way that is part of the private sector I think speaks to exactly what it is that we are trying to achieve in Corrections, with men and women in our system who genuinely want to turn their lives around so that when they are released—which they almost always are—they can make a positive contribution to society, and that is very good thing.

#### *Bills*

### STATUTES AMENDMENT (PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE) BILL

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 December 2016.)

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (15:39):** As you would be aware, the government is keen to progress implementation of the Planning, Development and Infrastructure Act 2016, which secured passage through this chamber in April last year. The statutes amendment transitional bill before the house makes provision for transitional matters already on foot and authorisations already issued under the Development Act 1993.

During the course of its passage through the House of Assembly, Mr Griffiths, the member for Goyder, detailed, during the committee stage, a number of matters raised with him by the UDIA

and the LGA. As a result, the government committed to following up these matters between the houses before commencing debate on the bill. I can inform the house that the government intends to move a number of amendments during the committee stage that respond to the concerns raised.

In brief, the amendments cover three matters. Firstly, amendments will be moved in relation to the change of use provisions which ensure that any action in relation to cessation of an activity is only recognised from the commencement of section 4(4) of the new act. The same principle will apply in relation to the operation of section 4(4) and (5) in any area under clause 4(8) of the bill. The second set of amendments clarify that any approval or consent issued under earlier acts, such as the current Development Act 1993, is still operative. This ensures there will be no doubts raised as to their validity.

Finally, changes will be made to the provisions relating to the Planning and Design Code. These changes make absolutely certain previous commitments given that any consequential changes to a development plan as a result of the code's introduction will only be done after council and community consultation.

Bill read a second time.

*Committee Stage*

In committee.

Clause 1.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** This is a broad question and the minister and his adviser may not have an answer. My question relates to the interface between agriculture, rural towns and changes of land use. In explanation, I recently had, with the Hon. John Darley, some meetings with some landowners who have had a change of land use on three sides. They are now confronted with a set of circumstances where, after all this summer rain, they have a range of weeds that have come up on their properties, which are declared weeds, so it is an offence for the landowner not to control those weeds.

However, the change of land use on the three sides of their property means that it is also an offence to use the chemicals that are registered to control those weeds because they cannot use them in close proximity to either the other crops, which is grapes, or houses, which could be the other alternative. With that interface, these producers do not wish to break the law by not controlling a declared weed, but the only chemicals they can use to control those weeds are prohibited for use because of the change of land use.

I suspect that will become more and more prevalent with that interface between horticulture, agriculture, residential development and changes of land use. I accept that it is not an amendment or a part of the bill but, given we had a long debate on the bill before the honourable minister was in the parliament—or he might have just been here last year when we were talking about planning—its head has risen again, so I thought it was an appropriate time to ask the question when we have the specialist advisers here.

I might just add that, obviously, there are professional spraying contractors who have professional equipment to apply these chemicals. They are prohibited. They are not prepared to break the law or take the risk to spray these chemicals close to other crops or people's houses. It is a real issue that we, as a community, have to grapple with to come up with a solution, so that farmers can farm and people can change their land use and also so that people can live safely in these rural towns.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** Thanks for the chamber's indulgence as we get some specialist advice. Notwithstanding the fact that the concerns raised by the Hon. Mr Ridgway do not necessarily pertain to specific measures within the bill, my advice is that the EPA does have the capacity to issue exemptions under particular circumstances regarding chemical licensing arrangements. That may be something that could potentially address the concern you have raised for the relevant parties. Also, the issue can be considered through rezoning stages of development. There are opportunities for the issues you have raised, I have been advised, to be addressed, again notwithstanding that it does not speak to the specifics of this bill.

Clause passed.

Clause 2.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** People do not normally speak to clause 2, which is the commencement clause, but it is important because this is a transitional bill. I am interested in understanding from the minister how this transition is progressing. Part 3 in clause 10 of this bill effectively says that on 1 April—so, in a very short period of time—we are going to have our new planning commission.

Clause 2 says that this bill will become an act on proclamation, so it is a roundabout way of asking the question: how is recruitment going? Has the new planning commission membership been settled? Has there been an announcement? I might have missed it. Has there been an announcement of a chair? Is there any risk that the 1 April deadline which is, effectively, in clause 10, the transitional provisions, might not be met?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** I have been advised that the commission has not yet been appointed and, naturally, it cannot be appointed until such time as this legislation has passed. Nevertheless, the selection process has been initiated. The government hopes that that would be completed by 1 April this year, subject to the bill passing. My advice is that if the bill were to pass and the appointment had not occurred by 1 April, then there is the capacity for the Governor, through proclamation, to amend that date.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I thank the minister for his answer. I should say that these are genuine inquiries, rather than being based on any particular information I have. One of the things with transitional provisions is that you have a system that marches on and, at a point in time, we are going to slot in a new entity; namely, this new planning commission. They are going to take over the role of the Development Assessment Commission and the role of the Development Policy Advisory Committee, and I am not suggesting that there is any other way you could do it. If you are going to have a new entity working within a system that keeps rolling on, you have to slot them in at a point in time.

The question I have relates to the processes of those earlier bodies. The Development Assessment Commission and the Development Policy Advisory Committee, over a period of decades, have established practices, protocols and procedures so that people who are dealing with these bodies know how it works. They know what happens when you go to a DPAC hearing. It used to be Mr Mario Barone who would conduct the hearing. You knew what was going on.

What I am not certain about is: when the new planning commission takes over these roles, is there an expectation that it will adopt the practices and procedures of the bodies whose work it is taking over, or is there likely to be a clean slate with new practices and procedures? How will the community know what those new procedures are? Again, it is not a tricky question. I accept that, at some point, you have to slot in this new body, but I wonder how the transition might work in practice.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** The commissioner is required to appoint an assessment panel and delegate his assessment powers. The Development Assessment Commission or some of its members could be appointed to any such panel or panels. There could be more than one panel; for example, the equivalent of the Inner Metropolitan DAC (IMDAC), if the commission was so minded. Regarding your question about practices and procedures, my advice is that the commission will likely use existing procedures and practices as a basis of going forward, and that is likely to be published on the ePlanning portal.

Clause passed.

Clause 3 passed.

Clause 4.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** When I spoke to this bill at the second reading in December, I suggested for the anticipation of members that, whilst on that date I was prepared to outline the reasons for these amendments, I would speak at some length when we got into committee. I have actually changed my mind. I do not really need to speak at any great length because when I re-read my notes from 1 December I pretty much explained why I think these amendments are necessary.

In a nutshell, what we are talking about is, under this new system, who was responsible for state planning policies. For the original suite of policies that the government included in the bill, the responsibility rested with the planning commission. The minister then pointed out that the Hon. David Ridgway and myself included a few extra policies in the bill: the adaptive re-use policy and, in my case, the climate change policy. For whatever reason, we have made the minister responsible for those policies and the government has leapt on this inconsistency and decided that they should make all of the state planning policies the primary responsibility of the minister.

I said last year that that is one way to resolve the inconsistency. Of course, the other way is to honour the original spirit of this legislation, to honour the recommendation made by the Brian Hayes expert panel and to do as the Hon. David Ridgway urged us to do on dozens of occasions, and that is to pay attention to how the Western Australians did it. According to Mr Hayes and according to the Western Australian legislation, these state planning policies should be the responsibility of the planning commission.

The government has now reversed that and, despite the planning minister's exhortations over many months that he was relinquishing power, when push comes to shove he has not been able to do it. He has not been able to let go. So, in this legislation he has taken back to himself the power to control the state planning policies. As members will remember, these are high-level documents and all the subservient documents—the zoning rules, setbacks, building heights and all these things—will need to be subservient to these state planning policies. It is really a question of where authority should lie if we are to believe the government that this system is going to be more professional and less political.

Unfortunately, the government has got this wrong in wanting to put these powers back into the hands of the minister. That explains why I have opposed clause 4, clause 5 and clause 6. It also explains why, when we get to clause 6, I have inserted two more clauses, 6(a) and 6(b), basically to put the power back into the hands of the planning commission and away from the minister. The same applies to clauses 7 and 8. They all relate to this same issue that the planning commission should be responsible for overseeing these policies and not the minister.

To reinforce the point, when you look at the Hayes expert panel report entitled *The Planning System We Want*, and you look at the job that they assigned to the planning commission, their words are that the planning commission should oversight state planning policies and not the minister. They do not give the job to the minister, they give it to the planning commission. So, quite simply, my amendments restate the commission as the responsible body.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** This amendment is opposed. The original Planning Development and Infrastructure Bill tabled in parliament gave responsibility for a range matters, including state planning policies, to the Minister for Planning rather than the commission. These provisions were significantly amended during debate to instead refer to the commission.

State planning policies are of significant importance as expressions of policies belonging to the government of the day as they are ultimately accountable to the people. On reflection, the government considers that, under the Westminster system, the representative of the elected government of the day rather than an unelected body should be responsible for ensuring that such policies are prepared.

Placing responsibility with the minister for ensuring that the required state planning policies exist, rather than with the commission, would be consistent with adaptive re-use and climate change policies under sections 61 and 62, as amended in this chamber earlier this year. Under the government's proposed amendments, state planning policies and amendments relating to design quality, integrated planning, adaptive re-use and climate change, will all be drafted in the same manner by the commission, but at the minister's instigation and on his or her behalf.

The requirements set out under sections 73 and 74 of the principal act would still apply, such that the commission would draft and the minister take responsibility for the state planning policies and amendments, including consultation in accordance with the Community Engagement Charter, submission to parliamentary scrutiny and potential disallowance.

**The Hon. D.W. RIDGWAY:** I indicate that the opposition wrestled with this because, as the Hon. Mark Parnell said, it was something that worked very well in Western Australia and had served a range of governments over a longer-term planning horizon, and the reserving of land for development and public infrastructure. The opposition has wrestled with these amendments and we have decided that we will support the government rather than the Hon. Mark Parnell's amendments.

We all know there is an election early next year, and we are not sure of the result, but if the Liberal Party is fortunate enough to win an election, it is something we will look at to see how it works in operation, and if we think that the Independent Planning Commission is required, it will be nice to know that the Hon. Mark Parnell might be willing to support those amendments. I am not the shadow minister.

I indicate that we will not be supporting any of the Hon. Mark Parnell's amendments and we will be supporting all of the government amendments. We had some 14 days of debate here last year. This is another bill that the planning minister, minister Rau, said we would have in this chamber. I think it is important to say from a record point of view that we have a few concerns. We are happy to support the government at this point in time, and not the Hon. Mark Parnell, and we will see how this bill and the new act work in practice over the next few years.

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY:** I will be supporting all of the Greens' amendments on these matters because I also understood that the minister was to relinquish these responsibilities.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I thank the Hon. John Darley for his indication of support and I am disappointed that the opposition will not be supporting it. I do not intend to divide on these amendments. We do need to move on with this. I make the observation that if the Hon. David Ridgway's hopes and dreams are true and that they are successful at the next election, and if one of the early acts of the new government is to divest itself of executive power under a piece of legislation, then if I had a hat, I would eat it. I will be surprised if that happens, but I will take the honourable member at his word that if they are successful they will review these provisions. My feeling is once these powers have been given to the minister, the minister has them for ever and a day.

Clause passed.

Clause 5.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I move:

Amendment No 2 [Parnell-1]—

Page 7, lines 5 to 7—This clause will be opposed

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I will not speak again to these amendments. They all relate to the same issue and I expect they will have the same result.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** I concur with the Hon. Mr Parnell.

Clause passed.

Clause 6.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I move:

Amendment No 3 [Parnell-1]—

Page 7, lines 8 to 10—This clause will be opposed

Clause passed.

New clauses 6A and 6B.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I move:



Amendment No 4 [Parnell-1]—

Page 7, after line 10—Insert:

6A—Amendment of section 61—Adaptive re-use

Section 61—delete 'The Minister' and substitute 'The Commission'

6B—Amendment of section 62—Climate change policy

Section 62—delete 'The Minister' and substitute 'The Commission'

New clauses negatived.

Clause 7.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I move:

Amendment No 5 [Parnell-1]—

Page 7, lines 11 to 22—This clause will be opposed

Clause passed.

Clause 8.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I move:

Amendment No 6 [Parnell-1]—

Page 7, lines 23 to 29—This clause will be opposed

Clause passed.

Clause 9 passed.

Clause 10.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** I move:

Amendment No 1 [Police-1]—

Page 8, after line 13 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 1]—Insert:

*earlier Act* means—

- (a) the *Planning Act 1982*; and
- (b) the *City of Adelaide Development Control Act 1976*; and
- (c) the *Building Act 1971*; and
- (d) the *Planning and Development Act 1966*; and
- (e) the *Town Planning Act 1929*.

This amendment inserts the titles of all previous planning and development acts. This change was requested by stakeholders between the houses. For the avoidance of doubt it ensures, through related amendments, that any approvals issued under any of the previous acts remain as valid approvals or consents.

**The CHAIR:** Minister, there are a number of amendments here to clause 10, do you want to move them all?

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** If the chamber is amenable, I think that is probably okay.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL:** I have a question: I understand the minister said that stakeholders are keen to avoid uncertainty. Are there any development approvals under the Town Planning Act 1929 that any stakeholders could identify were at risk of somehow failing for want of proper approval or that might somehow die during the transitional period if this was not included in the act, bearing in mind that we have existing use provisions which, effectively, entrench things that people have been doing for any period of time? I would not have thought there was a whole lot of work left to do for that 1929 act.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** I think industry and relevant stakeholders quite reasonably want to mitigate any risk, and there is a genuine concern that without this amendment there may be examples, but this seeks to mitigate that risk and seems to make sense.

**The CHAIR:** The minister has a further 10 amendments, is there any objection to moving them all at once?

**The Hon. D.W. Ridgway:** No.

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS:** Therefore, I move:

Amendment No 2 [Police-1]—

Page 8, line 26 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 3(1)]—After 'repealed Act' insert:

or an approval or authorisation under an earlier Act (and a reference in this Act to a development authorisation under this Act will be taken to include a reference to an approval or authorisation under the repealed Act or an earlier Act)

Amendment No 3 [Police-1]—

Page 9, lines 19 and 20 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 4(7)]—Delete subclause (7) and substitute:

(7) For the purposes of section 4(4) (but subject to subclauses (8) and(9)), any period of cessation of an activity occurring before the designated day will be disregarded (and in the case of such a cessation of an activity the relevant period for the purposes of section 4(4)(b) will be taken to run, and will be calculated, from the designated day).

Amendment No 4 [Police-1]—

Page 9, lines 35 to 38 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 4(9)(c)]—Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

(c) section 4(4) will not extend to a period of cessation of an activity in an identified area occurring before the day on which the Governor makes the relevant proclamation under that subclause (but in the case of such a cessation of an activity the relevant period for the purposes of section 4(4)(b) will be taken to run, and will be calculated, from the day on which the proclamation is made); and

Amendment No 5 [Police-1]—

Page 14, lines 12 to 19 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 9(3)(c) and (d)]—

Delete paragraphs (c) and (d)

Amendment No 6 [Police-1]—

Page 27, line 15 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 39(1)]—After 'Act' insert 'or an earlier Act'

Amendment No 7 [Police-1]—

Page 27, line 21 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 39(2)(a)]—

After 'planning consent under this Act' insert:

or a corresponding consent or approval under an earlier Act (other than the *Building Act 1971*)

Amendment No 8 [Police-1]—

Page 27, line 26 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 39(2)(b)]—

After 'building consent under this Act' insert:

or a corresponding approval under the *Building Act 1971*

Amendment No 9 [Police-1]—

Page 27, line 34 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 40]—After 'the repealed Act' insert:

or an earlier Act

Amendment No 10 [Police-1]—

Page 27, line 41 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 41]—After 'the repealed Act' insert:

(or the repeal of a provision of an earlier Act)

Amendment No 11 [Police-1]—

Page 28, line 5 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 42]—After 'the repealed Act' insert:

(or to the repeal of any provision of an earlier Act)

Amendments carried; clause as amended passed.

Remaining clauses (11 to 85) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

*Third Reading*

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:10):** I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

**ROAD TRAFFIC (ROADWORKS) AMENDMENT BILL**

*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November 2016.)

**The Hon. K.L. VINCENT (16:11):** The Dignity Party acknowledges the need for some change in the area of roadworks traffic management and also has concerns about the impact on pedestrians of detours during road and footpath works. As it currently stands, I understand that all council workers and contractors should have undertaken training in Standards for Workzone Traffic Management, plus they are required to have a safety plan approved before commencing roadworks.

Despite this, constituents advise me of repeated apparent breaches during the undertaking of works. I have also been informed of instances where incorrect temporary speed zone signs have been erected indicating a roadwork speed of 25 km/h on one side of the street but 50 km/h on the other side, as well as 50 km/h signs being displayed in an area which is a permanent 40 km/h zone. It seems that current compliance is not uniform and that the understanding of the impact, particularly on pedestrians, is not good. Hazards for vision-impaired pedestrians in particular include footpaths being ripped up and mounds of sand being placed for bedding pavers. In this instance, it is essential that barriers or mesh be put in place to delineate the footpath from works.

The government is driven (pardon the pun!) by an obsession to reduce congestion, whether that be to rip up the Parklands to shave a few minutes off the O-Bahn journey into the city or the purchase and placement of multiple electronic indicator boards to show real-time journey time. These are ad hoc measures that avoid the real issue of the overdependence of metropolitan commuters on private vehicle transport.

We all know that our travel time drops once senior school students have finished exams for the year and continues to get shorter as private and then public schools break up for the summer holidays. What a dream it would be if we could have those commute times all year round. There are, anecdotally, parents who drive their high school aged children to work for distances of less than a kilometre. At a time when health concerns about obesity and other conditions abound, we should be encouraging more walking buses to give students and their parents options other than taking the car to school or work.

Road workers and the staff who support them undertake essential repair and replacement of roads and infrastructure, and it is important that they feel confident to carry out their duties safely under the protection of reduced speed limits. Currently, the speed limit past roadworks in South Australia is 25 km/h, and this legislation seeks to increase this to 40 km/h. The justification, if I understand it correctly, is that drivers do not like to slow down to 25 km/h, especially if it appears that there are no roadworks taking place. I remain to be convinced that this increase in speed past roadworks is a wise move on the part of the government.

To reduce peak-hour congestion, it may be preferable to encourage people to leave home earlier, to stagger the start and finish times of the working day for those businesses that can do so, and to increase the availability of Go Zones for buses so that people can start and finish work later but still take advantage of frequent bus services. In these ways we could ensure that our traffic is spread out over time and not concentrated as much as it is now.

This bill seeks to establish a new process for the issue of permits and, whilst I am cautious about a big new computer system, particularly following on from the complete debacle of the introduction of upgrades to the NDIS portal or the 'not my debt' scandal in even more recent times, this should offer contractors a straightforward way of ensuring that they are authorised to carry out works. The increased coordination of roadworks promises to save both money and inconvenience to road users and, for this reason, is warmly supported by the Dignity Party, and we support the bill.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. I.K. Hunter.

### **NATIONAL PARKS AND WILDLIFE (CO-MANAGED PARKS) AMENDMENT BILL**

#### *Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November 2016.)

**The Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK (16:16):** I rise to make some remarks in relation to this bill, which the Liberal opposition is supporting. The National Parks and Wildlife (Co-managed Parks) Amendment Bill amends the co-management provisions of the National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Wilderness Protection Act. It also provides retrospective approval to two existing mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park, which have operated unregulated since 1972 due to an administrative error.

The National Parks and Wildlife Act and the Wilderness Protection Act both exist to establish and protect parks and wilderness areas throughout South Australia. In 2004, the National Parks and Wildlife Act was amended to allow for the co-management of parks, which was designed to recognise and include Aboriginal communities in the management process of their traditional lands. Similarly, in 2013 amendments were made to the Wilderness Protection Act to provide for co-management over state wilderness-protected areas.

These co-management agreements have allowed Aboriginal communities to care for their sacred places, upskill them, build land management expertise, and pursue potential cultural tourism and economic benefits. The state government has now entered into some 12 co-management agreements, which cover 35 of South Australia's parks and reserves, some 13½ million hectares or 64 per cent of the state's reserve system. I understand these 12 agreements include seven boards and five advisory committees, and some of these boards advise several parks, but under the existing legislation there is no legal authority to manage them jointly.

The bill provides administrative amendments to clarify the wording used to allow the co-management by one board over several parks. The amendments also allow for existing co-management agreements to be updated to allow existing co-management boards to merge. This is of particular relevance where one Aboriginal community is represented across multiple boards in the same region. There are also clauses in the bill which allow regulations to be made to fix expiation fees for alleged offences against the act. As previously mentioned, the bill enables two mining leases in the Ikara-Flinders Ranges National Park to be recognised, which is going to provide retrospective approval.

There are a number of co-managed parks, as I mentioned. The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources produced a document in February 2016, entitled 'Strong People, Strong Country: Co-managing parks in South Australia', which has a map, and I love maps. Pages 10 and 11 show the co-managed parks, which are largely located in the northern part of South Australia, that are currently covered under such agreements. With those words, I commend the bill to the house.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. G.E. Gago.

*Ministerial Statement***CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION**

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:19):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the Children and Young People (Safety) Bill made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Deputy Premier.

**SOUTH ROAD TRAM OVERPASS**

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety) (16:19):** I table a copy of a ministerial statement relating to the tram overpass made earlier today in another place by my colleague the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

*Bills***ELECTORAL (LEGISLATIVE COUNCIL VOTING) (VOTER CHOICE) AMENDMENT BILL***Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 6 December 2016.)

**The Hon. J.A. DARLEY (16:20):** The government's bill will change the manner in which above the line voting is conducted for the Legislative Council. At the moment, voters have the choice of either voting '1' above the line or numbering all below the line. Preferences from above the line votes are allocated according to a voting ticket submitted by a party, group or Independent. This has led to skewed results, whereby candidates who have received a very small number of primary votes have been elected off the back of preference deals.

The government's bill aims to eliminate these backroom deals by having preferences extinguished after all the candidates from the particular party or group have been exhausted rather than flowing on to another party, group or Independent. The Nick Xenophon Team is supportive of having a more transparent system. In fact, I introduced a bill for optional preferential voting in 2013. However, we believe that the government's proposal is skewed to favour the major parties and make it more difficult for smaller parties or Independents to become elected. Voters should have the ability to choose where their preferences go if they want to see preferences flow to other parties, groups or Independents without filling in all the boxes below the line.

As such, I have filed amendments which will allow for voters to put their own preferences above the line. Voters will have the choice of numbering up to six boxes above the line. Preferences will extinguish after all the candidates of all the boxes they have completed have exhausted. That is, if they choose to only fill in one box, the preferences will extinguish after all the candidates from the group or party have been exhausted. It will be the same as what the government is proposing. If, however, the voter chooses to fill in three boxes above the line, the preferences will flow from all the candidates from group or party one on through all the candidates from group or party two and then through party three. At this stage, the preferences expire, as there are no more candidates.

The aim of this bill is to give voters more choice. I believe my amendments will give voters more choice than what the government is proposing, rather than limiting them to only one party, group or Independent, or making them face the alternative of filling out all the boxes below the line.

**The Hon. M.C. PARNELL (16:22):** The Greens believe this bill is incorrectly named. The title refers to voter choice, yet what this bill does is actually remove one of the most important elements of voter choice, and that is the ability to allocate preferences. The government can say that if someone is so keen to allocate preferences they can number all the squares below the line, but we know that 95 per cent of voters do not do that. It is an onerous task, there is a risk of making a mistake, and they should not have to do it when it comes to allocating preferences.

The Greens' position has always been that we want to see electoral reform in the form of optional preferential voting. There are variations on that theme, and I look forward to discussing with

the Hon. John Darley, with my other colleagues on the crossbench and with the opposition—and hopefully with the government as well—how we can genuinely get a system of optional preferential voting so that in an ideal world voters could number as many or as few squares as they wished. They could favour as many or as few candidates as they wished. When they have stopped allocating preferences, their vote then exhausts.

One of the myths, I think, with much of this debate about electoral reform has been that the exhausted vote, regardless of when it exhausts, is some sort of democratic tragedy. It is not; it is an expression of the voter's will. If the voter only wants to preference one, two, three or six parties or candidates then that should be their right. The big problem with this bill is that you only get one vote above the line and you do not get any ability to allocate preferences. That said, the bill does overcome the great evil that I think all of us are keen to see overcome, and that is the backroom preference deals. It does that, but it does not do it in a way that provides for genuine voter choice.

The Greens have an optional preferential voting bill before parliament and the Hon. John Darley has had a bill as well, and he has now put forward some amendments which effectively turn this bill into an optional preferential voting bill. Whilst we are yet to go through all of the fine detail, the Greens are very attracted to what the Hon. John Darley is doing. Like I said, there are variations on a theme. Do you make people number at least six boxes above the line? Do you allow them to number up to six boxes above the line? Why six? Why not four or why not three? There are variations on a theme, but all of them have an advantage over this bill, which is that they do give voters some element of choice. I think we need to have that discussion.

I know the Hon. John Darley is interested in having a look below the line. How can we allow voters to exercise a preference for various candidates without having to go through the onerous task of numbering every single square? Whilst I have not actually seen the ballot papers, I understand that in the Western Australian parliament nominations closed today, and I think there is a record number of candidates. If we get a record number of upper house candidates it makes for a very onerous task. Is it 80, 90 or 100?

Will we get the famous New South Wales tablecloth ballot paper? If you force people to number every single square on a piece of paper that size they will inevitably make mistakes. The informal rate of voting for those who go below the line is much, much higher than above the line. The Greens will be opposing the bill as it is drafted. We will have a very close look at the Hon. John Darley's amendments, but we are very attracted to them. We are also attracted to seeing whether we could further amend the bill for allocating preferences below the line and I look forward to those discussions.

One of the reasons I have put myself down to speak on this bill at a very early stage is that we need to let the government know at a very early stage that this bill, in its current form, is going nowhere. What we do not want is the situation we had four years ago when it was the very final week of sitting before we got to seriously debate upper house voting reform. My sincere hope is that we knock this bill off in its current form or we amend it to provide for more voter choice, for an optional preferential system, and I look forward to discussing with my colleagues in all parties how we can make the voting system fairer.

**The Hon. D.G.E. HOOD (16:27):** I rise to speak also on the Electoral (Legislative Council Voting) (Voter Choice) Amendment Bill. As the Hon. Mr Parnell has pointed out, I am not comfortable with the title of this bill. I do not think the bill is correctly titled when it uses the term 'voter choice' because it actually seeks to limit choice, which is a problem. We know that record numbers of voters are voting for other than the two major parties these days and that is something that needs to be acknowledged and recognised.

I say at the outset that I associate myself with the comments of the two previous speakers, but not completely. After listening to their contributions today, there are a few minor points of difference, but Family First's position would be largely in agreement with the comments that the Hon. John Darley and the Hon. Mark Parnell just made. We also will be opposing this bill in its current form.

I have had a very brief look at the amendments that have been tabled by the Hon. Mr Darley. I think they were only tabled today, if I am not mistaken, so I have only had an opportunity to literally

glance at them and not look at them in any detail at all. I think I understand at least the gist of what he is trying to do without necessarily being across the detail, and that is to introduce a system very similar to the model used in the Senate at the last federal election. That is a model that Family First would, basically, look upon favourably.

As the Hon. Mark Parnell rightly pointed out, there are some considerations. Sometimes the detail can get in the way of achieving what I think would be in the best interest of all South Australians, and that is the introduction of a system along those lines but, of course, the detail can get in the way, as I said. Those questions come down to things like: should it be six above the line, for example, as it is in the Senate? Of course, in the Senate, six makes a great deal of sense because the state of South Australia elects six senators at each half Senate election, so six is probably the most obvious number.

Should it be 11 above the line in the Legislative Council, for example, given that 11 legislative councillors are elected at each normal election held every four years in South Australia? My initial response is that 11 sounds too many, but other members may, no doubt, have different opinions. Then, of course, you turn your thinking to below the line. At the moment, voters are required to number every box below the line in their order of preference. I may be mistaken, but I think we had 76 at the last election or something very close to that. That is an onerous task for many people. As the Hon. Mark Parnell indicated, only about 5 per cent of people avail themselves of that opportunity—not surprisingly, because it is quite an onerous task.

That is one aspect of the government's bill that I agree with. Essentially, they are trying to do away with group voting tickets. Our position is that that is not an unreasonable objective. I think group voting tickets have been overly demonised, frankly, but I can see their limitations and, as a result of that, our party would be willing to assist in formulating a solution that other members of this place agreed on, so that we could get some agreement.

To go back to the very first point I made, we will not support this bill in its current form and the reason, as I mentioned in my comments about the title including the term 'voter choice', is that the bill does not actually improve the choice available to individuals because it compels them simply to number one box. That is not a choice; that is a compulsion. Then, people do not have the opportunity to number subsequent boxes above the line if they choose. In my mind, they should have that opportunity. Certainly, that is our party position.

So many possibilities have arisen in this place over the last several years and various models have been presented. The Hon. Mr Parnell made mention of the fact that both he and the Hon. Mr Darley currently have before this place, and have had in various forms over the years, what are termed optional preferential voting bills. I myself introduced a bill which introduced what I called a threshold. It was agreed in the end amongst other members that 2.5 per cent of the vote would be the appropriate threshold, and that was included in my bill. That would mean that any party or individual who achieved less than 2.5 per cent of the primary vote for the Legislative Council at an election would be excluded from being elected.

That was my bill. I thought 2.5 was a reasonable number; it is not particularly high. Certainly, my sense in moving around the state of South Australia was that people want the opportunity for minor parties and Independents to be elected, but they are somewhat sceptical of members being elected on very low percentages. I was happy with a number in the order of two, three or four or whatever it may be, but I think there was general agreement that somewhere around 2.5 per cent was about right.

One of the reasons for that, I might say, is that now Senator Xenophon was originally elected on 2.8 or 2.9 per cent or something of that nature, and he has obviously gone on to have quite an impact on the Australian political scene. I do not think any of us would advocate excluding those sorts of individuals from the political environment. As I said, he was able to achieve 2.9 or 2.8 per cent or something in that order, so my proposal of 2.5 per cent would not have excluded him either.

To bring discussion back to this bill that the government has put forward, another thing the Hon. Mark Parnell said that I agree with is that this bill in its current form is not going anywhere. I cannot speak for the Liberal Party, but I understand that they will not support it in its current form

either. If that is the case, simple mathematics suggests that this is not going to pass in its current form and, therefore, we need to get on with the task of getting something that will pass.

The election next March is coming up very quickly, obviously. I really do not want to be in the situation, and I think other members would support me in this, that we were in prior to the last election, where literally on the last sitting day we were negotiating in this chamber, in the corridors, over the phone, etc., to try to get an outcome that all members and parties could agree on. We failed to do that and I am not surprised, given the rushed circumstances under which we were trying to operate.

I think we should aim to have this passed in the first half of the year. It needs to be fair for all. It needs to be fair for even micro parties, and it also needs to be fair—and I think I will get some loud 'hear hears' for this—for the major parties. It needs to be fair across the board and accurately represent the result of the election; that is, who is ultimately elected to the Legislative Council needs to, as best they can, represent the will of the South Australian public in terms of who they want to put there and how many of each group they want there. So, we need consensus soon, or at least a majority, but ideally consensus soon. I think this is something that cannot wait for very much longer.

Regarding the issue of votes exhausting, I am a bit uncomfortable with that. Other members will have different views on that, but I do not like the idea of a very large number of voters having their votes essentially wasted. I think the Hon. Mark Parnell made a solid point that some people who might like to vote for party XYZ and who do not deem any other party, group or individual worthy of their preferences, would simply exclude them. There would be some, I believe, who would consciously do that, but I also believe that there would be a substantially larger number of individuals who had their vote exhausted and either might simply not be aware that that is happening, or where that was not their intention. Those things need to be thrashed out.

With those comments, we are favourably inclined, at this very early stage, to a model of this general type, although obviously not specifically what has been put here. The amendments that the Hon. Mr Darley has tabled—I have only briefly looked at them—may provide an opportunity to work our way through this. We enter this debate with a spirit of cooperation. We want to do what is in the interests of South Australians. I think everyone has agreed that some change is needed, the question is what that will be.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.T. Ngo.

At 16:37 the council adjourned until Wednesday 15 February 2017 at 11:00.



*Answers to Questions***PUBLIC SERVICE PERFORMANCE**

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (20 September 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, the Minister for Water Murray, and the Minister for Climate Change has received the following advice:

Yes, the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR) is always striving to improve their structures to ensure they are responsive to the needs of the South Australian community.

**POLICE CORPORATE PROGRAMS**

In reply to **the Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (20 September 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):**

I am advised that the following are approved SAPOL corporate programs:

Neighbourhood Watch – a community based crime prevention program aimed at minimising crime through community and police working together. Neighbourhood watch is also the peak body under which Business Watch, School Watch, Health Watch and Transit Watch fall.

Blue Light—a crime prevention initiative that began in 1982 to provide young people with safe and well-supervised activities. As well as discos, the Blue Light Program includes the Blue Light Police Link Program and Living Skills Program.

Police Link involves officers visiting the Women's and Children's Hospital and Flinders Medical Centre and engaging with children.

The Living Skills Program is aimed at children between 12 and 14 identified as having a lack of social skills, are habitual truants or display low self-esteem or lack positive role models

Home Assist Program – a federally funded program aimed at improving home security and personal safety.

Safe Return Program – a joint initiative established between Alzheimer's Australia—South Australia (AASA) and SAPOL. The purpose of the program is to provide carers of people suffering from dementia or similar illnesses the ability to register the person with AASA and ensure a rapid return to their place of residence if they are located after being reported as a missing person, lost or disorientated.

School Programs—packages have been developed for the use of SAPOL members who are requested by a school to deliver topic based information sessions. The subject matter is developed in partnership with the Department for Education and Child Development (DECD).

ThinkUKnow Program—ThinkUKnow is a free, evidence-based cyber safety program that provides accessible cyber safety education to parents, carers and teachers through schools and organisations across Australia.

SAPOL Safer Journeys Road Safety Education Programs—The SAPOL Road Safety Section in partnership with the Motor Accident Commission (MAC) through the auspices of a Memorandum of Administrative Arrangement (MOAA) operates the 'Safer Journeys' Road Safety Education Program to provide 1,000 sessions to the public for each financial year.

**POLICE CORPORATE PROGRAMS**

In reply to **the Hon. J.S.L. DAWKINS** (20 September 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** In relation to the supplementary question regarding secondary student driver training, the Duke of Edinburgh Awards and a program called North on Target, and advise whether they are part of SAPOL's corporate programs, I advise:

Secondary Student Driver Training:

Road Safety Section (RSS), through its partnership with the Motor Accident Commission, deliver school based presentations as part of the SAPOL Safer Journeys Road Safety Education Programs. These presentations include:

- 'A guide to obtaining your L's and P's'
- 'The Fatal Five—speeding, inattention, seatbelts, dangerous drivers, drink and drug driving'
- 'Getting home safely'.

The Duke of Edinburgh Program:

The Duke of Edinburgh program is not and has never been a SAPOL program. The ethos behind the award is that it equips young people for life and work. Participants design their own unique program that challenges them to set goals while forging qualities of regular engagement, planning, resolve and commitment.

This program is a very worthwhile initiative that aids with youth development. Blue Light Activities are complementary to some key components of the Duke of Edinburgh Award. Applicants for the award are welcome to participate and assist with Blue Light Activities in order to get credit toward achieving it. Some Blue Light Branches have provided financial support to applicants. This arrangement is not formal and is ongoing.

The North on Target Program:

The North on Target program is not a SAPOL corporate program but is a crime prevention initiative of the Elizabeth LSA Drug Action Team supported by the City of Salisbury.

This program is based on the Right on Target program, developed and implemented in the Riverland region in 2001. It was an informal peer based education program implemented within the local primary school cluster.

The North on Target program was developed as a result of a research and feasibility study undertaken in 2004. The Northern Regional Crime Prevention Steering Committee decided to implement a modified version of this program in the northern region following extensive research and a regional forum.

The program was developed as an early intervention peer education program designed to reduce the commencement of substance abuse by young people at an early age.

#### INDULKANA COMMUNITY POLICING

In reply to **the Hon. S.G. WADE** (22 September 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** I am advised:

1. In the period 25 August 2016 to 22 September 2016 there were 18 calls for assistance from the Indulkana community. Only one call was received between the hours of 6pm and 6am.

2. The single incident occurring at night required police attendance and the response time was 39 minutes.

3. The Practice Directions of the Royal Commission states:

'Access to Documents Produced to the Commission Pursuant to Summons:

16. Documents produced by an individual or organisation under summons shall be treated as confidential by the Commission and shall not be released except where a release order is made by the Commissioner.'

Therefore a copy of the answers provided to the commission will not be released.

#### SA WATER CUSTOMER SATISFACTION RESEARCH

In reply to **the Hon. R.I. LUCAS** (22 September 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Water and the River Murray has received the following advice:

The customer satisfaction results for quarter 4 and for the 2015-16 financial year are now available on SA Water's website.

#### CONNECTING RESIDENTS WITH NATURE

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (18 October 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has received the following advice:

1. As part of the Connecting Residents with Nature project, two community consultation processes were carried out; the first process ran from October 2014 to June 2015, and the second ran from 21 April 2016 to 22 July 2016.

2. The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources formally consulted with each of the relevant friends groups throughout every stage of the project. The friends groups were represented on the northern and southern suburbs co-design teams. The friends groups were also invited to give feedback on draft park management plans. Relevant affected friends group presidents were emailed in April 2016.

3. The friends groups have been informally and formally consulted throughout the project.

### TATTOO INDUSTRY

In reply to **the Hon. T.A. FRANKS** (18 October 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** I am advised:

1. No extra resourcing has been provided to South Australia Police (SAPOL).

2. The applications made to the Commissioner of Consumer and Business Services (CBS) are to assign the applicant a reference number for the purpose of ongoing communication. This is not for the purpose of a licence to operate or an approval from the commissioner to operate.

The negative licencing scheme provides for businesses or persons providing tattoo services to operate unless they are automatically and permanently disqualified from trading or until such time as they are served with a disqualification notice by SAPOL on behalf of CBS.

3. Where the Commissioner of CBS is intending to disqualify a person from providing tattoo services, they will be notified by CBS and provided an opportunity to show cause as to why they should not be disqualified.

If a person is currently providing tattoo services (or intends to) and has not been contacted by the Commissioner of CBS they may continue to operate lawfully.

4. Any person may make a complaint to their local member of parliament, the Police Ombudsman or the Office for Public Integrity. Complaints may also be made directly to SAPOL and should be in writing wherever possible.

### PRISONER SUPPORT AND TREATMENT

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (19 October 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** I am advised:

When I announced the reducing reoffending target and appointment of the Strategic Policy Panel in August 2016, the panel was tasked with investigating best practice in correctional services policy to identify strategies that reduce rates of reoffending and promote rehabilitation and reintegration outcomes.

The panel was set a tight timeframe to provide their findings and worked tirelessly to understand the challenges facing the South Australian correctional system. Since August 2016, the panel had eight official meetings as well as additional meetings out of session with stakeholders, academics, prisoners, corrections staff, the Parole Board and Housing SA.

The panel's report was released publically on 9 December 2016. With the key principle of improving community safety, the panel has set out six overarching strategies underpinned by 36 individual recommendations, which outline a whole-of-system change in the approach to the management of offenders.

A copy of the report can be found online at: <https://yoursay.sa.gov.au/decisions/yoursay-engagements-10by20sa/about>.

I can advise that the government will respond within the first half of this year to the report recommendations through the development of an action plan to achieve the 10 per cent reduction in reoffending by 2020.

### KANGAROO ISLAND WILDERNESS TRAIL

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (20 October 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has received the following advice:

Fees for the Kangaroo Island Wilderness Trail (KIWT) are comparable to overnight walks elsewhere in Australia.

An introductory half-price discount for Kangaroo Island residents has been introduced to encourage the Kangaroo Island community to walk the KIWT.

### WALK THE YORKE TRAIL

In reply to **the Hon. R.L. BROKENSHIRE** (20 October 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has received the following advice:

Walking and cycling the Walk the Yorke trail is free.

**PRISONER MAIL SCREENING**

In reply to **the Hon. J.S. LEE** (2 November 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** I am advised:

The Department for Correctional Services has undertaken a number of enquiries to establish the nature and circumstance of this event. It has been identified that no formal investigation report is warranted at this time.

**PRISONER MAIL SCREENING**

In reply to **the Hon. K.L. VINCENT** (2 November 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** I am advised:

Prisoners have a legislated right to send and receive mail pursuant to Section 33 of the *Correctional Services Act 1982*. However, any mail sent or received by a prisoner will continue to be highly scrutinised.

**PRISONER MAIL SCREENING**

In reply to **the Hon. S.G. WADE** (2 November 2016).

**The Hon. P. MALINAUSKAS (Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety):** I am advised:

The third party was an ex-prisoner, who is also a relative of the intended victim.

No offences against the *Correctional Services Act 1982* or any other legislation have been identified for either the third party or Mr Marshall.

**NATURAL RESOURCES MANAGEMENT STAFF**

In reply to **the Hon. J.M.A. LENSINK** (15 November 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has received the following advice:

From 1 July 2012, all employees of the Natural Resources Management (NRM) Boards were transferred to DEWNR pursuant to the Public Sector (Reorganisation of Public Sector Operations) Notice 2012 (dated 21 June 2012).

Therefore all CBD and regional staff are DEWNR employees.

**WATER QUALITY**

In reply to **the Hon. M.C. PARNELL** (6 December 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Water and the River Murray has received the following advice:

SA Water continues to work with relevant agencies (DPTI, DEWNR/NRM and EPA) to ensure planning policies and on-ground implementation of adequate water development controls take regard of water quality protection in the drinking water supply catchments.

With appropriate development and catchment management, there is no evidence to suggest that increases in chlorine dosing will be required to treat the drinking water, or that Trihalomethane (THM) concentrations will increase.

SA Water publishes a Drinking Water Quality Report each year to provide transparency of performance of water quality against the health requirements.

**LOW-FLOW BYPASS SYSTEMS**

In reply to **the Hon. J.A. DARLEY** (7 December 2016).

**The Hon. I.K. HUNTER (Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Climate Change):**

The Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation has received the following advice:

I am advised that 11 low-flow trial sites have been established across the Mount Lofty Ranges; four of these are in the Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges Natural Resources Management (NRM) area and seven are in the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin NRM area.

These sites are being monitored in real-time and provide information about the volume of low flows released and the status of the landholders' dam.

Funding of \$340,000 for the establishment of these trial sites was provided by both NRM boards during the 2014-15 and 2015-16 financial years. None of the trial sites are located on properties owned by NRM board members or their family members.