

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday 30 October 2012

The **SPEAKER (Hon. L.R. Breuer)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (NATIONAL ENERGY RETAIL LAW IMPLEMENTATION) BILL

The Hon. **J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:02)**: I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (TAFE SA CONSEQUENTIAL PROVISIONS) BILL

The Hon. **J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:02)**: I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

GRAFFITI CONTROL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

The Hon. **J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (11:02)**: I move:

That the sitting of the house be continued during the conference with the Legislative Council on the bill.

Motion carried.

HENLEY SURF LIFE SAVING CLUB

The Hon. **J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (11:02)**: I seek leave to make a personal explanation.

Leave granted.

The Hon. **J.M. RANKINE**: On 17 May, I took a question on notice from the member for Davenport concerning the new Henley Surf Life Saving Club. He asked if any claims had been made by the builder due to delays in being able to begin construction. I received advice from SAFECOM during the parliamentary winter break that no claims had been made and I subsequently tabled my response on 4 September. This was the first sitting day following the winter break.

On 22 October, SAFECOM formally advised me that three claims were made as part of the builder's progress payments. These were respectively lodged on 30 April, 30 May and 30 June, but were only brought to SAFECOM's attention through a meeting of the Project Control Committee on 17 October. A claim for a delay of 40 days was made at a cost of \$31,488.70 from a total project commitment of \$3.57 million.

These claims were approved by the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure as the project managers. They could not be accepted for processing until 7 June as the necessary bank guarantees were not in place prior. SAFECOM has advised that the delays involved unexpected complexities with the amalgamation of three crown land titles and a portion of a road to be closed.

FIRST HOME OWNER GRANT (HOUSING GRANT REFORMS) AMENDMENT BILL

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 18 October 2012.)

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (11:05): I think I might speak on this bill, Madam Speaker, and indicate that I am the lead speaker on the bill to do with the First Home Owner Grant (Housing Grant Reforms) Amendment Bill 2012.

Mr Venning interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: The member for Schubert says do I have a conflict of interest? The answer to that is no. The reason he might raise that, though, is that prior to entering this place I was a builder but I sold all my interests two years after entering this place 18 years ago, so I think I am clear. I have a brother who is a plumber but this will not affect him much either, I suspect.

This is a bill to offer a scheme to the South Australian public for taxpayer funded grants in relation to First Home Owner Grants or housing construction grants and also for those who wish to purchase existing properties. This particular concept has had an unusual gestation under this government. In June 2008 the budget introduced a new first homebuyers grant scheme that replaced the then current first homebuyers stamp duty concession. The first home purchase valued up to \$400,000 would attract a grant of \$4,000 and the grant would be phased out for first home purchases valued between \$400,000 and \$450,000. The \$4,000 grant would be in addition to the existing \$7,000 First Home Owner Grant. That was in June 2008.

In September 2010 these grants were what the government called 'retargeted'. The retargeting enhancement of the First Home Bonus Grant provided savings of nearly \$80 million (\$76.9 million) over four years. The grants would be increased from \$4,000 to \$8,000 with the eligibility retargeted towards eligible first homebuyers who build or purchase a newly constructed home only. So, grants for buying existing homes would be ceased. The bonus grant will no longer be available for first homebuyers purchasing an existing dwelling. The grant phases out for the newly constructed dwellings valued between \$400,000 and \$450,000. The new arrangements will commence for eligible transactions entered into after 17 September 2010.

It started in June 2008 but was retargeted in September 2010. Then in June 2011, they were going to get phased out. The government's language was that the \$8,000 First Home Bonus Grant, which is currently available for eligible first homebuyers who purchase a build, a newly constructed home, would be reduced to \$4,000 from 1 July 2012 and fully abolished from 1 July 2013. The \$8,000 First Home Bonus Grant would continue to be available for eligible transactions entered into prior to 1 July 2012. For first homebuyers who entered into a contract to purchase or build a new home from 1 July 2012 until 30 June 2013, there would be a \$4,000 First Home Bonus Grant available.

The government had them in June 2008, retargeted them to get rid of grants for buying existing homes in 2010, then in 2011 they were going to be phased out. Then in May 2012 they decided to backflip on that and then extend them. In May 2012 the government said what we are going to do is quote to provide support for the housing market. The First Home Bonus Grant will remain at \$8,000 for eligible first home contracts entered into before 1 July 2013. The government had previously announced that the bonus grant would be reduced from \$4,000 from 1 July 2012 and end on 1 July 2013.

The \$8,000 First Home Bonus Grant is available for eligible first homebuyers who purchase a newly constructed home of up to \$400,000. What we now find is the government have backflipped on that promise, and it is now all in. You can now get a grant for newly constructed homes, you can get a grant for newly constructed apartments and, indeed, you can get a grant for buying an existing home. So, they have gone virtually the full circle and then some in their policy position.

Why did the government change its policy position? The government originally changed its policy position because the Treasurer was out there saying that it was his view that the First Home Owner Grant did little for housing affordability and essentially pushed the price of houses up. You only have to go to the Treasurer's press release of 9 June 2011—which, of course, is the budget week press release—which talks about the First Home Bonus Grant scheme. In his press release, the Treasurer says:

Much of the evidence suggests that in the long-run this bonus grant has the effect of simply raising prices for those building entry level homes.

Those are not my words; they are straight out of the Treasurer's press release. The position of the Treasurer and the government has been all over the place in regards to where they stand on these particular grants. I have some other quotes from the Treasurer. The Treasurer said, as quoted in

Hansard on 21 June 2011, when questioned about this, 'I think, with regard to the budget, there are better things that we can do to increase housing affordability.'

He went on to say in *Adelaidenow*, 'I don't think the First Home Owner's Bonus does much for housing affordability.' So, the Treasurer is not philosophically positioned where he naturally supports these particular grants as a way of providing cheap housing. The Treasurer hopes they may well provide a stimulus to the housing industry for more sales and more houses to be purchased, and therefore, more houses constructed.

Why does the Treasurer hope that? The Treasurer hopes that because, frankly, the construction industry in general, but particularly the housing industry, is certainly on its knees in South Australia. We have had the worst building approvals in 11 years. Construction work has been in decline over the last 12 months; it fell about 8 per cent from June 2012 for the 12 months previous. We have had the lowest dwelling commencements in 11 years.

The government reacted by holding a special round table with the building industry. The building industry had been screaming for some government action for many months, and eventually, in a set-piece, stage-managed production meeting, the government brought in the Housing Industry Association and others in the building industry so they could ultimately make the announcement that they were going to backflip on all their other schemes and reintroduce what is, I think, the most generous scheme of all the schemes they have had since June 2008.

So, the government have gone through a phasing out, an abolition, a retargeting, a reintroduction, an enhancement, and now an expansion of a scheme that they said does nothing for housing affordability and would ultimately only push up prices. The reason we are here is because the building industry of South Australia is certainly struggling.

I am just intrigued as to why the government have waited to have the meeting to make the decision to go down this path, when the housing and building industries have been lobbying the government on a whole range of issues over a number of years about policy decisions taken by the government that were making it simply too hard for the housing and building industries to compete. I have just made a list of them because, having been a builder before I came into politics and having family in the industry, I tend to follow the industry with interest. I have two sons working in the industry, and I follow it with some interest.

If we can go back to former treasurer Foley and the payroll tax issue on contractors in the building industry, where a number of builders were fined significant amounts of money (some in the hundreds of thousands of dollars) over the issue of whether payroll tax was eligible on payments to contractors. We argued from this side of the house that there should be a review of that matter to get exact clarification of the Treasurer's guidelines—that is, the Treasury guidelines through RevenueSA's website—as to when payroll tax is payable by contractors or not. The government's response was that it was not interested in having that review and to let the confusion stand in the industry and let them get fined, as they have been doing. Some builders, of course, went through the hoop.

Then, of course, we had the land tax issue. The Liberal Party moved for a review of land tax in the Economic and Finance Committee. The government voted that review down. We had the Urban Development Institute at the national conference present a paper saying that, in actual fact, the high land tax in South Australia was affecting land supply.

What does land supply impact on? It impacts on the cost of housing. Go out there and ask the housing industry: what is the most expensive part of your house? It is the land. The developers say that our high land tax regime in South Australia impacts on the cost of land, which impacts on the cost of housing, but did the government want to review the land tax? No, they did not want to do that either.

In fairness to the government, the opposition recently moved another motion in the Economic and Finance Committee about having a review of the whole tax system and, finally, the government has caved in and we are about to go through the process and set terms of reference. So, maybe in the next year before the election, with their having been in government for 10 years, we may finally actually get to have a look at some of these issues and hear from some of the industry groups one on one about the impact this has on the housing industry.

Then we have gone through this charade of the occupational health and safety legislation, which is about to be debated. I cannot recall if it has been voted on last week or will be this week, but it is about to go through the upper house if Mr Darley supports the government's view. The

Housing Industry Association and the building industry generally are vehemently opposed to the proposed introduction of the 'harmonised' occupational health and safety legislation Australia-wide.

Why do they oppose it? It is going to put up the price of housing. The housing industry produced modelling where single-storey houses were going to go up to the tune of about \$12,000 or \$13,000 extra per house and double-storey houses were going up by, from memory, something around \$21,000 per house. All these things add up to making housing more expensive, and all of them have been ignored by the government.

Of course, then we had the absolutely disgraceful decision by the government, before the election, to roll out and adopt the Liberal Party's announced policy of payroll tax rebates for apprentices and trainees in the building industry. Immediately after the election, in the budgets after the election, guess what they cut out? They cut out payroll tax incentives, as announced at the election, making it harder for single builders, the single employer, to employ apprentices. It does not necessarily impact as greatly on the group training schemes, but it certainly impacts on single builders, small builders, taking on single apprentices. They have made it harder for the building industry to employ apprentices—and you would have to ask why.

Just to top it off, because the budget is in such a mess—a deficit, in round numbers, of \$900 million this year and \$800 million next year—what is the government trying to do? It has its hand in the pocket of the Construction Industry Training Board, trying to grab \$3 million a year out of that board, to take it out of construction industry training to try to prop up the budget of DFEEST, of TAFE. So, they are making it more difficult for the construction industry to control and fund their own training.

To top it off, we have the worst performing workers compensation scheme in Australia, and we have the highest workers compensation levy in Australia. Our levy here is about two to 2½ times higher than most other levies, so it is more expensive to employ in South Australia than in any other state. We have the worst return-to-work rate in Australia so, under our scheme, if a worker is unfortunately injured, it takes longer for them to get back to work.

All those things add up to making it harder for the housing industry to produce, but the government has ignored all of them. Do not worry about looking at the payroll tax on contractors. Do not worry about looking at the impact of land tax on the cost of housing. Do not worry about the occupational health and safety costs and the increased costs on the builders. Do not worry about the impact of cutting out the payroll tax rebate for apprentices and trainees. Go and take your \$3 million out of the Construction Industry Training Fund and, whatever you do, do not fix up the workers compensation scheme.

The unfunded liability on workers comp has gone from something like \$56 million in 2001 to, I think, \$1.3 or \$1.4 billion. The one thing the government does do is go around in circles on this policy. First they had the policy; then they were restricting it; then they were retargeting it; then they were phasing it out; and now they are reintroducing it and expanding it. This government is all over the place on this particular policy.

The Treasurer will be pleased to know that, despite all of that, the opposition is not going to defeat this measure. We recognise that part of this is a reintroduction of a budget bill. We promised the Treasurer he would get his budget bill and he will get this particular measure, but I just make the point that, in my view as someone who follows the building industry quite closely, this government has been asleep at the wheel about how it can actually go about helping the building industry progress building and make it more efficient.

They have ignored all the issues the industry has raised, except this one. Previously of course when they have gone about retargeting it or phasing it out, the industry has totally opposed it. The industry has said, 'Don't do it; it will have an impact.' It is only now that the Treasurer's budget on stamp duty and land tax revenue, I suspect, is in trouble on the revenue stream that the government has decided to reintroduce and expand this measure.

The Treasurer's office rang my office and offered a briefing. We asked for a briefing. We said we were available by phone for the briefing. The briefing never occurred, which is fine; I will deal with that between the houses. The reality is that we could have had a briefing by phone—there was a time restraint, and that was offered—but there are some questions the Treasurer will need to answer during the committee stage. For instance, we were promised a copy of the modelling. The Treasurer went on radio on 16 October and said:

Well, roughly it's budget-neutral, we've aimed it to be budget neutral as far as we can, you've got to remember that a lot of this is based upon projections, we don't know precisely how many people will take up the grant...

We would like to see that modelling to show that this is somehow revenue-neutral. There have been some emails from the Treasurer's office which I appreciate, and the Treasurer's office tells us that there is a cost of around \$34 million in 2012-13. I am assuming that is a net cost.

What I would like to know is how many grants they think they are giving out in that year and how that impacts on how much stamp duty they think they are going to get as a result of the increased sales. Then in the next year—2013-14—they say there is a cost of \$13 million and again, I would like to see the projections and the calculations behind how we get to that \$13 million.

Then if it is going to be revenue neutral across the four-year period, one could only assume that there will be some projections, some estimates done within Treasury, that show that there will be \$47 million of increased stamp duty collected in 2014-15 and 2015-16, because the only way it can be revenue-neutral is if the cost of the scheme in the first two years is collected as extra stamp duty in extra revenue in years 2014-15 and 2015-16. We asked to see that projection and we have not seen that.

We will certainly be chasing the Treasurer for that between the houses, because we want to see exactly the number of extra people Treasury thinks will now be taking up this grant as a result of the size of the grant and the flexibility within the grants scheme and how that flows through, both on the cost side of the agenda and on the revenue side of the agenda. One assumes that the government is doing it to create more employment—payroll tax impact—and to create more sales, therefore stamp duty impact. We would like to see the cost impact and the projections of that particular measure.

I also need some clarification from the Treasurer about the value of the purchase of a new home; I am assuming that it includes the land component. If the grant is eligible for homes up to \$400,000 or \$500,000, I am assuming that it is a house and land package which to me means that you are really herding the grants out for housing in the outer suburbs. There would not be too many new houses in the inner Adelaide area—the inner ring of suburbs—that you could pick up for \$400,000, so one assumes that the modelling Treasury has done would show that most of these grants are going to be in rural areas or the outer suburbs, where the value of housing is less because, if you include house and land packages, you would struggle to buy blocks of land in some suburbs for \$450,000, let alone a house on it as well. We need some clarity around that issue.

As I understand the proposal in the details of the bill, the bill introduces some amendments to implement the changes announced by the government in October and also to implement changes to the First Home Bonus Grant announced in the 2012-13 budget. The bill amends the First Home Owner Grant Act 2000 to increase the First Home Owner Grant for new homes from \$7,000 to \$15,000 for contracts entered into after 15 October 2012. But the bill also reduces the First Home Owner Grant for established homes from \$7,000 to \$5,000, and this grant is abolished from 1 July 2014.

My understanding is that, for the purpose of the bill, a new home is considered to be a home that has not been previously occupied or sold as a place of residence and includes a substantially renovated home. I am not quite sure how a 'substantially renovated home' has not previously been sold as a place of residence. There would be very few people living in a house from the time it is built until it is renovated; I suspect that every house being renovated at some point has been sold. So, I cannot quite work out how a 'substantially renovated home' falls into the category of 'has not been previously occupied or sold'. I would seek some clarification around that, Treasurer.

The bill also removes the phase-out. So, the phase-out itself has been phased out: the First Home Bonus Grant of \$8,000 to \$4,000 from 1 July, which was announced in 2012-13 budget. So, only four months ago, the government announced the phasing out of this particular measure, and now, in actual fact, it is going to remain at \$8,000. It went from \$8,000 to \$4,000 to nothing; now it is going from \$8,000 to \$4,000 back to \$8,000, as I understand it. The First Home Bonus Grant will remain at \$8,000 for eligible transactions entered into between 1 July 2012 and 14 October 2012 inclusive.

From 15 October 2012, the \$8,000 First Home Bonus Grant will be abolished and replaced with a housing construction grant of \$8,500. So, it is actually a higher amount. This grant will be available for all new home contracts entered into between 15 October 2012 and 30 June 2013, and

that is for properties up to a value of \$400,000. The grant phases out for properties up to \$450,000. This is my point: if you are getting a grant for a new home and land valued at \$400,000, then I suspect this will only actually apply to certain areas, in essence.

This bill was only introduced to the parliament a week ago, last sitting week. The opposition sought feedback from the Housing Industry Association, the Master Builders Association, Business SA, the Tax Institute of South Australia, the Property Council of South Australia, the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, the Law Society of South Australia and the Australian Lawyers Alliance. The only group that got back to us in time for the debate today (because the government has brought it on within a week) was the Law Society, and that is not a criticism of the other groups; I accept that it is a time issue.

All the building industry groups (that is, the HIA and the Master Builders Association) have been out there in the media generally supportive of the measure, so I think it is fair to say that, regardless of there not being any formal feedback at this stage, they are generally supportive of the bill.

The Law Society raised a few interesting minor issues, which I will raise in my contribution now and leave the Treasurer to contemplate in between houses: whether the amendments suggested by the Law Society have merit. The Law Society said that this particular bill was considered by its commercial law committee and its Property Law Committee, and it provided the following comments based on their input:

In relation to the Housing Construction Grant, our view is that a more detailed eligibility criteria should be specified in the bill. There are a number of eligibility criteria set out in Division 2 of the current First Home Owner Grant Act 2000. For example, the applicant must be an individual of at least 18 years of age and be an Australian citizen or permanent resident. We understand that the new Housing Construction Grant will be available to all natural persons, companies and trusts however this is not expressly dealt with in the bill. Nor are there any criteria surrounding the residency of the applicant which may need to be considered further.

The Law Society raises a very good point. I think what the Law Society is saying is that any company, any trust or any overseas citizen can buy as many houses as they want under this scheme and they will get the grant—and I will ask the Treasurer to confirm that. Whereas, under the existing scheme, division 2 of the current First Home Owner Grant Act provides that the applicant must be an individual, at least 18. So, you cannot have two year olds buying houses.

Under the scheme that the government is currently proposing, a two year old, four year old, six year old or an eight year old could buy a house, so we will have rich families going out and buying four, five or six investment properties for their children. I understand that that is the government's intention: it wants as many places sold and built as possible.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: They don't have to because it's not limited per person anyway.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, it is not limited per person. The Treasurer makes that point. I will get that on the record. The Treasurer makes the point that it is not limited per person, so there is nothing to stop people getting five, six or 10 grants. The Law Society states:

In relation to proposed section 18BAB subsection (7) regarding who is a relative, our view is—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I'm not sure about that.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: He's actually Treasurer.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: That's right, yes. I have been following your tweets with interest, Tom—gracious backdown. I will continue:

In relation to proposed section 18BAB subsection (7) regarding who is a relative, our view is that paragraphs (b) and (c) should be consistent and both refer to lineal relationships. Therefore we recommend that paragraph (c) be amended to read 'a son, a daughter or remoter lineal descendant...'

I will leave the Treasurer to contemplate that.

We also note that new section 18BAB contains the following typographical errors:

- Subsection (5)(b) should read 'arm's length' (i.e. there is an apostrophe missing).
- Subsection (6)(e), the words 'otherwise as a shareholder' should be 'other than as a shareholder' and the word 'conduced' should be replaced with the word 'conducted'.

The report that accompanied the bill indicated that the bill was moved to 'provide an urgent boost to the state's housing construction industry and help stimulate the property sector and secure jobs'. From a policy

perspective, we query why the grants are limited to properties of the value of up to \$400,000 with housing construction grants phasing out for properties valued up to \$450,000. Particularly with the Housing Construction Grant, which is only to apply from 15 October 2012 to 30 June 2013, should there be that cap on the property value if the aim is to stimulate the property sector?

The Law Society is raising the issue: why is the cap at \$400,000 or \$450,000 if you are looking at stimulating the sector? Why cap it at that? There are as many jobs, more jobs probably, in a higher value home than necessarily in a lower value home. So, they are the Law Society's comments and I thank them for what was a quick response.

I have some questions, ultimately, for the committee stage when we go through the matter clause by clause. Some housing groups have raised with me the issue of how this works in relation to community title where you have, say, 10 allotments on a community title. The Treasurer can take this on notice (if he needs to) and come back to us. A community title includes the value of the road, footpaths and everything else. If the road value, the footpath value and the park value is on the community title, does that add to the housing value of \$400,000 to \$450,000 and therefore make them ineligible for the grant? They want some answer as to how that works.

They also want answers on the retirement villages, for instance, the retirement villages where you have 20 or 30 homes or in some lots just four homes, how that works in relation to the grants and the valuation of the properties. The other issue relates to the definition based on the market value of the four houses proposed on one allotment under the Retirement Villages Act or for community affordable housing. The housing group that wrote to me says it believes it will be ineligible under the criteria the government has set.

The other issue they raise is the reliance on market value as distinct from construction cost. If the driver is deliberate construction why compromise projects by tying the grant to the market value as it will eliminate, they believe, an enormous amount of projects, as distinct from construction cost? What they are really saying is that the construction costs (for them) might be, say, \$250,000 but they are going to sell it at \$350,000. The market value is different to the construction cost and they are wondering why the government has picked market value.

The other issue I wish to raise is that new buildings need to be ready for occupancy within 18 months. The way I read the rules you do not have to occupy them within 18 months, they just have to be ready for occupation within 18 months. I am wondering: who actually goes out and inspects them and decides when they are ready for occupancy? Does the council do that? Does Treasury do that? Who goes out and finally decides they are 'ready for occupancy' under this particular scheme? I would be interested in those answers.

Despite the government's continual change of policy position on this particular issue, as I have said, the opposition intends to make sure this measure is not defeated. It supports the measure. Hopefully, it will provide the stimulus to the construction industry that the Treasurer and Premier argue it will.

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (11:39): I rise today to support the First Home Owner Grant (Housing Grant Reforms) Amendment Bill. This bill is an excellent example of a government that is listening to both industry and everyday South Australians. We are experiencing difficult times in the construction industry and the property sector. People have indicated that without this new assistance new home starts were forecasted by the Housing Industry Prospects Forum to fall a further 10 per cent this financial year. Not only are we listening but we are responding.

I find it interesting that the member for Davenport wrote to many of the associations for their comments because, really, they were quite clear when this came out. The Property Council said that this is a win, win, win: homebuyers will get into the house they want, they will keep construction workers in their jobs, and they will keep the economy turning over, creating new jobs and opportunities.

The government did get quite a bit of support. The Housing Industry Association said they welcomed the announcement, as South Australia is experiencing a prolonged downturn which has had significant implications for both state employment and revenue. What they requested was 'short-term support to new housing', and this government through this bill will be delivering that.

We were hoping to see some changes in the industry. Master Builders Australia said that after a significant fall in July the industry was hoping housing approvals would bounce back and recover lost ground. It has not boosted new homebuyers (that was in October). I think what we are seeing here is that the government is responding. Peter Jones, the chief economist for Master Builders Australia, said that builders are struggling, and with little joy in the forward indicators there

is an urgent need for policy action at all levels of government. This government is listening, and we are responding.

The construction industry is a major employer and a strong employer of apprentices. In the northern Adelaide region, this month there are 1,500 apprentices and trainees in the construction industry. This is an industry that has seen quite significant growth over a 10-year period. We have seen a 37 per cent increase, from 2002 to 2012, during a Labor government. We have seen an increase from 46,300 people employed to 63,500 in October 2012.

One of the key areas where we see the importance of this industry is as strong employer of apprentices, including those in carpentry and joinery, bricklaying, roof plumbing, wall and floor tiling, wall and ceiling lining, painting and decorating, solid plastering, and concreting. Only last week a Salisbury High School year 11 student was telling me he was participating in the doorways2construction program.

Commonly known as D2C, it is our premier vocational education and training program in schools for the building and construction industry. It was initiated as a direct response to the increased need to encourage young people to consider the building and construction industry as a career option, improve the entry level training opportunities, and promote career pathways. It also aimed to create a positive image of the building and construction industry.

The aims of the program are to create an awareness amongst young people and to provide students with accurate information about careers. As the member for Davenport has pointed out, both of his sons have entered this industry. The doorways2construction is also helping to develop basic skills that students can take into the industry.

Last night, when I was doing my shopping at Woolworths I spoke to a young man who was originally from Uganda and who came to Australia a few years ago. He was wearing a doorways2construction shirt, so I thought, given I was talking about this today, how about I have a chat to him. He said, 'Yes, yes, I did this at Thebarton Senior College, and now I'm working for a landscaper.' He said, 'This is great, this got me in.' He said that one of the challenges he had was getting his first job. So, I think we can see some really practical examples of where this government has supported and continues to support this industry through apprentices, training and vocational education.

This bill is supporting South Australians to achieve the goal of home ownership. In my electorate of Ramsay (covering the suburbs of Salisbury, Salisbury Downs, Salisbury Plain, parts of Salisbury North, Salisbury South, Parafield Gardens, parts of Paralowie and Brahma Lodge), the majority of homes can be purchased for under \$300,000. This bill will help those people to break into the market. Checking out some of the local real estate prices, there is an opportunity to buy a brand-new four-bedroom home with ensuite and main bathroom, walk-in robe and double garage for under \$300,000. This bill enables a first homebuyer to receive up to \$23,500 in government support and all buyers to receive \$8,500.

For my constituents, coming out of the rental market and breaking into the housing market can be the most difficult of all. I even know, from when I bought my first house in 2004, that it was the HomeStart program that enabled me to break into the market, that introduced a graduate program, which enabled me, with less of a deposit than I would have been required to have normally, to access that market. In 2004 we had seen a dramatic growth in housing prices and people, including me at the time, were starting to get priced out very quickly, and we knew that if we did not get in soon the market would continue to rise.

When you are paying rent, saving for a deposit can be a long process. This bill gives a helping hand to achieve that goal sooner, and I congratulate the government for listening to industry and responding to the needs of South Australians.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:46): It is a pleasure to speak on this bill and it is always a pleasure to follow the shadow treasurer, the member for Davenport, because he does his homework very well, is very thorough and includes all the information and all the angles. I share his concern about the topsy-turvy approach the government has taken to this style of support, the backflips, and I also share his concern about the fact that the housing industry is in great difficulty at the moment for many reasons, including the enormous tax impost the government has put on the industry—the highest taxed state in the nation.

Let me also say very clearly to everybody here that, like the shadow treasurer, my colleagues and I do actually support this move. It has some positives about it that are very

welcome. I know that in the electorate of Stuart in my travels I come across builders, subcontractors and tradesmen who all tell me they are having some difficulty, even the ones who are still doing very well. They say that things are not as good as they were, so support in this area will certainly be very welcome.

I was talking to a builder in Wilmington on Saturday morning, and he was certainly saying that in his experience subcontractors are probably doing it tougher than just about anyone else at the moment. So support for them is welcome. As most people would know, in the electorate of Stuart the \$400,000 threshold would probably buy you 99 per cent of the houses in the electorate, so it can certainly be applied to the electorate of Stuart.

There are also other benefits, which I am sure the government and Treasurer have considered, that are very positive and benefit all of the flow-on industries and not just those industries and businesses directly or immediately related to the building of a property. At any time people move, as I am sure most people here know, there are always unexpected expenses and extra things for which you have to outlay. I am sure that other industries, like landscaping, the furniture industry, home wares, removalists and many others, will benefit from this and that is very important.

One of the things lacking in our economy across the nation at the moment is a volume of transactions. There are concerns that families out there, whose incomes have perhaps not dropped, are not spending as much as they were. Hopefully this move will help speed up the transactions and also increase their volume, which is very positive for any industry.

Of course there are some risks to our economy as well. I am sure we would all agree that any time you provide a subsidy to industry there are risks, and we have seen many cases where, as soon as a subsidy is applied, it just simply increases the price straightaway. There is a lot of work to be done by the government to ensure that the application of this new support is done appropriately.

The very reason for this introduction is that things are tough, because there is an oversupply of trades, subcontractors and builders, and they are trying to inspire and improve the industry. By definition, you would expect that the cost of homes and the cost of trades would be relatively cheap at the moment, so it would be a great shame for the population at large if the application of this new strategy just quickly put prices up.

Right now, of course, while it is difficult for the industry, there are enormous benefits for consumers to have lower prices, so it would be a great shame if all of a sudden, through the application of these subsidies, prices just went up, as we saw through the federal government's stimulus package. All of a sudden, there was money available and overnight it cost a lot more to get exactly the same job done, because of the money that the federal government pumped into the economy. That will be very important.

As I said, representing the electorate of Stuart, I am very keen to see small and medium-sized businesses, particularly the small subcontractors and tradesmen, supported here through this, and I find it very curious that, at exactly the same time as the government is trying to take a positive step in this direction to support these sorts of industries, the government is putting them under enormous pressure in my electorate through a new maintenance contract through Housing SA.

Let me say very clearly, I fully support very careful oversight of spending taxpayers' money, and there is absolutely no need to be spending more taxpayers' money to maintain taxpayer owned homes which are there for the benefit of underprivileged people than you need to. I think the government needs to be very careful, and at the moment what it is trying to do, Madam Speaker, in your and my electorate, is put tradesmen under a great deal of pressure in terms of the new contractual arrangements it is trying to get them to enter into for Housing SA maintenance contracts.

One of the most starkly concerning issues here is the removal of any travelling allowance. It is quite understandable that a Port Augusta based subcontractor or tradesman should not be paid any travelling allowance to do work in Port Augusta, Stirling North, or Port Augusta West, but if they go to Quorn, Iron Knob, Hawker, Copley, Coober Pedy, Dunjiba, Marla or Marree, you would think that it would be quite fair that they would get paid for that.

I think the government is making a false assumption that there are tradesmen already based in those other locations who can do the work. If there were, it would be quite fair for them not

to be paid travelling allowance, but the reality is, as you and I both know, Madam Speaker, that there are not appropriately qualified tradesmen in many of those locations.

At the same time as I support the government trying to help this sector of the industry through the subsidies on residential homes, it is also making life very difficult through the Housing SA contracts. I ask the Treasurer and Housing SA to take that into consideration, because it would not be appropriate, and I am sure it is not the government's intent, to give with one hand and take that support away with the other hand.

There are some traps and, like the shadow treasurer, I think some of the traps will be in where the subsidies are applied. I note that the member for Davenport has some questions up already about renovated homes and will come back in the committee stage, so I will be grateful for the Treasurer's responses there. Clearly new residences, brand new built homes, are pretty straightforward. I wonder whether it would perhaps apply to warehouses transformed into residences, where an existing property was not a residential property before and becomes a residential property.

I also wonder about properties that were residential properties but were vacant for a long time, and then were purchased and lived in, whether they might attract the subsidies, or whether because they were previously residential properties, they would not attract the subsidy. Our home in Wilmington, for example, was vacant for a year and a half before we purchased it. Would that style of example have attracted this subsidy or not?

I support this bill. I am concerned about potential traps with regard to unintended consequences in terms of impact on prices and I think there might also be some unintended consequences with regard to where and when the subsidy might be applied, but I certainly support the intent of this bill.

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (11:55): The reforms this legislation will mean to everyone in the building and buying sector are very important and, as the member for Taylor, I would like to address some of the advantages of the changes the housing construction grant will bring to first homebuyers in my electorate in the north of Adelaide that relate to community, not just the maths of the boost the initiative will provide. The reforms in this legislation will mean everyone building or buying a new home could be eligible to receive state government assistance almost immediately from the 15 October date.

The recent boundaries redistribution in my electorate of Taylor proved it was the second fastest growing electorate in this state (next to the electorate of the member for Light, who is both my neighbour in the house and in the community sharing Angle Vale with me). Since I was elected in 2010, many areas in my electorate have become new housing areas. New communities are starting and new people are moving into the area, with mortgages and at the mercy of uncertain economic times.

There are many new housing estate areas in Taylor and these include: the expansion of Andrews Farm (which is almost 20 years old now); new homes and families moving into the Virginia Grove area and a rapidly expanding Virginia; additional homes being built in Angle Vale and Burton; Springbank Waters still enlarging; Direk, Two Wells and Lewiston; and redevelopments occurring at Salisbury North. All of these areas are attracting new families to the north, or keeping families close to where the jobs growth is strong and where their families made their homes over 20 years ago when their mum and dad were starting out in the housing market in nearby areas which are now well established, such as Paralowie, Burton and Andrews Farm.

These reforms and the grant provide the existing home owners scheme with an urgent boost that will help the state's housing construction industry and stimulate the property sector after the number of dwellings built in SA declined by 18 per cent in the last financial year. With a soft property market, the housing construction industry is doing it tough, and these measures will not only help families and young people about to make a start in the housing market but they will also assist the many apprentices and construction and building workers (who I see in my shopping centres weekly) stay employed in the building sector so they can continue to pay their mortgages and look after their families in the north of Adelaide. It will also help build the new communities and new homes that are coming to the north every day that I see when I drive around delivering new constituent letters.

These reforms are life changing for many families, and many people are dependent on construction jobs in the north. It is important this initiative is passed through this parliament. It is an example of our Labor government listening to the concerns of the building industry and people in

my electorate who are trying to enter the housing market for the first time, and I praise this initiative.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:57): I rise, too, to speak in support of the First Home Owner Grant (Housing Grant Reforms) Amendment Bill which the Treasurer introduced only a couple of weeks ago into this house. This bill introduces the legislative framework required to implement the changes to the housing assistance grants that the government announced on 14 October 2012. It also introduces the required amendments to implement changes to the First Home Bonus Grant announced in the 2012-13 budget.

We get some renaming. The First Home Owner Grant Act 2000 will become the First Home and Housing Construction Grants Act 2000. Also, the bill will amend the First Home Owner Grant Act 2000 to increase the First Home Owner Grant for new homes from \$7,000 to \$15,000 for contracts entered into, on or after 15 October 2012. The bill will also reduce the First Home Owner Grant for established homes from \$7,000 to \$5,000. This grant will be abolished for established homes from 1 July 2014. In the definitions, for the purposes of this bill, a new home is considered to be a home that has not been previously occupied or sold as a place of residence and includes a substantially renovated home.

Also, this piece of legislation removes the phase-out of the First Home Bonus Grant from \$8,000 to \$4,000 from 1 July 2012. This was announced in the 2012-13 budget. The First Home Bonus Grant remains at \$8,000 for eligible transactions entered into between 1 July 2012 and 14 October 2012 inclusive.

From 15 October 2012 the \$8,000 First Home Bonus Grant will be abolished and replaced with a housing construction grant of \$8,500. This grant will be available for all new home contracts entered into between 15 October 2012 and 30 June 2013, or where building commences during that time for an owner/builder and where the property has a value up to \$400,000. The grant phases out properties valued up to \$450,000. I think this legislation will help people making decisions to buy housing and certainly, throughout my electorate, from Pinnaroo through to Goolwa, there will be many opportunities for people to buy homes in the budgeted band width where this money would be available.

The concern I have, as we have seen with these programs in the past, whether they have been state programs or federal programs that come in as well, is that the builders just add the grant to the price of the quote. Essentially, the incentive just gets eaten up and it just becomes a higher price structure for people to build. That is something we have to be very aware of, that it is just not used for industry to profiteer. It might all feel warm and fuzzy to get a few thousand dollars for a grant—and sometimes more than a few thousand dollars—but if it is only going to be tacked on in the background in the original quotes that people get for building a dwelling, there is really not much point apart from people getting a good feeling, because you are still spending the equivalent amount of money. I certainly think there have been such problems in the past.

With all the developments throughout my electorate—and one of the major developments that springs to mind is the Murray Bridge Racing Club proposal at Gifford Hill where there will be 3,500 opportunities for new homes—this could certainly come well into play, and I think that projects like that development could see more support from this government.

We also have to ask the question why we are in such a state in South Australia. Why is industry at such a low ebb? Why is there such a lack of confidence that the government have decided to introduce this legislation? It is because people do not have confidence, working in an environment of the highest taxed state in the nation, the hardest place to do business in this country, and it is just becoming totally uneconomic for some people to even survive with the rising cost of amenities, the rising cost of essential services like water and power, and I think that is one of the reasons we are here today debating this bill.

As I indicated, I think there is a lot of merit in this, but it will be absolutely pointless if all that happens is industry grabs hold of it and just tacks on whatever the amount is, whether it is \$8,000 or \$8,500, whatever the appropriate grant is for the quote at the time. People will feel good, they will think they have saved that amount of money, but it is just built into the price. I am not sure how a government of any persuasion will be able to make sure that does not happen; I will be interested in the Treasurer's remarks. With those few words, I indicate our support for the bill.

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (12:04): I indicate that I will be supporting the First Home Owner Grant (Housing Grant Reforms) Amendment Bill; it is a great move in the right direction. I think in the first place we should be asking ourselves why fewer houses are being built, and there

are several reasons for that: after the global financial crisis, our bankers became much more cautious in lending people money and our people became much more cautious in borrowing money. Probably, in the long run, it will be a good thing that the people who are now borrowing money to build or buy houses are probably much more sustainable into the future.

There was also a situation where the house building industry was going along gangbusters and was probably going along at an unsustainable rate, when the number of new houses that were being built was out of kilter with the number of extra people we had. If you look at the figures, I know that in Mount Gambier the average number of people per home dropped from about 3.6 down to about 2.4, so there is a day of reckoning and you just cannot keep building new homes without building populations.

I think that where we are now is much more sustainable, and this bill will add a boost to the building industry, give a stimulus that is needed, and give more confidence to those who work in the industry, and that confidence will flow right through the whole system. I commend the government for this bill and indicate that I will be supporting it.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:06): I rise to support the First Home Owner Grant (Housing Grant Reforms) Amendment Bill. I think it is a good initiative as a taxpayer-funded scheme to assist the purchase of newly constructed homes. It has been a very uncertain path for the construction industry and for people who are looking to enter newly built homes. Listening to the Treasurer's comments over a short period of time, about how we are going to have assistance schemes started and stopped, has really created an uncertain and eerie feeling within the construction industry.

Although I am not a first homebuyer, I have a son who considered it and his friends who have considered going there, and they are getting mixed messages as to whether they should go in or whether they should not. This construction grant has been an important catalyst to the decision-making process as to whether they will construct a new home, whether they will not, or whether they will sit back. That funding in today's world is, as I see it, critical for them to make that decision.

My view is that, again, the Treasurer has been reactive and, sadly, he has not taken a proactive approach in addressing the downturn in the building and construction industry. I do have an interest since, as the member for Davenport said, I have a son entering the construction industry. It is an industry that has its peaks and troughs, but it is stimulated by government incentives and government schemes that put a little more assurity through funds into the industry, and to see this new construction industry grant be presented has had some really good and positive impacts, particularly in Chaffey.

I have been contacted by several building companies in the Riverland who have told me how they think the government should be stimulating the process to enhance the industry. They were already dealing with a lot of concerns, not only within their businesses but also within building a home and customers coming to them considering having a home built. They have to deal with the customer's concerns and, obviously, land tax has been very much a disincentive to go in and buy land, and then to build on that land, because land taxes are so high. Of course, the building industry employs a lot of labour and so the payroll tax has a significant impact on its bottom line.

Many builders have come to me and said that they are spending a lot of time and a lot of effort in being OH&S compliant and putting a lot more resources into the OH&S sector. Again, that is not a reflection on them because there are very large WorkCover levies that builders and the construction industry have to pay. The Work Health and Safety Bill has, again, increased the cost of building a home, and obviously both sides of government have been heavily lobbied by the building and construction industry. To me, it is just another disincentive to build a home. I guess it has been a message of poison in a lot of cases: why would the government put this disincentive with the OH&S compliance when, all of a sudden, the balance is that they are going to put this first home construction grant?

We look at the lack of assistance with apprentices and the assistance packages in the building and construction industry taking on apprentices which, in essence, is the core of a lot of the building industry's future—the taking on of apprentices. It is a burden to particularly builders in that they have to take on the training and the role of mentor. There is also irregularity in that while going through an apprenticeship, apprentices disappear for schooling and other training, and it is not easy. I can take that on board having previously been an apprentice.

I remember the burden that it put on the workforce but also having to get into the swing of the construction of a home or construction of a particular project. All of a sudden you are left one

staff member short because he is off at trade school or off doing another form of study, so that is another burden. In saying that, though, I support the first home owner grant. You have to support any measure that is an incentive for people to give consideration to building a home.

That money is there to support the decision people make when wanting to build a home. Of course, funding packages are a stimulus for people to make a decision because, as we all know, money is one of the biggest burdens when building a home but it is also one of the biggest burdens in making the decision as to when you are going to enter the home owner fray, if you like. Particularly for young people it is a life-changing decision because of the commitment they have to make when building a home. The financial burden changes the dynamics of the way a lot of people live. With an expendable wage each week you can go out and live as you like but once young people have that commitment they have to really pull in their horns and get on with the job.

Any grant from the government is something I am always wary of because government interference is always a short-term fix. Very rarely are these grants seen as a long-term solution. It really is something of a stopgap and at the moment it is for the construction and building industry. However, any minute that assistance grant money will run out and then we will have to look at another short-term fix to stimulate the construction industry.

I can give some positive feedback after that announcement was made by the Treasurer. One builder I socially catch up with was ecstatic. He had no-one walk through his doors for weeks, and all of a sudden in that first week he had four committed orders put on his desk, which does go to show that this has been a stimulus that has satisfied the customers, or the consumer, so I think it is a positive.

It is a good thing for the building industry, particularly in the Riverland. We have seen a lot of downturn. A lot of our economy has been sucked up with the drought and a lot of it has been sucked up through uncertainty with commodity prices, and this is just something that is a bit of a telltale about what people are thinking.

Obviously the announcement has put a smile on the face of the construction industry. As I say, I have spoken to several builders, and it has put a smile on the face of builders, it has put a smile on the face of the tradesmen and, of course, it has put a smile on the face of the home builder. Again, I have risen to support the bill, and I am pleased with what it has achieved in this very short space of time.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (12:15): As indicated by the member for Davenport and other members on this side, we will be supporting the amendments to this bill. The building industry in my electorate, as in the electorates of a number of other members, is critically important. Indeed, the South Coast flourishes through the building sector. Also, like other members, I have two sons and a son-in-law, and one son is completely reliant on the building industry, my son-in-law is an electrician who takes some part in the building industry and my other son is at university doing a degree which will allow him to enter into the industry; so, there is some self-interest—

Mr Pegler: He must have thrown to his mother.

Mr PENGILLY: She has got a degree, yes, you're right. It is important. The point was well made by other speakers, and the member for Davenport in his lead speech made a number of points which should be considered. I know that the member for Chaffey referred to the government's reactive action in this and he is probably somewhere near the mark. The simple fact of the matter is that South Australia is in a horrendous state economically due to the complete mismanagement by the government, and it is a sad day when we have to jog it along here again to get it over the line on this bill.

It is really important that our building industry in South Australia has some continuity. It is really important that the people who are employed in that industry, whether it be apprentices or long-term tradies, have some surety about where they are going. Unfortunately at the moment I know that one business down in Victor Harbor closed its doors in the last six months, and there are probably a number of tradies who are looking at pretty limited prospects in the immediate future.

The building industry has always ebbed and flowed, like a number of other industries, but the chronic pain that is inflicted on small business in this state by this government only adds another level of impost which they find difficult to come to grips with. The over-regulation, the over-bureaucracy and the general lack of knowledge by the government about how small business operates is a sad indictment on where South Australia has gone.

Small business particularly—whether it be builders, farmers or whatever, and big business—wants government out of its face. It wants local government out of its face, it wants state government out of its face and it wants federal government out of its face. People are over big government—they are absolutely over it to the back teeth. All they are doing is trying to run a business and make a profit out of that business and they are getting screwed to the wall by different levels of government on regular occasions.

The government has chosen to come in here at fairly short order with this bill and it seeks the opposition's support to get it through as quickly as possible, and I think we are doing that. When it gets up to the other place, well, heaven's knows what will happen with it up there. However, I need the building industry to be successful in my electorate, as others do. This is a step towards assisting, but, if you get rid some of red tape, some of the bureaucracy and some of the nonsense, Mr Treasurer, you might assist the building industry a whole lot more.

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (12:19): I rise today to speak in support of the First Home Owner Grant (Housing Grant Reforms) Amendment Bill 2012.

The Hon. I.F. Evans: A very popular bill, this one.

Mr SIBBONS: The member for Davenport said it is a very popular bill, and he is absolutely right. The passage of the bill is really important for my electorate of Mitchell, just as it is important for each and every one of the 47 electorates. This legislation is vital for our building industry, flagging somewhat in the face of a flat housing market and in need of a shot in the arm. The number of new homes built in South Australia last financial year was down 18 per cent and, without the assistance afforded by this bill, our new home starts are forecast to fall by a further 10 per cent in this financial year.

In recent times I have spoken with a number of my constituents who are looking for work in the housing construction area, and they certainly knew that something needed to be done. We all know that stimulus is necessary to awaken a soft housing sector, and I am very pleased that the state Labor government is getting on and doing what it can with the introduction of this legislation into the parliament.

Some 60,000 South Australians currently work in the construction industry. We need to ensure that these people remain in employment and, more than that, we need to help breed the confidence and foster the demand necessary for increased employment in the building industry. I believe these reforms will be the adrenaline the sector craves to get construction businesses, large or small, working and employing more people again. So ultimately this bill is crucial for jobs; not just jobs for those constructing new houses but also for those working in all the related trades and for a wide range of suppliers.

This bill is about jobs, but it is also about more than jobs. It is also crucial for the young people and the low-income earners in Mitchell and the other electorates who are trying to break into the housing market for the very first time. It is a helping hand for those who would otherwise not quite be able to make the step into new home ownership, carefully and strategically targeted where it is most needed.

As well as assisting first homebuyers, it will bring an incentive for many other homebuyers to build a new home or buy off the plan rather than buying an established property—the bottom line, quite simply, being job creation. The trickle-down effect of more new houses being built in South Australia will be a significant boost for those industries reliant on the building trade. The reforms in this legislation include:

- creating an \$8,500 housing construction grant for all buyers of brand new homes until 30 June 2013, regardless of whether or not it is their first home. This will also apply to properties with a value of up to \$400,000 and will phase out for properties valued up to \$450,000. This replaces the existing \$8,000 First Home Bonus Grant;
- increasing the First Home Owner Grant from \$7,000 to \$15,000 for first home owners who build or purchase a brand new home. This is ongoing; and
- reducing the First Home Owner Grant from \$7,000 to \$5,000 for first home owners who purchase an established home up until 30 June 2014, when it will expire. This is a deliberate push to target jobs in the housing construction industry.

Along with the government's budget announcement on stamp duty concessions for off-the-plan apartments in the city and Riverbank Precinct, eligible first homebuyers could receive as much as

\$39,830 in state government assistance. Those first home owners building or buying a brand new home elsewhere will still be eligible for a maximum of \$23,500. That will really make a difference to people saving for their first home.

I encourage all members present to consider their constituents employed or seeking employment in the housing building industry and related trades and suppliers when they cast their vote on this legislation. If, as I hope, the bill becomes law, I would encourage people looking for a new home to take a serious look at building or buying a new home, including off-the-plan apartments. There will never be a better time to do so, so take advantage of well-targeted and constructive reforms aimed squarely at delivering jobs growth.

Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder) (12:25): I also wish to make a contribution, which will not be as long as some others. I will put on the record that it must be in the gene pool of my family that we have great aspirations to own homes. In my case, I built a home when I was 24. I am very proud of the fact, though, that my children have contributed to the state Treasurer's revenue in the last 12 months, with my son at the age of 22 buying a home in Adelaide and my daughter at the age of 20, with her partner, buying a home in Maitland on Yorke Peninsula. My son bought a house with his partner, too. It is those young people who have committed to property ownership—

Mr Pederick: You'll fund the whole shortfall the way you're going.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Not quite. I am just glad I do not have any more kids, with the contribution the old man has made to help them to buy these homes, but, anyway, that is what we do. I was really proud about that, and they have benefited from some form of first home owner grant to assist them in that. I put that on the record.

I will take up a point made by the shadow treasurer in his contribution that the really hard part of this equation is the land tax, and the development costs and the holding costs for developers when they come to do developments that create opportunities for new homes to be built on greenfield sites. Yorke Peninsula and the Goyder electorate have had some exceptional growth in the last 10 years. A lot of subdivisions have been done. People have made very strong decisions about lifestyle choices. They want either to have a holiday home on the peninsula or move there, or they transition from Adelaide to a holiday home on Yorke Peninsula and then permanent living.

Mr Pengilly: They want a good local member.

Mr GRIFFITHS: Hopefully they have one. It has put a lot of pressure on actually finding people who have the capacity for that money to build those homes. There has been a large uptake and, if you look around the peninsula, there are an enormous number of subdivisions that have been completely sold out. There are many that are still in the stages of development. There are some that are languishing a little bit, and I want to focus on The Dunes development at Port Hughes. Sadly, all members in this chamber would be aware of them having financial difficulty and I think in about mid-July going into a form of administration. Ferrier Hodgson are the company doing that.

The Dunes development was a vision of Peter Butterly. It owes, as I currently understand it, \$13 million as part of the development costs, but I know a big trigger for them to make the eventual decision to walk away from it basically and go into receivership was the land tax bill that they got in July. They have developed in a certain way which has created a greater liability for land tax, and I do acknowledge that, but I am told—and quite accurately—that the land tax bill they got in July was \$1 million. When you are holding development costs and sales have been relatively slow because of the unwillingness of people to commit financially to building new homes, even though it is a great site, it put them in a very difficult financial position. However, this impost of land tax of \$1 million coming in as a lump sum bill early in July was, I believe, probably one of the final trigger points.

People behind the company have not told me that. I have had a briefing with the administrators about what the situation is and they have not told me that either, but it is a position that I put to the chamber. When the member for Davenport talks about the myriad costs associated with home ownership and development costs, he raises a very valid point that, yes, this form of support is necessary. That is why I will always stand up to support it, but there are also the bigger picture issues to look at when it comes to holding costs, development costs and land costs.

Mr Bob Day is quoted quite often as saying that, with respect to housing development, it is land development costs and land costs that are the more significant part of building a new home. That is an issue that the parliament and both parties will have to consider quite seriously over the

next 16 months, but it is important that we review this and get it right to try to bring those costs down a little bit.

There was one point that the member for Stuart made to me, and he omitted it unfortunately from his own contribution, and he posed the question of what the impact on property prices will be as a result of this. Will it push them up? He used the analogy of solar panels which I think is accurate and which many of us can relate to. In the period up to the end of September last year, if you wanted to put on solar panels, the expense was quite high. In my case I put 20 panels on my roof (a 3.8 system) at \$14,000 but as soon as September had finished and the big rush was over the price dropped enormously, and now you could probably get the same system for about \$5,000.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Yes, and the subsidy is removed and all these sorts of things, even though a level of subsidy still exists, but the prices have dropped enormously. Is there a similar capacity here where the prices will have an increase as a result of an additional grant being available? I know that the Treasurer's briefing to the shadow treasurer apparently talks about it being cost neutral over the forward estimates.

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

Mr GRIFFITHS: Roughly cost neutral over the forward estimates. There is no doubt at all that it will stimulate people to make decisions to either get into property ownership or to build new homes, and that is a good thing. I am lucky that, because of the development growth that has occurred in my area, there are many building companies locally who employ a lot of young people and give them opportunities to get into a trade. I have a lot of Adelaide based businesses that build in my area, too, and they still purchase things locally even though most of them sadly spend long days there and bring everything with them, but it is the complication of it all.

So, the opposition will support this because it provides an opportunity for the economy to grow. We only want to see jobs created, we only want to see people have the commitment and the courage to make big financial decisions, and there is no doubt in my mind that this grant will assist some who are wavering to make that final decision and to get into building a home or home ownership for the first time.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (12:32): I thank honourable members for their contributions. I will try to respond to some of the issues that have been raised in particular by the member for Davenport, although I understand we will go into committee and so I will be able to provide more detail or go over anything that I have missed.

At the outset, I will talk about a couple of issues. Firstly, this measure is about stimulus. It is not about housing affordability. This is about kickstarting a market which has dropped to levels—I think the lowest level it has been since the early 1990s. Housing construction, as all members here would agree, is one of the key drivers of our economy. It employs the construction industry generally and employs more than 60,000 South Australians. Representations have been made to the government and the government has observed the state of the housing construction market and has responded in this way to the calls for us to intervene in the market to get some stimulus. Anecdotal evidence over the last fortnight or so since the announcement has been that it is beginning to achieve what we set out to do.

The other point I should make with regard to the various definitions is how there are definitions of what constitutes a first home. Essentially there is nothing new in what is being proposed here. We are simply using the same definitions and the same eligibility criteria as have always existed for these first home owner grants. So, whether someone is a first home owner, whether a home is a newly constructed home and therefore eligible for the grant or not, we are simply using the existing criteria that is in the existing act.

The member for Davenport asked about the modelling with regard to the costs and the budget effect. Broadly speaking, over the forward estimates, it is budget neutral. It achieves that budget neutrality not through any clawback, stamp duty or payroll tax, but through the wind down of the existing First Home Owner Grant for established homes. The existing First Home Owner Grant for established homes winds down basically upon passage of this bill through the parliament to \$5,000 and then is wound down completely from 30 June 2014, and the clawback of the costs of the stimulus occurs through the wind down of that grant.

We have not made any presumptions about the effect on stamp duty collections or payroll tax through this measure; they will become apparent in time. But, the revenue neutrality of it comes through the wind-down of the existing First Home Owner Grant for existing homes; that is how it offsets. The first two years have a significant budget impact—\$30-odd million in 2012-13 and then a smaller impact in the second year—but in the third and fourth years, that money is clawed back through the wind-down of that existing grant. If the member for Davenport wants any further information, I am more than happy to provide that.

With regard to market value, and the questions about why we are using market value, it has been used since 2008. It is a commonly used and accepted term and, as I say, it is the criteria that is used in the existing legislation. Substantially renovated homes have always been eligible for first home grants. The term is defined in the act, and so far no issues have arisen in this area with regard to the existing grants.

Whether a home is ready for occupation is a council responsibility. Applicants declare on the application form that the home has been completed, or will be completed in 18 months. Past application compliance work has also been done by RevenueSA. As I understand, in the act, the completion in 18 months is generally expected to be in the contract to build. If it is not, then there is a requirement that it is completed within 18 months. There remains, however, discretion with the commissioner, I think, to extend that in the event that, through some unforeseen circumstances, the home is not able to be completed in that time.

With regard to the question about community titles, they are eligible for grants, and they have been since 2000. I am advised that a home on a community title has its own value, and no issues have arisen historically in valuing homes on community titles. Again, it goes back to these first home owner grants. The \$400,000 to \$450,000 tapering off for eligibility of these grants is not something that is new to this, it is something which has existed for as long as these grants have been around.

Retirement village residents are generally not eligible for these grants because, generally speaking, residents in retirement villages do not actually own the residence that they occupy. When they move into a retirement village, they are essentially purchasing a right to occupy, rather than purchasing the title the residence is on. To be eligible for the grant, the title actually has to pass and change hands.

An 18-month eligibility criteria applies, or a contract needs to state that the home will be completed in 18 months. As the member for Davenport points out, it is true that the Housing Construction Grant—the \$8,500 grant which began on the day of the Premier's announcement—will wind up on 30 June next year, so it is for a limited time only. That grant is available to any purchaser of a newly constructed home. Indeed, a person can buy multiple homes and receive the grant for each of those homes. This measure is about stimulating the housing construction market.

If an overseas investor, a trust, company or an individual investor wants to go out there and build a dozen homes, then we are achieving what we have set out to do. It is really about kickstarting the housing construction industry. It does run out on 30 June, so it does not entail any long-term liability or financial issues for the state because it is only available for a very short period of time.

I have tried to answer, at least in an overview, the issues that have been raised. I thank honourable members for their comments, and I thank the opposition's support for the bill.

Bill read a second time.

In committee.

Clause 1.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Treasurer, thanks for your answers in regard to the second reading contributions. You mentioned in your answer that it is roughly revenue neutral because the existing grant for existing homes is wound out. What is the annual budget for the grants for existing homes currently across the forward estimates?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The existing cost of the First Home Owner Grant for both existing and newly constructed homes for the 2012-13 financial year is \$52.5 million, and that obviously goes up for indexation, so it steps up over time based upon transaction numbers. About 20 per cent of that goes to newly constructed homes—roughly \$10 million. The cost to the

government of the First Home Owner Grant for existing homes is about \$40 million year at the moment, for 2012-13. It would go up over time.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is the Treasurer quoting from an electronic government docket?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is a summary of the modelling. I am more than happy to provide it to the member for Davenport.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Sounds good; thank you for that. So, the \$40 million a year, each year, across the forward estimates, is for the existing home grant and that is being wound out. So, in the last two years, it is a \$40 million saving, which the modelling shows will be picked up by the new home grants. How many new home grants do you think will be paid out for the \$40 million that will be saved under the existing home grants?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In terms of the impact on the budget for 2012-13, there will be a negative impact of \$34.3 million. For 2013-14, there will be a negative impact of \$12.9 million. From 2014-15, as the existing home owner grant gets wound down, there will be a positive impact of \$25.2 million—so this is the clawback in the last couple of years—and then in 2015-16, there will be a positive impact of \$28.9 million.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Thanks for that, but the point I am trying to make is that, in order to calculate the savings of \$25 million in the third and fourth years, you must have calculated a certain number of transactions. This thing is open ended. There is no cap on the number of grants that are available, so I am interested in what number of grants Treasury has modelled in each of the years because, for all we know, Treasury could be half right or there could be twice the amount in those years. What number of grants across the forward estimates are you calculating?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In terms of what we have worked on, there are a number of facets. In terms of the Housing Construction Grant—that is the \$8,500—between the Premier's announcement and 30 June next year, we expect 5,019 applications and our costs are based on that. In terms of the first homebuyers, who are able to receive on top of that the \$15,000 First Home Owner Grant—and that is the one that is ongoing—we expect that, for 2012-13, that will be 1,313; for 2013-14, 2,030; for 2014-15, 2,135; and for 2015-16, 2,223.

For the estimated number to receive the \$5,000 First Home Owner Grant, bearing in mind that this is the grant that is stepping down for established homes, we expect that number to be 2,188 for 2012-13, 6,089 for 2013-14 and 507 for 2014-15, which is the year that it steps down. That is essentially a timing issue between financial years.

Clause passed.

Clauses 2 to 5 passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 6(2), which amends section 3 of the act, talks about a comprehensive home building contract as distinct from a home building contract, and I am wondering what is the importance of the word 'comprehensive', as distinct from a 'home building contract' for a new home. At what point does a contract become comprehensive?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is a term that is used in the existing act. It is defined as:

...a contract under which a builder undertakes to build a home on land from the inception of the building work to the point where the home is ready for occupation and if, for any reason, the work to be carried out under such a contract is not completed, includes any further contract under which the work is to be completed;

This is to ensure that it is a contract to build a new home and that it is done from start to finish, I am advised.

The CHAIR: Not a partial home, I guess.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes.

Clause passed.

Clauses 7 and 8 passed.

Clause 9.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: I want to check whether the following is possible under the scheme. My understanding is that, under the scheme, you can get only one First Home Owner Grant.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: You can be a first home only once.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: You can be a first home only once, but you can have as many existing home grants as you want. So, I can buy as many existing homes as I want, but I can get only one First Home Owner Grant. I could get a First Home Owner Grant to build my first home and then, at the same time, apply for five grants to buy five houses and get the existing home grant?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No. The existing grants are the First Home Owner Grant and the First Home Bonus Grant, but I think what the member for Davenport refers to is the first home grant, which applies to both existing and newly constructed homes for first homebuyers. So, any first homebuyer, at the moment, whether they are purchasing a newly constructed home or an existing home, is eligible for that First Home Owner Grant.

There is also the First Home Bonus Grant, which has existed for a little while now and which is for first homebuyers purchasing newly constructed homes. But both of those grants, as they were, were only for first homebuyers. If you are a first homebuyer, you are eligible for the First Home Owner Grant. If you are building a newly constructed home, you were eligible also for the First Home Bonus Grant—the two grants.

What the difference is in what I am proposing in this legislation is that we get rid of the grant for first homebuyers of existing homes and that we have a new Housing Construction Grant, which is available to anyone, regardless of whether or not they are a first homebuyer, of \$8,500 if they are building a new home. But the First Home Owner Grant as it existed was a grant for which only first homebuyers were eligible.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So, let me check this, then: Iain Evans goes out and buys a house as his first home; I can get a First Home Owner Grant. Can I then demolish that house and have a new house built and apply for a grant for the new house, as it is a new home, and therefore I would get two grants: one to buy the property; and then one to build a new house on the property once I have demolished the old house?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You could get the Housing Construction Grant under what is proposed. So, if you had previously purchased a home, received the First Home Owner Grant under the old rules, and then today you went out and demolished that home, signed a contract before 30 June to build a new home, you would be entitled to the Housing Construction Grant (the \$8,500), yes, that is correct.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Is it not true also that, under the new rules, I can go out and buy my first home, then demolish that home because it is a ramshackle shack, have a vacant block of land and then apply for the other grant for building a house and therefore receive two grants?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If you have previously owned a house—

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: No, it is your first home. Let me explain again. A 20 year old buys an old shack on a block of land. It is his first home, so he applies for the First Home Owner Grant under the new rules. It is under \$400,000, so he is eligible. He demolishes the house having not lived in it and then says, 'I actually want to build a new house—

Mr Griffiths: Or two.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: —or two or three houses on the block.' Now, the block was occupiable. Nothing in the rules say that you have to occupy it; they just say that at the point of after 18 months it has to be ready for occupation. What I am saying is that, under the rules, I think you could actually get two grants. I am not necessarily objecting to that, I am just trying to find out what the rules say.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The existing act provides for occupancy, so, in order to get the First Home Owner Grant, you have to occupy the house for six months. That is under section 12—Criterion 5—Residence requirement of the existing First Home Owner Grant Act 2000. You cannot buy a house, not occupy it, get the grant, then demolish it and get another First Home Owner Grant. Any individual can only get the First Home Owner Grant once.

The exception to that is the new Housing Construction Grant, but that finishes on 30 June next year. Yes, you are right—and that is what I was trying to explain before—if anyone, including

myself, demolished their existing home and built a new home on the block before 30 June, they would be eligible for the Housing Construction Grant, irrespective of whether they had received a First Home Owner Grant previously. Anyone is eligible for the Housing Construction Grant, the difference being that it is only until 30 June next year; it is not an open-ended subsidy.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: If they are quick, they could do it. That is my point.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If anyone is quick, yes; and they can indeed get it for more than one house.

Clause passed.

Clauses 10 to 15 passed.

Clause 16.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Clause 16 states that the house must be finished within 18 months, etc. When is the grant paid? Is it paid up-front or when the building is actually finished?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: If you have a contract, which I think would be most common for people building homes, it is upon your first progress payment. Other than that, it would generally be upon settlement.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: So, who goes out and checks whether they are actually completed, or occupied, within the 18-month period? You stipulate in here that it must be completed within 18 months, but do we have public servants running around checking the sites to make sure they are finished within 18 months, having already given them the money, because we pay them the money on the first progress payment which is always when the foundations are laid? So, we have paid them the money, then, 18 months later, how do we check it?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The first thing to state is that, generally, for most people it will be sufficient for it to be in the contract. So long as the contract says the house is to be completed within 18 months, that will be sufficient. For contracts where that is not the case, yes, there is a compliance section within RevenueSA and they do risk-based assessments and, yes, they do go and check individual properties.

Clause passed.

Remaining clauses (17 to 20), schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (13:01): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

[Sitting suspended from 13:01 to 14:00]

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DRUG PARAPHERNALIA) AMENDMENT BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

STATUTES AMENDMENT AND REPEAL (SUPERANNUATION) BILL

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

SMITH, CORPORAL SCOTT JAMES

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:03): I move:

That the House of Assembly expresses its deep regret at the tragic death of Corporal Scott James Smith of the Barossa Valley, who lost his life serving our country in Afghanistan, places on record our appreciation of his dedication and service to our nation, and as a mark of respect to his memory the sitting of the house be suspended until the ringing of the bells.

It was just over two weeks ago that we gathered at Unley Oval to commemorate the 10th anniversary of the Bali bombings. We know that, for the Bali bombing and for the more than 100 Australians who lost their lives in terrorist attacks since 9/11, each of those attacks had a link

to Afghanistan. Each of those attacks involves someone who had been trained there, trained in bomb making, trained in the ways of terrorism. Our commitment to the stabilisation of a nation that has been the training ground for terrorist organisations that have threatened and killed Australian citizens is not without its challenges. The price of our commitment in Afghanistan has once again been made very real to us with the death of Corporal Scott James Smith, whom we honour and remember today.

On Sunday 21 October 2012, elements of the Special Operations Task Group were conducting a disruption operation against a network of insurgents in Helmand province. Corporal Scott James Smith was involved in clearing a compound area when an improvised explosive device detonated, killing him instantly. Scott was a combat engineer. He joined the army in 2006 and in 2008 was posted to the Special Operations Engineer Regiment, where, in a short period of time, he developed into one of our nation's most promising special service soldiers.

He was just 24 years of age, born in 1988, yet by the time of his death he had already served in the Army for almost seven years and had completed previous tours of Afghanistan and the Solomon Islands. He was a recipient of a number of awards, including the Australian Active Service Medal, the Afghanistan Campaign Medal, the Australia Service Medal and the NATO International Stabilisation Assistance Force Medal.

Corporal Scott James Smith was one of us. He was a product of the Barossa Valley, where he attended Faith Lutheran School. The Australian Defence Force has described him as an exceptional soldier who possessed all the qualities and charisma of a great junior leader. He has been described by his unit as a genuine, honest and dedicated member who was probably one of the best junior non-commissioned officers that the unit has seen.

Perhaps the most incisive analysis of Scott's character came from his family. They spoke of his altruism, his dedication and his firm belief that his actions truly did make a difference. They also spoke of his larrikin charm, his cheeky smile and his kind words. Mostly, they said they will remember his lovable character that endeared him to all those around him.

His community remembers him as a man of substantial character and leadership skills, particularly when the chips were down. In summary, this young man was the real deal, and now he is gone. I cannot begin to imagine the profound grief that has befallen Corporal Scott Smith's family: his partner, Liv; his parents, Katrina Paterson and Murray Smith; his sister, Roxanne; his Army mates; and his many friends in the Barossa community and especially at Faith Lutheran College. They are all deeply in our thoughts today.

Corporal Scott's death brings to 39 the number of Australian soldiers killed in Afghanistan. The roll of honour grows longer and our hearts grow heavier. Losses on the battlefield are true tragedies. While they might disappear from the headlines in newspapers and on the radio after a few weeks, they will always remain devastatingly real for the families. Corporal Scott James Smith's contribution and sacrifice will be always be remembered. Lest we forget.

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:07): I rise to second this motion and on behalf of the South Australian Liberal Party offer our most sincere condolences to the family of Corporal Scott James Smith: his mum and dad, Katrina and Murray; his sister, Roxanne; and his partner, Liv. For those of us here today who are parents, it is almost unbearable to contemplate the loss and suffering the family is currently enduring. It is a loss made no less profound by the fact that it is shared by many: Scott's friends, his Army mates and the wider Australian community. Our nation has lost a fine young man in the service of us all.

However, in the passing of a young man we must try to remember and celebrate all that he did, for Scott Smith was a man with a lot to offer, who gave life everything before giving his life. Obviously, I did not know Scott personally. However, in tributes to him I have learnt of a fresh faced Barossa Valley boy, a youngster who grew up with a permanent smile on his face, a practical joker who relished the role of larrikin, and a reliable son and brother who was the glue that held his family together. It will be these memories, I am sure, that will help those who loved him the most cope with their tremendous grief.

Australia's war effort in Afghanistan has now claimed 39 lives. These fallen soldiers, all someone's husband, son, dad, or brother, have sacrificed their lives to make ours better. Each death is a tragedy. Each one brings home to us all the extreme risk facing our servicemen and women each and every day they are on deployment.

When I read tributes or news reports from Afghanistan, it is encouraging, and indeed uplifting, to learn that among the coalition troops, the Aussies are often considered the most professional and the best. I have long held that view and have often remarked upon the ability of our soldiers to build positive relationships with locals, even against a backdrop of conflict. They are soldiers who will not leave your side when the going gets tough, when the unit is under fire, when survival becomes the very essence. It is the Australian spirit. Scott Smith was one of these soldiers.

Scott was on his second deployment to Afghanistan, a special forces soldier, indeed a member of the highly regarded Special Operations Engineer Regiment. Despite being only 24 years old, he was considered by his peers as one of the best junior non-commissioned officers the unit had ever seen. Scott knew the risks. He was not a soldier to enter conflict without being fully briefed and prepared, and he also very strongly believed that what he and his comrades were doing on the harsh battleground of Afghanistan (and, more specifically, the northern Helmand province) was making a real difference. He never questioned the importance of the struggle, he never doubted, and he never dodged the duties that he was given, no matter how risky or grave they may have been.

It was on duty on 21 October on a joint Australian-Afghan compound clearance and disruptive mission against insurgents that Scott lost his life. He was killed instantly by that most feared of weapons, the unseen but deadly improvised bomb, the IED—an improvised explosive device—in other words, a crude, homemade explosive cocktail often hidden by the roadside and responsible for two-thirds of coalition troop deaths since the war began 11 years ago.

This is the work of many Australian Army troops, scouring the valleys and the ridges on foot patrol and in the air and in armoured mine-clearing vehicles. The risk of death is ever present. It is the mark of the man that, for Corporal Smith, it was an environment in which he thrived in spite of the incredible risks. His physical, moral and emotional courage were unsurpassed. One need only consider his outstanding military honours and awards to appreciate this courage and commitment.

He had been awarded the Australian Active Service Medal with clasp International Coalition Against Terrorism; the Afghan Campaign Medal; the Australian Defence Medal; the Army Combat Badge; the Australian Service Medal for an earlier deployment in the Solomon Islands and, again, for counterterrorism and special recovery; the Army Soldiers Medallion; and the NATO International Stabilisation Assistance Force Medal with Multi-Tour Indicator.

He was an exceptional soldier and he set the bar high. His dedication was a magnificent example to those fortunate enough to serve alongside him. One of his senior officers said in tribute, 'Scott was a fine soldier, a good bloke and a wonderful Australian.' One of his comrades I think summed it up best when he said, 'Scott's sense of obligation, his sense of loyalty and his sense of purpose made him the epitome of the calling of the combat engineer.' Our thoughts are with Scott's family as we remember and pray for a young soldier, a good man who was fighting to make the world a safer and better place. I commend the motion to the house.

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: Members, before I call the next speaker, I note the presence in the gallery of a group of years 11 and 12 students from Woodville High School, who are guests of the Premier. Welcome. It is nice to see you here.

SMITH, CORPORAL SCOTT JAMES

Debate resumed.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:12): As the state Minister for Veterans' Affairs, I rise to support this condolence motion. I would like to extend my deepest sympathy to the partner of Corporal Scott Smith, his family and his friends. As the son of a Vietnam veteran and a father myself, my heart goes out to Scott's parents. I can try to understand but I know that I can never share the heartache implicit in having to farewell a child in this way. Scott's family will forever be impacted.

Corporal Scott James Smith died in the proud and selfless service of his country. He was born in the Barossa Valley in 1988. His life was one crowded hour in which he saw service in the Solomon Islands, once before in Afghanistan, and had also worked on the security surrounding the visit to Australia by President Obama. Scott is one of several brave South Australians to have

made the ultimate sacrifice in Afghanistan since the Australian Defence Force commenced Operation SLIPPER in 2002. Sergeant Andrew Russell died in 2002; we lost Sapper Darren Smith and Private Tomas Dale in 2010 and Sapper Jamie Larcombe last year.

Scott's passing serves to remind us yet again of the reality of what we ask our defence personnel to do in various theatres of conflict around the world. Our young men and women put their lives on the line in a very real way every single day. As those who remain, it is our clear responsibility to care for the families of those who are gone, care for those who return to us injured and, on the broader political stage, continue to strive for an environment where war is not seen as an acceptable solution to international problems. With the loss of Corporal Scott Smith we have lost one of our finest and we are forever diminished. Lest we forget.

Mr VENNING (Schubert) (14:14): It gives me great sadness today to support the condolence motion for a young man, 24 years of age, who grew up in the Barossa Valley, Corporal Scott James Smith. I support the words of the previous speakers, particularly the Premier, the Leader of the Opposition and the minister. Corporal Smith's life was so tragically cut short while serving his country as a member of the Special Operations Task Group serving in Afghanistan on 21 October 2012. As we have just heard, Scott grew up in the Barossa Valley, and I have a very close relationship with his grandfather, Mr Jim Paterson, of Greenock. Scott spent some time during his secondary education at several schools in the Barossa, particularly the Faith Lutheran School and the Nuriootpa High School. I understand that both schools have paid tribute to Scott.

We have noted several of our other brave soldiers who have died. We all feel and share the loss, but it is even more keenly felt when it is so close to home. The Barossa is much muted by this tragic news and in disbelief, and we feel we have lost a member of our community family. He joined the Army in 2006 and had been posted to Darwin, and more recently he was based at the Holsworthy Barracks in Sydney, New South Wales.

As members have heard, Defence has described Corporal Smith as one of its brightest during his short career. He was awarded many honours and awards and has been described by Defence as an 'exceptional soldier who possessed all the qualities and charisma of a junior leader'. When I was talking to his school mates on the weekend, I was told that this gentleman had an infectious and spontaneous personality. He was very popular with his school mates.

He was a much-decorated and respected soldier. As the member for Schubert and branch president of the RSL, I express my sincere sympathies and condolences to Scott's family. To his parents, Katrina and Murray, his sister, Roxanne, grandfather, Jim, and girlfriend, Liv, you will feel his loss more than anyone. May it provide some comfort to you to know that his sacrifice will never be forgotten.

Yes, Scott joins three other South Australians who have paid the supreme sacrifice in Afghanistan. We will never forget. Truly, they shall grow not old, as we that are left grow old. Lest we forget.

Mr HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite) (14:16): I rise to support the motion moved by the Premier. The house and the entire South Australian community find great sadness in the death of Corporal Scott James Smith of the Special Operations Engineer Regiment based at Holsworthy Barracks in Sydney, New South Wales—sadness because he was a local South Australian country boy, sadness because his family and his partner have suffered a great loss, sadness because his regiment and country have lost a good man with great promise; a life cut short out of duty to us.

In Afghanistan we are fighting a great evil. It has been a base for terrorists to plan and support attacks around the world from September 11 to the Bali bombing, attacks designed to maim and kill and destroy innocent men, women and children. These terrorists are extremists and zealots dressed under the guise of Islamic fundamentalism.

Islam is not the problem. As a person who has lived in two Muslim countries, it is very clear that this is a great religion followed by wonderful people. The problem is bigotry, zealotry and extremism which would see one small class of human beings dominate others and force upon them a bizarre vision for a future world in which freedom is suppressed, women and minorities persecuted, violence reigns supreme and the light of humanity extinguished by a great darkness. This darkness has raised its head before in genocides, in religious wars and in totalitarianism of the right or the left over centuries. We now fight it in its current guise.

To the family and friends of Scott, can I say that he died serving the cause of truth, freedom and justice. All that stands between freedom-loving Australians and the great evil of which

I have spoken has been him, his comrades and our democracy. With our friends around the world, good must fight evil and light must defeat darkness. Australia has lost 39 of its best young people fighting this war. There is another story around the 424 who have been savagely wounded and who are presently being nursed by their families, some with debilitating injuries. They have paid a huge price as well. Each one of these men, normal everyday Australians, one and all, volunteered to serve in the ADF. Thousands apply every year. Few are chosen after exhaustive medical, psychological and aptitude testing. You have to be good to get in. One of the best.

In Scott Smith's case, he had to endure an exhaustive Special Forces selection process, a process which picks the best of the best amongst the ranks of the ADF. He had to be smart, he had to be strong, he had to be emotionally and physically tough, he had to be well-educated, sharp, sensitive and astute.

Corporal Smith and all of the fallen were extraordinary Australians. It is important that as a parliament we pause to reflect on Corporal Scott Smith's sacrifice and I commend the Premier for bringing this motion to the house. It is important as MPs that we reaffirm our respect and commitment to the mission and to him and to his comrades and that we thank his family.

I last spoke on this in memory of Sapper Jamie Larcombe, another combat engineer from South Australia, killed during an engagement with insurgents on 19 February 2011. I read out the names of the 23 who had fallen at that time in the desert sands of Afghanistan. Since then, we have lost another 16 souls, bringing the total to 39. Many of these men have fallen from within the three regiments with which I served: the Royal Australian Regiment, the Special Air Service Regiment and the commando regiments. Like every member of this house, I feel the pain of this loss as an MP. At a personal level, I also feel it as a former comrade of these men.

On behalf of ex-servicemen across South Australia, who also respect their service and feel their pain, I want to mention each of the 16 who have died since this house last recognised their sacrifice on 22 February 2011. They are:

- Sergeant Brett Wood, Medal of Gallantry, Distinguished Service Medal, 2nd Commando Regiment, who was killed by an improvised explosive device during a dismounted patrol on 23 May 2011.
- Lance Corporal Andrew Jones, 9th Force Support Battalion, died of wounds as a result of a small-arms fire incident on 30 May 2011.
- Lieutenant Marcus Case, 6th Aviation Regiment, died of wounds sustained in a helicopter crash on 30 May 2011.
- Sapper Rowan Robinson, Incident Response Regiment, died as a result of gunshot wounds sustained in an engagement with insurgents on 6 June 2011.
- Sergeant Todd Langley, 2nd Commando Regiment, killed during an engagement with insurgents on 4 July 2011.
- Private Matthew Lambert, 2nd Battalion, The Royal Australian Regiment, died of wounds as a result of an improvised explosive device strike on 22 August 2011.
- Captain Bryce Duffy, 4th Regiment, Royal Australian Artillery, killed as a result of a small-arms fire on 29 October.
- Corporal Ashley Birt, 6th Engineer Support Regiment, killed as a result of a small-arms fire on 29 October 2011.
- Lance Corporal Luke Gavin, 2nd Battalion, The Royal Australian Regiment, died of wounds as a result of a small-arms fire on 29 October 2011.
- Sergeant Blaine Flower Diddams from the Special Air Service Regiment, killed during a small-arms engagement with insurgents on 2 July 2012.
- Sapper James Martin, 2nd Combat Engineer Regiment was killed as a result of small-arms fire on 29 August 2012.
- Lance Corporal Stjepan Milosevic, 2nd/14th Light Horse Regiment (QMI) , killed as a result of a small-arms incident on 29 August 2012.
- Private Robert Poate, 6th Battalion, The Royal Australian Regiment, killed as a result of a small-arms fire on 29 August 2012.

- Private Nathanael Galagher, 2nd Commando Regiment, killed in a helicopter crash on 30 August 2012.
- Lance Corporal Mervyn McDonald, 2nd Commando Regiment, killed in a helicopter crash on 30 August 2012.
- Corporal Scott Smith, whom we recognise today, Special Operations Engineer Regiment, killed by an IED on 21 October 2012.

Each of these men has had a life cut short and leaves behind a grieving family. Each of them has been denied an opportunity to go on and lead a fulfilling life and to serve their community because of their sacrifice. Each of our men and women serving around the world in various places in harm's way are there because they subscribe to certain core values: they love their country; they are imbued with a sense of duty first; and they adhere to a value system that puts integrity, truth, honour and mateship at the forefront. They are men and women of their word. Scott Smith clearly exemplified these values. In a statement following his death his family said:

Scott was a tremendous soldier. It is openly acknowledged that he was well respected within his workplace and by those who knew him.

We knew the Army was Scott's second family, his home away from home. Scott truly believed his actions made a difference; he was a truly dedicated soldier, who also knew how to relax in his time away from work.

Scott lived life to the fullest. He was born in the Barossa Valley and was water skiing as soon as he could stand—it was one of his great loves.

Scott attended school in the local area and used his school holidays to learn to barefoot water ski.

Liv, Scott's German princess, met him when she was an exchange student in Australia. After that, the pair could be found in all sorts of mischief together.

Scott loved being outdoors and keeping fit throughout his lifetime and pursued many sports—from long distance running, to cricket and any sort of competition he could be involved in.

Scott had a great sense of humour and was very much into practical jokes. He could also be very relaxed when not at work—becoming renowned for his cheeky smile and kind words. But mostly Scott will always be renowned for being a loveable character that held the family together.

Scott had a lot of time for those who had time for him, and his generosity in all things was often spoken about. One of the things you could rely on Scott for was calling whenever he was able and was thinking of you, at midday, midnight, or anywhere in between.

Scott had a larrikin charm that endeared him to all those around him, and these qualities ensure he will always be held in the hearts of those who knew him.

Our family is united in grief as we try to come to terms with our loss.

We thank everyone for their heartfelt wishes and messages of condolences, but ask that our privacy be respected during this difficult time.

On behalf of the house, I thank Corporal Scott James Smith's family for gifting him to this great nation. He and his comrades exemplify everything to which a young person growing up in South Australia could rightly aspire. In a world where the word 'hero' is often thrown about lightly, these are the real heroes: quietly getting on with the job of serving their nation, their names unknown until a bullet or a bomb reminds us of the great sacrifice they make so that we can be free. The house knows that the moment Scott fell another courageous young Australian, whose name we do not know, stood immediately into his place.

Scott Smith, thank you for your service. Thank you for the great sacrifice you have made. You now rest with the veterans of Gallipoli, Kokoda, Vietnam and the other battles that have helped shape this nation as a freedom-loving people who stand for all that is good. With your comrades, you rest in good company.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (14:28): I rise, too, to support the condolence motion for Corporal Scott Smith. I was very fortunate: in the time my brother served in the armed forces, I managed to see him deploy on overseas duty twice and managed to welcome him home. As has been indicated before, I cannot imagine the terrible loss that Scott Smith's family are going through in knowing they will not be able to hold him in their arms again. He has paid the ultimate sacrifice, keeping us safe throughout the city, the state and our nation, and we salute him for that. My niece went to school with Scott at Tanunda Primary School and also at Nuriootpa High School. She said that he was just a lovely bloke who was a great character.

I say to the family: please accept our motion today. We honour his service. We are very grateful for it. We obviously do not see the service that these men and women do for us in these nations far away from Australia, yet we are so proud of what they do for us, and what they will do for us into the future. To Corporal Scott Smith, Special Forces combat engineer, we say farewell; you are gone but not forgotten, and our condolences to your family, your partner and your friends.

The SPEAKER (14:30): Members, I am sure that you will all join me in passing on our sympathy to Corporal Smith's family, to his friends and to his comrades, and I ask that you join me in carrying the motion in silence.

Motion carried by members standing in their places in silence.

[Sitting suspended from 14:31 to 14:40]

WIND FARMS

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop): Presented a petition signed by eight residents of Millicent requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to call a moratorium on the installation of any further industrial wind turbines until full independent Australian research has been conducted and assessed, resulting in the establishment of national regulations and guidelines.

RICHMOND PRIMARY SCHOOL

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford): Presented a petition signed by 809 citizens of Richmond Primary School and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to install a red-light camera at the Richmond Primary School crossing on South Road.

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

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

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr PEDERICK (Hammond)** (29 June 2011) (Estimates Committee A).

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland—Minister for Employment, Higher Education and Skills, Minister for Science and Information Economy, Minister for Recreation and Sport): The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
CSIRO	\$20,000.00	Australian Institute for Food and Nutrition Research	Yes
Flinders University	\$62,500.00	SA Government TTCF Funding Facility	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$125,000.00	SA Government TTCF Funding Facility	Yes
Itek Pty Ltd	\$62,500.00	SA Government TTCF Funding Facility	Yes
Innovate SA Incorporated	\$10,000.00	Project Managing the Mining Innovation Seminar Series Program	Yes
Innovate SA Incorporated	\$20,000.00	Project Managing the Research Excellence Pilot Program	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$100,000.00	Molecular Basis of Cellular Recruitment	Yes
SARDI Innovative Food & Plants	\$100,000.00	Brassica Development of New Markets and Climate Change	Yes
University of South Australia	\$100,000.00	Manitoba Bioactive Dairy Protein Study/Pulses Project	Yes
CSIRO	\$10,000.00	Support for the Carbon Kids Program	Yes
University of South Australia	\$15,000.00	Professional Development Scholarship Awarded to Associate Professor Linda Davis	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Flinders University	\$15,000.00	Professional Development Scholarship Awarded to Associate Professor Catherine Abbott	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$15,000.00	Professional Development Scholarship Awarded to Dr Rachel Gibson	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$15,000.00	Professional Development Scholarship Awarded to Professor Bronwyn Gillanders	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$10,000.00	CRC for Sustainable Regional Communities—Professor Andrew Beer	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$15,000.00	Professional Development Scholarship Awarded to Dr Claire Jessup	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$15,000.00	Professional Development Scholarship for Ying Zhang	Yes
Environment Protection Authority	\$100,000.00	CRC Care	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$50,000.00	CRC E-Water	Yes
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$50,000.00	DWLBC Round 10 CRC (Future Farm Industries)	Yes
Government of South Australia—Rail Commissioner	\$100,000.00	DTEI Round 10 CRC (Rail CRC)	Yes
Primary Industries and Resources SA—PIRSA	\$50,000.00	Round 9 CRC (Australian Invasive Animals)	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$300,000.00	CRC National Plant Biosecurity, Beef Genetics, eWater and Competitive Pork Industry	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$350,000.00	CRC Sheep, Australian Seafood and Future Farms	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$50,000.00	CRC Future Farm Industries	Yes
Department of Trade and Economic Development	\$100,000.00	CRC Funding for Advanced Auto Technology	Yes
Department of Education and Children's Services	\$228,000.00	CSIROSEC Funding	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$45,000.00	Employment of an Inspiring Australia Program Officer	Yes
Technology Industry Association	\$75,000.00	Technology Industry Association Skills Program	Yes
Concept Creation (NAMIG)	\$175,000.00	Funding for NAMIG	Yes
Computers in Education Group of SA	\$10,000.00	Participation of teachers and schools in the 2011 FIRST Lego League in South Australia	Yes
Australian Institute of Policy and Science	\$70,000.00	South Australian Tall Poppy Campaign for the 2010-2011 financial year	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$50,000.00	Sponsorship—SpiRit of Science Program	Yes
CSIRO	\$40,000.00	Funding in support of National Science Week in South Australia 2011	Yes
Barnett Communications & Marketing	\$30,650.00	Finalisation of the judging process and delivery of the Awards gala dinner	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$10,000.00	Funding contribution for Science in Society Projects	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$10,000.00	The Science and Engineering Challenge Program	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$15,000.00	Women in Science Workshop	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
University of Adelaide	\$2,000,000.00	Construction of Building Infrastructure and purchase of equipment for a new Institute of Photonics and Advanced Sensing	Yes
University of South Australia	\$1,000,000.00	Material and Minerals Science Building and the Plazzo, Mawson Lakes	Yes
Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure	\$90,000.00	Geospatial Nodes for Earth's Crust Survey	Yes
Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering	\$11,000.00	Science in Parliament Project	Yes
Central Northern Adelaide Health Service	\$18,175.00	Neural Recovery following Spinal Cord Injury	Yes
Flinders University	\$50,000.00	SA Access to Synchrotron Project	Yes
Flinders University	\$435,450.00	Micro Algal Biodiesel Feedstock for SA	Yes
Flinders University	\$20,000.00	Funding for proposal re marine biotech project	Yes
SARDI—Aquatics	\$369,834.00	Development of a Sustainable South Australian Macroalgal Aquaculture Industry	Yes
SARDI—Innovative Food & Plants	\$11,654.00	Seafood Safety & Market Access	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$372,000.00	Advanced Optical—Fibre sending platforms for health, defence and the environment	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$400,000.00	STARR—Sensin Technologies for Advanced Reproductive Research	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$126,641.00	Adapting to climate change in South Australia: Human Dimensions of Transect Project	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$321,473.00	Developing world-class trace element micro-analytical imaging facilities for South Australia	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$448,502.00	Climate change communities and environment: Building research capability to identify climate change vulnerability	Yes
University of South Australia	\$134,500.00	Plant Image Analysis of the Development of Stress Tolerant Crops	Yes
University of South Australia	\$375,000.00	Murray Darling Basin Source Water	Yes
University of South Australia	\$628,000.00	Nano-Fabrication Facility	Yes
Deep Exploration Technologies	\$289,791.00	Funding for Drilling Research and Training Facility	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$187,413.00	Aerial and Satellite Imagery Exploitation Program	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$400,000.00	Transect for Environmental monitoring and Decision making (TREND)	Yes
University of South Australia	\$110,000.00	Regional Sustainability Centre in Whyalla	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$100,000.00	State Government Support for the ARC Centre of Excellence in Plant Cell Wall Biology	Yes
Flinders University	\$200,000.00	Social & Economic Determinants of Health Inequities	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$200,000.00	Optical Fibres for Light-Matter Interactions	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Common Ground	\$10,000.00	Digital Inclusion @ Common Ground project to 31 December 2011	Yes
Australian Information Industry Association	\$80,000.00	AIIA Facilitation of Digital Strategy Initiatives of SA	Yes
City of Prospect	\$30,000.00	High Speed Broadband Online Entrepreneurship Program	Yes
Women in Business & Regional Development	\$5,275.00	Web 2.0 for Intermediate Users Program	Yes
Southern Success	\$20,000.00	High Speed Broadband Business Implementation Program	Yes
City of Playford	\$10,000.00	Northern Adelaide Digital Economy Strategy	Yes
Monkey Stack Pty Ltd	\$6,000.00	Incubator for Digital Artists Program 2010-11	Yes
Bridges8 Pty Ltd	\$7,500.00	I'm a Scientist: Get me Out of Here	Yes
University of South Australia	\$9,000.00	BIS Cooperative Program SP2 2011	Yes
Adam Internet Pty Ltd	\$10,000.00	AdamMax Customer Satisfaction Survey	Yes
Adam Internet Pty Ltd	\$250,000.00	Broadband Development Fund	Yes
Regional Development Australia	\$63,000.00	Mid North Broadband Project Extension	Yes
Regional Development Australia	\$50,000.00	Mid North Broadband Project	Yes
Environment Protection Authority	\$100,000.00	CRC Care	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$50,000.00	CRC E-Water	Yes
Department of Environment and Natural Resources	\$50,000.00	DWLBC Round 10 CRC (Future Farm Industries)	Yes
Government of South Australia—Rail Commissioner	\$100,000.00	DTEI Round 10 CRC (Rail CRC)	Yes
Primary Industries and Resources SA—PIRSA	\$50,000.00	Round 9 CRC (Australian Invasive Animals)	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$300,000.00	CRC National Plant Biosecurity, Beef Genetics, eWater and Competitive Pork Industry	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$350,000.00	CRC Sheep, Australian Seafood and Future Farms	Yes
SARDI—Business Services	\$50,000.00	CRC Future Farm Industries	Yes
Department of Trade and Economic Development	\$100,000.00	CRC Funding for Advanced Auto Technology	Yes
Department of Education and Children's Services	\$228,000.00	CSIROSEC Funding	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$45,000.00	Employment of an Inspiring Australia Program Officer	Yes
Technology Industry Association	\$75,000.00	Technology Industry Association Skills Program	Yes
Concept Creation (NAMIG)	\$175,000.00	Funding for NAMIG	Yes
Computers in Education Group of SA	\$10,000.00	Participation of teachers and schools in the 2011 FIRST Lego League in South Australia	Yes
Australian Institute of Policy and Science	\$70,000.00	South Australian Tall Poppy Campaign for the 2010-2011 financial year	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$50,000.00	Sponsorship—SpiRit of Science Program	Yes
CSIRO	\$40,000.00	Funding in support of National Science Week in South Australia 2011	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Barnett Communications & Marketing	\$30,650.00	Finalisation of the judging process and delivery of the Awards gala dinner	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$10,000.00	Funding contribution for Science in Society Projects	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$10,000.00	The Science and Engineering Challenge Program	Yes
The Royal Institution of Australia	\$15,000.00	Women in Science Workshop	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$2,000,000.00	Construction of Building Infrastructure and purchase of equipment for a new Institute of Photonics and Advanced Sensing	Yes
University of South Australia	\$1,000,000.00	Material and Minerals Science Building and the Plazzo, Mawson Lakes	Yes
Department for Transport, Energy and Infrastructure	\$90,000.00	Geospatial Nodes for Earth's Crust Survey	Yes
Australian Academy of Technological Sciences and Engineering	\$11,000.00	Science in Parliament Project	Yes
Central Northern Adelaide Health Service	\$18,175.00	Neural Recovery following Spinal Cord Injury	Yes
Flinders University	\$50,000.00	SA Access to Synchrontron Project	Yes
Flinders University	\$435,450.00	Micro Algal Biodiesel Feedstock for SA	Yes
Flinders University	\$20,000.00	Funding for proposal re marine biotech project	Yes
SARDI—Aquatics	\$369,834.00	Development of a Sustainable South Australian Macroalgal Aquaculture Industry	Yes
SARDI—Innovative Food & Plants	\$11,654.00	Seafood Safety & Market Access	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$372,000.00	Advanced Optical—Fibre sending platforms for health, defence and the environment	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$400,000.00	STARR—Sensin Technologies for Advanced Reproductive Research	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$126,641.00	Adapting to climate change in South Australia: Human Dimensions of Transect Project	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$321,473.00	Developing world-class trace element micro-analytical imaging facilities for South Australia	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$448,502.00	Climate change communities and environment: Building research capability to identify climate change vulnerability	Yes
University of South Australia	\$134,500.00	Plant Image Analysis of the Development of Stress Tolerant Crops	Yes
University of South Australia	\$375,000.00	Murray Darling Basin Source Water	Yes
University of South Australia	\$628,000.00	Nano-Fabrication Facility	Yes
Deep Exploration Technologies	\$289,791.00	Funding for Drilling Research and Training Facility	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$187,413.00	Aerial and Satellite Imagery Exploitation Program	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$400,000.00	Transect for Environmental monitoring and Decision making (TREND)	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
University of South Australia	\$110,000.00	Regional Sustainability Centre in Whyalla	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$100,000.00	State Government Support for the ARC Centre of Excellence in Plant Cell Wall Biology	Yes
Flinders University	\$200,000.00	Social & Economic Determinants of Health Inequities	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$200,000.00	Optical Fibres for Light-Matter Interactions	Yes
Adelaide Convention Centre	\$6,499.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Adelaide Hospitality and Tourism School / Gateway Training	\$3,025.92	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Adelaide Western General Practice Network Inc/Healthfirst Training Australia	\$15,891.66	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Animal Industries Resource Centre	\$26,127.94	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
ARO Educational Services	\$374,350.36	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
ASC Training & Development	\$2,637.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Ascent Training Group	\$19,330.56	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Ashley Institute of Training	\$23,356.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Aspect Solutions	\$29,574.75	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
ATEC—Adelaide Training and Employment Centre	\$2,584,334.95	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
ATS Arrow Training Services	\$21,861.24	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian and International Industry Training / B.I.T.E. Australia—Beauty Industry Training and Education	\$29,329.09	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Child Care Career Options	\$31,759.52	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian College of Commerce & Management Pty Ltd	\$17,260.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Fisheries Academy Ltd	\$19,286.96	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Food Training Centre	\$23,817.78	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Industry Group Training Services Pty Ltd	\$248,842.02	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Institute of Technology Transfer	\$14,209.44	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Nursing & Midwifery Education Centre	\$21,884.88	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Tourism College and Recruitment Centre	\$5,136.96	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Australian Training Alliance Pty Ltd	\$5,908.45	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Workplace Training Pty Ltd	\$216,198.85	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Automotive Business College	\$73,087.25	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
AWC Business Solutions	\$37,197.84	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
AWC Training	\$98,087.71	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Balance Training Services Pty Ltd	\$36,914.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Bannister Technical	\$502,418.70	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Barkuma Inc	\$93,246.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Barrington Training Services	\$10,135.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
BE Logistics Training, Border Express	\$14,696.19	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
BJ Network Consulting Australia	\$94,491.42	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Building Skills Centre	\$150,006.48	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Business SA	\$36,171.90	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Career Boss	\$9,865.50	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Careerlink Training and Recruitment Services	\$4,777.50	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Careers Australia Institute of Training Pty Ltd, Careers Australia Institute of Business, Careers Australia Institute of Hospitality	\$30,023.58	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Carers' Training Centre Pty Ltd / Nursing Dynamics	\$19,596.16	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Cemons Skills Centre	\$68,186.42	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Charles Darwin University	\$9,490.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Child Care Services Training	\$11,646.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Christie & Betro	\$3,445.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Civil Train South Australia	\$745,370.73	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
CLB Training and Development Pty Ltd	\$7,407.90	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Clip Joint Education	\$296,146.77	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
CMC—Training at Work Pty Ltd	\$46,924.12	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
College for Learning and Development	\$137,534.55	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Educational Services and Consultants Pty Ltd	\$15,210.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Electus	\$554,219.74	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Enable Training and Recruitment/Enable College	\$48,316.08	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Enhanced Training Services	\$206,312.88	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Equals International	\$18,851.70	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Essential Training Services	\$209,564.16	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
ETSA Utilities	\$104,863.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Excel Training	\$3,540.50	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
F.C.T.A.	\$391,438.44	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
First Impressions Resources/ The Australian Retail College	\$1,209.60	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Flexible Training Solutions	\$9,075.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Focus Training Solutions Pty Ltd	\$23,108.64	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Ford Motor Company of Australia Ltd	\$9,423.37	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Franklyn Scholar	\$763,171.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Furnishing Industry Association of Australia Ltd	\$59,390.46	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
FutureStaff Pty Ltd	\$175.50	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Grow SA Limited	\$19,659.11	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
GrowSmart Training	\$43,113.90	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Heather Langton Academy of BeautyTherapy	\$3,823.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Heta Incorporated	\$6,124.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Holmesglen Institute of TAFE	\$27,409.92	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Hosanna International College	\$50,066.16	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Hospitality Group Training Inc	\$40,024.98	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Hospitality Industry Training Pty Ltd	\$26,260.56	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Hostec Hospitality Services	\$595.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Hungry Jack's Pty Ltd	\$9,850.23	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
icareers	\$27,085.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Independent Institute of Food Processing	\$161,863.46	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Industry Training Pty Ltd	\$726,705.50	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Insync Training Solutions Pty Ltd	\$104,183.58	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Integrity Business College	\$26,949.30	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Into Training Australia	\$3,820.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Jobs Australia Ltd	\$18,812.88	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
JRL Training Services	\$35,633.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
KMC Community Services Training	\$13,725.60	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Lead Seekers College	\$495.36	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
LITA Training	\$17,133.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
MADEC Australia	\$3,329.28	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Master Builders Association SA Inc	\$96,304.02	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Maxima Training Services	\$447,836.31	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
McDonald's Australia Ltd	\$38,347.89	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
MEGT Institute	\$40,889.88	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Mint Training Pty Ltd	\$52,820.88	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Mission Australia Training Institute	\$9,740.12	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Morgan and Hay Community Services Training and Development Centre	\$16,026.72	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
MSS Training Academy	\$4,177.92	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
MTC Training	\$130,943.06	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Murray Mallee Training Company Ltd	\$64,816.38	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
National Institute of Training Pty Ltd	\$2,630.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Nationwide Training Solutions Pty Ltd	\$59,762.42	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
New Deal Pty Ltd	\$27,212.23	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Nexus Recruitment and Training	\$56,659.14	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
NIBA College of Insurance and Risk Professionals	\$1,521.60	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
North East Vocational College	\$510,585.28	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Northern Melbourne Institute of TAFE	\$68,845.24	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
PEER VEET	\$1,107,331.23	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Pegasos Strategic Training Pty Ltd	\$37,637.22	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Performance Edge Systems Pty Ltd	\$68,420.10	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Performis	\$27,799.48	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Pharmacy Guild of Australia, The	\$110,773.66	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Pizza Hut	\$7,010.25	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Positive Training Solutions Pty Ltd	\$16,123.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Print Training Australia/Humanagement/Humanagers	\$348,992.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Quality Automotive Training	\$190,514.30	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Quality Training and Hospitality College	\$349,829.21	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Queensland Institute for Aviation Engineering Pty Ltd	\$11,958.05	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
RAMC Pty Ltd	\$26,587.74	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Ramsden Telecommunications Training	\$62,972.42	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
RDNS Education Centre	\$55,222.75	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Real Estate Institute of SA Inc	\$125,825.70	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Real Estate Training College	\$156,099.30	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Red Earth Training Solutions	\$11,734.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Regional Skills Training Pty Ltd	\$365,864.27	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
River Murray Training Pty Ltd, Australian College of Community Safety	\$64,638.91	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
SA Training and Consulting	\$8,228.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Sempcom Petroleum Transport Training Pty Ltd	\$13,933.47	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
SG Learning and Development Pty Ltd	\$18,636.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Shermans Hairdressing Academy	\$59,146.24	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
SITE Academy	\$2,101.20	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Source4	\$2,492.34	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
South Australian Learning Centre	\$20,420.48	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
South West Institute of TAFE	\$585,742.32	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Sport SA	\$63,406.32	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Stanborough Wemyss Contracting Pty Ltd	\$87,990.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Status Employment Services	\$11,354.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Stones and Muirden Business College and Training Centre	\$38,378.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Strive Training Australia	\$25,956.09	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
SWAT Stokes Workplace Assessment Tng Group PL	\$14,298.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Tactical Training (Australia) Pty Ltd	\$1,224.96	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
TAFE SA Adelaide North Institute	\$13,005,512.30	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
TAFE SA Adelaide South Institute	\$5,608,629.71	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
TAFE SA Regional	\$3,539,830.60	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Target Training	\$14,667.48	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Targeted Training	\$179,100.53	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
TexSkill Ltd	\$3,971.10	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
The MTA Group Training Scheme Inc	\$1,226,235.37	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
The Thebarton Senior College	\$1,792.59	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Timber Training Creswick Ltd	\$3,791.32	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Training Innovation Management and Enterprises	\$25,616.16	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Training Prospects	\$1,596,074.24	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Training Sense Pty Ltd	\$2,380.98	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Transport Training Centre Inc	\$55,077.30	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Transport Training Solutions Pty Ltd/Allan Miller Driving School	\$298,507.30	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Transqual Pty Ltd	\$10,891.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Trison Business College	\$2,453.70	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
UCMS Academy	\$46,560.00	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Vantage Automotive Pty Ltd	\$20,374.04	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Vocational Training and Education Centres of SA	\$42,988.80	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
VTECH Automotive Training	\$345,283.72	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
W G Learning Pty Ltd	\$5,714.10	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Western Pacific Training	\$22,728.88	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
William Angliss Institute of TAFE	\$115,232.19	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Wirraway Homestead Youth Centre, Wirraway Training	\$6,614.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Worklink	\$2,246.40	Delivery of Off Job and On Job Training to Apprentices and Trainees	Yes
Australian Manufacturing Workers Union (SA Branch)	\$90,025.00	Australian Manufacturing Workers Union—Project Officer	Yes
Business Services Industry Skills Board	\$35,000.00	Industry Partnership Program—Home Sustainability	Yes
Business Services Industry Skills Board	\$0.00	Industry Partnership Program—Financial Upskilling	Yes
Electrotechnology Water Skills Board SA	\$84,582.00	Industry Partnership Program—Utilities Upskilling	Yes
Electrotechnology Water Skills Board SA	\$76,500.00	Industry Partnership Program—IT Attraction	Yes
Defence Teaming Centre Inc	\$37,500.00	Industry Partnership Program—Leadership Program	Yes
Defence Teaming Centre Inc	\$90,000.00	Industry Partnership Program—Women in Defence & Resources	Yes
Defence Teaming Centre Inc	\$340,000.00	Industry Partnership Program—Accelerated & Critical Skills	Yes
Food, Tourism and Hospitality Industry Skills Council	\$59,660.00	Industry Partnership Program—Cheese Industry	Yes
Food, Tourism and Hospitality Industry Skills Council	\$28,500.00	Industry Partnership Program—Regional Hospitality	Yes
SA Health & Community Services Skills Board Inc	\$103,600.00	Industry Partnership Program—Childcare Upskilling	Yes
Service Skills SA	\$123,750.00	Industry Partnership Program—Aquatics Project	Yes
Service Skills SA	\$43,878.00	Industry Partnership Program—Arts & Events Project	Yes
Service Skills SA	\$19,010.00	Industry Partnership Program—Retail Executive	Yes
Transport & Distribution Training SA Inc	\$17,460.00	Industry Partnership Program—Maritime Attraction	Yes
Transport & Distribution Training SA Inc	\$133,050.00	Industry Partnership Program—Transfield Rail Attraction	Yes
Transport & Distribution Training SA Inc	\$50,288.00	Industry Partnership Program—Upper Spencer Gulf Attraction	Yes
Mineral Resources & Heavy Engineering Skills Centre Inc	\$70,000.00	Targeted Training Projects—Indigenous Leadership	Yes
TAFESA Adelaide North Institute	\$22,800.00	Targeted Training Projects—SRS Clients	Yes
Civil Contractors Federation SA Branch	\$65,000.00	Targeted Training Projects—Split System Training	Yes
Civil Contractors Federation SA Branch	\$80,000.00	Targeted Training Project—Bituminous Training	Yes
Civil Contractors Federation SA Branch	\$80,000.00	Targeted Training Project—Concrete Training	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Plumbing Electrical Electronic & Refrigeration Vocational Education Employment & Training Inc	\$171,600.00	Skills for Environmental Sustainability—Solar Photovoltaic Project	Yes
TAFE SA	\$56,000.00	Skills for Environmental Sustainability—Riverland Water Project	Yes
River Murray Training Pty Ltd	\$70,000.00	Skills for Environmental Sustainability—Riverland Water Project	Yes
Suzlon Energy Australia Pty Ltd	\$200,000.00	Skills for Environmental Sustainability—Wind Project	Yes
Workers Educational Association of SA Inc	\$77,000.00	Election Commitment—WEA Upskilling	Yes
Hirotec Australia Pty Ltd	\$43,105.00	Election Commitment—Automotive Training	Yes
ZF Lemforder Australia Pty Ltd	\$40,250.00	Election Commitment—Automotive Training	Yes
Futuris Automotive Interiors (Australia) Pty Ltd	\$44,306.00	Election Commitment—Automotive Training	Yes
Toyoda Gosei Australia Pty Ltd	\$42,500.00	Election Commitment—Automotive Training	Yes
Plumbing Electrical Electronic & Refrigeration Vocational Education Employment & Training Inc	\$80,975.00	Election Commitment—Automotive Training	Yes
TAFE SA Regional, Port Augusta	\$33,000.00	Election Commitment—Electro-Tech Trades Assistant Project	Yes
TAFE SA Regional, Port Augusta	\$42,000.00	Election Commitment—OZminerals Surface Extraction Project	Yes
Regional Development Australia Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula	\$110,000.00	Election Commitment—Mining	Yes
Plumbing Electrical Electronic & Refrigeration Vocational Education Employment & Training Inc	\$151,715.00	Election Commitment—SRS Clients	Yes
TAFE SA Adelaide South Institute	\$140,000.00	Election Commitment—SRS Clients (Aust Tax Law 1&2& Corporate Law)	Yes
TAFE SA Adelaide North Institute	\$53,200.00	Election Commitment—SRS Clients	Yes
TIME Pty Ltd	\$120,000.00	Election Commitment—Child Services	Yes
The MTA Group Training Scheme Incorporated	\$136,000.00	Election Commitment—Upskilling Tradespersons	Yes
The MTA Group Training Scheme Incorporated	\$204,800.00	Election Commitment—Pre-Vocational Training	Yes
City of Playford	\$20,000.00	Election Commitment—Marni Waeindi—Horticulture	Yes
City of Playford	\$20,000.00	Election Commitment—Marni Waeindi—Agriculture	Yes
TAFESA Regional—Berri	\$35,380.00	Fletcher Freighters—retrenched workers	Yes
TAFESA Regional—Berri	\$54,906.00	National Foods—retrenched workers	Yes
TAFESA Regional—Mount Gambier	\$16,380.00	Carter Holt Harvey—retrenched workers	Yes
Forestworks Ltd	\$120,232.00	Kimberly-Clark Australia—retrenched workers	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Regional Development Australia—Limestone Coast Inc	\$20,000.00	Kimberly-Clark Australia—retrenched workers	Yes
Adelaide Training & Employment Centre (ATEC)	\$135,000.00	Industry & Indigenous Skill Centre (IISC) Program with Adelaide Training & Employment Centre	Yes
Adelaide Western General Practice Network Inc	\$63,721.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Adelaide Western General Practice Network Inc	Yes
Australian Fisheries Academy Ltd		National Training Infrastructure Program with Australian Fisheries Academy Ltd	Yes
Australian Nursing Federation (SA Branch)		National Training Infrastructure Program with Australian Nursing Federation (SA Branch)	Yes
Bordertown High School		National Training Infrastructure Program with Bordertown High School	Yes
Cemons Hair & Beauty Care Centre		National Training Infrastructure Program with Cemons Pty Ltd	Yes
City of Playford	\$62,258.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with City of Playford (Marni Waeindi)	Yes
Civil Contractors Federation SA Branch	\$194,927.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Civil Train South Australia	Yes
Cleve Area School	\$8,250.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Cleve Area School	Yes
Cowell Area School		National Training Infrastructure Program with Cowell Area School	Yes
ETSA Utilities	\$136,500.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with ETSA Utilities	Yes
Hamilton Secondary College	\$120,000.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Hamilton Secondary College	Yes
Heathfield High School		National Training Infrastructure Program with Heathfield High School (Stage 2)	Yes
Iwantja Community Inc	\$224,500.00	Industry & Indigenous Skill Centre (IISC) Program with Iwantja Community Inc	Yes
Kaltjiti Community Aboriginal Corporation	\$275,000.00	Industry & Indigenous Skill Centre (IISC) Program with Kaltjiti Community Aboriginal Corporation	Yes
Lefevre High School	\$0.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Lefevre High School	Yes
Minda Inc		National Training Infrastructure Program with Minda Inc	Yes
Mineral Resources & Heavy Engineering Skills Centre Inc (RESA)	\$1,326,000.00	Mineral Resources and Heavy Engineering Skills Centre Inc (RESA)	Yes
North East Development Agency—Gully Corp		ANTA Infrastructure (Skills Centre) Development Program	Yes
North East Vocational College	\$207,332.00	Industry & Indigenous Skill Centre (IISC) Program with North East Vocational College—2010	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Oak Valley (Maralinga) Inc		National Training Infrastructure Program with Oak Valley (Maralinga) Inc	Yes
Plumbing Electrical Electronic & Refrigeration Vocational Education Employment & Training Inc	\$184,702.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with PEER VEET—2008	Yes
Plumbing Electrical Electronic & Refrigeration Vocational Education Employment & Training Inc	\$159,525.00	Industry & Indigenous Skill Centre (IISC) Program with PEER VEET—2010	Yes
Rostrevor College		National Training Infrastructure Program with Rostrevor College	Yes
Service to Youth Council Inc		National Training Infrastructure Program with Service to Youth Council Inc	Yes
St Francis de Sales College	\$144,386.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with St Francis de Sales College	Yes
St Michael's College, Adelaide		National Training Infrastructure Program with St Michael's College, Adelaide	Yes
Tatachilla Lutheran College Association Inc	\$20,500.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Tatachilla Lutheran College Association Inc	Yes
Tauondi	\$44,949.00	Industry & Indigenous Skill Centre (IISC) Program with Tauondi Inc—2010	Yes
Tauondi	\$13,600.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Tauondi Inc—ICT	Yes
Tauondi	\$33,745.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with Tauondi Inc—Refurbishment	Yes
The Heights School		National Training Infrastructure Program with The Heights School	Yes
The MTA Group Training Scheme Incorporated	\$135,900.00	National Training Infrastructure Program with MTA Group Training Scheme	Yes
The University of Adelaide—Elder Conservatorium	\$1,089,062.00	The University of Adelaide—Elder Conservatorium of Music	Yes
Tumby Bay Area School		National Training Infrastructure Program with Tumby Bay Area School	Yes
Tyndale Christian School Inc		National Training Infrastructure Program with Tyndale Christian School Incorporated	Yes
Youth Education Centre		National Training Infrastructure Program with Youth Education Centre (Magill)	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$11,000.00	Scholarships	Yes
Adelaide University	\$110,000.00	Scholarships	Yes
Flinders University	\$13,750.00	Scholarships	Yes
Flinders University	\$4,400.00	Scholarships	Yes
Trustee for the Sir Charles Bright Scholarship	\$2,200.00	Scholarships	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Business Services Industry Skills Board	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Construction Industry Training Board (funding deed terminated as at 30 June 2011)	\$145,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Electrotechnology and Water Skills Board	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Food, Tourism & Hospitality Industry Skills Advisory Council	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Manufacturing Industry Skills Advisory Council	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Primary Industries Skills Council	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
SA Health & Community Services Skills Board	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Service Skills SA	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Transport & Distribution Training SA	\$200,000.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Catholic Education SA	\$408,183.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, to establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
SA Independent Schools Targeted Programs Authority Inc	\$390,610.00	To support the minister, through the Training and Skills Commission and DFEEST, to establish priorities and workforce development strategies to meet South Australia's current and future skills and workforce needs.	Yes
Common Ground	\$10,000.00	Digital Inclusion @ Common Ground project to 31 December 2011 To demonstrate the benefits of technology, developing digital literacy and on-line participation for residents at Common Ground Housing facility who are at risk of being socially isolated. The grant will enable a trial of the use of technology and the development of digital literacy for residents.	Yes
Marree Progress Association	\$12,200	Information required from Wendy Golder P&E Directorate This grant was not included in the list provided by OCE	
Australian Information Industry Association	\$80,000.00	AIIA Facilitation of Digital Strategy Initiatives of SA Facilitation of ICT industry involvement in driving the uptake of high speed broadband by SA businesses and citizens in order to maximize social and economic benefits of participation in the digital economy.	Yes
City of Prospect	\$30,000.00	High Speed Broadband Online Entrepreneurship Program Provide subsidy to small business owners in the cities of Prospect and Tea Tree Gully to attend e-business workshops.	Yes
Women in Business & Regional Development	\$5,275.00	Web 2.0 for Intermediate Users Program Provide subsidy to female small business owners in the Limestone Coast region to attend workshops on integrating social media tools into their business strategies	Yes
Southern Success	\$20,000.00	High Speed Broadband Business Implementation Program Provide subsidy to small business owners in Willunga to attend e-business workshops	Yes
City of Playford	\$10,000.00	Northern Adelaide Digital Economy Strategy Contribution to the development of a Digital Economy Strategy for the Northern Adelaide Region by the Cities of Salisbury, Playford and Tea Tree Gully	Yes
Service Skills SA	\$90,000	Engaged Retail Industries in the Retail Indigenous Employment Project and responsible for the Project management, facilitation, support from and linkages to other appropriate state initiatives and government departments.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
SAGE Didactic	\$45,000	Delivery of 4 day foundation course to 25 young Aboriginal people to engage with and develop their technical skills and knowledge with practical experience utilising current industrial control technologies; a minimum of 20 completed the course.	Yes
Mining, Energy and Engineering Academy	\$45,000	Project provided 39 Aboriginal job seekers with pre-employment training and supported 32 participants to gain full time employment with John Holland Group, for the Precast stage of the Urban Superway project (15 months). Project included a specific recruitment campaign for 12 Aboriginal females, the Indigenous Women in Civil Construction Recruitment Campaign.	Yes
Aboriginal Health Council	\$20,432	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Career Employment Group	\$35,000	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Di-Monty Training Solutions	\$10,998	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Exact Mix	\$36,000	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Ngarrindjeri Ruwe Contracting	\$13,200	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Tauondi Inc	\$15,929	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Far North	\$20,988	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland	\$12,727	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland	\$13,636	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands and Riverland	\$13,636	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Exceptional Recruitment	\$30,545	The Commonwealth of Australia has established the Training Initiatives for Indigenous Adults in Regional and Remote Communities Programme. The purpose of the Programme is to identify and support the implementation of practical, flexible and integrated projects that will ensure that Indigenous Australians in regional and remote areas can engage in training opportunities.	Yes
Career Employment Group	\$72,000	Pre-employment training and support for Aboriginal people to enter the mining sector and industries that support the mining sector	Yes
Access Working Careers	\$42,800	Pre-employment training and support for Aboriginal people to enter the mining sector and industries that support the mining sector	Yes
OZ Minerals	\$80,000	Pre-employment training and support for Aboriginal people to enter the mining sector and industries that support the mining sector	Yes
Career Employment Group	\$99,000	Pre-employment training and support for Aboriginal people to enter the mining sector and industries that support the mining sector	Yes
Exceptional Recruitment	\$95,960	Pre-employment training and support for Aboriginal people to enter the mining sector and industries that support the mining sector	Yes
SANFL	\$130,000	A 2010 election commitment was to provide additional vocational and employment opportunities for young Aboriginal graduates from the South Australian Aboriginal Sports Training Academy (SAASTA) program. The program will involve 14 young Aboriginal graduates recruited from across South Australia undertaking full-time traineeships with the SANFL and Netball SA.	Yes
Aberfoyle Community Centre Inc	\$23,608	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Aldinga Community Centre Inc	\$16,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Anglican Community Care—Mt Gambier	\$24,566	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Bagster Road Community House Inc	\$40,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Bowden Brompton Community Group Inc	\$12,500	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Christie Downs Community House	\$16,300	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
City of Charles Sturt	\$12,500	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
City of Marion	\$10,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
City of Marion	\$40,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
City of Prospect	\$11,200	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Coromandel Community Centre Inc	\$13,794	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Encounter Centre Incorporated	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Engineering for Humanity Inc	\$23,400	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Hackham West Community Centre	\$23,500	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Heta Incorporated	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Hut Community Centre Inc., The	\$24,350	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Uniting Care Wesley Port Adelaide—Joan Gibbons Neighbourhood Centre	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Mid Murray Community Support Service Inc	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Midway Road Community House Inc	\$24,967	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Milang Old School House Community Centre	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Morella Community Centre	\$50,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Mount Barker Family House	\$17,750	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Multicultural Communities Council of SA	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Multiple Sclerosis Society SA—Multiple Solutions	\$12,600	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Murray Mallee Community Education Network Inc	\$20,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Muslim Women's Association of SA Inc	\$12,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Northern Area Community and Youth Services Inc	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Overseas Chinese Association of SA	\$15,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Paralowie R-12 Community Centre	\$19,500	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Pooraka Farm Community Centre Inc	\$41,856	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Renmark Paringa Community Centre (Chaffey)	\$21,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$20,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Salisbury East Neighbourhood House Inc	\$24,360	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Sophia Ecumenical Feminist Spirituality Inc.	\$15,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Southern Yorke Peninsula Community Telecentre Inc	\$10,618	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Tailem Bend Community Centre Inc	\$16,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Uniting Care Wesley Port Adelaide Taperoo Community Centre	\$22,333	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
Vietnamese Community in Australia, SA Chapter Inc	\$32,803	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
YouthJET-Regional Eastern Adelaide Development Initiatives Inc	\$25,000	Multi-literacies grant funded project that focussed on one or more of a range of key literacies (e.g. prose, finance, computer literacy); projects are non-accredited but linked to the skill levels of the IVEC 1.	Yes
City of Marion	\$39,200	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
City of Salisbury	\$24,500	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Encounter Centre Incorporated	\$24,000	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Hut Community Centre Inc., The	\$49,000	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Migrant Resource Centre of SA Inc	\$47,302	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Milang Old School House Community Centre	\$49,000	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Northern Volunteering SA Inc	\$24,410	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$89,500	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Southern Volunteering (SA) Inc.	\$49,000	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Vietnamese Community in Australia, SA Chapter Inc	\$49,000	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Vietnamese Community in Australia, SA Chapter Inc	\$14,700	Transition grant funded project that assisted adults to make successful transitions from non-formal to formal learning	Yes
Anglican Community Care—Mt Gambier	\$50,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Anglican Community Care—Mt Gambier	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Adelaide Hills Council	\$28,519	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Adelaide Hills Council	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Advancing Whyalla	\$26,482	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Bedford Industries	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Camden Community Centre	\$10,370	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Catherine House	\$45,431	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Catherine House	\$29,549	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Renmark Paringa Council— Chaffey Community Centre	\$29,910	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Christie Downs Community House	\$40,920	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
City of Charles Sturt	\$49,400	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
City of Marion	\$49,200	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
City of Marion	\$50,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
City of Onkaparinga	\$24,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
City of Playford	\$40,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	\$33,500	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
City of Port Adelaide Enfield	\$24,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Community House Port Lincoln	\$18,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Community House Port Lincoln	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
District Council of Yankalilla	\$36,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
DOME Association	\$50,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Elizabeth Community Connections	\$16,458	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Employment Directions	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Encounter Centre	\$13,200	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Encounter Centre Inc	\$15,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Heta Incorporated	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Heta Incorporated	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Infuse	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Regional Development Australia	\$39,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Kilburn Blair Athol Community Action Group Inc	\$26,300	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Mid Murray Community Support Service	\$35,607	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Milang Old School House Community Centre	\$57,300	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Morella Community Centre	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Morella Community Centre and Burton Community Centre	\$88,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Mt. Gambier Men's Shed	\$34,750	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
New Day Ministeries	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Overseas Chinese Association	\$40,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Para Worklinks Incorp	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Paralowie R-12 Community Centre	\$25,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Pooraka Farm Community Centre	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Pooraka Farm Neighbourhood House	\$50,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$52,400	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Reynella Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Riverland Division of General Practice	\$15,445	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
St Vincent de Paul Society	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
St. Vincent de Paul Society & Hutt Street	\$100,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Tailem Bend Community Centre	\$59,810	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Tailem Bend Community Centre & Murray Mallee Community Centre	\$96,524	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
The Bowden Brompton Community Group	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
The City of Salisbury	\$59,520	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
The Hut Community Centre	\$50,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
The Hut Community Centre	\$60,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
The Multiple Sclerosis Society of SA & NT	\$20,124	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Augusta	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Pirie	\$50,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
UnitingCare Wesley Port Pirie	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Whyalla	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Volunteering SA & NT Inc	\$48,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Centacare Catholic Family Services—Wandana Community Centre	\$33,952	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Centacare Catholic Family Services—Wandana Community Centre	\$30,000	Foundation skills grant funded project that provided accredited training (based on Education Skills Development 1 curriculum) that addressed barriers to participation in formal education, training and work.	Yes
Access Working Careers	\$32,259	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
Anglicare SA—ACE	\$33,090	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Australia Refugee Assoc	\$14,545	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
Disability Works	\$56,911	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
Disability Works	\$10,227	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
DOME Association	\$58,080	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
DOME Association	\$12,000	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
Equals International	\$40,484	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
New Day Ministeries	\$77,836	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
New Day Ministeries	\$11,000	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Skilled Group	\$58,080	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
Skilled Group	\$10,080	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	
The Quality Training Co	\$40,268	The Employment Assistance Program (EAP) was a state based employment program delivered under the South Australia Works initiative. The program ceased in 2010-11. EAP funded organisations to provide individualised assistance to jobseekers that are disadvantaged in the labour market. The EAP aimed to assist unemployed people experiencing barriers to employment to enable them to become more competitive in the labour market and ultimately move into sustainable employment.	Yes
DOME Assoc	\$60,000	To assist the development and implementation of appropriate strategies and structures to support infrastructure needs which will enable the organisation to become independent of government funding support while sourcing program funds on a competitive basis in the marketplace to assist mature aged unemployed people to obtain employment with employer participants	Yes
Access Working Careers	\$36,000	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Accustom Youth to Work	\$20,000	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
Balance Training	\$37,925	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
Civil Train Construct	\$26,651	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
Civil Train Construct		The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
Civil Train Construct	\$32,219	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
HIA Playford Alive	\$31,576	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
SYC Construction	\$91,928	The Learn to Earn program was established by the SA Government to provide training and employment opportunities for young South Australians, who may be currently disadvantaged in the labour market	Yes
Alliance of U3As in South Australia	\$18,000	Workforce Development grant funded project, which supported professional development and capacity building for the ACE sector and the adult literacy field.	Yes
Community Centres SA	\$50,000	Workforce Development grant funded project, which supported professional development and capacity building for the ACE sector and the adult literacy field.	Yes
Para Broadcasters Assoc. (PBA FM)	\$18,730	Utilising radio and the internet, the program provides access to audio resources and supports and showcases adult education to a broad range of listeners.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
City of Marion	\$10,000	Funding is provided for the Marion Learning Festival, which promotes the City of Marion as a 'learning community', where learning is delivered responsively through partnerships involving educational institutions, workplaces and community groups.	Yes
Community Centres SA	\$60,000	For the implementation of Phase 1 of the Community Services SA Workforce Development Plan	Yes
Community Centres SA	\$37,500	For production of Community Services SA Workforce Development Plan	Yes
Mental Health Coalition of SA	\$25,000	To provide psychosocial rehabilitation training programs to 200 workers employed by non-government organisations, within the mental health services sector of South Australia.	Yes
Tauondi Incorporated	\$1,225,000	Tauondi College provides a range of culturally sensitive education and training programs, both accredited and non-accredited, for Aboriginal people, providing pathways to employment or further training.	Yes
Tauondi Incorporated	\$1,000,000	Tauondi College provides a range of culturally sensitive education and training programs, both accredited and non-accredited, for Aboriginal people, providing pathways to employment or further training.	Yes
Bedford Industries	\$450,000	The Abilities for All program funds are provided to Bedford Industries to assist people with a disability who are not actively participating in the labour market. Participants follow a path of non-accredited learning in community centres through a partnership arrangement with CANH	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Pirie	\$330,000	Funding is provided to deliver Building Family Opportunities Program in Port Augusta. The South Australian Government has developed the Building Family Opportunities Program to focus on long term jobless families with children and dependents who are aged 24 years or less. The Program aims to break the cycle of intergenerational joblessness by providing Jobless Families with the necessary assistance to gain suitable employment in a decent job.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	\$605,000	Funding is provided to deliver Building Family Opportunities Program in Port Adelaide. The South Australian Government has developed the Building Family Opportunities Program to focus on long term jobless families with children and dependents who are aged 24 years or less. The Program aims to break the cycle of intergenerational joblessness by providing Jobless Families with the necessary assistance to gain suitable employment in a decent job.	Yes
Centacare Catholic Family Services	\$988,000	Funding is provided to deliver Building Family Opportunities Program in Playford. The South Australian Government has developed the Building Family Opportunities Program to focus on long term jobless families with children and dependents who are aged 24 years or less. The Program aims to break the cycle of intergenerational joblessness by providing Jobless Families with the necessary assistance to gain suitable employment in a decent job.	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	\$384,000	Funding is provided to deliver Family Centred Employment Project in Port Adelaide Enfield/City of Charles Sturt in conjunction with the Building Family Opportunities Program	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Pirie	\$40,000	Funding was provided to increase the capacity of service providers to deliver Building Family Opportunities program. The South Australian Government has developed the Building Family Opportunities Program to focus on long term jobless families with children and dependents who are aged 24 years or less. The Program aims to break the cycle of intergenerational joblessness by providing Jobless Families with the necessary assistance to gain suitable employment in a decent job.	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide	\$49,874	Funding was provided to increase the capacity of service providers to deliver Building Family Opportunities program. The South Australian Government has developed the Building Family Opportunities Program to focus on long term jobless families with children and dependents who are aged 24 years or less. The Program aims to break the cycle of intergenerational joblessness by providing Jobless Families with the necessary assistance to gain suitable employment in a decent job.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Centacare Catholic Family Services	\$40,000	Funding was provided to increase the capacity of service providers to deliver Building Family Opportunities program. The South Australian Government has developed the Building Family Opportunities Program to focus on long term jobless families with children and dependents who are aged 24 years or less. The Program aims to break the cycle of intergenerational joblessness by providing Jobless Families with the necessary assistance to gain suitable employment in a decent job.	Yes
RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and KI	\$70,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and KI	\$42,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Murraylands and Riverland	\$10,500	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$14,000	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$52,500	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Murraylands and Riverland	\$10,500	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Murraylands and Riverland	\$21,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Yorke and Mid North	\$28,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Yorke and Mid North	\$35,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$14,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Yorke and Mid North	\$21,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
RDA Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu and KI	\$21,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
RDA Murraylands and Riverland	\$21,000	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
RDA Whyalla and Eyre Peninsula	\$70,000	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$17,500	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$56,000	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$33,264	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$11,725	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
City of Onkaparinga	\$33,600	Funding for Stepping Stones for Jobs enables the delivery of tailored, location-specific projects that support young people gain skills, qualifications and jobs across three State Government Regions—Southern Adelaide, Northern Adelaide and Western Adelaide.	Yes
RDA Barossa	\$38,500	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
RDA Far North	\$70,000	Strategic Projects include a number of training and employment projects targeting unemployed persons and those at risk of involuntary job loss.	Yes
City of Onkaparinga	\$651,581	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
North East Development Agency	\$227,444	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Northern Futures	\$497,609	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Adelaide Hills, Fleurieu & Kangaroo Island	\$634,644	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Barossa	\$243,364	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Eyre & Western	\$468,729	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Far North	\$355,480	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Limestone Coast	\$282,640	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Murraylands & Riverland	\$507,827	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Regional Development Australia—Yorke & Mid North	\$655,269	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Western Futures	\$328,139	Working Regions 2011—14 Funding Deed Agreement—The program aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Adelaide Hills Regional Development Board Inc.	\$150,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Barossa & Light Regional Development Board	\$135,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
North East Development Agency Inc	\$192,500	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Eyre Regional Development Board Inc.	\$200,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Fleurieu Regional Development Board Inc.	\$210,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Kangaroo Island Development Board Inc.	\$75,500	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Limestone Coast Regional Development Board	\$150,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Northern Futures Inc.	\$307,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Riverland Development Corporation	\$200,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
City of Onkaparinga	\$331,250	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Southern Flinders Ranges Development Board Inc.	\$200,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Western Futures Inc.	\$200,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Whyalla Economic Development Board Inc	\$200,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Yorke Regional Development Board Inc.	\$155,000	South Australia Works in the Regions 2009—12 Funding Deed Agreement— aims to strengthen the capacity of local communities to determine and respond to their working and training needs.	Yes
Transport Training Centre	\$124,500	Transport and Logistics Employment and Training Program. To provide jobseekers with industry specific training and wrap around support so they can access employment opportunities identified by the Western Adelaide Employment and Training Network. The project will provide Certificate III in Transport and Logistics (Road Transport) to 30 jobseekers with 15 of the participants provided with assistance to gain a HR licence. 16 participants are expected to gain employment as a result of the training and partnership with Western Futures and Industry.	Yes
Whitelion Inc	\$100,000	The Whitelion project is a not-for-profit organisation that provided employment and mentoring services for 25 Aboriginal and non-Aboriginal young people who transitioned from custody or who were at risk of ending up in the youth justice system.	Yes
Mining, Energy and Engineering Academy Limited	\$20,000	To provide 100 indigenous participants with mentoring support and case management to ensure a minimum of 60 indigenous participants are sustainably employed with Woolworths Limited and their subsidiary retail outlets.	Yes
Mining, Energy and Engineering Academy Limited	\$80,000	To provide 100 indigenous participants with mentoring support and case management to ensure a minimum of 60 indigenous participants are sustainably employed with Woolworths Limited and their subsidiary retail outlets.	Yes
Peer Veet	\$36,000	Funding for the purpose of delivering training to eight (8) skilled migrant jobseekers in Certificate II Air-Conditioning Split Systems. The program will primarily enable skilled migrants to attain qualifications and skills resulting in them holding an industry licence to work as installers of split air conditioning systems. Funding based on the RTO capacity to deliver training within the Productivity Places Program delivery requirements at the cost of \$4,500 per participant.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Learning Potential International	\$52,200	Funding for the purpose of delivering twenty-nine (29) skilled migrant jobseekers the Certificate IV in Small Business Management. The Purpose will primarily enable skilled migrants to develop business skills to set up a small or micro-business. Funding is based on the RTOs capacity to deliver training within the Productivity Places Program delivery requirements at the cost of \$1,800 per participant.	Yes
Pathways Training	\$80,000	Funding for the purpose of delivering to twenty (20) skilled migrant jobseekers Certificate IV in English Proficiency. An increase in the recognised level of language competency will contribute to the skilled migrant's employability. Funding is based on the RTOs capacity to deliver training within the Productivity Places Program delivery requirements at the cost of \$4,000 per participant.	Yes
Disability Works Australia	\$100,000	The Disability Employment Register is an Equal Opportunities Program pursuant to Section 65 of the Public Sector Act (2009). The Register contributes to South Australia's Strategic Plan (SASP) target T6.22 Diversity in the Public Sector: Double the number of people with disabilities employed by 2014. The Disability Employment Register enables people with disabilities, who are not currently employed in the public sector, to apply for positions advertised in the Government of South Australia's Notice of Vacancies. Since 2007-08 DFEEST has provided annual funding to Disability Works Aust. (DWA) to manage the South Australian Government Disability Employment Register. (2010-11 funding)	Yes
Disability Works Australia	\$80,000	The Disability Employment Register is an Equal Opportunities Program pursuant to Section 65 of the Public Sector Act (2009). The Register contributes to South Australia's Strategic Plan (SASP) target T6.22 Diversity in the Public Sector: Double the number of people with disabilities employed by 2014. The Disability Employment Register enables people with disabilities, who are not currently employed in the public sector, to apply for positions advertised in the Government of South Australia's Notice of Vacancies. Since 2007-08 DFEEST has provided annual funding to Disability Works Aust. (DWA) to manage the South Australian Government Disability Employment Register. (First payment 2011-12 funding)	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
City of Playford	\$16,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	No— Agreement with LGA
Local Government Association	\$20,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Adelaide Convention Centre	\$32,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Attorney-General's Department	\$25,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Department of Correctional Services	\$262,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Trade & Economic Development	\$10,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Department of Education & Children's Services	\$140,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Department of Environment & Heritage	\$30,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Department of Environment & Natural Resources	\$15,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	No—Out of Scope for T115
Department of Families & Communities	\$20,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Families & Communities	\$10,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	No—Out of Scope for T115
Department of Health	\$144,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
SA Water	\$151,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Department of Transport, Energy & Infrastructure	\$165,000	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	Yes
Department of Treasury & Finance	\$1,421,773	In 2010-11 funding for trainees placed in Electorates was to be transferred to the Department of Treasury and Finance. This did not occur until 2011-12, therefore DTF continued to invoice DFEEST on a quarterly basis to reimburse the cost of salaries for trainees.	No—Out of Scope for T115

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of Treasury & Finance	\$334,756	In 2009-10 the Department of Further Education, Employment, Science and Technology (administered by the Industry Skills Development Branch) managed the recruitment of all youth trainees, apprentices and cadets into the Public Sector and local government through the CareerStart SA Program. Trainees placed in Electorates were fully funded. The program focused on providing opportunities to targeted groups identified as the most disadvantaged in accessing the labour market.	No—Out of Scope for T115
Pathways Training and Placements	\$13,294	The Next Step Training & Employment Program aims to provide injured workers with new training & employment opportunities to facilitate their return to work, by directing workers to participate in a self-directed, self-paced, industry demand-driven program. Each participant will have an individual employment and training plan tailored to their individual needs, skills and wants.	Yes
Women's Studies Resource Centre	\$16,750	Funding provided to enable the relocation of resources from the Women's Studies Resource Centre to the Barr Smith Library and TAFE SA.	Yes

PUBLIC SECTOR EMPLOYEES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (4 July 2011) (Estimates Committee B).

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development):

A response to this question was published in *Hansard* on 15 February 2012 (page 54) in reply to a Question on Notice asked by the Hon. R.I. Lucas on 7 July 2011.

MURRAY FUTURES

In reply to **Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop)** (12 July 2012).

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation): I am advised:

The Intergovernmental Agreement on Murray Darling Basin Reform includes \$80 million of Murray Futures funding for water purchasing from willing sellers in South Australia. The Australian Government has 100 per cent funded and managed this program.

The Australian Government has advised:

The commitment to make \$80 million immediately available for water purchasing in South Australia has been met, by securing the purchase of 34.4 gigalitres of South Australian water entitlements as at 31 December 2009.

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Joint Parliamentary Service—The Administration of, Annual Report 2011-12

By the Premier (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Auditor-General's Department, Operations of—Annual Report 2011-12

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. P.F. Conlon)—

Regulations made under the following Act—
Maritime Services (Access)—Revocation of Maritime Services (Access)
Regulations 2001

By the Treasurer (Hon. J.J. Snelling)—

Construction Industry Long Service Leave Board—
Actuarial Report 2011-12
Annual Report 2011-12

By the Minister for Health and Ageing (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Health Advisory Council—
Balaklava Riverton Annual Report 2011-12
Kingston Robe Annual Report 2011-12
Murray Bridge Soldiers' Memorial Hospital Annual Report 2011-12
Naracoorte Area Annual Report 2011-12
Northern Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2011-12
Penola and Districts Annual Report 2011-12
Yorke Peninsula Annual Report 2011-12
Retirement Villages Act 1987—Annual Report 2011-12

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.D. Hill)—

Adelaide Festival Centre—Annual Report 2011-12
JamFactory Contemporary Craft and Design Inc—Annual Report 2011-12
Libraries Board of South Australia—Annual Report 2011-12
South Australian Museum Board—Annual Report 2011-12

By the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation (Hon. P. Caica)—

Dog and Cat Management Board—Annual Report 2011-12
Flinders Ranges National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2011-12
Upper South East Dryland Salinity and Flood Management Act 2002—Annual
Report 2011-12
Vulkathunha-Gammon Ranges National Park Co-management Board—Annual
Report 2011-12
Witjira National Park Co-management Board—Annual Report 2011-12
Response by the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation—65th Report—
Natural Resources Committee—Bushfire Tour 2012 Case Study—Mitcham Hills
17 February 2012
Regulations made under the following Act—
Aquaculture—Lease Areas and Licence Areas—Fees

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. M.F. O'Brien)—

Privacy Committee of South Australia—Annual Report 2011-12

By the Minister for Science and Information Economy (Hon. T.R. Kenyon)—

Bio Innovation SA—Annual Report 2011-12

By the Minister for Transport Services (Hon. C.C. Fox)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Liquor Licensing—Dry Areas—Long Term—Victor Harbor—Period of Prohibition

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development)
(14:42): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: In recent days, we have taken major steps forward in achieving the Murray-Darling Basin plan that South Australia has been fighting for. From the outset, I said that the South Australian government would not settle for second best on the River Murray, we would not settle for a basin plan that compromised the health of the river and that we would not—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: You have still got your Mazda parked on the front bench here. When are you going to park him out the back?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: From the outset, I said that the South Australian government would not settle for second best on the River Murray. We would not settle for a basin plan that compromised the health of the river and that did not provide recognition for the respect that South Australians have shown the river over many decades. When 2,750 gigalitres was proposed in the draft plan, the science showed it fell well short.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is why we campaigned hard for the return of more water. It is a great credit to the thousands of people—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Aren't you embarrassed he is still sitting there?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is a great credit to the thousands of people—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —who have supported our fight for the Murray—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Premier, could you just sit down for a moment?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that last—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Can we have some order from members on my left, please?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is a great credit to the thousands of people who have supported our fight for the Murray that, last Friday, the Prime Minister decided to announce that the federal government will return 3,200 gigalitres of water to the Murray-Darling Basin and will provide \$1.77 billion to allow the extra 450 gigalitres of water to be obtained through water recovery projects that minimise the impact on communities. On Sunday, I welcomed a further commitment by the commonwealth of \$265 million for water recovery and industry regeneration projects in southern—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —in southern Australian river communities. This funding is a major step to ensuring the burden of adjustment does not fall on our irrigators and is a major boost for industry and communities along the length of the river. They would not have seen a dollar of this if they had lowballed themselves like those opposite.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The fight for the Murray is not over yet. The basin plan will be finalised in coming weeks and will then be introduced to federal parliament. If all South Australian federal members of parliament support the plan, it will become law. And I will just repeat that for those opposite—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will just repeat that for those opposite so they can actually understand this: if all South Australian federal members of parliament support the plan, it will become law. That is why today I am writing to all South Australian members of federal parliament urging them to support the changes to the plan. It is why I am writing to every state member of parliament to ask them to seek a clear commitment from their federal colleagues that they will support the changes. I know you are in regular discussions with Christopher Pyne, so it is just a question of actually—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The Deputy Leader of the Opposition, order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We are on the cusp of a historic breakthrough. We have a rare opportunity to put right an injustice that has lasted for more than 100 years. It only needs those elected to represent South Australians to stand up and fight for South Australia, to fight for the River Murray.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, order!

JAMES NASH HOUSE REDEVELOPMENT

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:47): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Today I am pleased to announce an increase in forensic mental health capacity in South Australia. Currently there are 30 beds at the forensic facility at Oakden—James Nash House as it is known—and 10 beds at Glenside. The 10 beds at Glenside are being relocated to the James Nash complex into a new contemporary design complex adjacent to the existing facilities. Having all forensic consumers located in the same area will maximise security and clinical efficiencies.

The government has also been successful in securing funding from the commonwealth to construct a 10-bed Step Down Rehabilitation Unit which will be designed to allow forensic patients to transition to the community with greater ease. Construction will be completed in June 2013, and this addition to the existing 40 beds will increase overall capacity in the forensic system to 50 beds. It will enhance patient flow, as consumers who do not have acute needs will be able to move to this service thereby opening up space for other acute consumers.

Whilst the increasing capacity to 50 will make a positive difference to the waiting list, the government acknowledged that for South Australia a capacity of 60 beds has been recommended by a number of peak bodies and consumer advocates including the Mental Health Coalition of South Australia, the Office of the Public Advocate and the Principal Community Visitor. We therefore sought to examine options to further increase capacity by another 10 beds. I mentioned it to the member for Waite during estimates when we examined this issue, and I said that I would come back to explain how I was going to do that; well, today I will.

Today I am pleased to announce that the state funded redevelopment project has been revised in scope to expand the original concept of a 10-bed complex, with a project cost of \$19 million, to a 20-bed one. The current construction market is favourable to purchasers, and the efficiencies of design mean that doubling the capacity can be done for an estimated additional

\$3 million (\$19 million for 10 beds and \$22 million, essentially, for 20 beds), revising the total project cost to \$22 million.

The funding for this will be reallocated from other SA Health projects which have come in under budget. The expanded project will now be taken to the Public Works Committee. When the new 20-bed facility is completed by mid-2014, the increase in capacity will align this state with the national average for forensic mental health beds. Importantly, it will relieve pressure on general acute mental health services. When a forensic patient is in the acute mental health system, they take the place of non-forensic patients and there is a flow-on effect for hospital emergency departments, and there have been reports of that from time to time, as members would know.

Emergency departments are not the most appropriate setting for mental health patients anyway, who consequently also sometimes require security guards, adding considerable additional cost to their care. In addition to significantly increasing the capacity of forensic mental health services in South Australia, a further benefit of this expanded project is the estimated peak construction workforce of about 50 workers to build the facility. I thank the officers of my department who came up with this ingenious way of fixing this particular problem.

QUESTION TIME

HEALTH SYSTEM

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Will the minister explain why a reduction of 114 beds in the health system does not mean a reduction in health services, given that the South Australian Salaried Medical Officers Association, the Nursing and Midwifery Federation and the AMA all say that these cuts will mean a reduction of services?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (14:54): I thank the acting shadow minister for health for her question. It is interesting that at this time when health is such a major issue, the Liberal Party does not have a permanent spokesperson on health at all. There is nobody on the other side who can talk about it. No wonder the Leader of the Opposition—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order. Standing order 98 requires that the minister's answer not be debate and be relevant to the question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The minister is aware of that.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: She is a bit sensitive, Madam Speaker, and that is why she makes mistakes when she goes onto the radio to make claims about it.

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order. The same standing order requires the minister to stick to the substance of the matter raised in the question, not to go off on a debate.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you. If the minister's answer relates to the substance of the question, he can answer as he chooses.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I refer you back to the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I will deal with the substance of the question. The question was, how can reducing the number of hospital beds equate to no reduction in health care? I will explain that very simply to the house. I will just go through some basic mathematics. We have about 3,000 hospital beds operating in Adelaide on any given day. It does vary a bit, because we flex up and we flex down dependent on seasonal demand, but say we have 3,000 hospital beds.

The average length of stay of a patient is around about 6½ days. What we know is that many patients spend about half a day to a day longer in hospital than they ought because they have not been discharged. The reason they have not been discharged is that we have a system in place where doctors do the discharging.

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Madam Speaker, they ask the question; she interjects; she objects to me saying anything political, yet she reserves the right to interject against me.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr PISONI: It is elementary not to address members by their correct title. 'She' is not acceptable.

The SPEAKER: Sit down, member for Unley. That is no point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! We will get some normality in this place. Order! Minister.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Madam Speaker, every time I come in here and try to answer a question which is a sensible question, I answer in a sensible way and I get the same kind of inane interjections—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —from the other side. They don't like the logic of what I am saying, so they interject.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order, deputy leader?

Mr MARSHALL: It's 98: relevance. The minister has been asked to address the substance of the question. He wants to give us a lecture. He wants to give us a lecture on civility, but—

The SPEAKER: Sit down! Sit down! You have made your point of order. It is not an opportunity for you to debate. Minister, back to the question.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: To get back to the logic. Thank you, Madam Speaker. I hope to get a bit of time to allow myself to finish this. The point I was making is, there are about 3,000 hospital beds. Patients on average spend longer in hospital than they need to, because the discharge policies we currently have in place, which are led by doctors, mean that doctors often are not available to let people go when they are ready to go. Consequently—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The same thing happens, Madam Speaker. Why would they get upset when I respond to interjections? The logic is, if you can get patients discharged in a timely way—and this is a recommendation that was made to the government by the nurses union, who—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister is trying to answer the question. Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This was the logic of the position put to the government by the nurses union, which said that there should be a policy in place, a protocol led discharge policy or a nurse led discharge policy in place, as happens in many other jurisdictions. It is something that we were considering in any event. To do this would mean we could conceivably take about half a day out of the average length of stay of patients in hospitals.

If we were to do that, that is equivalent to about a 10 per cent reduction in the need for beds in our system. We are not asking to reduce by 10 per cent; in fact we are looking at less than 5 per cent of the hospital beds across the metropolitan area. It is absolutely achievable to run our system in a smarter way, to get better productivity out of our system and to do things which are better for patients.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Ask me some questions! Go on; don't interject—ask a question. Have the guts! You be the shadow minister for health for a day. The policy will mean patients will get out of hospitals sooner, not before they need to get out, but in a timely fashion. It will produce a more productive system. This is what the nurses recommended. We have endorsed it; we think it is the right way to go, and I understand that doctors support it as well.

ADVANCED MANUFACTURING STRATEGY

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (14:59): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about last week's announcement to reform advanced manufacturing in South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (14:59): Before I do, I must just observe—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —that the Leader of the Opposition leads on health just to draw attention to the fact that she is completely paralysed from being able to reshuffle—

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order: standing order 98. What is the relevance of the Premier's statement to the question that was asked by the member for Mitchell?

The SPEAKER: I am sorry, leader. He has only been speaking for about 20 seconds so I really haven't seen where he is leading. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I was just warming up, Madam Speaker. I was warming to my task, which was to address the honourable member's question. I thank the honourable member: being a former automotive worker, he understands the importance of manufacturing for our beautiful state. While the opposition were fighting amongst themselves under leadership, we were introducing reforms in the manufacturing sector that will secure jobs for South Australians for decades to come.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Deputy leader, order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The decision by the Hawke and Keating governments to open up the economy to international competition, of course, has brought 21 years of uninterrupted prosperity for our state, but it has been uneven. It has had a particular impact on the manufacturing sector, which has been exposed, of course, to international competition. The old methods—the high tariff wall, the low costs behind that large tariff wall—are no longer available, so we believe a strong manufacturing sector is a vital part of a diversified economy. One of the major lessons that I think has been learned through the global financial crisis—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —is that those economies that do have a strong manufacturing sector, like Germany and the Scandinavian nations—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Who did you line up with? David, you are on whose side?

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: standing order 98, relevance. The Premier is completely straying from the question—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr MARSHALL: —which is about manufacturing—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr MARSHALL: —which he's got no idea about.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, you do not get up and debate the question yourself when you have a point of order. Also, Premier, I would ask you to refer to members by their title.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, I was just trying to quieten down those members opposite because they were engaged in a conversation across the chamber. I think this is an important issue that does need to be attended to.

While Adelaide remains the most competitive city in Australia to do business and Australia is one of the most developed nations in the world, there is no realistic way that we can compete on the basis of low costs and low wages, and we would not want to. We want to retain our capacity to ensure that our workers get decent wages and conditions and a decent quality of life. In the future, our manufacturing sector must compete on the basis of our ability to sell high quality goods built in an innovative way for which consumers across the world are prepared to pay a premium price.

That is what our manufacturing work strategy is all about. It is about transforming our manufacturing sector so that we can secure jobs in this most crucial sector over the coming decades. We will focus on building clusters of activity to bring people together from across industry, together with academics and our vocational educational institutions. Many of these clusters are already well developed, like the automotive industry in Edinburgh Park and the defence industry in Port Adelaide and Mawson Lakes. Others are emerging, like the biomedical precinct in City West and Thebarton and the CleanTech precinct.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There's a constant stream of abuse. Maybe, Madam Speaker, if he could—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Just like you were trying to help Isobel. Trying to help Isobel out, were you, just wandering in—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker. The latest Deputy Leader of the Opposition should know it is out of order to interject. It is no use taking points of order if you are going to interject.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The Crown rests, Your Honour.

The SPEAKER: There has been a barrage of interjections coming from my left—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, just like he tried to help the Leader of the Opposition. He walked in trying to knife her and then walks out a half hour later—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: how can this possibly be relevant to a question on manufacturing?

The SPEAKER: Thank you, sit down. Premier, I refer you back to the question.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. These clusters that we have invested in are going to be an important part of bringing together those innovative businesses which are going to be the future of manufacturing in our state. We believe that this is the future, because this is the means by which we spread the prosperity of our nation amongst more of our citizens. Those countries that have a strong manufacturing sector are the ones that are able to maintain the greatest degree of social cohesion as they spread the prosperity that comes into their economy amongst a larger number of workers, and that is what has always held South Australia together. That is our vision for the future of South Australia.

The SPEAKER: The Leader of the Opposition.

HEALTH SYSTEM

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:04): Thank you, Madam Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs REDMOND: —my question is, again, to the Minister for Health and Ageing. If the 114 hospital beds that the government is closing were not necessary and removing them will not reduce health services, why are those beds there in the first place?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:05): Well, I understand why the Leader of the Opposition does not understand a lot about the health portfolio—she has only had it for about three days. But can I just let her know—

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mrs Redmond interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! You have asked the minister a question; allow him to answer it.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You see, the trouble is, if I can be a little analytical, the kind of questions that the leader asks are always smart-alec questions designed to be clever, rather than designed to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —elicit information.

Mrs REDMOND: Point of order: standing order 98. In what way is the minister's comment not debate?

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The point is, Madam Speaker, I have pointed out to the house that, by changing the process by which we discharge patients, we can make incredible productivity improvements in the health system, and that is what we are attempting to do. I find it risible that opposition members would be asking questions about health cuts and the numbers of staff in our hospitals when their plan is to reduce by 25,000 to 35,000 the number of public servants in our state.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You said it yourself, Isobel.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: That's what they said. That's what honest Issy said.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis: You said it yourself.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Madam Speaker, No. 98, debate. It is not about our policy.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The question is not—

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I think the minister has finished his answer, anyway.

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The minister for mines, order! The member for Taylor.

CAPITAL CITY DEVELOPMENT PLAN

Mrs VLAHOS (Taylor) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Can the minister inform the house about the recent changes to the Capital City Development Plan?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, Minister for Business Services and Consumers) (15:06): I thank the honourable member for her question. I am pleased to advise that the government has now finalised the new planning rules for the Adelaide CBD which are aimed at revitalising the city centre and unlocking millions of dollars in investment potential. The changes were gazetted last Thursday (that is, 25 October) to the City of Adelaide Development Plan, which came into interim effect in March of this year.

I personally met with a number of residents, including residents in Halls Place, as part of the consultation process, and we have given greater opportunity for residents who are adjacent to or nearby developments to have an opportunity to express their opinion in the development assessment process. New measures include:

- more importance on community engagement for 'catalyst sites' and in areas where medium and high-rise development and low residential areas connect (or interface zones as they are known);
- more focus on relating a building to its local environment;
- policies that ensure that adult licensed premises are established in appropriate parts of the city away from residential areas and prominent frontages; and
- exemptions to minimum building heights to allow for low-rise buildings in special circumstances, such as in the event of fire damage.

Since the introduction of these measures in March, a total of \$1.2 billion worth of private development projects have been proposed within the city. Already four projects to the value of \$256 million have been approved by the Development Assessment Commission. These changes will complement the existing investment in the Adelaide Oval, the Adelaide Convention Centre, the Riverbank Precinct and the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, and, of course, will continue to create employment opportunities for South Australians.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Does the Department for Education and Child Development have a policy that protects children by informing parents and staff when an employee at a public school has been charged and/or convicted with sex offences committed against children in their care?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:09): Of course this government, this department, puts the protection of children uppermost in every act that we undertake—every policy. I would like to report—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Madam Speaker, this is a very serious, legitimate question and I am happy to answer it in the same vein. I am advised that a situation arose in late 2010 at a school in Adelaide's west. Allegations of a serious nature were raised. Police were immediately alerted and an individual was charged over the allegations. The staff member's employment was immediately terminated. The individual was sentenced to six years' gaol. In sentencing, the judge did not name the school or family involved to protect the child. I am advised that, given the sensitive nature of the incident and on advice of SAPOL, who I have to say do an outstanding job, the school did not send information to the community about this incident—on the advice of SAPOL.

Of course, a number of measures were undertaken by the school—and I accept that this is a legitimate issue—to ensure the continued care and safety of all students, including the following steps: all students provided with age-appropriate child protection curriculum; all staff working with students are screened and volunteers who support school excursions, for instance, and sports coaching are also screened; all staff and volunteers working with students receive regular documented reporting child abuse and neglect training; comprehensive procedures for managing

allegations made against staff and volunteers are in place; and all staff are given explicit advice about their duty of care to students and appropriate interactions with students. In addition, I understand arrangements were made by the school for support to be provided on an individual basis to children, families and any staff following this incident.

When it comes to the protection of our children, wherever we might find them, in a school or in an after school hours service, for instance, we take our obligations very, very seriously. Our commitment to child protection, for instance, in this state is completely unparalleled. When we came to power in 2002 the budget in this area was about \$90 million and it is now close to \$300 million. We have trebled the budget. There is a list as long as my arm of achievements—

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order?

Mr MARSHALL: We have listened very carefully to the minister but she has not gone near the question once. The question was, very specifically: does the department have a policy?

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Sit down. I think the minister answered that in the first 30 seconds. Minister, have you finished?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Have you finished your answer, minister?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Yes.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:12): Supplementary question: in light of the minister's answer, can she then explain why last month parents of a metropolitan high school where Stephen David Andrews was teaching and was committed for trial for communicating with a student for sex and accessing child pornography were written to by the department and advised of the incident?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:13): We take every case very, very seriously and we will not act, firstly, to further victimise children or, secondly, to jeopardise a matter that is before the courts.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I am happy to investigate more deeply into the allegations made by the member for Unley, because we all know—

Mr Pisoni: What allegations?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Into the suggestions made by—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Bragg, order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: So, I am very happy to look at that incident, but I have to say that we take our responsibilities very seriously.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mrs GERAGHTY (Torrens) (15:13): My question is to the Premier. Can the Premier inform the house about the response to his call for South Australian federal members of parliament to support a plan which returns 3,200 billion litres of water to the River Murray and protects our irrigators?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for State Development) (15:14): You will recall a little earlier I told you that I was writing to all South Australian federal members of parliament asking them to support the basin plan for 3,200 billion litres of water. We had a little glimmer of hope this morning when we saw reports that there was a group of South Australian federal MPs of the Liberal Party who decided that they were going to muscle up to Tony Abbott and tell him that he should look after South Australia. So, I was waiting to see what the

outcome would be of that federal caucus meeting, these big strong men out there muscling up to Tony Abbott and actually standing up for South Australia. Apparently, it has all gone to water. It has all—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Apparently there was a little squeak made by Mr Ramsey from out at deep fine leg; he managed to say a few words—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Deep fine leg?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and he was there—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: That's the Eyre Peninsula is it—deep fine leg?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: He is way up there, that's right; but the locals—

The Hon. I.F. Evans: Love the regions, don't you?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I do love the regions, and I say—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —go up to the Riverland; they love me, and they are not too enamoured with the local member.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: And they are not too enamoured with the local member, let me tell you. Madam Speaker, I met a few—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, I met some fine young men, some fine young irrigators; they look like great candidates to me. They look like great candidates for an upcoming state election. But, Madam Speaker, when we did pose the question to the member for Sturt, all he could come back with was not an answer to the question, 'Do you support the plan for 3,200 extra gigalitres of water?'—he just came back with abuse. So, they will do everything—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: They will do everything they can, Madam Speaker, to duck the question—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is a pretty simple proposition: if every federal Liberal MP votes for this plan, it passes the parliament. It is as simple as that. What we are asking them to do is to stand up for South Australia—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: Shoulder to shoulder.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Shoulder to shoulder with the rest of South Australia. It is not too late to get on board. It is not too late to get on board. Even Mitch can climb aboard; there is room in the cart for Mitch. Well, there is on this issue—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Not if it's a Mazda!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right; well Mazdas are fine, but we actually aren't settling for settling for second best in relation to this river; we are prepared—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —to fight to make sure we have a healthy river, and those opposite—

Mr Whetstone: You are gutless!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Oh, gutless? Gutless; is that right? Here's the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This is the member for Chaffey, who would have sold out the river on day one—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —calling me gutless.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: the Premier, although wanting to tell us all that everybody loves him—

The SPEAKER: No—

Mr MARSHALL: —which is completely delusional—

The SPEAKER: Thank you—

Mr MARSHALL: —is now attacking the member for Chaffey.

The SPEAKER: Sit down! Member for Norwood, sit down! Somebody called him gutless from the other side of the chamber. I am not sure whether it is parliamentary language or not. He can respond to it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Madam Speaker, on this side of the house, we have stood steadfast with the rest of the South Australian community in fighting for a healthy river.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Point of order, Madam Speaker: the Deputy Leader of the Opposition takes points of order then sits down and immediately interjects. It is out of order. Having assumed a lofty position, he should behave a little better.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Deputy Leader of the Opposition, order! Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think this issue does demonstrate a difference in approach. The difference in approach is that we tried to unify South Australians behind what is probably one of the most important issues facing our state, and those opposite have sought to spread the disunity they find within their own party into the broader community, setting irrigator against environmentalist—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Madam Speaker, the question was very specifically about the response from federal South Australian MPs, and I ask that you bring the Premier back to answering that question.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, member for Stuart. Premier, you have 13 seconds left.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Madam Speaker, and I conclude on this note: they have not only an obligation but a duty to approach their federal Liberal colleagues and demand that they support the 3,200 gegalitre plan to restore this river to health.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Leader of the Opposition, order!

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That is what they have an obligation to do, and they should not be allowed to shirk their responsibilities.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:19): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister confirm that the Minister for Education's office or the Department for Education did not apply pressure to the western suburbs governing council to keep the conviction of Mark Christopher Harvey, the director of the out of school hours care, for the rape of a child in his care, away from the parents of the school?

The SPEAKER: Minister, did you understand that question?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:20): Would you mind asking the member to repeat the question, please?

The SPEAKER: Yes, I had trouble following the question also.

Mr PISONI: The question is: can the minister confirm whether her office or her department applied or did not apply pressure to the western suburbs governing council—

Members interjecting:

Mr PISONI: I'll start again, with these interjections, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr PISONI: We've got a convicted paedophile in school and the Labor Party is laughing about it over here.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Thank you.

Mr PISONI: Laughing about it, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: This is not an opportunity to debate. Will you please ask your question?

Mr PISONI: Can the minister confirm that the Minister for Education's office or her department did not apply pressure to the western suburbs governing school council to keep the conviction of Mark Christopher Harvey, the director of the out of school hours care, for the rape of a child in his care, away from the parents of the school?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I thank the member for repeating that question. Clearly, this is an incident that arose in late 2010, so I have no choice but to take that question on notice, but is the member suggesting that that is something that should have occurred? So, I am very happy—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I am very happy to take this question on notice.

The SPEAKER: Order! I do not think that was a point of order. Minister, I did not hear the last bit of your answer. You were coming back, I think you said.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I reiterate the facts as they appear to me. The situation arose in late 2010, so it's two years ago. I am very happy to take that question on notice.

Mr Pisoni: How many other victims are there?

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: I think the most important thing here is that we act on the advice of SAPOL and we act in the best interests of children.

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:22): Supplementary, Madam Speaker: can the minister advise if other victims have emerged since the arrest and conviction of Mark Harvey?

The SPEAKER: Minister. I will count that as a question.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:22): Can I say that I find the way that he is using this issue absolutely irresponsible.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! What is your point of order?

Mr PISONI: The minister is implying—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The minister has only been speaking for 15 to 20 seconds.

Mr PISONI: She is not answering the question.

The SPEAKER: Sit down and see what she says.

Mr PISONI: She is attacking me for asking the question. This is a serious question about paedophiles in schools, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: No, there is no point of order. Sit down. Minister, can you answer the question?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: Clearly, that's another one that I am happy to take on notice.

HOUSING CONSTRUCTION GRANT

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:23): My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house about last week's response to the government's new Housing Construction Grant?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Treasurer, Minister for Workers Rehabilitation, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:23): I would like to thank the member for Little Para for his question. Since the announcement of the revised housing grants, there has been much interest from the community and industry about the new \$8,500 Housing Construction Grant. The grant reforms have received widespread support and been welcomed by the Real Estate Institute of South Australia, the Property Council, Business SA, the Urban Development Institute of Australia and many others. My office and RevenueSA have received a significant number of phone calls from members of the public interested in accessing the grant.

In the last two weeks alone, RevenueSA received 1,644 phone calls about the Housing Construction Grant and the First Home Owner Grant. This reflects a sevenfold increase in the level of general grant inquiries. On 16 October alone there were 377 phone calls related to grants, compared to only 30 grant related phone calls on the equivalent day in the preceding period.

There is absolutely no doubt that the introduction of the Housing Construction Grant has sparked a lot of positive interest from members of the public looking to build a new home, with inquiries as of yesterday still double the normal rate. It is also pleasing to see that last week developers such as Lend Lease followed the government's lead by offering an additional grant of \$8,500 to purchasers of selected lots at Blakes Crossing. This means that purchasers of these lots could receive \$17,000 in financial assistance plus an extra \$15,000 if they are an eligible first home buyer. AVJennings has also introduced a similar arrangement under which purchasers could receive an additional \$8,000 grant for selected lots at St Clair, Pathways at Murray Bridge, Eyre at Penfield and River Breeze at Goolwa.

While the property market is soft and the housing construction industry is doing it tough, it is great to see industry working with the government to encourage people to build new homes and get into the property market at this time. The new Housing Construction Grant, along with the first home buyer scheme and off-the-plan stamp duty concession, will provide a much needed boost to

the state's housing construction industry and property market. It will provide job security to the 70,000 South Australians currently working in the industry and will help boost the state's economy.

The government is very pleased about the level of public interest in the new Housing Construction Grant and we are very pleased to have received such positive feedback and support from the community and industry in the last few weeks. I encourage anyone looking to build a new home to take up the generous assistance on offer from both the government and developers and visit www.nobettertime.com.au.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:27): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister confirm that the 349 job cuts in his department he announced yesterday are in addition to a further target of about 850 job cuts across the health system just to meet the savings required in the current budget?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:27): Can I believe my ears? The Leader of the Opposition is asking me about Public Service job cuts. This is the person who wants to cut by 25,000 to 35,000 jobs in South Australia.

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Sit down. There is no point of order. The minister has just started his answer.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: I have, Madam Speaker. The point I was making is that the hypocrisy on the other side is outrageous.

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, Madam Speaker. He has defied your ruling and begun his answer again with debate. Standing order 98.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Sit down. Minister, I am waiting to hear your answer.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Thank you for that reminder of standing order 98. The difference between the other side and our side is we are being honest about what we are doing. We have told the public what we are doing. We have a targeted process in place to improve the productivity of our system.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: The other side want to—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —under the banner that was created by the member for Waite, create an audit commission so that after the election they can cut 30,000 jobs.

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order, Madam Speaker: standing order 98, substance of the question and debate.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Sit down.

DENTAL CARE

Mr PEGLER (Mount Gambier) (15:28): My question is to the Minister for Health and Ageing.

An honourable member interjecting:

Mr PEGLER: Actually this will be good luck, I think. Minister, what is being done to improve dental services in country areas?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurana—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:28): I thank the member for Mount Gambier for his question. I am very pleased to advise the house on a number of initiatives that we are working on to improve dental health services in our state. For example, site works have now started for the—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Have you got some comment?

Mr Gardner: You're reading.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: You want me to stop reading. Okay.

Mr Marshall: This is questions without notice.

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Sure.

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: They're geniuses, Madam Speaker! I am pleased to inform the house that site works have started for the SA Dental Service clinic at Wallaroo. I think this is probably a reflection on the member for Mount Gambier rather than on me but is the ignorance of the people on the other side. We have started works—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order, minister for mining!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: We have started site works at Wallaroo. The new clinic will importantly include two additional dental chairs, and this additional capacity—

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Minister for mining, order!

The Hon. J.D. HILL: This clinic will provide extra capacity by the way of two additional dental chairs and this capacity will increase the number of country people who can be treated each year and help reduce local waiting times. The Wallaroo clinic will comprise five dental surgeries (which I am sure the local member is very pleased about), an intra-oral radiology facility, a sterilisation area, a waiting room, a reception area, as well as a staff amenity and car park. It will replace the existing out-of-date clinic at Kadina. Unlike the clinic at Kadina, the new facility will provide facilities for the treatment of both eligible adults and children.

To give you an idea of the number of country people this new infrastructure will be able to benefit, there are around 8,000 adults in the area who are eligible for public dental care and nearly 2,000 children currently enrolled for care in the old Kadina clinic who will transfer to the new clinic; so, a lot of capacity. The Wallaroo Dental Clinic was a jointly funded project involving the commonwealth and the state and, we understand, it will start treating patients in about the beginning of next year.

We are also doing work, of course, in other locations, and we are planning new infrastructure at Port Lincoln, Mount Gambier and Murray Bridge. It is in Mount Gambier that I want to particularly draw the attention of the house because considerable work has been done in Mount Gambier as well. I understand that the work will be completed by 2014. In that town we have planned dental infrastructure to comprise 10 dental chairs: six chairs will be used by the Dental SA staff to treat both children and adults, and the remaining four chairs will be used by undergraduate dental students who will be placed on a rotation system.

That will come at a capital cost of \$2.7 million and is part of the \$27 million hospital redevelopment that I know the member is very pleased about. Importantly, this will provide an additional four dental chairs to what currently exists and it is planned to open about a year later than the Wallaroo centre. We have services being expanded all over the state in good cooperation and collaboration with the commonwealth. I commend the commonwealth for its support.

Just to put all this in some perspective, when we first came to government in 2002, the average waiting time for a course in dental care in our state was 49 months—49 months people waited for dental care—and it is now down to 15 months, and we will do better as well. With these investments, with the support from the commonwealth, with the changes that are being made we will get that right down again.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET

Mrs REDMOND (Heysen—Leader of the Opposition) (15:32): My question is again to the Minister for Health and Ageing. Can the minister advise the house whether, and if so by how much, the health budget for the current year has thus far been overspent? The minister undertook

12 days ago to provide an answer to the house about how far over budget the current budget was after the completion of the first quarter on 30 September.

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kaurua—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:32): I have sought the information that the member for Waite asked me. I thank the current acting shadow minister for health for reminding me that I have yet to provide that information to the house. However—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.D. HILL: —why has it taken so long?—it is true that the health budget is tracking pretty much the same way it had in previous years, that the amount of money that is provisioned for health is not sufficient to cover the existing demands. That is why we are going through a savings process, a savings process which they object to. They say we spend too much in health and then when we try to reduce the amount of money they object to that. There is no consistency, they have no policy; in fact, they have had only one policy in 10 years, and that—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: clearly debating the issue.

The SPEAKER: I think the minister has finished his response. Have you?

The Hon. J.D. HILL: Yes.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. The member for Ashford.

PORT AUGUSTA PRISON

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:34): My question is directed to the Minister for Correctional Services. Can the minister inform the house of the significance of last week's opening of the Banksia Unit at Port Augusta Prison?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister for Multicultural Affairs) (15:34): I thank the member for Ashford for this question. Last Wednesday I had the pleasure of opening the new Banksia Unit at the Port Augusta Prison. Madam Speaker, I would like to acknowledge your attendance at the opening as well as the member for Stuart. Unfortunately, the shadow minister for corrections, the member for Morphet, was unable to attend. I hope from his recent tweeting and his interest in his former portfolios that it is not an indication that he is angling to return to those and leave corrections and emergency services.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: They do love you, Duncan. They do love you. The opening of the Banksia Unit was a truly significant occasion for Port Augusta. I had the pleasure of opening this unit, but I want to pay tribute to the Minister for Trade, because he did the very hard work of getting the money out of Treasury for the construction of this facility.

This construction provided significant local economic spin-offs, with more than 250 contractors engaged on the project and 27 new correctional officers from in and around Port Augusta having been recruited to work in the unit. The \$16.2 million 90-bed unit is the most significant piece of prison infrastructure completed in this state for a quarter of a century, but it will soon be eclipsed by the \$23 million 108-bed expansion at Mount Gambier Prison, which is already underway.

So far, the Mount Gambier project has resulted in an injection of \$6 million into the economy of the state's South-East. The design and features of the Banksia Unit make it the benchmark in high-security prisoner accommodation. Importantly, the new unit includes a programs room, a service delivery room and a health facility, all incorporated down the spine of the building.

Whilst at the prison I also had the pleasure of presenting service awards to five correctional officers. Ten year medals were presented to Andrew Elliot and Robyn Jenkins. Twenty-year service medals were presented to Kym Grantham, Dennis Matthews and Craig Bowshire (who also received a 15-year national medal). I would also like to congratulate Shaun Barry, who was unable to attend the presentation of his 10-year service medal.

These recipients are real examples of dedication and commitment in our correctional system. I would also like to express my congratulations to Brenton 'BJ' Williams, the Port Augusta Prison general manager, Paul Robinson, John Case, and Bill Beggs, in addition to all the staff at Port Augusta, and in Adelaide, without whose input, cooperation and expertise the venture would

not have been possible. It would not have been delivered on budget and ahead of schedule, as it was.

The investments made in our corrections system illustrate this government's commitment to both offender rehabilitation and community safety, a commitment which has resulted in this state reporting the lowest return to prison rate in the nation for the last four years.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (15:37): My question is to the Minister for Water and the River Murray. How can the government claim victory in relation to the Murray-Darling Basin, given that the Premier originally demanded 4,000 gigalitres be returned to the basin, but has now settled for a return of just 2,750 gigalitres by 2019 and a potential additional 450 gigalitres by 2024 (12 years away), subject to a range of conditions, including funding, and now makes claims about meeting MDBA environmental targets, apparently abandoning South Australia's stated environmental water requirements, which the Goyder Institute confirmed are more rigorous?

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The question is replete with argument from its start and then the allegations of abandonment. That would be standing order 97. If inviting an argument, they cannot complain when they get one.

The SPEAKER: Thank you, minister, and that is true. I uphold that point of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Norwood is interjecting again.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Point of order.

Mr GARDNER: Frivolous points and repetitive points of order are also out of order.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Yes, we do not have frivolous points of order.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, did you wish to answer that question?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:39): Yes, madam, I am sorry. They were making a noise and I did not know I had been invited by you to do so. Quite simply, South Australia achieved a significant win in its fight for the Murray by the federal government and the Prime Minister—

An honourable member: A Mazda?

The Hon. P. CAICA: —committing far more than a Mazda, even though—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: You just don't look the same there, Mitch.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: As I have said, we have achieved a significant breakthrough and as the Premier also said, the fight is not over yet by any means. Again, we do want the opposition to join with us in this as is the case with the rest of South Australia. What we have seen is the federal government committing to return 3,200 gigalitres and, indeed, committing to provide an extra \$1.77 billion to recover the extra 450 gigalitres of water and address constraint—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: It won't be subject if, indeed, it's passed through the parliament, which is what the Premier was talking about earlier. It needs to get passed through in that format. Quite simply, the opposition's view, without me being disrespectful on this whole matter, in particular the member for Chaffey, has been quite appalling. What we have done is get far more

support from the community within the member for Chaffey's area than we have got from the member for Chaffey or anyone in the opposition. We know that the—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Chaffey will leave the chamber for the rest of question time!

The honourable member for Chaffey having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P. CAICA: We know that the former deputy leader was quite satisfied to hurl up the white flag very early in the piece and settle for 2,750.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: What we did know is that, on the authority's own science, 2,750 gigalitres was not enough.

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: We never signed up for that. We get 3,200. They're a little bit confused and I think they need a briefing on the process to date, but I'll keep working through this—

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, order! We will listen to the minister in silence.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. What we've always said, based on what the authority's own science said that was reviewed by our state government's scientists, then peer reviewed by the Goyder Institute, was that 2,750 would not deliver. It would not deliver to the key indicator sites or, indeed, return the system to an appropriate level of sustainable health. As a result of that, South Australia requested that the ministerial council in turn—

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for MacKillop will leave the chamber for the rest of question time!

The honourable member for MacKillop having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. P. CAICA: As a result of that, we sought that 3,200 gigalitres modelled. It has been modelled with key constraints removed or relaxed, and it's shown again, on the science, that will return the system to a much healthier situation, indeed, a sustainable level of health providing those constraints were relaxed or removed—again, based on the science of the authority itself, undertaken and reviewed by our state's scientists, then peer reviewed by the Goyder Institute, which includes CSIRO scientists.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: We say, and have always said, that whilst we didn't know what the figure was, it was always said that in the absence of science, we would say that between 3,500 and 4,000 would be around it. Where they're negligent in their views on this, or they may be just deliberately being that way, is that we've always said it would be based on the best available science. That science tells us that 3,200, with constraints relaxed or removed, with not just the \$1.77 billion to recover that extra 450 gigalitres—

Mr Pederick: It sounds like a marine parks argument.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Well, ask me a question about that. With the \$1.77 billion that the federal government has committed to, to recover that extra 450 gigalitres, coupled with extra money that is still required, and that's why the fight is not over, for infrastructure to be built along there to best use or to remove those constraints—

Mr Pederick interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! The member for Hammond will leave the chamber for the rest of question time!

The honourable member for Hammond having withdrawn from the chamber:

The SPEAKER: You are like a foghorn.

The Hon. P. CAICA: What we have seen is one side of the house fighting with a unified South Australia to deliver this once-in-a-lifetime opportunity; what we see on the other side is people grappling for their own positions within that, and you won't be there for very long Steven because you'll be moving along.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr MARSHALL: This is clearly debate, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I'm sure, Madam Speaker—

The SPEAKER: Order! I think you have probably finished your answer and I will uphold that point of order. Have you finished your answer?

The Hon. P. CAICA: If you say so, Madam Speaker, yes.

The SPEAKER: You can finish if you have not, but you are actually out of time.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, what we need is for the opposition to get behind this campaign to return the system to an appropriate level of health. The science tells us that 3,200 gigalitres, delivered in the conditions that I have said, will do that. It is about time they got behind it instead of settling for second best.

ENVIRONMENT, WATER AND NATURAL RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (15:45): My question is to the Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation. Following the amalgamation of the Department for Water and the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, can you advise of some of the key services which will be delivered to South Australians through the department—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

Ms THOMPSON: Would you like me to repeat—

The SPEAKER: Yes, can you repeat the question?

Ms THOMPSON: Minister, following the amalgamation of the Department for Water with the Department of Environment and Natural Resources, can you advise of some of the key services which will be delivered to South Australians through the new Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources?

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton—Minister for Sustainability, Environment and Conservation, Minister for Water and the River Murray, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation) (15:46): DEWNR administers a wide range of programs supporting the environment, conservation, natural resource management and water, including the River Murray. These programs are of critical importance to maintaining and improving the sustainability of our terrestrial and marine environments and they also play a critical role in supporting the sustainability of our primary industries.

Just to mention a few key areas of activity, DEWNR has developed comprehensive fire management plans for public land which provide the strategic direction for fire management activities necessary to mitigate the risk that bushfire poses to life, property and the environment. The government, through DEWNR, maintains the botanic gardens (one of our iconic conservation, cultural and tourism locations) in addition to managing more than 300 parks and reserves covering 20 million hectares that conserve a range of natural and cultural sites and provide important areas for tourism and recreational activities. In addition, DEWNR facilitates the coordination of each regional NRM board as they work to meet the needs of the local communities in terms of managing natural resources, including the protection of marine and coastal environments.

I spoke just recently in this place about the opening of the new natural resource centres and the important roles they will play in our regional communities, and I thank those local members from the various regions who attended those openings. Of course, DEWNR plays a pivotal role in the planning, implementation and coordination of strategies to provide for the sustainable use of our water resources, including through prescription and licensing; and, very importantly, having worked to underpin the successful campaign to provide a more sustainable future for the health of the River Murray and the communities that depend on having a healthy river system in South Australia.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: You'll still be able to fish, Vickie.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: You are fishing for that leadership role, again, I know.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: One is sailing towards the finish line and the other—

Mr MARSHALL: I know they will be workshoping this all week, but can we get back to the substance of the question?

The SPEAKER: Thank you, yes. Back to the question, minister.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order!

The Hon. P. CAICA: One is sailing to the finishing line, Madam Speaker, and the other into the sunset. However, while some would view DEWNR as an environment agency, it clearly has a pivotal economic role as well, a role that is especially understood by regional South Australians who the opposition like to take as their own. Hence, I think it is important for the public to know about some of the implications of which I have advised in relation to proposals for the one in four staff cuts across the public sector as proposed by the Liberal Party. That was not denied by the member for MacKillop, I might add.

That would result in 100 fewer full-time equivalents in DEWNR's fire brigade, reducing our bushfire response capacity, with DEWNR staff being the largest brigade within the Country Fire Service. The one in four cut would reduce opening hours for the Adelaide, Mount Lofty and Wittunga botanic gardens, and a deterioration of the gardens that would have a significant impact—

The Hon. I.F. Evans interjecting:

The Hon. P. CAICA: Not at all. It would have the garden looking more like a park than it should.

The Hon. I.F. EVANS: Point of order, Madam Speaker: standing order 128.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What about your interjection?

The SPEAKER: Order! Minister, I would ask you to wind up your answer. You have only got a few seconds left, anyway.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Madam Speaker, I will wind up my answer. Again, this one in four staff cut that is being proposed by the opposition would have timelines in the service provision of the water licensing area blow out, with processing for well construction permits rising from five business days to 15 business days. And we would lose 100—

Ms Chapman: That's not winding up.

The SPEAKER: Order!

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order. Madam Speaker, I think the minister has well and truly exceeded his four minutes.

The SPEAKER: No, he still has a few seconds.

Mr Marshall: It felt longer.

The SPEAKER: Minister.

The Hon. P. CAICA: What will be interesting is how long it takes for the deputy leader to become the leader; that's what is interesting.

The SPEAKER: Thank you.

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. There is a point of order.

Mr MARSHALL: Can we get a point of order on this constant debate that is coming from the minister?

The SPEAKER: Yes. There is a series of interjections coming from the other side, but I would ask you now, minister, to wind up your answer. Have you finished?

The Hon. P. CAICA: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is one thing—and I think that the Minister for Health made this point earlier—to look for sensible efficiency improvements over time but it is quite another to make savage cuts to the Public Service apparently based on ideology.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:51): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Which suburbs are being considered for inclusion in the Adelaide High School zone expansion?

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:51): I was expecting this question or a question of this variety because last week I had the fortune of attending a meeting of the Prospect Primary School Governing Council, and they in fact invited a number of the other governing councils to participate. The member was there, as was David O'Loughlin, the Mayor of Prospect. He was also there, and we had a very frank and a very positive discussion I felt actually about not only the fantastic expansion of that first-class high school, Adelaide High School, but also the associated zoning.

The government gave a commitment. In fact, it was Jane Lomax-Smith who gave a commitment, upheld and reiterated by the previous minister (Hon. Jay Weatherill), and I reiterated that same commitment; so, clearly, we are considering Prospect and Walkerville. As I explained on the night, when you go to fiddle with a zone—and all of our high schools are zoned—it is clearly going to have an impact on neighbouring schools and suburbs. So, this is an exercise that is actually quite complex because—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI: No. I gave a commitment, which I intend to uphold, that the zoning would be released. Our view about what the zoning should look like will be released before the end of the year, but we are working very carefully and very hard not only in relation to the Adelaide High School expansion but also in relation to Marryatville High School, Glenunga International and Brighton High School, and all first-class state schools. I am incredibly proud of the job they do.

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport.

ADELAIDE HIGH SCHOOL

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (15:53): I have a supplementary, Madam Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Well, yes. You do not have much time, though.

Ms SANDERSON: Are any suburbs being considered to be removed from the current zone?

The SPEAKER: That is not a supplementary: that is another question.

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (15:53): I thank the member for this question. She highlights the careful balancing act that we need to contemplate in drafting up the new zone, and I will be very happy to share that information with her when we have completed the work.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:53): My question is to the Minister for Health. Can the minister confirm that the MYEFO statement released by the federal government last week

showed that federal health payments to South Australia are falling by around \$120 million over the next four years, what impact will this have on the state health services and will this require any further job losses within the health system?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:54): I will seek some advice about the matter. I do not have a briefing on it. I acknowledge the importance of the question and the rehearsal that the shadow treasurer is making for the shadow ministry for health, as a number of others seem to be doing today, but I will take it seriously and I will get some information for him.

HEALTH DEPARTMENT BUDGET

The Hon. I.F. EVANS (Davenport) (15:54): My question again is to the Minister for Health, as the Treasurer is not here. Can the minister confirm that, even after the cuts of 349 jobs across the health department, his department will still be above the Treasury-approved cap for full-time equivalents and, if so, how many positions will the department remain above that cap? Is the minister required to further reduce the number of full-time equivalents within the health system to meet the Treasury-imposed cap?

The Hon. J.D. HILL (Kurna—Minister for Health and Ageing, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse, Minister for the Arts) (15:55): I thank the member for the question. We have a 2012-13 full-time equivalent savings target of 675.96. That is comprised of a full-time equivalent growth target of 339.2, which represents growth in the 2010-11 and 2011-12 budget savings initiatives, and the unachieved component from 2011-12, which was 336.76. The decisions I announced yesterday will go some way to dealing with those matters, but there is still more that we need to do. In fact, yesterday I announced a range of other measures, including the responses to the reports that I presented some time ago. So, we still need to do more work.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Order! I am sorry, I did not hear if the minister was misbehaving.

PUBLISHING COMMITTEE

The Hon. M.F. O'BRIEN (Napier—Minister for Finance, Minister for the Public Sector) (15:56): I move:

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

Motion carried.

GRIEVANCE DEBATE

CHILD PROTECTION

Mr PISONI (Unley) (15:57): At issue today is the failure in procedure and duty of care to children and their families at Department for Education sites by this government and by the department choosing not to notify parents of paedophile activity by DECD employee Mark Harvey, the former director of the western suburbs primary out of school hours care. Today we heard from the Minister for Education that it is government policy not to tell parents that an employee of the education department has raped a child in their school. That is what we heard today from this minister. We heard today from the minister that it is department policy not to tell parents that that has happened.

In addition to his work as the director for the after school hours care, Mark Harvey was employed on a temporary basis as an SSO between 11 October 2010 and 2 December 2010, dealing with special needs students. He was arrested on 2 November 2010, so he remained on the department payroll on a temporary basis for another month after he was arrested for the rape of a primary school child. The department failed to advise parents at the school that Mark Harvey was arrested while he was employed as the director of the out of school hours care. He was arrested, of course, for child sex offences. They further failed to notify school parents when Mr Harvey was subsequently convicted in February of this year, and he is now serving six years for the rape of a student at that school.

This failure has jeopardised timely and appropriate counselling for potentially affected families and children and other abused students—potentially 150 students who are using this out of school hours care facility. It has been further alleged by parents active in the school community that

the department had misled the school's governing council to keep this issue quiet. How many more children have been harmed by this government policy of not telling parents when they have been under the care of a paedophile in their school?

What has the recommendation of Child Protection Services been? Why has the community not been officially notified and workshops organised for the potential effect on these families? Why have there not been any further investigations? Where is the consistency in policy in approach to paedophiles with access to children through DECS sites? We heard in question time that, in one school, parents were told, and, in another school, parents were not told. For some reason, it appears that there is no consistent policy with the department and the minister's office in regard to dealing with children that are in the care of paedophiles in our schools.

The government's departmental reorganisation, combining child protection and education does not appear to be working for abuse victims at our DECS schools. At least one other family, having since found out about Mr Harvey's convictions, through means other than the department or school, quizzed their children, only to discover that they too had been abused by Mr Harvey. These children have since been interviewed by SAPOL's Child Protection Unit, and further charges, I understand, are pending.

The response from the assistant regional director in questioning from a concerned parent was dismissive and threatening. This is the email sent to a parent who dared to challenge the department's attitude to the parents at this western suburbs school:

I refer to your email to the...Primary School Governing Council [who] has referred your email to [me] for consideration.

I note your comments concerning the media article that appeared online in Adelaidenow, and your extrapolation of that set of events to those involving Mr Mark Harvey. You allege the department has failed in its duty of care to its students and that we have failed in providing appropriate counselling to those students.

We reject your allegations and note any parent who believes this is the case can bring appropriate action against the department by utilising the relevant grievance procedures or if they are inclined including bringing litigation against the department for negligence...

So, in other words, a parent raises the concern about the department's handling of this situation, and the department's response is: 'Sue me'; 'Sue me' is what the department says to the parents. This was signed by the Assistant Regional Director, Greg Petherick. It is an absolute disgrace, the way that this government and this minister have handled this incident.

We are concerned about the number of other students that have been interfered with by Mr Mark Harvey, and parents do not even have the tools to manage that situation by being given the knowledge by the department or the minister.

COWDREY, MR M.

Mr SIBBONS (Mitchell) (16:02): Today I rise to congratulate Australia's most successful Paralympian, swimmer Matt Cowdrey, on yet another well-deserved honour as part of an incredible career. The competition pool at the South Australian Aquatic and Leisure Centre in my electorate of Mitchell was recently named in his honour, and I believe it is worthy recognition for this inspirational young South Australian.

Matt has earned an amazing 23 medals, including 13 gold, across three Paralympic Games. At the most recent titles, this year in London, he won eight of those medals (five gold, two silver and one bronze), earning a place in each event in which he competed, and breaking his own world record in the 50-metre freestyle. Matt's 2012 Paralympic performance buoyed Australia's swim team to a best-ever tally of 18 gold, and 37 medals in total.

He also won five gold medals, three silver medals and set five world records in Beijing in 2008, and won three gold, two silver and two bronze medals and set two world and Paralympic records at the Athens games in 2004. All being well, we look forward to him leading Australia's charge again in two years' time in Glasgow for the Commonwealth Games, and in four years' time at the Rio Paralympics.

Swimming Australia president David Urquhart recently said Matt's leadership of the team in London was 'unparalleled', and described him as an 'outstanding ambassador' for his sport; I could not agree more. Born with a congenital amputation of his lower left arm, 23-year-old Matt has been swimming since he was five years old, and competing since 1994. Soon making his mark in the S9 classification, he broke his first Australian open record when he was only 11 years old, followed shortly by his first world record at age 13.

In the years since, in addition to his Paralympics effort, he has also earned multiple world championship titles and three Commonwealth Games gold medals. He won two of these and set two world records in the 2006 games in Melbourne, at which he was Australia's only male swimmer, including able-bodied competitors, to win individual gold. But perhaps most astonishing of all his great achievements was his performance in the IPC World Swimming Championships in Brazil in 2009—seven gold medals and seven world records. Across his career, he has competed across a range of distances and disciplines: 50-metre freestyle, 100-metre freestyle, 400-metre freestyle, 100-metre backstroke, 100-metre butterfly and the 200-metre individual medley.

A man of many talents, Matt was also recently one of the stars and leading goalscorers in the Little Heroes Foundation Slowdown 2012 charity football match which raises money for children living with cancer and other serious illnesses, and their families. That match gave him the chance to represent his beloved Adelaide Crows alongside former stars of the club including Tony Modra, Andrew Jarman and Mark Ricciuto. Matt is a keen golfer too and competed in the 2010 Amateur Amputee Golf Championships.

Despite currently living and training on Queensland's Sunshine Coast, he still regards himself as a proud South Australian. He studies media and law at Adelaide University and also works for the Department of Foreign Affairs and Trade. When he retires from swimming, he hopes to secure an overseas post with DFAT.

Matt serves as an inspiration to all of us, to strive to do our very best despite the challenges we may face along the way. His performances in the pool have taken enormous strength and courage and we can all learn something from the determination and spirit he demonstrates. With the added recognition of our state's top pool bearing his name, we can be sure he will continue to be a role model for young and aspiring swimmers for years to come. I extend my warm congratulations to Matt.

MURRAY-DARLING BASIN PLAN

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (16:06): I rise today to speak on the Premier's ministerial statement and also his Dorothy Dix questions today. I am quite outraged to think that the Premier would come in here today and declare that he will put pressure on our federal colleagues to make the decision in the right manner when it comes to the Murray-Darling Basin plan.

Most people in this place would note that, on Friday, the Premier, flanked by the Prime Minister, announced a \$1.77 billion funding exercise to obtain an extra 450 gigalitres of water. That 450 gigalitres of water has now put the Murray-Darling Basin plan back to 2024 and, in that time, I think it is absolutely outrageous that he would hang the state out to dry; that is the operative term, 'hanging the state out to dry'. By 2024, we could have another drought with no outcome, with no solution-based approach to this Murray-Darling Basin plan.

My address to the Premier directly—and I know that he is not here, but he needs to listen—is that, while he has been busy grandstanding with a taxpayer-funded, vote-grabbing smokescreen for failure, I have been talking with my federal Liberal colleagues and ensuring that they understand what is at stake with the basin plan. They are listening to me and they are not listening to the Premier.

Premier, you have been taking credit for the fight for the Murray campaign, but you have done absolutely nothing except mothball the desal plant and threaten to derail the plan with a High Court challenge. If anyone is going to take credit for the federal Liberal MPs supporting a basin plan, it is the Liberal Party of South Australia, not you, Jay Weatherill, not you as the Premier of South Australia.

You have been diluting your demands. In October, you came to the Riverland and demanded 4,000 gigalitres and not a drop less. You said that the irrigators in the Riverland region would not give up one more litre of water and, if you had to, you would go to the High Court. You have backflipped at every stage of the way.

Now, there has been another announcement. He has come out and said that there is \$265 million of commonwealth funding going to the Riverland region. I welcome that. I welcome that funding going to the Riverland region because that is the region that will be most impacted in South Australia with this Murray-Darling Basin plan.

Make no mistake, the \$265 million is barely enough to counteract the amount of water that is going to be needed for South Australia's contribution to the sustainable diversion limits. So Premier Weatherill, how much extra water will South Australia have to give up with your demands

for a higher water content into the river? Again, the Prime Minister says more water equals a healthy river. What rubbish! In 2010 we had 23,000 gigalitres come into South Australia. We still have salinity issues at Lake Albert. We still have salinity issues at the barrages. We have put no infrastructure money into South Australia whatsoever. We have been given a paltry \$20 million out of \$5.8 billion in the Sustainable Rural Water Use and Infrastructure Program.

The Premier is hailing this as a win, that this is a success. He has been out to federal member Christopher Pyne's office today, doing a press conference saying that he needs to put the pressure on Mr Pyne for more water. Mr Pyne is well aware of exactly what is going on in the Murray-Darling Basin Plan because every step of the way I, the member for Chaffey, am keeping him and his colleagues involved, explaining to them exactly what impact it will have on South Australia and, just as importantly, what impact it will have on the most affected electorate here in South Australia—the electorate of Chaffey.

Yet, we get this blistering comment about how I am not deserving of being the member for Chaffey. We get the water minister to say that my attitude is atrocious. My attitude is about having a sustainable river here for South Australia with a balanced social, economic and environmental outcome. It is not about grandstanding with taxpayers' funds for a \$2 million campaign. It is not about saying this is a wonderful win. At what cost is this wonderful win to the people of South Australia?

The Premier today keeps coming out and saying that this is a win, and I am standing by the Prime Minister here to say that I am going to save the River Murray. Premier, you are not saving the River Murray while you are talking politics and not addressing the solution based approach that this state needs. This state has a huge contribution to put into water reform in this state and yet the Premier continues to ignore it. He continues to look past what we can do to fix up what we have here in South Australia. That solution based approach must be adopted.

Time expired.

SALISBURY FOOTBALL CLUB

Ms BETTISON (Ramsay) (16:12): It was a beautiful sunny morning for the inaugural Salisbury Football Club Community Fun Day on Sunday 23 September 2012. I was delighted to be invited to join members and their families for the end-of-year presentations and to stay on for the Community Fun Day. It was the under 6s that I had the opportunity to congratulate for their enthusiasm during their first year of football. With their proud parents and grandparents looking on, the boys took the three steps up to the stage with excitement mixed with nervousness. It was at this point, I must admit, that we had a bit of a dropping of one of the trophies, and I give my apologies to those young boys. For each of the players, we stopped for a quick photo with the trophy and certificate, and a free soft drink and sausage after the presentation.

Salisbury Football Club was established in 1880. It is one of the oldest clubs in the northern suburbs. The Magpies are proud of their past and confident of their future. They wear their black and white colours with pride. Salisbury Football Club aims to be the most successful family orientated and professional amateur league club in the northern suburbs of Adelaide. They are committed to providing opportunities to people of all ages and a safe and family orientated environment in which they can encourage people to enjoy a lifetime of involvement in Aussie Rules. The club is working hard to engage young boys and a few girls into playing Aussie Rules. This season they fielded under 6, under 10, under 13, under 14, under 15 and under 16 teams in their junior competition.

The Community Fun Day was held to bring the Salisbury community together to raise awareness of what Salisbury has to offer. Along with some fantastic rides, jumping castle and big slides, there was face painting and a 'dunk the coach' target game. I was pleased to see the traditional clown and darts sideshows were also in attendance. After I had spent a session helping out on the barbecue, where the most often asked question was 'do you want onions with your sausage?', I had the opportunity to spend some time talking with the stallholders. Neighbourhood Watch, the Returned Services League and the Navy recruits joined in the Fun Day with stalls around the oval. Unfortunately we had a shower or two but the Community Fun Day finale was a very exciting display of fireworks.

Like all of our sporting clubs, they cannot exist without the support of volunteers who work tirelessly to assist the players in training and coaching, game management, first aid, timekeeping, and not to forget the person who washes the jumpers—very dirty jumpers—week in, week out. I particularly want to thank Judy Hill, the secretary of the club; Steve Ireland, the treasurer; and

David Ward, the president. I also wish to thank the sponsors of Salisbury Football Club: the Mawson Lakes Hotel, Advanced Linemarking Services, Northside Wholesale Quality Cars, and Sportspower Salisbury.

While on the topic of sport I would also like to talk about the Salisbury East Little Athletics, who on Sunday 13 October had their opening session for the season, and they were very excited this year to hit a record amount of 200 registered players. People can participate in little athletics from the age of three to 16. We have had some excitement at the club with a new uniform—a beautiful blue and green—and, once again, we have a very active volunteer group. I would like to pay attention to Tim Warnes, the president, and Jenny Dasie, the secretary. Also thanks to Sportspower, their major sponsor, McDonald Salisbury and A&J Kennedy Plumbing.

While on the theme of sports, I also wanted to draw attention to the Salisbury council and their recent Growing for Gold scheme introduced during the school holidays. It enables children from the age of three to 16 to participate in their local community, with 20 per cent of participants going on to join their local clubs. We were fortunate to have 18 sports in the Salisbury area that children were able to participate in. The Salisbury council is very active in engaging local community in sport and is encouraged to limit the barriers of entry for people to enjoy sport in their community.

MENTORING EP

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (16:17): Today I rise to talk about an event which I will be attending this evening, the 2012 Positive Ageing Awards; it is part of the Every Generation Festival. I am particularly pleased to be attending tonight because one of the finalists in the Every Generation Intergenerational Award is a program called Mentoring EP, which is based in Port Lincoln and rolled out across the educational facilities there. The award is sponsored by SA Health, and it recognises programs in which both older and younger people participate. This is particularly so with Mentoring EP. I would like to acknowledge Mr Garry Downey and his efforts in establishing this program. In fact, he is here today and I am very pleased he has sat patiently in the gallery for this moment. I look forward to joining him tonight at this evening's event, and I wish Mentoring EP well.

About 350 people are attending tonight, and we are pleased to be a part of that. I am also particularly pleased to be representing Mentoring EP, because I was thrilled sometime ago to be asked to be patron of this particular program. I was pleased to be able to do that and to take part in just a small way in this program. It is a relatively new organisation. It was formed in 2009, and they provide community partners, individuals and businesses with support in youth mentoring in Port Lincoln and other parts of Eyre Peninsula.

It came about because existing mentoring programs at Port Lincoln High School, West Coast Youth and four local primary schools were brought together. The collaboration has grown. The number of active community mentors began at approximately 30 in 2009, and it is up to over 90 supporting mentors, with around 100 local young people as mentees. One of the best aspects of their mentoring activities is the diverse range in all ages and skills of the volunteer mentors. They are all volunteers, and it is a wonderful thing to see all that vast resource of experience and skill come together and be shared with those younger members of our community—that great wealth of experience.

Interestingly, we also have about a 50-50 split between male and female mentors, which is always nice to have, and the children appreciate having a same-sex mentoring sometimes. The experience that older people can impart on younger people in country communities is vital for the career development and ongoing work and education opportunities for the youth in places such as Port Lincoln and the Eyre Peninsula more broadly. That is at the heart of what Mentoring EP is all about.

The recognition tonight will probably be for the older mentors, but it is clear to me that it gives them a real sense of worth and achievement in having a genuine, positive impact on the lives of those young people whom they are mentoring. Often, mentoring takes place in a very informal way, but through this program we were able to formalise that mentoring process and really get some commitment from both the mentors and the mentees. Mentees is not a word that I was familiar with, but apparently those who are mentored are in fact mentees. Good luck to all of them.

Often, they are students who are in their last year or two of school and are confronted with all the challenges that go along with finishing school—finishing SACE, stepping out into the workforce, going into apprenticeships, or going off to uni—which people with experience can help

guide them through. But it is not just those students who are finding difficulty with those areas; it is also about mentoring and challenging those really talented students as well.

My congratulations go to the program. I wish them well in the coming year. I understand the funding streams could change direction. That brings with it some challenges, but I know the schools have been supportive thus far and have benefited from the program thus far, and that with the support of those schools the program will be able to continue under the stewardship of convenor Gary Downey and his committee, some of whom will be joining us tonight. Congratulations to all involved. Well done, and I am very proud to be a part of this program.

O'SULLIVAN BEACH CHILDREN'S CENTRE

Ms THOMPSON (Reynell) (16:22): I would like to briefly congratulate the O'Sullivan Beach Children's Centre for the wonderful work that it does in supporting families and children to make the best of the opportunities that our wonderful education system provides. The centre has only been open for just over a year, and I was pleased to visit there last Friday as part of Save the Children activities and to be reminded of the many activities that are held there.

Many agencies use the centre and so it has become comfortable for parents who are struggling to just go down to the children's centre, because there is no stigma attached. There is no fear that their children are going to be taken away from them because they are not doing a good enough job, and there is plenty of opportunity to learn, not only from the skilled staff who provide the range of services, but also from each other. I know Premier Weatherill is very committed to the notion that parents often learn the best from each other and that this can be guided by skilled staff.

I watched the children very determinedly and excitedly watering the garden, which has grown already, with nice little beds elevated to children's height, the children complying very easily with the rule that 'You may eat herbs at any time, but other things are not allowed to be picked until they are ready to cook.'

One of the functions that occurs there concerns one of the issues that used to be dealt with under Families and Communities, where children are removed from their parents and there is a need for the parents and children to develop healthier relationships. It was very heart wrenching to see these parents coming together to gradually learn the parenting skills that somehow they missed out on learning. A generation back, we seem to have not done a very good job as a community in teaching parents how to parent and we need to be very active in supporting those who missed out on that vital skill. The centre has recently put together a mural which symbolises the whole community, with children and parents all working together and growing and learning, and they are hoping that the Minister for Education and Child Development will be able to open this.

One of the spontaneous comments that came about that pleased me greatly was that the people working in the centre really believe that the amalgamation of the old child protection unit and the department of education is working. It took some time for people to recognise that this might be a good thing but, already, they are finding that services are more coordinated, staff are understanding each other and learning from each other; and, overall, some very positive steps have been taken towards providing the best chance for every child.

I congratulate all the parents and the many workers, as well as the community supporters of the O'Sullivan Beach Children's Centre and congratulate the vision of the ministers who were determined that this would be part of Labor's program for government.

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

The Hon. G. PORTOLESI (Hartley—Minister for Education and Child Development) (16:22): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable the report of the Auditor-General for the year ended 30 June 2012 to be referred to a committee of the whole house and for ministers to be examined on matters contained in the report in accordance with the timetable as distributed.

The ACTING SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Wright): An absolute majority not being present, ring the bells.

An absolute majority of the whole number of members being present:

Motion carried.

In committee.

The CHAIR: We are examining the report of the Auditor-General. The person being examined is the Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning and Minister for Business Services and Consumers for a total of 30 minutes. Member for Bragg, you are the person asking the questions. I just remind members that they need to refer to a particular page in the report and questions should relate to the Auditor-General's Report not other matters which need to be asked elsewhere. The member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to Part B: Agency Audit Reports, Volume 1, of the Auditor-General's Report to 30 June 2012. At page 104 the Auditor-General commences his report to the parliament on the operations of the Attorney-General's Department. I commence by congratulating the Attorney for getting his financial accounts in on time this year so that at least at this point we can be dealing with the Auditor-General's opportunities, unlike on the last occasion when I think for the first full year of the Attorney-General's operation that did not occur.

I was disappointed to read this year (at page 106) a number of reports in respect of the Victims of Crime Fund. My first question relates to this fund, and in particular under the heading 'Alleged fraud against the Victims of Crime Fund (VOC Fund)'. The report commences:

The Acting Chief Executive was advised of an alleged fraud against the VOC Fund on 10 August 2012.

My first question is: is that correct, and if it is not correct what date was the Acting Chief Executive advised of the alleged fraud and on what day was it reported to the police?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank the honourable member for her question. I have sought advice about the matter and I am advised that there was some communication between the Crown Solicitor and the Attorney-General's Department on or about the 10th. I do recall, and it may be of assistance to the honourable member, that upon becoming aware of this matter, or having it drawn to my attention, I made it clear that it was very important that the Auditor-General was advised. If my memory serves me correctly, either I or somebody from the department then wrote to the Treasurer, drawing this matter to the Treasurer's attention, because obviously it was a very serious matter.

I am not sure how much the honourable member knows about the background to this, but it was actually something that was detected by people in the Crown Solicitor's Office. A very vigilant individual in the Crown Solicitor's Office became suspicious upon working on a particular file. That suspicion was aroused by the fact that certain elements of this file appeared somewhat familiar. The individual then advised senior management of that. Senior management immediately started to make inquiries about that matter and I was alerted to the fact that they had this concern. SAPOL was brought into the matter straightaway, and the Auditor-General virtually straightaway as well.

As the Attorney, obviously I am very concerned that this has occurred. It is obviously something you would not like to have occur, particularly in relation to a fund such as this. I do not want to comment too much on the circumstances because the matters are still obviously before the courts, but I am satisfied, on the basis of briefings I have had, that staff in the Solicitor-General's Office and the Attorney-General's office were very prompt in dealing with the matter as soon as their suspicions were aroused. I believe that I was advised pretty promptly about the matter, as were SAPOL and the Auditor-General.

In as much as one can make anything positive out of what is something one would rather not have to be dealing with, I think we can say that the department acted in a very responsible and cooperative manner. In as much as you can say something good about something that you would rather not have happen, I am very pleased that the officers in the department acted with that sort of integrity once they became aware of the matter.

Ms CHAPMAN: The minister might be aware that the first public statement on this matter was via *The Advertiser* on 15 August this year. That article advised that the matter had been referred to the Auditor-General for investigation. As you pointed out in your previous answer, it was promptly attended to and is consistent with the Crown Solicitor's Office also advising the police. That published article, though, confirmed that it had been referred for the purpose of looking at the processes, obviously, and yet in this year's report the Auditor-General says that he is not undertaking any examination. As you will have read, the reason is this:

The matter is currently subject to investigation by the South Australia Police (SAPOL) and the amount alleged to have been misappropriated is yet to be quantified. SAPOL has taken possession of certain documentation for forensic examination. As such the VOC Fund's operations cannot be the subject of specific audit examination in the short-term.

He says, 'I haven't got any documents; I can't do anything,' in short, which is reasonable. Has there been any action taken by you or anyone in your department to facilitate the inquiry by the Auditor-General—leaving aside entirely, of course, whether the people currently charged are guilty or not of anything, obviously; we are not going to get into that. I think you would agree, Attorney, that the public statements on this suggested that there was going to be some reassurance, I suppose, that the Auditor-General's inquiry was underway, when clearly it is not, or certainly not at the time of publishing this report.

My first question is: what action has been taken to ensure that the Auditor-General can get on with its inquiry, i.e., production of the documents, provision of copies and whether there are other aspects that can be made available for the purposes of that inquiry? If not, when do you understand that this can take place?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank the honourable member for the question. I think the position is basically this: the Auditor-General—and, look, the Auditor-General can speak for himself, rather than—

Ms Chapman: He's not here, so you have to.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, okay, I will try and channel the Auditor-General for a moment, alright? If I were the Auditor-General, I think I would say to you, 'I'm going to leave this alone until the police have finished with it, and get hold of the bits and pieces.' That may or may not be the Auditor-General's view; that would be my view if I were the Auditor-General, because I would not want to be tripping over SAPOL, and I would not want to be interfering with what they are doing.

But, I can assure you that, as far as I am concerned, the Auditor-General will have and does have the full cooperation of the Attorney-General's Department and the Crown Solicitor's Office in relation to this matter. If the Auditor-General makes any request of us for assistance or whatever, then I am sure we would be only too happy to accommodate that. I think we need to just bear in mind that there is no suggestion in the passage to which you have referred us that it has anything to do with us saying to the Auditor-General, 'Don't go any further'—

Ms Chapman: No.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —it is actually the Auditor-General, of his own motion, determining he did not want to proceed. I am sure if he was saying that on the basis that the Attorney-General's Department, or crown law, or anybody was being slightly recalcitrant about cooperating with him, I am sure that would be written there too, but it is not.

We are happy to cooperate, and have at all times been happy to cooperate, but we do not control the Auditor-General's time frame, and we do not control the exercise of the Auditor-General's discretion about whether the Auditor-General wishes to intrude into a matter that is the subject of an active police investigation or an active court matter; that is really something for them. To be perfectly frank, I am not even sure if there are protocols between the Auditor-General's office and SAPOL about these things. I just do not know, because it is not part of my responsibility.

Ms CHAPMAN: As the first law officer of the state, Attorney, let me put this to you—I am assuming you have read the rest of the paragraphs that have been outlined by the Auditor-General, in which—

The Hon. J.R. Rau: I have read exactly what you're asking me to read; exactly what you—

Ms CHAPMAN: Let me ask you this: have you read, under the item 'Alleged fraud against the Victims of Crime Fund (VOC Fund)', which is around point 6 on page 106, down to point 4 on page 107, which is about eight paragraphs?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will read it now to make sure I am fully acquainted with everything you are going to ask me.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Attorney will see that the department is effectively hamstrung in being able to undertake any investigation. They have reported to us here in this report to the parliament that the department—that is, your department—is apparently cooperating with the police in their inquiries but, whilst they will monitor the developments on that, they are not in a position to be able to provide any audit statement here to the parliament at present. So, here we are in October. We have got no assurance from them because they are effectively hamstrung from doing anything. We have got your or your department's statement to the media that the Auditor-General has been advised on this matter and it is with the police—

The Hon. J.R. Rau interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Maybe seized of it but obviously not doing anything—and we have a Victims of Crime Fund still operating. So, what have you done, Attorney, to make sure, firstly, that the problem has been quarantined or that there is no other problem happening with the Victims of Crime Fund at present?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thank the honourable member for her question. First of all, what have we done? We have actually cooperated with the police, we have informed the Auditor-General, we have basically turned our pockets inside out and said to them all, 'Whatever you want, you have our cooperation.' That is point No. 1. Point No. 2 is: the Auditor-General's Report itself, in one of the paragraphs that you took me to on page 106, refers to the fact that the Auditor-General anticipates fully dealing with this matter in the 2012-13 audit report, so it is not as if it is going to be left and never tackled.

Also, I am advised that there was some reasonable confidence that the fraud could be reliably isolated to the Victims of Crime Fund itself. Because of the particular modus operandi, I think, of the alleged perpetrators, it would not be much value to them doing that elsewhere. I do not want to go into particulars because that probably would not be wise.

In order to provide further assurance however, the Auditor-General and the Attorney-General's Department undertook to review other administered areas that may be at risk of fraudulent activity. I think it is important to note there that that does not mean exactly the same fraudulent activity: they are areas where some sort of fraud might be perpetrated.

The review was undertaken by the department's internal auditors, which are PricewaterhouseCoopers, and provided comfort over the controls in operation in these other areas. As part of this process, I am advised certain recommendations were made to further improve controls, which are now being considered by the relevant areas.

PricewaterhouseCoopers has also undertaken a review of the interim controls implemented by the Crown Solicitor's Office as a response to the alleged fraud. The Crown Solicitor's Office is considering these draft findings. It is intended that a more detailed review of the control environment will be conducted by PricewaterhouseCoopers once the police investigation has been concluded.

I just want to put something else on the record here because I think it is important. At one point, early in the investigation, the whole of the victims of crime process almost ground to a complete halt, and it did so because the department was being prudent in trying to manage the risk which, at that point, was less well understood than it is now. At that point, there was, as I said, a virtual grinding to a halt of payments under that fund in order to ascertain whether each individual file was free of this sort of problem.

Can I say that that caused some distress in the community because there were many people who had applications for compensation from the fund who were being confronted with time lines which were not really acceptable and were not time lines which were due to any failure on their part. They were time lines that were due to the fact that the department was being as prudent as it possibly could about this fund. I just think it is important that members in the house understand that this is not the sort of fund where you can reasonably just shut it down, close it completely and wait for some audit in never-never land. You have to appreciate that the people who are attaining funds out of this are victims and it was really important for us to get the fund back on an even keel, and I am pleased to say that the department has done a very good job of that, and the fund is now functioning well.

I am advised that the department has a very high degree of confidence that the particular problem that they were confronting here has been isolated and the controls that are in place at the present are adequate to deal with the risk of more of this type of event being discovered.

Ms CHAPMAN: Unfortunately, that does not fill me with confidence, Attorney, because on page 113 under 'Fraud management', the Auditor-General also reports about that management review. This is not a new issue. Essentially, this had been identified some time ago as a problem in relation to not having a policy of management. Whilst you say that a review has been undertaken, as the Auditor-General points out, the fraud policy was scheduled for review in December 2011 and a draft was considered by the audit and risk management early in 2012. It was incorporated into an amended policy.

The updated policy was approved by the chief executive after the audit visit in May 2012. This is all from the year before. A reminder to all policy responsible officers will be sent to ensure that review dates are more closely adhered to in the future. The fraud policy will be revised to clearly stipulate that an incident will be included on the fraud incident register after a matter has been fully investigated and approved. That is when it identified that it even had previous incidents—not necessarily resulting in prosecutions, but incidents—in which there had been a failure to implement even whatever policy they had before. So, it does not fill me with confidence your telling me that they have done a review. The Auditor-General tells us that, Attorney. We still do not know whether this policy has been implemented. If it has, apart from having identified by August that there was a serious problem of fraud, your department has not even acted on the request of the Auditor-General from the previous year.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There is a lot in that remark. First of all, there is the financial year and the calendar year and, as we all know, they are not the same. But in the financial year to which this report refers, and in the calendar year that we are presently in, I am advised that in May the department did make the approved changes. It did not run for the whole of the financial year but by May, which is still in this calendar year, I am advised the changes were brought in which is reflected in that particular passage on page 113.

Ms CHAPMAN: So if you have a policy in place as at May 2012, what is it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, thank you for that question. I am advised that the document is in the nature of a policy document which I assume would fit into a compendium of policy documents which every officer reads every evening before they retire, but this is one I am pretty sure they would have been reading because it has been kind of current in the department. I reckon a lot of their minds would have been sharpened up on this one. The short answer is that it is a policy document. It is included amongst the policy documents and it forms part of the policy framework of the workplace. It is what people are supposed to do.

Ms CHAPMAN: Attorney, surely you can come into this house, after what has been exposed in your department, and assure this parliament that it has its policy in place, that the senior people who are in charge of money have read it, that they understand what is in it, what its key features are, and that it is being implemented. It does not fill us with confidence to have answers from you, dismissive as they are, some smart alec response, about how people in your department would have read this nightly. I expect a serious answer to a serious question.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will give you a serious answer. You are asking me whether each and every person in the department has read this. Obviously, I do not know. I can ask individual officers whether they have read it, but my understanding is that this policy was worked through. It has been embraced by the department, it is now the departmental policy. I do not have information about whether particular officers or public servants have given special attention to this, but I do know—and I am confident about this—that the officers whose responsibility is the financial management of the Attorney-General's Department are well aware of it.

Ms CHAPMAN: What has happened in the office that runs the claims in relation to the Victims of Crime Fund that is different now to what it was before May 2012? What action is being taken to ensure that a person who is in charge of processing and approving the claims is not able to do it again—whoever it was who was responsible for this—and defraud the Victims of Crime Fund that now operates. Can you tell us in this place whether that action is being complied with and whether it is protecting the over \$100 million now in that fund?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think I might have said before that the PricewaterhouseCoopers review of the interim controls has been implemented by the Crown Solicitor's Office as a response to that. The Crown Solicitor's Office is presently working on those draft findings.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is there a second sign-off on the approval of these claims?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: You are asking me about particular issues about the actual procedure that was in or was not in. I would have to take that particular question on notice because I do not want to make up an answer without knowing the answer.

Ms Chapman: Then take this on notice.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I will take that on notice. I do not want to say too much about exactly what went on here because it is a criminal matter presently before the courts, but the allegations involve a very particular modus operandi. I am very confident that officers of the department in that area are very alert to that particular type of behaviour being repeated. If somebody devised a

completely different mechanism for attempting to defraud the fund, ideally the controls we put in place would identify that quickly.

I think it is worthwhile mentioning that this was actually detected by the department itself. This was not something where SAPOL came in and found this terrible thing. I think that is the most telling aspect of the whole thing. Officers of the department identified this thing for themselves before anyone else had a clue what was going on and made the appropriate reports to the police and Auditor-General, which I think demonstrates that there is a strong culture of doing the right thing in the department.

Ms CHAPMAN: What is the current balance of the fund?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that it is \$109 million.

Ms CHAPMAN: There is also reference to this fund on page 121. Can the Attorney confirm that only \$836,000 was actually recovered from offenders of victims of crime during the subject year?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am afraid I know nothing more that I can assist the honourable member with other than that statement on page 121, and, yes, it does say that that was \$836,000.

Ms CHAPMAN: Is it fair to say that, in relation to the \$34 million in the Victims of Crime Fund levies incurred, at least \$33 million of that remains uncollected debt?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If that is what it says, I am certainly in no position to argue with it. I am not sure what page that is on—122, yes. I certainly would not argue with what the Auditor says about those matters.

Ms CHAPMAN: Why was there a \$3 million decline from \$10 million to \$3 million in the revenues from the SA government from the previous financial year?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am advised that that was a decrease in appropriation to the fund. I am advised that that had something to do with one-off funding in the previous year for children in state care matters.

Ms CHAPMAN: On the Crown Solicitor's Office, how much was spent on contracting of private sector legal advice over the last financial year and how did that compare with the previous year?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think that is one we will have to take on notice.

The CHAIR: The time allocated for the examination of the Auditor-General's Report in relation to the Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Planning, and Minister for Business Services and Consumers has expired. I now call on the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, and Minister for Housing and Urban Development for a time of 30 minutes. Member for Bragg, you speak on behalf of the opposition?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, I do. I refer to items of transport and infrastructure in particular. I will say that in this committee we were advised that minister Rankine, when she comes to deal with her portfolios, advised that we were to ask this minister any questions in relation to road safety. I can tell the committee I will not be asking this minister anything to do with road safety; it is not within his area of responsibility, and I will be taking it up with minister Rankine. But I just report to this committee that that was the direction from minister Rankine's office. If she doesn't know anything about road safety I am not going to be bothering this minister with it.

On transport and infrastructure at page 1239, on the Gawler rail funding, I would like to ask you, minister, in respect of the \$42.5 million that was received, when—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: What page are you on?

Ms CHAPMAN: Page 1239; it is paragraph 48. When did the state government—that is, the date—receive the \$42.5 million for the Gawler rail project that is held in the former AusLink advance account? When did the state government receive it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I did not actually hear what you said, sorry.

Ms CHAPMAN: When—that is, what date—did the state government receive the \$42.5 million, which is referred to as being held in the former AusLink advance account?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I understand it was in the last financial year. I do not have a specific date. It is not the sort of information that people ask us for very often, but I am sure we can find the specific date.

Ms CHAPMAN: This was an existing project, minister. The federal budget was announced on 8 May. The state budget, for all of us, was on 31 May. Can you confirm whether this money had been paid to the state government before or after the announcement of the state budget?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, I will check the specific date. I am struggling to see what the relevance is, but if that is what you want to know, I will check the date.

Ms CHAPMAN: The report suggests on page 1239 that in June 2012 the Treasurer approved a change in the purpose of the AusLink advance account to include commonwealth funding received for specific projects. That is, after your state budget has been published, there is a Treasurer's approval to change that. Was the money in this account all the time, or was it in another account? If so, what was it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will have to check when this money was received, but all that that refers to is that when the name of an account is changed we need Treasury to approve it. It is not a matter of enormous substantial difference; it is simply the change of the name of an account.

Ms CHAPMAN: No, with respect, it says a change in the purpose of that account, not the name of the account. Presumably he has granted approval for that fund now, as of June 2012, to be able to be the holder of commonwealth funding received for specific purposes. That is what he has approved.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Well, if you know, I'll leave it to you.

Ms CHAPMAN: So my question to you is whether it was in any previous account, or whether it had been in there without approval.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Given that I do not know when it was transferred, it is a bit hard to say. Can I say, the member for Bragg apparently understands it all. She is telling me, so I might just leave it to her. You want to know when some money was transferred to us; we will find out. You want to know if it was in this account first or second; I will find out for you. I am struggling terribly to understand the relevance of it and I will just see if there is anything else I can help you with. We will check the dates, but I am told it was in an AusLink account and transferred to that account. I do not know why the accountants want to do these things, but that is what happened.

Ms CHAPMAN: I was not clear about that, minister. It was in an AusLink account and transferred to this account: is that what you are saying?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, I know you are not going to agree because you have already said what your view is. It was simply the change of the name of the AusLink account to this named account. That is all. That is because, of course, AusLink is not around any more.

Ms CHAPMAN: So I assume, then, from that answer, that it has always been the same account: this has been a name change. Is that your position on this?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: That is what I have been told, and I am quite happy to believe them. Frankly, if this is the biggest issue you have found, we can all go now, I think.

Ms CHAPMAN: Do I assume that the minister is going to be walking out of a committee inquiry? I hope not. So, it is in the same account. Can the minister explain to the committee why \$41 million has been advised to *The Australian* on 2 September as the funds that were paid in advance for the Gawler upgrade, when the Auditor-General clearly identifies \$42.5 million?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I do not recall that but can I say: I do not think what appears in the media is an appropriate part of this. Frankly, I will go and find out why a media report says 41 and this says 42. I am quite happy to do that, but I am sure you will find there is nothing untoward happening.

Ms CHAPMAN: Consistent with that, on 16 October this year, at the Senate estimates, Mr Mrdak answered a question and said:

My understanding is that \$41 million is already with the South Australian government this year and \$35 million is due to be paid next financial year on the project. That balance has been expended.

So I will get back to the \$41 million. Is that the \$41 million which is part of this \$42.5 million, or not?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Now you have gone from *The Australian* newspaper to Senate estimates. Can I suggest you direct your questions to the Auditor-General's Report, because that is what we are here for? I am not at all certain about what—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order. Apart from the minister not wanting to answer the question—

The CHAIR: No, he was not saying that.

Ms CHAPMAN: What I am going to explain is that at page 1240 the Gawler upgrade, the Auditor-General tells us, is \$42.49 million; and they are the questions I am asking the minister.

The CHAIR: The point the minister was making was that he is neither responsible for what *The Australian* publishes nor is he responsible for any questions and answers in the Senate. He is actually responding to the Auditor-General's comments. Can you please direct your questions regarding the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will continue with the answer as given. I do not know what Mr Mrdak said in the Senate. I have no reason to doubt that the member for Bragg is quoting Mr Mrdak correctly, but I do not know what he said and I cannot assist the member for Bragg with this. What I can do, if the member for Bragg believes there is an inconsistency between reports elsewhere and the Auditor-General's Report, is try to find out if that is the case and why. But I assure the member for Bragg that I am certain that we will find there is nothing here for anyone to get too concerned about.

Ms CHAPMAN: We will await that with interest. Do separate funding agreements exist for the Gawler electrification and the Gawler upgrade?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: My staff advise me that they would not be confident to say either way. They know there was a big package, of course, for Gawler, but they would have to check to see how that is detailed.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have all acquittals been provided to the commonwealth for the Gawler rail projects?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am sorry. I am just struggling to understand where in the Auditor-General's Report it raises the acquittals to the commonwealth.

Ms CHAPMAN: We have this money left.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I understand that you want to ask me about acquittals for the commonwealth, but it does not appear in the Auditor-General's Report. I am happy to provide that information because I am a very decent fellow and I will always try to help, but I am struggling to understand what relevance it has to this Auditor-General's Report. I will ask these people to find it out, but I do not know where we are going.

Ms CHAPMAN: That's not surprising. If the state government cannot demonstrate that the electrification of the Gawler line will be completed within a certain time frame, will that commonwealth funding have to be returned?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: This has really gone, Mr Chairman, far enough. These are not questions about the Auditor-General's Report which is a look back at the activities of the previous financial year. The member for Bragg is looking forward to what may or may not happen with the commonwealth. I suggest that if the member for Bragg wants to ask me a question at question time she has ample opportunity, but this is an examination of the Auditor-General's Report. I have officers here to provide information on the Auditor-General's Report and not on extraneous matters.

I invite the member for Bragg to ask a question tomorrow at question time, and I will be happy to provide whatever briefing we can on these matters because that is what we do. It is not really a good use of the people who are here to talk about the Auditor-General's Report.

Ms CHAPMAN: That is good coming from the minister who so far has not answered any questions even about what date he opened an account, but, anyway. What state funding was used for the Gawler electrification project before it was cancelled? What is the total amount?

The CHAIR: Whereabouts in the report does that appear?

Ms CHAPMAN: There are a number of references for the electrification program.

The CHAIR: Just find me one.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I just point out that this information was in fact provided earlier. The question was asked in some other forum by the minister and we provided that information. Now, given that it does not appear to be in any way relevant to what we have in front of us, and naturally we do not have that with us, we will look at it again.

Can I say, so that the member for Bragg understands, that the processes for acquittals with the commonwealth are not timed at the same time we do this. They come subsequently. In fact, some of them will still be being done for the previous financial year, as I understand it. Again, if the member for Bragg wants to get into extraneous matters I would love to get a question at question time sometime. There is ample opportunity.

Ms CHAPMAN: Mr Chairman, if the minister has even read this report—I do not know whether or not he has—there is reference on page 1184 in respect of the income, going over onto page 1185 relating to the commonwealth revenues and identification there of \$146 million for the Gawler line electrification resleepering. Further down in respect of the revenue (on page 1186), we have explanations as to why there are certain changes in the financial accounts, including the funding that has gone towards the Gawler rail line project.

This is a major piece of infrastructure which has been going on for sometime. It is the subject of the financial year that we are talking about. It even continues into this financial year because there is money still sitting in an account to be spent. My simple question is: how much of the money so far that has been spent on this project is from the state government? That's all. It is pretty simple. The whole financial accounts are here.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I would agree that some things are pretty simple; I will not take it further than that.

The CHAIR: The member is asking the question: how much of state funding was spent during that financial year?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: The member for Bragg believes that I should have foreseen that she would want to know that, even though there is no real issue about that raised by the Auditor-General. I took the view that we would be here talking about the issues the Auditor-General has raised and that might be of some relevance to the member for Bragg, but instead the member for Bragg wants to go behind some numbers in there that have caused no concern to the Auditor-General and somehow cut them up. As I said, I am happy to seek to provide that information.

As I understand it from an earlier question, the difference between the \$42.9 million that was referred to and the \$41 million that people have talked about is that the \$41 million is what was unspent of the \$42.9 million. There was some \$1.5 million spent, so there is no inconsistency. It has been merely reported in that way. I am very happy to provide this information to the member for Bragg but, again, it does not seem to be particularly relevant to the matters that have been raised by the Auditor-General.

Ms CHAPMAN: I refer to page 1182 in respect of the South Australian Aquatic and Leisure Centre. The question to the minister is: what is the current status of the legal action between the department and Candetti Constructions in respect of the aquatic centre?

The CHAIR: What was your question?

Ms CHAPMAN: What is the current legal status?

The CHAIR: Where is that in the Auditor-General's Report? Are you asking for the legal status as at 30 June? 30 June is the cut-off for the Auditor-General's Report.

Ms CHAPMAN: To be clear about this—

The CHAIR: If you want to question about something today, that is for question time.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will ask what it was at 30 June and I will ask what it is at present.

The CHAIR: No, the present is ruled out.

Ms CHAPMAN: If you rule it out—

The CHAIR: I will.

Ms CHAPMAN: —I will dissent from your ruling.

The CHAIR: You can do that. Please do that. I am more than happy for you to do that.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will wait for the minister's first answer.

The CHAIR: Okay. At 30 June, minister.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Again, I am not an unreasonable fellow. I am quite happy to get an update on what the state of that is, if there is in fact any legal action afoot, but it is not—

Ms Chapman: It says there is. It says it there.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Yes. Again, I am trying to make this simple. This is looking back at the previous financial year. You have asked what is occurring now. I believe the date today is 30 October, if I can assist the member for Bragg with that. What the status is some four months after the end of the financial year is not something we have brought the details of because we did not expect to be asked it. I am quite happy to find the details. We have absolutely nothing to hide, but it does seem to be a terrible waste of time on an Auditor-General's examination.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will remind the minister, who has been here for 20 years or so—he ought to have read 100 of these reports by now—that in fact these reports are prepared after the financial year in respect of the financial year, and they report on a number of things, including what has happened since. Several times just on that page, for example, in respect to the Adelaide Oval redevelopment it identifies what has been happening since and that the report has been tabled on 30 August 2012, etc. So, clearly in the Auditor-General's Report he is telling the parliament what they are doing, what they have failed to do, what they have stuffed up or whatever during that year, and then he gives a summary of what the events are following that period. In particular, in respect of the state aquatic centre, he says that the Auditor is aware that the department is in dispute.

The CHAIR: Your question is what, member for Bragg?

Ms CHAPMAN: My simple question, which I think the minister has said he will take on notice, is an update of the legal proceedings between those two parties.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Just so we are absolutely clear because of all this smart-alecky stuff, as I read it it says 'in dispute'.

Ms Chapman: Yes.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: How do you get legal proceedings out of 'in dispute', because I am in dispute with you but it is not a legal proceeding.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We are not. So, I am in dispute with you, but let me say that I have no trouble updating—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If you are going to get up and make long speeches instead of questions, do not be offended if I do that too. All that I would say is that you must be terribly disappointed with the clean bill of health given to the departments by the Auditor-General because you will not go near a question about the Auditor-General's Report. Please, I invite you to in the 10 minutes you have left.

Ms CHAPMAN: I hate to disappoint the minister, but on page 1166 the minister obviously overlooked to read this in his whole portfolio: in fact, he got a qualified opinion from the Auditor. Sorry, minister, but the Auditor clearly was not happy—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Let's talk about that!

Ms CHAPMAN: —with your department's operations—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Let's talk about that!

The CHAIR: Minister, could you—

Ms CHAPMAN: —and hence we have quite a lot of concerns that he has raised. My next question, however, is at page 30, 'Deposits lodged with the Treasurer', and in particular—

The CHAIR: Page 30?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, in relation to the boat fund levy.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Page 30?

The CHAIR: That's what she said.

Ms CHAPMAN: Statement G.

The CHAIR: You will have to wait a second while I find page 30.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you.

The CHAIR: I assume that is in Volume 1, or the overview?

Ms CHAPMAN: I will just find my page of it. It is 'Deposits lodged with the Treasurer', and I will just find the volume, because I only have my printout here. I am talking about the Recreational Boating Facilities Fund on page 30. I will just show you the statement.

The CHAIR: No, you find it in the report for me, please.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will show you here, Mr Chairman: page 30—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: No, I am not talking your statement. Statement G, continued under 'Deposits lodged with the Treasurer—Balances as at 30 June 2012'.

The CHAIR: Member for Bragg, the minister will not answer this question unless you find for me a reference in the report—a reference I can actually—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The CHAIR: Minister—

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, but different book.

The CHAIR: Minister, could you just please—

Ms CHAPMAN: You've got the wrong book, minister.

The CHAIR: Which volume?

Ms CHAPMAN: I do not have that in front of me; I have just said that to you.

The CHAIR: No, where in the report is it? It is not on page 30, because I have looked through page 30, so it must be some other page.

Ms CHAPMAN: Again, Mr Chairman, with respect, you are looking at the wrong volume; I just explained that I have the photocopy—

The CHAIR: I might be looking at the wrong volume; can you point out the right volume for me then, member for Bragg? That is your duty.

Ms CHAPMAN: You poor boys; you have the whole department here—you have the head of the department here, you have all these advisers—

The CHAIR: No; it is your job, sorry.

Ms CHAPMAN: —and you cannot tell me—

The CHAIR: No, don't shift responsibility—

Ms CHAPMAN: —that the minister cannot even find—

The CHAIR: Member for Bragg—

Ms CHAPMAN: I am telling you, under the title of 'Deposits lodged with the Treasurer', of all of the funds—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: In which volume?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, he knows where it is; of course he does.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: In which volume? I cannot find it.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have not got the volume number; that is what I just said to you. It is at page 30 of the Treasurer's funds that are held on your behalf. You have got all these advisers sitting there and you cannot find—

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

The CHAIR: Minister—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will not have the advisers insulted because the member has invented a page number. I have page 30 in front of me, and it does not have it, and I will not have the advisers insulted.

The CHAIR: Member for Bragg, you can either specifically identify the item or go to the next question.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question is in relation to the Recreational—

The CHAIR: Hold on, we are covering old ground.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I am happy to try to answer, but it would be helpful if I could be referred to it somewhere.

The CHAIR: The minister will have to refer to it in his answer, so unless you can actually work out where it is coming from, it is not going to be very helpful.

Ms CHAPMAN: I have just had some help; it is Volume 6.

The CHAIR: Volume 6; thank you. That is very helpful.

Ms CHAPMAN: My first question is—

The CHAIR: No; hold on.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: Just in defence of the people she has been insulting, Volume 6 starts at page 1837.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is Statement G.

The CHAIR: Okay, it is Volume 6, it is the statements at the end of the report—

Ms CHAPMAN: Correct.

The CHAIR: —Statement G, I think you referred to?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, page 30. Hooray! Have we found it? Have you found it, minister?

The CHAIR: We are almost on the same page.

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I help? Can I approach—

The CHAIR: No!

Ms CHAPMAN: Can I approach the minister?

The CHAIR: Hold on—minister—

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: It is absolutely outrageous and insulting—

The CHAIR: Minister—

Ms CHAPMAN: Can you find it?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: —you were wrong. Mr Chairman, I refer to—

The CHAIR: Minister, resume your seat or you will be leaving the chamber.

Ms CHAPMAN: Thank you. My question is—

The CHAIR: The member for Bragg, you will stick to the rules lest you leave the chamber as well.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question is, Mr Chairman, in respect of the Recreational Boating Facilities Fund. Do you have that there? It is about point 6 on the page.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: I've got it; once you could actually find it, it was very easy for us.

Ms CHAPMAN: Okay, well, you are on the page, or off the page, or whatever?

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: It is an appendix.

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, that's right: page 30. So you have got the right page? Okay, good. You will see there that, as at 30 June 2012, it had \$12,267,387 in it. You are in charge of it, let me tell you—I assure you of that.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon: Do you have any questions or just insults?

Ms CHAPMAN: Are you familiar with the fund?

The CHAIR: The member for Bragg, just stick to the question. Your question is?

Ms CHAPMAN: Right, my question is: during the 2011-12 year, did you receive any recommendations from the Boating Facility Advisory Committee that you did not approve?

The CHAIR: Sorry, has the Auditor-General raised that in any part of his report?

Ms CHAPMAN: No, I am asking about the fund.

The CHAIR: No.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: All of that farce was about the member for Bragg asking a question that she would more appropriately—

The CHAIR: Ask a question.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: If I might go so far as to say that, had she at some point screwed her courage to the sticking point at question time and asked the question, I would have been happy to seek an answer. But she goes to a fund and then asks a question about recommendations that may or may not have been approved, which have nothing to do with anything the Auditor-General said. Can I say that I do not recall not approving any recommendations from the fund—I do not recall it. That does not mean it may not have happened and, can I say, it was not something we prepared for this, because, frankly, this is a specious, extraneous issue to drag in because there is a column that has \$12 million in it. I mean, it is just a joke.

Ms CHAPMAN: My next question is: what is the total value of payments made from this fund in the 2011-12 year?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will have to check that for the member for Bragg. Again, like I said, if the Auditor-General had raised some issues about payments from the fund, we might have been alerted to an issue around it. As it is, if the member for Bragg wishes to look at those matters contained in the appendix—not on page 30 but in Statement G—she will see that there are a large number of funds, and I do not believe anyone is going to be able to tell her payments out of those funds off the top of their head unless, in some way, they have been alerted to an issue by the Auditor-General. We have not. I am quite happy, again, to provide these things, but the member for Bragg could get these quite easily by asking for a briefing, or asking a question. It has got nothing to do with this.

Ms CHAPMAN: My final question then is: what is the total revenue collected under the Recreational Boating Facilities Fund levy in the 2011-12 year?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: I will find that out for the member for Bragg.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will return to the aquatic centre, which is at page 1182. One of the tenderers, minister, for the aquatic centre was unsuccessful and was contracted by the department to fix the defects in the construction prior to the Australian Swimming Championships earlier this year. What was the total value of that work in the 2011-12 year and has any further rectification of work been required?

The CHAIR: Where is it in the report?

Ms CHAPMAN: Page 1182—goodness me.

The Hon. P.F. Conlon interjecting:

Ms CHAPMAN: Reference it? There are pages of it.

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: We will check that. Just so we understand, what occurred is that there was a dispute between us and the original contractor. That dispute was, from the contractor's perspective, that they should be paid more and, from our perspective, that the contractor should not.

The member for Bragg would be aware that that contractor then, unfortunately, was involved in further difficulties and, in particular, from memory, was in administration at around this period of time. Given the dispute and given the circumstances of the contractor, we then gave it to someone else to rectify what we thought were the difficulties. I cannot tell you off the top of my head what we paid, but it was seen to be the only thing we could reasonably do in the circumstances. I think it is regrettable when any business goes into administration.

I am getting some signals on what the money is, but what I will say is that whilst it was a difficulty, the aquatic centre has proved to be an absolutely outstanding success. It is a great place to visit. I have had my kids there. Making the rectifications, incurring costs and having the dispute later with the contractor was the wise thing to do, and I think we should take a little pride in how Adelaide was received as the host of those championships. It was a very good outcome. It is very close to my electorate and it is in the Mitchell electorate. It is a very popular venue. I am told that the rectification works are somewhere in the space of \$2 million to \$3 million but I will get a more accurate figure for you.

Ms CHAPMAN: I won't be following any—

The CHAIR: The time has expired.

Ms CHAPMAN: One more question.

The CHAIR: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will not be asking about the swimming habits of the minister's children, which is very interesting.

The CHAIR: No. The time has expired.

Ms CHAPMAN: Having taken—

The CHAIR: The time has expired.

Ms CHAPMAN: Having taken up time with that, is there any chance I can have a further question?

The CHAIR: It will depend on the question you ask. If it is directly related to the Auditor-General's Report and you are not fishing somewhere else, then I will let you ask the question.

Ms CHAPMAN: Having discussed the first part which was at page 1182, at the bottom of the paragraph you will see, minister, on the bottom of that page he talks about how there is going to be a follow-up contract for financial management issues. So, we will see whether or not your comments are accurate. He says there that he is going to have a further supplementary report to parliament on this.

The CHAIR: And your question is?

Ms CHAPMAN: Before that he says—

The CHAIR: No, your question is? Do you have a question, member for Bragg?

Ms CHAPMAN: He says, 'It is expected that any findings arising from the review will be formally discussed and communicated to the department in the latter part of 2012.' My question is: has your department been advised of that?

The Hon. P.F. CONLON: No, we haven't. I thank the member for Bragg for this very special time we have spent here.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COURTS EFFICIENCY REFORMS) BILL

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: In relation to this matter, in the interests of getting this resolved quickly so that we do not waste any more time, basically the situation is that we will accept amendments Nos 1 to 4 in the Legislative Council. I think a number of those amendments were to do with jurisdictional limits which I know the member for Norwood had a view about. I had a different view about it but I think I said before there is no right or wrong answer to that. I have discussed it with the Chief Magistrate. The Chief Magistrate has indicated to me that they can live with it as amended, so I am not going to make an issue about it because I had a different number. I

think it would have been better to start with a smaller number, but that is fine. The Chief Magistrate can live with it, and I want to get the bill through.

The second bit which I cannot live with is amendment No. 5 made by the Legislative Council. The reason for that is that that amendment would have meant that a person could become chief magistrate and by virtue of being appointed chief magistrate they would then become a District Court judge. They can then immediately resign as chief magistrate and we would be left with a District Court judge we did not expect and no chief magistrate. That was the problem with it. I believe there is an amendment floating around here which is—

The CHAIR: Will you indicate to the committee what you wish to do?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes. This is the House of Assembly bill No. 15, motions moved by the Attorney-General, so this is the new part 6A which deals with the appointment of the Chief Magistrate. It basically establishes that if a person is appointed chief magistrate, yes, they become a District Court judge, but, no, they cannot decide, 'Well, I'm just going to jettison the chief magistrate bit and just telling everybody in the District Court, here I am, look after me.' That is basically the situation. There are obvious reasons why we would not want that to happen. You could be on this endless merry-go-round of appointing chief magistrates, and they decide they want to be District Court judges and never get one, so that would just be silly. We are moving amendment No. 5, and Nos 6 to 13 in the Legislative Council we are accepting. My understanding is that that is acceptable to the opposition.

The CHAIR: Can I suggest we deal with the three parts separately in case there are any discussion?

Amendments Nos 1 to 4:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 1 to 4 be agreed to.

Motion carried.

Amendment No. 5:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That this house disagrees with amendment No. 5 made by the Legislative Council but makes the following alternative amendment in lieu thereof:

New Part, page 7, after line 28—After Part 6 insert:

Part 6A—Amendment of *Magistrates Act 1983*

19A—Amendment of section 6—Appointment to administrative offices in magistracy

(1) Section 6—after subsection (2) insert:

(2a) A person is not eligible for appointment as the Chief Magistrate unless he or she is a legal practitioner of at least 7 years standing.

(2b) For the purpose of determining whether a legal practitioner has the standing necessary for appointment as the Chief Magistrate, periods of legal practice and (where relevant) judicial service within and outside the State will be taken into account.

(2) Section 6(3)—delete 'the Chief Magistrate or'

(3) Section 6(4)—delete 'shall' and substitute:

(other than an appointment as the Chief Magistrate) will

19B—Insertion of section 6A

After section 6 insert:

6A—Chief Magistrate to be magistrate and District Court Judge

(1) The Chief Magistrate will be taken to have been appointed as a magistrate and as a Judge of the District Court of South Australia (if he or she is not already a magistrate or a Judge of the District Court of South Australia).

(2) Section 6 of the *Judicial Administration (Auxiliary Appointments and Powers) Act 1988* applies to the Chief Magistrate and, for that purpose, the office of Judge of the District Court of South Australia will be taken to be the primary judicial office of the Chief Magistrate and service as Chief Magistrate will be

regarded as if it were service as a Judge of the District Court of South Australia.

- (3) However—
- (a) the Chief Magistrate may not perform the duties, or exercise the powers, of a Judge of the District Court of South Australia while the Chief Magistrate holds an appointment as Chief Magistrate; and
 - (b) the Chief Magistrate may resign from the office of Judge of the District Court of South Australia and from the office of the Chief Magistrate without simultaneously resigning from office as a magistrate and such a resignation will not give rise to any right to pension, retirement leave or other similar benefit.
- (4) The Governor may, by regulation, make provisions relating to existing entitlements, and recognition of prior service, of the person holding the office of the Chief Magistrate on the commencement of this section or a person appointed to the office after that commencement, including by making modifications to the application of an Act that deals with superannuation or pensions.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Legislative Council has reviewed a number of courts efficiency reforms, and the opposition will be supporting the motions, as moved by the Attorney-General, in response. The agreement to Nos 1 to 4 has been noted. In respect of amendment No. 5, we have a compromise position, essentially. Members here may not have been aware that the position of the government in another place had been to reject the opposition's amendment to deal with this question of a chief magistrate's appointment to be a District Court judge contemporaneously, the conditions of which flow as a result of the resignation from a position.

The government had previously presented a proposal, via the Attorney-General's contribution back in June (including in his press release), in which they claimed that the government's amendments were to bring South Australia in line with practice in New South Wales, Victoria and Queensland. What was clearly exposed in the debates in another place was that that was not the case. The Queensland provision dealt with this issue which identified that the Chief Magistrate in that jurisdiction may not perform the duties, or exercise the powers, of a District Court judge while the Chief Magistrate held the office as Chief Magistrate.

Whilst it was exposed that the proposals of the government were not consistent with other jurisdictions, the Hon. Stephen Wade presented a proposal to remedy the difficulty in this regard. The government's representative, the Hon Gail Gago, identified that she would not support that way forward, essentially identifying, she claimed, that the government had a concern, in that it would allow chief magistrates to resign as a chief magistrate without resigning as a District Court judge and resign as a chief judge without resigning as a chief magistrate.

Whilst the Hon. Stephen Wade had pointed out that the way to deal with some of the concerns raised was in fact to appoint one of the Supreme Court judges to undertake duties in the circumstance of a conflict, this further compromise which is now before us is one which essentially confirms that the chief magistrate will be taken to have been appointed as the magistrate and as a judge of the District Court of South Australia. However, the chief magistrate may not perform the duties or exercise the powers of a judge of the District Court while the chief magistrate holds an appointment as chief magistrate and the chief magistrate may resign from the office of judge of the District Court of South Australia and from the office of the chief magistrate without simultaneously resigning from the office as magistrate, and such a resignation will not give rise to any right to pension, retirement, leave or other similar benefit.

Personally, I think this is a clumsy way of dealing with it, but I understand that there is a compromise position on this, that this is the way to deal with concerns raised by a number of parties, and so on that basis we will not be opposing it. I mentioned that the government, having insisted that there be a provision for the chief magistrate resigning, that the provision that he or she must also resign as a District Court judge is one that we will accede to. We also acknowledge and thank the government's agreement to deal with and accept the amendments to deal with retrospectivity, that is to avoid the retrospectivity effect, and accepting the proposal to increase the small claims to \$25,000.

I did read the debates in respect of the minor statutory proceedings also being amended to fit in with that. I had not been aware there had been any issue in this regard, but that has also been tidied up. Most importantly, which the Attorney may be surprised to hear, we are delighted that the

government has agreed to accept the increase in the retirement age of magistrates from 65 to 70 years. We thank the government for coming to their senses in that regard.

I note this, because so many times in this jurisdiction we come in here with amendments to legislation. The Hon. Gail Gago, in the debates on this, objected to this proposal in another place, even though she was voted down on the 65 to 70 years, on the basis that the government was considering itself increasing the retirement age and had a suite of other amendments that they wanted to bring in on a review of the Magistrates Act generally.

It is just absurd to me that the minister or the Attorney would come in, and through their representative in another place, and say, 'We are not going to accept this, because we want to deal with this more broadly and it is more important that we do a complete review,' and yet every day we come into this parliament and make amendments to acts. In fact, I am about to deal with two tiny little amendments to trustee companies and to wills in this jurisdiction, when we have a whole myriad of problems in the succession and wills area, and I would hope that we are finally going to get a review on that legislation.

So, please, spare us these pathetic excuses which are raised in this instance in a deliberate attempt to deny the people who thought of this idea to act on it and to get it happening, to make sure it happened. The churlishness of the government is just beyond all comprehension because they do not want to be pipped at the post. They do not want anyone else to have any sensible idea. Do not come in with this idea that we cannot possibly do this because we have got a whole review and the next day—the next session, in fact, in the next few minutes—they will dish us up legislation that we will have to deal with to fix up bits of legislation.

Please, give us some decent explanation if you are going to be so churlish as not to give proper recognition to those in the parliament who have acted to remedy an ill, and in this instance it is. That is a rather qualified thank you, Attorney, but understand this: if you want to deny reasonable people the recognition that they deserve, then do it in a grownup way.

The CHAIR: Move it along, please.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As always, the member for Bragg has tempered her charity with some vitriol. In relation to the Magistrates Court Act, we have been conducting a review with the Chief Magistrate, dealing with a great number of things, and it is true that we would have preferred all those things to go together so that the magistrate has had an opportunity to see the package that was being offered in relation to the magistracy. But, given the fact that we were going to do it anyway, I am quite relaxed about the opposition moving it because, as I said, we were going to do it, anyway. The question is whether it was done in this bit of legislation or whether it was done in—

The CHAIR: We can come back tomorrow.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: No, we will do it today. I am getting there.

The CHAIR: I suggest you move along, then.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The other thing I wanted to say is this. As far as amendment No. 5 is concerned, I want to make the point that there may be circumstances where there is some sort of conflict or issue within the District Court where there are people who, for whatever reason, cannot attend to a matter and it might be handy to have somebody else. But, we are not doing it that way and that is fine. I am relaxed about it.

Motion carried.

Amendments No. 6 to 13:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments Nos 6 to 13 be agreed to.

Mr MARSHALL: I would like to speak on amendment No. 7 from the other place. This amendment relates to clause 20 of the government's Statutes Amendment (Courts Efficiency Reforms) Bill, in particular, to an amendment to the Magistrates Court Act 1991. Of course, this amendment deals with the threshold in the minor civil division of the Magistrates Court which is commonly referred to as the small claims jurisdiction.

Members in this house—and, of course, the Attorney-General—would know that I moved an amendment to the Magistrates Court Act myself back in July of last year to the exact effect that the Attorney-General is agreeing to in the house today. Peggy Hora was the Thinker in Residence

who spoke about the need for cost-effective access to justice, and this was really a recommendation from her report back as far as 2010. We are pleased that the government is going to finally agree to this. It is a big win for small business which is struggling with increasing costs at the moment. It is a massive win for them. The small claims jurisdiction will allow small business with minor civil disputes to go without representation into the Magistrates Court and seek speedy and cost-effective remedy to actions that they may have.

I suppose that the important question to ask is: why has there been a delay? The Attorney-General came into the house today and he said that he has spoken to the Chief Magistrate on this issue and that the Chief Magistrate agrees that there is no problem with this threshold moving to \$25,000. Well, it begs the question why the Attorney-General did not go and speak to the Chief Magistrate earlier in this process.

Why has it taken the Attorney-General and his department so long to go and have that conversation, because I can tell members that I had that conversation about 18 months ago. I think that it is very tardy of this government. It has held up the passage of this reform through its own action. Do not forget that, when I moved this originally in my own private member's bill, it was the government which actually opposed it. It would not have a bar of it. It is very disappointing that it has taken so long to come through, because all those businesses, all those small businesses and all those individuals have essentially been denied cost-effective and speedier justice than what has been delivered in the intervening period.

With those short remarks and being cognisant of the time, I will conclude my remarks and say that I am pleased that the government has finally agreed to this amendment, amendment No. 7.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There is a little bit of fluff in there. He missed the point that I said to him in the first place, 'Yes, look that's fine. There's no correct answer.' I had a view. I went back to the Chief Magistrate for a view. In the end, it is my call. She has been an adviser. In the end it was not worth fighting about, so, fine.

Ms SANDERSON: I rise to speak in support of amendment No. 6. This amendment was an idea that actually came to my electorate office—the silly idea to keep the retirement age for magistrates at 65 when this very piece of legislation was being used to increase the Chief Magistrate's age of retirement to 70.

Given our ageing population and the need to encourage people to work longer, it makes perfect sense to lift the retirement age of magistrates to 70; and the Magistrates Association, as has been mentioned, was consulted and was supportive of this change. To quote the Hon. Stephen Wade from the other place:

The amendment supports the retention of skills, knowledge and experience in our courts. It brings the retirement age of magistrates in line with the retirement age of judicial officers in the superior courts and recognises that people over the age of 65 still have an enormous contribution to make.

I was astounded when I read *Hansard* and that the Hon. Gail Gago in the other place stated:

In principle the government does not oppose the increase; however the government is already considering increasing the retirement age of the magistrates in the context of a wider review of the Magistrates Act 1983, and therefore the government opposes the amendment.

Given that it was the government that used this statutes amendment to lift the retirement age of the Chief Magistrate which brought this to my attention, I felt it only reasonable to use the same piece of legislation to increase the retirement age of magistrates. I asked why both could not be done at the same time, and I am glad that the government came around to accept the idea.

Motion carried.

At 17:59 the house adjourned until Wednesday 31 October 2012 at 11:00.