

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 2 November 2016

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

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: NEW ADELAIDE CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT SCHOOL

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:01): I move:

That the 553rd report of the committee, entitled New Adelaide Central Business District School, be noted.

This is indeed a very exciting project promoting an inclusive, experiential learning environment of self-responsibility on behalf of students. The new Adelaide central business district school will be situated on Frome Road in Adelaide on the current Reid Building site. It will accommodate 1,250 students as well as teaching, administration and maintenance staff and will have a special focus on STEM subjects.

The proposal for the site is to refurbish the Reid Building and construct a second seven-storey building to its south, providing the required teaching spaces. The two buildings will be connected via a central atrium that will include the entrance, reception and general meeting and lecture area. In addition, the scope of this project also includes:

- information and communication technology infrastructure;
- a roof terrace over the gymnasium;
- 200 bicycle parks of which 170 are secure parks in the basement; and
- a dedicated drop-off and pick-up area on both sides of Frome Road.

The school will be constructed in stages, with stage 1 including the construction of the new southern building, the interconnecting central atrium and the partial refurbishment of the Reid Building. Stage 2 will complete the refurbishment of the Reid Building following the current tenants vacating the premises. The school is due to open at the commencement of the school year in 2019 for year 8 and year 9 students. Access can be provided upon completion of stage 1 of the project, should it be required.

A review of the Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation central archive revealed that sites of significance have been recorded within or immediately adjacent to the project site. This includes a burial site within 100 metres of the Reid Building. DPTI have confirmed that they have consulted and are continuing to work with a cultural heritage expert who has developed a cultural heritage management plan for the project. In addition, they are also consulting the Kurna Aboriginal Community and Heritage Association and the Ramindjeri Heritage Association. These discussions will continue throughout the project, and should any remains be found, work will immediately stop and further advice will be sought.

The cost of the project is \$100 million (excluding GST), which includes all construction and on-costs as well as new ICT equipment and infrastructure costs. Construction works are due to commence later this year, with completion by October 2018. I would like to thank the Department for Education and Child Development for presenting this important project to the committee. They certainly presented it with a lot of enthusiasm and hope for the future on this site.

I also thank the committee members: the members for Colton, Torrens and Finniss, and the member for Chaffey, as he has now completed his time on our committee. We thank him for his work and diligence in relation to all the projects on which we have had witnesses come to the committee

over the last few years that he has been a committee member. We welcome the member for Unley in his place. We also thank Alison Meeks and Ryan Piekarski for their work. Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:05): Quite obviously and clearly, the opposition members of the committee supported this project, as \$100 million for the future of our young people's education cannot be quibbled about. It will be interesting to see this project come to fruition, even though we are probably some three years away from the first stage being completed. It will add significantly to the educational capacity of South Australia and, more particularly, those children and young people who will be attending the school in due course. With those few words, I support the project.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (11:06): I welcome the opportunity to speak briefly on the 553rd report of the Public Works Committee on the new Adelaide central business district school. The new school, due to open at the commencement of the school year in 2019 with its first year 8 and year 9 students, will accommodate the 1,250 students as well as teaching, administration and maintenance staff. The school will have a general high school curriculum and, I am pleased to say, it will also have a special focus on STEM subjects—science, technology, engineering and mathematics—and, in addition, it will include health sciences.

During the committee, we were shown visuals of how the school buildings will present, providing a new kind of innovative and contemporary learning environment that is a first for South Australia. As a former teacher, and having taught and visited many schools in our state in my current and former position, I can say that this is truly a learning environment that will be embraced by the students and teachers, providing them with a wealth of learning and teaching opportunities.

While the suburbs and schools that are likely to be included in the zone for this new high school are yet to be finalised, Bowden, Brompton, Hindmarsh, Hilton, Kurralta Park, Glandore, Black Forest, Nailsworth, Medindie, Medindie Gardens, Gilberton, Walkerville, Collinswood, the eastern part of Torrensville, Mile End, Richmond and Marleston have been named, and it is anticipated that others will be added. An end user working group has been established comprising principal representatives from key schools, the department's principal project director and the government steering committee.

I look forward to the opening of the new Adelaide central business district school. I have spoken to many of its future students and those who are hoping that they will be included as future students, all of whom are excited about the progress of what is setting out to be an outstanding new school facility in Adelaide in a Parklands setting.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:08): I would like to thank both members who have contributed to this debate and acknowledge that they are both members of the Public Works Committee and also the interest the member for Torrens has in this particular project. With that, I commend the report.

Motion carried.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION: ANNUAL REPORT 2015-16

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:08): I move:

That the report of the committee, entitled Annual Report 2015-16, be noted.

I am pleased to present the 10th annual report of the Parliamentary Committee on Occupational Safety, Rehabilitation and Compensation. It reflects another busy year for the committee and the commitment of members, who have many other commitments and responsibilities. The committee's primary function is to keep the administration and operation of legislation affecting occupational health and safety, rehabilitation and compensation under continuous review. This is an important function and one the committee takes seriously.

During the 2015-16 reporting period, the committee continued its inquiries into work-related mental health and suicide prevention. This inquiry is important in that it reflects the increased community focus on mental health issues and the role that everyone plays in preventing mental health harm and suicide.

Under the Work Health and Safety Act, a person conducting a business or undertaking (a PCBU) has a duty of care to ensure psychological as well as physical health and wellbeing for workers. The previous Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act was focused only on physical health and wellbeing. Whilst the inclusion of psychological health in the Work Health and Safety Act is relatively new, there are many organisations doing good work in this area.

Those at risk of suicide are mainly men of working age, but women record high levels of attempted suicide. The World Health Organisation reports that depression is one of the major reasons for disability and estimates that it will be the number one health concern in developed nations by 2030. Depression and anxiety are two of the most common mental health disorders and are very treatable, but left untreated they can lead to the risk of suicide—and the number is more than twice the road fatality rate.

The inquiry into work-related mental health and suicide prevention provided the committee with an important opportunity to hear from a range of individuals and organisations that are making a difference, but there is still much more to be done to encourage men, in particular, to seek help when they are doing it tough. The committee has also been inquiring into the Work Health and Safety (Industrial Manslaughter) Amendment Bill, which was referred from the Legislative Council. The Hon. Tammy Franks MLC, from the other place, stated that we needed safer workplaces and that fatality rates were rising.

The committee agrees that there has always been a need to focus on improving safety, particularly as technology changes and as young people enter into unfamiliar workplaces and older people work longer. All these things challenge businesses to stay informed and ensure they are doing their best to make sure their workers go home at the end of each day without injury or illness. Data on workplace fatalities now includes road traffic fatalities and bystanders who are killed as a direct result of a work activity, which can give the appearance that fatalities are increasing when, in fact, they are reducing.

Men are more likely to die at work than women because of the industries in which they work. High-risk industries such as transport, warehousing and agriculture, forestry and fishing are largely male dominated and therefore reflect the higher male fatality rate. SafeWork SA places a high focus on monitoring these industries to ensure compliance with the Work Health and Safety Act and subordinate legislation.

As well as undertaking these two major inquiries, the committee has undertaken two field trips during the reporting period. In October 2015 the committee undertook a field trip to the Hillgrove Resources copper mine and Kanmantoo Bluestone quarry, which are both located about 55 kilometres from the CBD.

These businesses are quite different. The Hillgrove Resources copper mine is an open cut mine employing 190 people and many contractors. It has a high focus on safety and works closely with the Kanmantoo community on issues relating to dust, noise, lighting and environmental rehabilitation. The Kanmantoo Bluestone quarry is a small, family-owned business with historical significance that provides slate and aggregate as well as crushed rock for road bases.

These visits were facilitated by the Mining and Quarrying Occupational Health and Safety Committee and SafeWork SA. The committee is very appreciative of their assistance and advice in arranging the visits, which were very informative. I would also like to particularly thank the owners of the Kanmantoo Bluestone quarry for their assistance and guidance on that day.

In November 2015, the committee visited the Riverland for two days, during which time it visited Accolade Wines (Berri Estates), Almondco and Costa Exchange as well as the Berri Hospital. The committee also took the opportunity to visit the SafeWork SA office in Berri to learn about their education and enforcement programs within the region.

It was a privilege for the committee to visit the Riverland region, and I would particularly like to thank the member for Chaffey, Mr Tim Whetstone, for his assistance during that visit. It was also a real pleasure and privilege to visit the Kanmantoo mining region. Both of these field trips provided the committee with an opportunity to learn about the businesses and the challenges they face and how those challenges are being addressed.

These visits followed on from the committee's inaugural field trip the previous year to the beautiful Barossa Valley, which was hosted by the member for Schubert, where we undertook three site visits. We thank again the member for Schubert and team Schubert for their assistance during that visit.

In 2017, the committee plans undertake more regional visits, and in particular we will visit Whyalla and Roxby as part of our inquiry into the Return to Work Act and scheme, which was referred from the other place. We will be talking to the member for Giles, in particular, to assist the committee to plan these visits. As a result of the increased workload the committee has been experiencing, we will shortly be engaging a research officer to assist the very busy executive officer.

I would like to take this opportunity to thank all those people who have contributed to the inquiries undertaken by the committee. We have met many people as witnesses and also on our field trips. I would like to thank those people who took the time to make the effort to prepare submissions and speak to the committee. I would also like to thank the businesses in the Riverland and Kanmantoo that were so welcoming; they provided valuable insight into work and life in their unique regions.

I extend my thanks to the members of the committee: the member for Schubert and the member for Fisher and, from the other place, the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. John Darley and the Hon. John Dawkins. My thanks also go to the committee's executive officer, Ms Sue Sedivy, who does a marvellous job for us all.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:17): I will not hold up the house for long, except to say that I have been on this committee for over two years now and it has become more and more rewarding the longer we go on and do our work together. We are very much the little committee that could. We have undertaken a large number of inquiries, as the member for Ashford has talked about.

The industrial issues that are presented to us in the main are not new issues and there is an ongoing need to try to find a balance and a way through. It is interesting that a lot of the testimony and advice that we get comes from two different sides, and sometimes those two different sides can be quite conflicting in the way that they present evidence to us.

What excites me is the fact that our committee works extremely well together and actually seeks to find the truth of the argument and the best way forward with a very common sense and knowledgeable approach. It is quite exciting for me. It is one of those things that the people of South Australia could do well to look at more closely because it is a great example of parliamentarians from all sides coming together with goodness in their hearts and good intent to bring about positive and sensible change.

I want to thank Sue Sedivy certainly and the other members of the committee for another fantastic year. I would also like to thank members in the other house for giving us the opportunity to undertake what I think will be a mammoth inquiry over the next 12 months as we deal with the new referral that has just been put to us to review the return-to-work scheme.

I very much look forward to that as we deal with this very important topic of how we can keep people in their work places safe, how we make sure everyone goes home to their loved ones happy and healthy every night whilst making sure that we do so in a way that does not deliver undue burden, cost or red tape and that we indeed find that middle ground that provides the best outcomes for everybody involved in industrial situations.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:19): I would like to thank the members again for their contribution, as well as our wonderful executive officer, and hope that our annual report will be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: TOD RIVER DAM SAFETY UPGRADE PROJECT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:21): I move:

That the 554th report of the committee, entitled Tod River Dam Safety Upgrade Project, be noted.

The Tod River Dam is situated on the Toolillie Creek (I have the member for Flinders here who can guide me, so that is good), a tributary of the Tod River over on Eyre Peninsula. It is around

27 kilometres north of Port Lincoln in the Whites Flat and Koppio area. The dam was constructed between 1918 and 1922 to supply water to Eyre Peninsula. It has a maximum capacity of around 11.3 gigalitres.

Since 2002, the dam has been offline due to water quality issues and is no longer used to supply water on Eyre Peninsula due to the high salinity levels. This is being actively managed by SA Water, but the water remains well above drinking water standards, as well as being unsuitable for agricultural use. In addition, in recent years the level of the water has been reduced to around 8 per cent of its full capacity.

SA Water constantly monitors all its assets, including dam infrastructure, to ensure compliance with national standards. In this case, the Australian National Committee on Large Dams (ANCOLD) guidelines are used. Safety and risk assessments conducted on the Tod River dam have identified that the dam is noncompliant with current ANCOLD guidelines. Given that SA Water has an obligation to manage all its dams safely and manage the risks, and has a commitment to comply with the ANCOLD guidelines, it has proposed these works as an effective and efficient means of upgrading the dam to ensure compliance with the guidelines.

These works were considered by SA Water for the upgrade. They were a standards-based upgrade, a partial decommissioning, a full decommissioning, and a hybrid option, being a phased dam safety standards-based upgrade with a lowered full supply level. The latter is the preferred option, supported by both the economic and financial analysis. It also allows the dam to remain online for current recreational use and other potential future uses. The cost of the preferred hybrid option is \$6.305 million (GST exclusive). It will see the water level maintained at the current 8 per cent.

When questioned by the committee on why, other than cost, the dam is being decommissioned, SA Water said that they were keen to maintain the dam to allow for potential future uses of the water. Although investigations already undertaken have identified that it is not cost-effective to treat the water to drinking water standards, in the future there may be potential to treat the water to a lesser standard for, say, irrigation or mining purposes, should there be a demand and also if it is economically viable.

The Tod River Dam is an important piece of local infrastructure, from both a water perspective and a historical perspective. It is listed on the South Australian Heritage Register, recognising its historical significance as an early water supply for Eyre Peninsula. SA Water has been working with the heritage section of the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources to ensure that the works are in keeping with the surrounds and heritage value.

There has been a significant amount of consultation with the community, local members of parliament, the member for Flinders, and the local councils. This is a very important project for the region, and the community is highly interested in the project, given the importance of water issues on Eyre Peninsula. This is reinforced by the discussions the committee had with local government representatives during our visit to Lower Eyre Peninsula last year.

It is to be remembered that this project is about safety and potential risks that could occur in an extreme event, including potential loss of life, loss of key infrastructure and local property damage. It is not about addressing water security, either water quality or quantity for Eyre Peninsula. SA Water will continue to consult with the local community throughout the project, and it has taken on board the other concerns the community has raised, including that of water security.

I would like to thank the member for Flinders, who attended this particular committee meeting when we had witnesses and gave his evidence and perspective on behalf of the local community from his area. I would also like to thank all my other committee members, and our hardworking support staff to the committee. With that, and given section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the proposed project.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:26): I, too, would like to contribute to the discussion today on the 554th report of the Public Works Committee. I thank the committee for the opportunity to present to their most recent meeting, when they also took evidence from SA Water regarding the Tod River Dam upgrade.

This has not been without its concerns within the local community. We have had the opportunity—through some rather belated public consultation from SA Water and also through the opportunity for me to present to the committee—to raise some of these issues. To SA Water's credit, they have listened broadly to what the community has had to say about this, and their concerns, in the first instance at least, that were that there was very little public consultation with regard to this works program.

The member for Elder has very succinctly described the history and the iconic status of the Tod Reservoir. At the risk of going over old ground, I would once again like to speak in the parliament about the status of this reservoir on Eyre Peninsula. It was built through the early 1920s and ultimately, along with the railway line, it aided a big part of the settlement of inland Eyre Peninsula. In its day, it was an extraordinary engineering feat before the days of mechanical bulldozers or excavators. Some steam-driven machinery would have been used, but essentially it was horse-drawn and men with picks and shovels.

To dig a dam which ultimately had a capacity of some 11.3 gigalitres in the early 1920s was an extraordinary feat. Even more extraordinary was that the water captured and held within the dam was pumped to the top of Knotts Hill, which is the high hill adjacent to the reservoir. From there, incredibly, it gravitated all the way to Ceduna—some 250 miles. It was the most remarkable engineering feat unsurpassed anywhere in the world. Even in America, they had not managed to do this—250 miles of gravity-fed water reticulation in the 1920s.

There were some holding tanks at Minnipa Hill, which added to the pressure on the second half of the journey. It was quite a feat and incredibly important. Ultimately, pumps were installed and that increased the efficiency of the system. Its gravity feed was up the map as well, which made it more extraordinary. The water went north. The member for Elder quite rightly pointed out that the reservoir has been offline since 2002 largely due to salinity issues. SA Water's obligation now is to provide potable water through their reticulation system.

Salinity was always an issue within this particular catchment. It was recognised from the very early days that salinity had to be actively managed. Over time, the salinity of the reservoir increased so that it no longer fell into the World Health Organisation and SA Water standards of 1,000 parts per million salinity as acceptable for drinking water. Of course, in the early days, it did not have to be potable water. It was purely and simply to stop water and primarily to run the trains up and down the peninsula.

I mentioned the fact that the locals were concerned about the lack of consultation initially. SA Water has addressed that. After some pressure and some demand, SA Water held two public meetings, both in Tumby Bay. Both were very well attended. I managed to get to one of them. The local government was involved, and some 60 to 80 people were at both meetings. They really wanted answers to some questions, particularly around the long-term future of the dam, the reservoir and also, as the member for Elder related, the long-term security for Eyre Peninsula.

This upgrade was never intended to address the water security issue on Eyre Peninsula. Obviously, SA Water has said that, but I can assure people that it remains at the top of the mind of the residents of Eyre Peninsula. Initially, when this project was announced some three years ago in the state budget figures, it was a significantly higher figure than the current \$6.3 million. I for one was quite excited to hear that money was to be spent on the Tod River Reservoir on a dam bank upgrade because I thought, in my naiveté, that there would be a long-term use for the water in this iconic reservoir. It was not to be, however.

As has been stated in the report, the upgrade will merely ensure that the dam bank is safe to hold water at around 8 per cent of the dam's capacity. I think that is a waste of a useful resource, but that is my personal opinion. SA Water has assured us that there will be an opportunity in the future, should the demand occur, for further upgrades and for the capacity for the reservoir to be installed. Who knows what the future might bring? There might be water security issues that unfold quite quickly, and there could be demand from another customer. I know that there have certainly been talks between the government and a potential mining company about drawing water from the reservoir. We will see where that goes.

I will finish by saying that there is a certain amount of bemusement amongst the locals, particularly with regard to the ANCOLD demands. I understand that South Australia is a signatory to these dam safety requirements. In a nutshell, the ANCOLD requirements include that this dam bank is upgraded in order to withstand our one in 600,000-year flood event. I kid you not—one in 600,000 years. That is more than half a million.

Mr Pengilly: We'll probably still be here.

Mr TRELOAR: Well, I might be, Michael—you never know your luck—and the member for Schubert certainly will be. This is extraordinary, all this is in a catchment of some 40 square kilometres. That is all it is—a tiny catchment. As I indicated in my evidence to the committee, if I think about 600,000 years ago, that is BC, before modern humans even walked on this earth, so it is quite an extraordinary commitment by the South Australian government and almost defies common sense. I think far more of a risk than the safety issues downstream is the impact some of this work could have potentially, given that the water flows will be going by the dam on local government assets, crossings and the like.

There have been some concessions from SA Water. They have agreed to set up a reference committee and I congratulate them for that. I hope that the call for membership goes out soon. It will give the local community and local individuals the opportunity to be part of the discussion not just about this project but about works in the future and that ever present and ongoing water security issue.

The other concession we received from SA Water as a result of a meeting between myself, the Minister for Water, some local constituents and SA Water representatives was that they would more actively manage the salinity within the reservoir. They intend to do that by not just relying on the inflows of Toolillie Creek, which is the most saline of the three inflows, but by actively directing into the reservoir some water at least from Pillaworta Creek, which is of better quality, and in that way manage the salinity. When a small body of water is not actively managed, ultimately the salinity will become higher and higher, and the outcome is not good environmentally or practically in the long term.

I accept that the work is going to go ahead. I accept also that SA Water have made some concessions along the way with a somewhat belated effort at community consultation. I hope very sincerely that that consultation continues and, with the opportunity of setting up a reference group, I think that will be a very valuable chance for the local community to retain some ownership of what once was a very iconic public asset and one which the local community still feels very strongly about.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:36): I listened with interest to the member for Flinders, as did the committee in the hearing a couple of weeks ago. It became pretty obvious pretty quickly that the Tod dam is a pretty iconic part of Eyre Peninsula. When I was going to school some decades ago, one of the things we learnt about was the geographical and infrastructure history of South Australia. In those days, we used to know the names of all the reservoirs and dams; indeed, the Tod River Dam was one of those that was discussed regularly.

I must admit that when I first read of the project of some \$6.3 million to strengthen the wall of a dam that was not being used, I asked a few questions about why on earth we were going to do that. It was made pretty clear to us that it was in the best long-term interests of Eyre Peninsula to upgrade this wall. The one in 600,000-year flood really did not concern me too much. Quite frankly, if we got away with it this year with the high rainfall we have had, we are doing pretty well.

As the member for Flinders said, and as was expressed during the hearing, it may well have a future use, and I would like to see that that could happen. Indeed, in due course it could have a desalination plant on it; that is a use. It is a substantial volume of water. Given that Port Lincoln in particular is growing reasonably steadily and that water is a prerequisite for us—we cannot exist without water, shelter and food; they are the prerequisites for human existence—at sometime in the future that may well justify our keeping the body of water there.

I know that the member for Flinders is pretty passionate about it. I think SA Water had erred in doing consultation on this project prior to going out, but they have picked up their game and are now doing that consulting. They were not keen to admit it, but they did admit that perhaps they had

not done it quite properly, and the member for Flinders has honoured them for that. We might have to go and look at it, member for Flinders. This project will be of benefit in the long term, so the opposition members have supported it.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:39): I would like to thank the member for Finniss and, in particular, the member for Flinders for their contribution to and support of the Tod River Dam upgrade. I recommend the report to the house.

Motion carried.

**PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND
COMPENSATION: REFERRAL OF THE WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (INDUSTRIAL
MANSLAUGHTER) AMENDMENT BILL**

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (11:40): I move:

That the 25th report of the committee, entitled Report into the Referral of the Work Health and Safety (Industrial Manslaughter) Amendment Bill, be noted.

The committee's 25th report is the result of an inquiry undertaken in response to a referral of the Work Health and Safety (Industrial Manslaughter) Amendment Bill to the committee by the Legislative Council. The purpose of the bill, which was introduced by the Hon. Tammy Franks MLC from the other place, was to provide stronger penalties for employers and corporations whose negligent work practices result in work-related fatalities.

Work-related fatalities are unacceptable and not only end the life of an innocent worker but also have far-reaching consequences for the family, friends, other workers and those close to the deceased. While one workplace fatality is one too many, there has been, I am pleased to say, a continued downward trend in workplace incidents, injuries and fatalities which, our committee argues, are the responsibility of everyone to prevent.

In the past 12 years, there have been three previous attempts to introduce a similar bill to prosecute individual employers who recklessly disregard the health and safety of their workers and where that disregard has resulted in the death of a worker. The committee heard from a number of sources that there were legal difficulties with holding employers accountable for a workplace death, particularly if the organisation is large and complex. Many levels of management accountability often make it difficult to identify the directing mind of the organisation when decision-making is diffused through the organisation.

I have to say that I was certainly involved as the shadow industrial relations minister, when first coming into the parliament, in trying to introduce such legislation, so my history goes back some 19 years. I have to report that we have been stunningly unsuccessful in making those changes, but the good news is that the work that has been done with regard to the harmonisation bill, the introduction of the Work Health and Safety Act, really has changed the relationship between workers and businesses. Workers are now engaged in many different arrangements—I think they were before, but they are certainly more prevalent now—such as being on contract through labour hire organisations as subcontractors and, sadly in many ways, in my view, there has been an increasing casualisation of the workforce.

The language of the Work Health and Safety Act no longer refers to employers and employees. We refer to a 'person conducting a business or undertaking' (PCBU). These people have a duty of care and officers have responsibilities to any worker on the worksite regardless of the employment relationship. This change reflects the complex arrangements at large worksites, particularly construction sites. On these sites, it is possible for an employer to take every reasonable measure to protect the health and safety of workers but for a contractor or someone else to enter the site and create an unsafe situation.

I reflect on a site that has had an awful record—the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. A site like the new Royal Adelaide Hospital has many contractors, subcontractors and others working on site with different employment relationships. One can easily imagine a builder erecting a barrier around a void on a construction site only to have it removed by a contractor to gain access to the site for different reasons.

An inexperienced worker who falls through the void and is killed does not do so because the employer is negligent but because of the negligence of a third party. In this scenario, the Work Health and Safety Act places the obligation on the contractor who had the duty of care for all those who were working on the site, the 'person conducting a business or undertaking'. An investigation would reveal who had the duty and how the failure had occurred, but under the Work Health and Safety (Industrial Manslaughter) Amendment Bill it would be difficult to prosecute the guilty party if they were not the employer.

It was also brought to our attention that the bill may prevent prosecution of any person who aided or abetted a work-related death. Submissions to the inquiry from legal and policy interest groups, including the Law Society, the Director of Public Prosecutions and the Flinders University Centre for Crime Policy and Research, all raised concerns about conflicting language, definitions and other aspects of the proposed bill compared with the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and the Work Health and Safety Act.

A major difficulty with the bill is that it focuses on the employer and employee relationship, rather than on the more complex work arrangements in place on many large industrial sites, where contractors, labour hire personnel and subcontractors work from time to time often under very differing and complex supervision arrangements. The bill also attempts to adopt some aspects of the Australian Capital Territory Criminal Code, as well as Britain's Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act, which did not align with the Work Health and Safety Act. I must say that in the past one of the references I have used is, in fact, the British Corporate Manslaughter and Corporate Homicide Act, but I think we need to recognise that things have moved on with the Work Health and Safety Act.

Employers voiced a common view that it is better to prevent fatalities than to prosecute individuals after the death of a worker. There is also a common view that increased penalties in the Work Health and Safety Act, particularly the category 1 offence, which has a maximum penalty of \$3 million for corporations and up to \$600,000 and/or five years in prison for officers who expose a person to a risk of death or serious injury or illness, are a significant penalty improvement on the former Occupational Health, Safety and Welfare Act.

The Work Health and Safety Act does not wait for a fatality to occur before a prosecution can take place. It is the risk exposure that will be prosecuted, which is aimed at prevention of work-related fatalities. On a personal level, I have some concerns with relying just on the Work Health and Safety Act, but I think it is important that, as the Presiding Member, I reflect the view of the whole committee.

The committee noted that currently it is possible to prosecute an employer and any other individual for manslaughter under the Criminal Law Consolidation Act, as has occurred (and time has moved on since we started this inquiry) in the case of Colbert, when the employer showed reckless disregard for his employees by not maintaining the brakes on a truck, which ultimately resulted in the death of an innocent man, leaving a distraught family without a husband and father. Many fellow workers and friends are very upset about this terrible death.

The committee recommends that the Crown Solicitor and the Director of Public Prosecutions consider a protocol to ensure that due consideration is given to prosecuting a manslaughter charge in the case of a work-related fatality where it is appropriate to do so. The committee recommends that this should not prevent the Crown Solicitor from also prosecuting a corporation under the Work Health and Safety Act. Based on the evidence presented to the committee, members maintain that there are adequate legal systems in place to deal with industrial death arising from negligent disregard. On this basis, the committee does not support the proposed amendment to the Work Health and Safety Act.

I would like to thank all those who made submissions and gave evidence to the committee. My thanks also goes to the hardworking committee members: the member for Fisher and the member for Schubert, as well as the Hon. Gerry Kandelaars, the Hon. John Darley and the Hon. John Dawkins from the other place. I really do appreciate the fact that we do work together on very difficult references that we seem to get regularly from the Legislative Council, but also on the work that we have generated. My thanks go, in particular, to the committee's executive officer, Sue Sedivy.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:50): In the previous speech, I talked about the collegiality of this committee when dealing with difficult issues, and this is one of the main things I was thinking of. The issue of industrial manslaughter was given to us, and it is an extremely delicate issue.

First off, I want to say that all deaths in workplaces should, to the greatest extent they can, be avoided. I do not think we can get to a situation where we are able to prevent these things completely, because sometimes freak accidents do happen—and we see this on our roads—but we should always be striving to reduce them as much as we can. Our target should be zero; unfortunately, I am not sure that we are going to get there.

The distress that a workplace death causes to those at that workplace but also to the families and friends must be immense; it is a tragedy I cannot fully comprehend, not having dealt with it—although, interestingly, in my previous life I talked to a number of workers who have dealt with it at previous workplaces. It is hugely tragic, and when this referral was sent to us we wanted to deal with the topic in a very respectful but thorough manner to, as I said previously, try to find the truth.

I think the reason we, as a committee, ended up not supporting this bill is because in the end what it sought to try to achieve and what it would have achieved were two separate things. Essentially, the bill itself would not work as the proponents would have intended. The member for Ashford talked about the fact that trying to prosecute an employer for an industrial death is, potentially, not the best way to go about it and that, in fact, in the case of this bill it is extremely limiting.

One of the reasons that industrial manslaughter—and, again, the member for Ashford talked about how many times the parliament has dealt with this over a long period of time—the reason that the legislation has moved on, is because of the improvements made under the Work Health and Safety Act 2012 where there was this new idea of a 'person conducting a business or undertaking' (a PCBU). It is an extremely awkward phrase but one that is much more comprehensive and encompassing in understanding the variety of employee-employer relationships or commercial relationships that exist across South Australian worksites.

An example often brought up is the construction industry, where we have a series of head contractors and subcontractors and it is essentially impossible to understand who is an employer versus a subcontractor. The fact is that the duty of care should exist at all stages of those commercial relationships, and essentially the PCBU definition is designed to be able to capture all those. The PCBU is also designed to capture a workplace that has an employer and employees, to make sure that everybody has a stake in safety in the workplace.

Again, I think this industrial manslaughter bill focuses too much on the employer, the ultimate employer, as opposed to the person who has the power to be able to make the change. That is often the employer, but take, for instance, a company that employs 100 people across a variety of different worksites. The ultimate employer—the chief executive or the owner of the company—is only able to be at one site at one time. The company has to have a structure, and that is the responsibility of the employer, to be able to ensure safety across the sites; however, there are responsibilities that site supervisors or managers have, and those responsibilities also need to be taken into account.

An interesting thing we found out, and where the inquiry headed, was the fact that manslaughter is an option; in common law manslaughter is very much an option on the table for where industrial deaths occur. The common law definition of manslaughter can be used as a charge against the person ultimately responsible for having caused that industrial death.

Interestingly, the Colbert case is one that ebbed and flowed over the course of our inquiry. Initially, Colbert was found guilty. The decision to have an appeal was granted based on some technical issues around how the evidence was presented but, once it did go to appeal, it was very quickly upheld because the fundamental nature of the case proved that Colbert was indeed guilty of manslaughter. So manslaughter can be used.

Common law manslaughter is there, so really where our inquiry headed was to look at why common law manslaughter is not used more often when it comes to dealing with workplace death. Essentially, as close as we can get, and this is certainly where our recommendations head, is the fact that where SafeWork SA goes to investigate on a worksite an industrial death, they are likely to

talk then to the Crown Solicitor and SafeWork develops a brief and talks to the Crown Solicitor about the most appropriate charge.

Certainly in the case of a workplace death, if there is some form of breach of the Work Health and Safety Act, then they can pursue a category 1 offence under the act which carries a prison term of up to five years and a varying scale—I think it is up to a \$2 million fine for a category 1 offence for corporations. Essentially, that is a path that they follow.

Interestingly, in the Colbert case, because it was a road fatality police were first on the scene, and potentially, because the police had developed a brief and sent that to the DPP, they may have had a different view when looking at the ability to charge under criminal law as opposed to the majority of the Work Health and Safety Act, which is civil, except in the case of some category 1 offences that do get treated as criminal cases.

Essentially, where we got to was that SafeWork SA, the police, the Crown Solicitor's Office and the DPP all need to work together to ensure that, where there is evidence to support a higher level charge of common law manslaughter, that it is pursued and that, even though it may be easier to prosecute under the Work Health and Safety Act, if the evidence suggests that a prosecution is viable the higher charge of common law manslaughter is pursued because we have shown through Colbert that it is available. All parties need to be aware that they should pursue the highest and most serious charge where there is evidence to support that.

In closing, I would like to thank the committee for their honest and considered deliberation and for the fact that we were able to take evidence from adversarial sides and coalesce that evidence to try to find the truth and try to find where the right of the argument lay, with the understanding that our committee always has to look at what is in the best interests of improving safety outcomes on worksites across South Australia and also make sure, to the greatest extent that our committee can, that people who go to work in the morning come home happy, healthy and safe at the end of the day.

Thank you very much to the committee. I think we have reached a fairly final conclusion on this issue. To those who are proponents of this bill, can I say that it is not that we do not want employers to be responsible for their actions and the responsibilities that they have to their employees: it is that the model legislation, the work health and safety legislation, that we have in place does adequately deal with these things. Common law manslaughter is available and on the table and we merely need to ensure that, to the greatest extent possible, the legislation is used to its full extent.

Motion carried.

Bills

ELECTORAL (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:59): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:00): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Electoral (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016, hereafter referred to as 'the bill' (not to be confused with a British TV program of the same name), proposes—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Excuse me. Order!

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —various amendments to the Electoral Act 1985 (the Electoral Act). The bill proposes amendments to the Electoral Act that respond to recommendations made by the former Electoral Commissioner in her report on the 2014 state election and also seek to curb the increase in pre-poll voting. I seek leave to have the remainder of the second reading explanation inserted in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

In addition, there are a number of other miscellaneous amendments to the Electoral Act. Each of these categories of amendments are discussed in turn.

Amendments that respond to recommendations made by the former Electoral Commissioner

There are a number of measures contained in this Bill that respond to recommendations made by the former Electoral Commissioner in her report on the 2014 State election.

The Bill make amendments to section 12 of the Electoral Act, and the definition of 'officer' in section 4 of the Electoral Act, to clarify that:

- the Electoral Commissioner can employ staff to assist her with her responsibilities under various pieces of legislation, and not just under the Electoral Act;
- temporary staff can be employed in relation to the administration of the Electoral Act and any other Act.

This acknowledges the fact that the Electoral Commissioner has responsibilities not just under the Electoral Act, but also under a range of other legislation including, for example, the *Local Government (Elections) Act 1999*.

Section 11 of the Electoral Act is repealed. It is not required as matters of staffing are adequately dealt with in section 12 of the Electoral Act.

The Bill amends section 26 of the Electoral Act to place some conditions on the inspection of the electoral roll. A person seeking to inspect the electoral roll will be required to provide his or her name to the Electoral Commissioner and provide suitable identification on request. There is also scope for the further conditions to be applied by way of regulation. These amendments strike a balance between maintaining an open and transparent electoral roll, and providing a level of protection to the voters whose names appear on that roll.

The Bill amends sections 43A and 45 of the Electoral Act to clarify that deregistration of a registered political party by the Electoral Commissioner under section 43A(5) as a result of failure to comply with the annual return requirements can only occur after written notice has been provided by the Electoral Commissioner to the registered political party.

The Bill amends the Electoral Act to make clear that nominations of candidates endorsed by a political party under section 53 of the Electoral Act can include the nomination of a single candidate. This could be expected to occur, for example, in the context of a by-election. Section 53 is currently headed 'Multiple nominations of candidates endorsed by political party'. This heading is changed to 'Nominations of candidates endorsed by political party'.

The Bill make amendments to the Electoral Act so that the prescribed amounts that must accompany a nomination can be paid in a manner prescribed by regulation. Currently, those amounts must be paid by cash or banker's cheque. Given that the amounts are quite high (\$3000 per candidate), the former Electoral Commissioner was concerned that payment by cash is no longer appropriate.

The Bill amends section 54 of the Electoral Act to remove the requirement for the address of a candidate to be read out at the declaration of nominations where the candidate's place of residence is suppressed from publication on the electoral roll under section 21 of the Electoral Act. Section 21 allows for an elector's name to be suppressed from the roll where to do otherwise would place at risk the personal safety of the elector, a member of the elector's family or any other person.

The Electoral Act has provisions which apply specifically to 'declared institutions', which can include hospitals, nursing homes, aged care homes, as well as prisons. The Bill removes references in sections 71 and 83 of the Electoral Act to 'inmates' of declared institutions, and instead refers to 'residents' of declared institution.

The Bill makes a number of amendments that are intended to make it easier for people with a disability to cast a vote.

There are several amendments that will ensure that people who are unable to sign are still able to cast a declaration vote where they are eligible to do so. The Bill makes amendments to sections 74 and 82 to allow a person who applies for registration as a declaration voter, or applies for the issue of declaration voting papers, to provide with their application a medical certificate which indicates that they are unable to sign. They would then be exempt from the requirement to sign the declaration on the ballot paper envelope.

Section 80 of the Electoral Act provides for a voter who requires assistance to be accompanied by an assistant while in the polling booth. Section 80 currently allows the assistant to assist the voter to mark the ballot paper,

or to mark it for them at the voter's direction. The Bill makes amendments so that, where the voter is making a declaration vote and is required to sign the declaration certificate, the assistant can sign the declaration on their behalf.

Section 80A of the Electoral Act allows a voter to vote *near* a polling booth in certain circumstances. These might include where, because of physical disability or illness, the voter is not able to go inside a polling booth. The Bill proposes amendments to section 80A to cater for the scenario where a person voting near a polling booth is doing so by way of declaration vote.

The Bill reworks section 81 of the Electoral Act. Current sub-section 81(1) requires a person voting at a polling booth who has previously been sent declaration papers to either present those declaration papers to the presiding officer or sign a declaration that the papers were not received. That sub-section is being deleted. There is no need to require a voter to bring their declaration voting papers to the polling booth, or otherwise to sign a declaration. Where a voter to whom declaration voting papers have been sent votes on polling day, the polling day vote will count. Any completed declaration voting papers received from the voter would be held out of the count.

The Bill amends section 84 of the Electoral Act to clarify that the secure facilities containing declaration ballot papers must be opened and forwarded as soon as practicable (rather than at the close of poll) to the appropriate returning officers or deputy returning officers.

The Bill inserts new Part 9 Division 5A into the Electoral Act. This new Division allows for regulations to be made that will provide for electronically assisted voting for sight-impaired electors to be implemented in South Australia. Part 9 Division 5A is modelled on similar provisions in the *Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918* (Cth). By inserting these new provisions, the Bill removes the current legislative roadblock that exists to the implementation of electronically assisted voting for people with vision impairment. It will enable regulations to be made which provide for a method of electronically assisted voting for use by sight-impaired voters.

The Bill amends section 91 of the Electoral Act, which deals with preliminary scrutiny. These amendments will enable the scrutiny process to be carried out in a manner which reflects the fact that the declaration certificate is now on a 'tear off extension' to the declaration envelope and can be separated from the declaration envelope. Currently, the process is that, once a deputy returning officer has checked the declaration certificate and is satisfied that the declaration vote should be admitted for further scrutiny, they take the ballot paper from the envelope and place it in a ballot box without inspecting or unfolding it. The new process will ensure voter secrecy by requiring the deputy returning officer to:

- remove the declaration certificate from the declaration envelope;
- rearrange the envelopes that no longer bear their tear off extensions so that the anonymity of the vote is maintained; and
- withdraw the ballot paper from its envelope and place it into the ballot box or facility.

Amendments directed toward pre-poll voting.

There are a number of amendments contained in the Bill that are directed toward curbing the increase in pre-poll voting. The total number of votes issued at pre-poll centres in 2010 was 37,464. In 2014, it was 82,020. This represented a 118.9% increase. It is considered likely that this reflects a tendency of people to vote prior to polling day for reasons of convenience, which is not one of the permitted grounds of pre-poll voting under the Electoral Act.

This Bill proposes to put in place measures which encourage voters to vote on polling day, and discourage pre-poll voting for convenience.

The primary rationale for adopting this approach is that the outcome of an election is supposed to reflect the views of an electorate on polling day.

Further, facilitating the casting of votes prior to polling day does not sit well with the new funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme. That scheme requires candidates, political parties and others to report their political expenditure and donations and requires more intensive reporting in the election period. The scheme provides for improved transparency and scrutiny of political parties and candidates. Given that steps have been taken to provide the public with increased access to information about the donations and political expenditure of political parties and candidates prior to polling day, it makes sense that voting should, where possible, occur on polling day. This allows voters to cast their vote with all of the information that we are now making available to them.

The funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme also provides for public funding to be payable to political parties and candidates, which essentially goes part of the way to reimbursing political parties and candidates for the cost of their election campaigns. It is inconsistent to allow tax payer money to be used to fund campaigns, and at the same time to facilitate large numbers of voters casting their votes before the end of the campaign.

The Bill makes changes to section 8 of the Act, which sets out the powers and functions of the Electoral Commissioner. The Bill inserts new section 8(1a), which provides that the Electoral Commissioner must, where relevant in the carrying out of the Electoral Commissioner's functions under the Electoral Act, promote and encourage the casting of votes at a polling booth on polling day. This makes clear that, in South Australia, the focus of elections should be polling day and that, where possible, people should vote on polling day. Declaration voting should be the exception rather than the rule.

The Bill makes amendments to section 73 of the Electoral Act to provide that pre-poll voting centres in South Australia will only be allowed to open in the 5 days leading up to polling day.

The Bill also prohibits exhibiting a sign or notice relating to the election within 100 metres of a pre-poll centre in South Australia. It is considered likely that, in some instances, the large amount of political party material and signage around pre-poll centres attracts attention to them, and may contribute to the increase in pre-poll voters for reasons of convenience.

Finally, the Bill introduces a prohibition on publicly advocating that an elector may exercise their vote in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Act. This is intended to ensure that parties and candidates do not encourage voters to cast pre-poll votes where the voters are not eligible to do so.

Other amendments

The Bill makes a number of other miscellaneous amendments to the Electoral Act, including:

- The Bill proposes to amend section 62 of the Electoral Act to remove the scope for Independent candidates to print descriptive information on their ballot papers. The *Electoral (Legislative Council Voting) Amendment Act 2013* changed the amount of descriptive information permitted next to the word 'Independent' from five words to three. This Bill proposes to remove the scope for descriptive information entirely. The Bill makes amendments to section 74A of the Electoral Act to make it an offence for anyone other than the Electoral Commissioner to distribute an application form for the issue of declaration voting papers.
- The Bill makes amendments to section 92 of the Electoral Act to reflect the fact that there are no longer voting ticket squares for candidates. Limiting eligibility for voting ticket squares to political parties and group is a change that was made by way of the *Electoral (Legislative Council Voting) Amendment Act 2013*, but the consequential amendments to section 92 were not made at that time.
- The Bill increases the penalty provisions in section 113 of the Electoral Act to \$50,000. This increase is intended to act as a deterrent to those involved in political processes who may authorise, cause or permit the publication of an electoral advertisement contrary to section 113.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation

Subclause (1) inserts a definition of medical practitioner for the purposes of the amendment in clause 17 of the measure. Subclause (2) amends the definition of *officer* to include a person appointed to assist the Electoral Commissioner in the administration of other Acts.

5—Amendment of section 8—Powers and functions of the Electoral Commissioner

The clause amends section 8 to insert a new subsection (1a) which provides that the Electoral Commissioner must, where relevant in the carrying out of the Electoral Commissioner's functions under the Act, promote and encourage the casting of votes at a polling booth on polling day.

6—Repeal of section 11

This clause repeals an obsolete section.

7—Amendment of section 12—Staff

This clause amends section 12(1)(b) to provide that persons may be employed by the Electoral Commissioner as required for the administration of the Act or any other Act.

8—Amendment of section 26—Inspection and purchase of rolls

This clause inserts a new subsection (1a) which provides that a person may only inspect a copy of the electoral roll if the person:

- provides the person's name and address to the Electoral Commissioner; and

- if requested to do so by the Electoral Commissioner, produces evidence of the correctness of the name or address as provided in a form determined by the Commissioner; and
- complies with conditions (if any) prescribed by the regulations.

9—Amendment of section 43A—Annual returns and other inquiries

This amendment is consequential on the amendment in clause 10.

10—Amendment of section 45—De-registration of political party

This amendment provides that the Electoral Commissioner may de-register a party if the registered officer of a registered political party fails to comply with a requirement under section 43A. This provision was formerly located in section 43A(5) and is to be relocated to section 45, in order for section 45(2) to apply to such a deregistration.

11—Amendment of section 53—Nominations of candidates endorsed by political party

The amendment in subclause (1) provides that a single candidate, or multiple candidates can be nominated on a nomination paper for election as a member of the House of Assembly or the Legislative Council.

The amendment in subclause (2) deletes the reference for a payment to be in cash or a bankers cheque and inserts a requirement for payments to be paid in the manner prescribed by the regulations.

12—Amendment of section 53A—Nomination of candidate by a person

This amendment deletes the reference for a payment to be in cash or a bankers cheque and inserts a requirement for payments to be paid in the manner prescribed by the regulations.

13—Amendment of section 54—Declaration of nominations

This clause amends section 54(1) to provide that the address of a nominated candidate must not be declared at nomination if a candidate's address is suppressed from the roll under section 21. Instead, the returning officer must declare, in the case of a candidate nominated for election to the House of Assembly, the House of Assembly district in which the candidate resides, and in the case of a candidate nominated for election to the Legislative Council, must not declare the address of that candidate.

14—Amendment of section 62—Printing of descriptive information on ballot papers

This clause makes amendments to remove the possibility of an application to have a description consisting of the word 'Independent' followed by not more than 3 additional words printed adjacent to the candidate's name on ballot papers to be used in the election.

15—Amendment of section 71—Manner of voting

This amendment deletes reference to an inmate of a declared institution and substitutes a reference to a resident of a declared institution.

16—Amendment of section 73—Issue of voting papers

The clause substitutes section 73(2). In addition to the existing provisions in relation to the issue of declaration voting papers to an elector (now provided for in proposed section 73(2)(a)), proposed 73(2)(b) provides that declaration voting papers must only be issued to an elector who appears personally before an officer in South Australia other than at a polling booth on polling day at times determined by the Electoral Commissioner that fall within the 5 days before polling day.

Proposed section 73(2)(c) provides that the additional provisions in proposed 73(2)(b) do not apply to an elector who is a resident of a declared institution.

17—Amendment of section 74—Issue of declaration voting papers by post or other means

This clause inserts a new subsection (3a) to provide that an application under section 74 for the issue of declaration voting papers to an elector, or for registration of an elector as a declaration voter, may be made by a person other than the elector if the application is accompanied by a certificate from a medical practitioner, in a form approved by the Electoral Commissioner, certifying that the elector is, because of physical disability, unable to sign the elector's own name.

18—Amendment of section 74A—Offence to distribute application form for issue of declaration voting papers

This clause deletes certain requirements from the offence of distributing a declaration voting application form.

19—Amendment of section 80—Voter may be accompanied by an assistant in certain circumstances

The clause inserts section 80(3)(e) to allow for a person to assist a declaration voter in the following ways:

- by assisting the voter to complete the appropriate declaration on the envelope;

- if the voter is unable to do so, by completing and signing the declaration on the voter's behalf in the presence of an officer (who must sign the envelope as witness);
- by folding and placing the ballot paper in the appropriate envelope and sealing the envelope.

20—Amendment of section 80A—Voting near polling booth in certain circumstances

The clause amends the section to provide for the procedure for a voter casting a declaration vote if the voter is unable to enter a polling booth.

21—Substitution of section 81

This clause deletes and substitutes section 81 as follows:

81—Voting by elector to whom declaration voting papers have been issued

The proposed section provides that an elector to whom declaration voting papers have been issued (otherwise than at a polling booth) is entitled to an ordinary vote at a polling booth, but a declaration ballot paper purporting to be a ballot paper of that elector must not be admitted to the scrutiny.

22—Amendment of section 82—Declaration vote, how made

The amendment in subclause (1) is consequential on the amendments in clauses 17, 20 and 25.

The amendment in subclause (2) permits a person to assist a voter to complete and sign a declaration on the voter's behalf if the voter is unable to do so.

23—Amendment of section 83—Taking of declaration votes by electoral visitors

These amendments delete references to an inmate of a declared institution and substitute references to a resident of a declared institution.

24—Amendment of section 84—Security of facilities

The amendment in this clause widens the security protections in the existing section to include all ballot boxes whether opened at the close of poll or at some other time.

25—Insertion of Part 9 Division 5A

This clause inserts a new Division as follows:

Division 5A—Electronically assisted voting for sight-impaired electors

84A—Electronically assisted voting for sight-impaired electors

The proposed section allows the regulations to make provision in relation to voting in an election by sight-impaired electors by means of an electronically assisted voting method. A sight-impaired elector is defined as an elector whose sight is impaired such that the elector is unable to vote without assistance.

84B—Applying provisions of Act to elector using electronic assisted voting

The proposed section provides for certain provisions and prohibitions in the Act to apply to a voter using the electronically assisted voting method.

84C—Electoral Commissioner may determine that electronically assisted voting is not to be used

The proposed section allows the Electoral Commissioner, by notice in the Gazette, to determine that the electronically assisted voting method is not to be used either generally or at 1 or more specified places, in respect of an election.

26—Amendment of section 91—Preliminary scrutiny

The clause amends the scrutiny process of declaration votes by inserting references to the tear-off extensions on declaration voting envelopes, and makes amendments consequential on the amendments in clause 17.

27—Amendment of section 92—Interpretation of ballot papers in Legislative Council elections

This clause makes a technical amendment.

28—Amendment of section 113—Misleading advertising

This amendment increases the maximum penalty for the offence of misleading advertising to \$50,000.

29—Amendment of section 125—Prohibition of canvassing near polling booths

The clause inserts proposed subsection (4) which provides that if a place is open for the issue of voting papers in an election other than on polling day, a person must not exhibit a notice or sign (other than an official notice) relating to the election at an entrance of, or within, that place, or in any public or private place within 100 metres, or

such lesser distance as may be fixed in a particular case by the presiding officer, of an entrance to that place, with a maximum penalty of \$750.

Proposed subsection (5) provides that an officer may, if directed by the presiding officer or Electoral Commissioner, remove a notice that the Electoral Commissioner or presiding officer believes on reasonable grounds to be exhibited in contravention of section 125. Proposed section (6) makes it an offence with a penalty of \$2,500 or imprisonment for 6 months for a person to obstruct an officer in the exercise or attempted exercise of a function under proposed subsection (5).

30—Amendment of section 126—Prohibition of advocacy of forms of voting inconsistent with Act

Subclause (1) makes a technical amendment to include a reference to a how-to-vote card permitted to be distributed under section 112A. Subclause (2) inserts new subsections (3) and (4). Proposed subsection (3) provides for an offence if a person advocates that an elector may exercise their vote in a manner inconsistent with the provisions of the Act relating to the manner in which an elector may exercise a vote, with a maximum penalty of \$2,500. Proposed subsection (4) provides that it is a defence to a charge of an offence against proposed subsection (3) to prove that acts alleged to constitute the offence arose from an honest and reasonable misunderstanding or mistake on the part of the defendant.

Debate adjourned on motion of Mr Pederick.

ELECTORAL (FUNDING, EXPENDITURE AND DISCLOSURE) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:01): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to amend the Electoral Act 1985. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:02): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

The Electoral (Funding, Expenditure and Disclosure) Amendment Bill 2016, hereafter referred to as 'the bill', proposes various amendments to the Electoral Act that relate to funding expenditure and disclosures in part 13A of the Electoral Act. Part 13A was inserted into the Electoral Act by the Electoral (Funding, Expenditure and Disclosure) Amendment Act 2013, which commenced on 1 July 2015, and sets out an electoral funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme for South Australia. The amendments contained in the bill are made in response to various concerns that have been raised by the Electoral Commission of South Australia and political parties in relation to part 13A.

The bill proposes an amendment to section 130A to clarify the approach that should be taken to the rounding of indexed amounts in part 13A. Currently, section 130A(8) provides that amounts should be rounded to the nearest whole number. The bill amends section 130A(8) to clarify that, for amounts referred to in section 130P, they will be rounded to the nearest whole cent. This amendment is necessary because section 130P sets the amount of public funding payable per vote at either \$3 or \$3.50 (indexed). If, in the course of indexing those amounts, they were rounded to the nearest whole dollar, the outcome would be quite absurd. All indexed monetary amounts, other than in section 130P, are much higher amounts or thresholds and so the same issue does not arise. People want to hear more, I know.

The bill proposes the repeal of section 130C. Section 130C provides that 'nothing in this Part requires the disclosure of any details required to be furnished to the Australian Electoral Commission under part 20 of the Commonwealth Electoral Act 1918.' Section 130C is problematic. Its effect is unclear. Given that South Australia's reporting requirements and time frames are stricter than those in the commonwealth scheme, there is a risk that section 130C could operate to undermine the strict reporting requirements in the South Australian scheme. The commonwealth and South Australian

disclosure schemes have been designed and operate separately and differently from each other. Section 130C is not required.

The bill proposes an amendment to section 130E to provide that if a registered political party has endorsed a candidate in an election, the agent of the party is the agent of the candidate. This is already the case in the context of Legislative Council elections, where a registered political party endorses all the members of a group. While it is assumed that all candidates in House of Assembly elections who are endorsed by a party will nominate the party agent to be their agent, currently each candidate is required to take the step of nominating the party as their agent. The bill sets the starting point as being that all candidates endorsed by a party will have the party's agent as their own. Tantalisingly, I seek leave to insert the remainder of the speech into *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Bill amends section 130Q, which sets out the circumstances in which public funding payments should be reduced or not made. One such circumstance is where, broadly speaking, the political expenditure incurred is less than the amount of public funding payable. This is to ensure that no candidate or party obtains a windfall benefit from the public funding scheme. The Bill amends section 130Q to clarify that where a public funding payment is being made to the agent of the party, that consideration should be given to the combined political expenditure of the political party and its endorsed candidates when determining whether any reduction to the amount of public funding should be made under section 130Q.

Section 130U of the Electoral Act provides for special assistance funding to be paid on a half yearly basis to compensate political parties for the cost of complying with the reporting obligations in the funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme. The Bill amends section 130U to:

- provide scope for the amounts of half yearly special assistance funding to be increased by way of regulation; and
- increase the period for lodging an application for special assistance funding from within 7 days of the end of the half yearly period to within 30 days of the end of the half yearly period.

In addition, the Bill insert new section 130UA, which allows for an additional one-off amount of special assistance funding to be paid to registered political parties to assist with the initial costs associated with complying with the funding, expenditure and disclosure scheme. For parties with 5 or fewer members, the one-off payment is up to a maximum of \$56,000. For parties with 6 or more members, the one-off payment is up to a maximum of \$96,000.

The Bill makes a minor amendment to section 130Z of the Electoral Act, which relates to expenditure caps. It clarifies that, for political parties, the expenditure cap relating to House of Assembly elections will be calculated by reference to the number of candidates endorsed at the hour of nominations, rather than at the start of the capped expenditure period. This is to reflect the fact that parties are unlikely to have endorsed all of their candidates at the start of the capped expenditure period.

The Bill amends sections 130ZF, 130ZN, 130ZO and 130ZP of the Electoral Act with a view to clarifying the requirements for lodging returns under Part 13A. These amendments are not intended to water down the reporting requirements. Rather, they clarify what the reporting periods are, and when the return for each reporting period is due. An issue that was identified with the current provisions is that, in the weekly reporting period prior to an election, weekly returns are due on the last day of the week to which they relate. Practically speaking, compliance with this is not feasible. The amendments will allow reports in relation to a weekly period to be due 5 days after the end of the period to which they relate.

The Bill alters the requirement to furnish audit certificates in the designated period, being the period starting on 1 January prior to a general election and ending 30 days after polling day. During parts of the designated period, returns are required to be provided on a weekly basis. The requirement for each of these returns to be accompanied by an audit certificate is onerous. This Bill proposes that in the designated period, audit certificates will be required twice. The first audit certificate will be due one week before polling day, and will relate to all returns furnished up until that date. The second audit certificate will relate to all of the remaining returns furnished in the designated period.

In addition, the Electoral Commissioner will have a discretion to extend the period for providing an audit certificate outside of the designated period by 30 days.

Section 130ZZE of the Act sets out a range of offences relating to Part 13A. The Bill inserts new section 130ZZE(9), which provides a defence for a person who can prove that they exercised all reasonable diligence to prevent the commission of the offence.

Finally, the Bill amends section 107 of the Electoral Act to provide that the Court of Disputed Returns may declare an election void where a person has incurred political expenditure in excess of the applicable expenditure cap during the capped expenditure period in relation to the election, and the Court of Disputed Returns is of the view that the result of the election was affected by the breach.

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Electoral Act 1985*

4—Amendment of section 107—Orders that the Court is empowered to make

The clause provides a new subsection (7) to allow the Court of Disputed Returns to declare an election void on the ground of a breach of section 130ZA if the Court finds, on the balance of probabilities, that the result of the election was affected by the breach.

5—Amendment of section 130A—Interpretation

The clause amends section 130A(8) to provide that an amount adjusted by indexation in accordance with the subsection is to be rounded up to—

- in the case of an amount referred to in section 130P—the nearest whole cent; or
- in any other case—the nearest whole number.

6—Repeal of section 130C

This clause repeals an obsolete section.

7—Amendment of section 130E—Appointment of agents by parties, candidates and groups

The clause amends section 130E to provide that if a registered political party has endorsed a candidate or all the member of a group of candidates, the agent of the party is the agent of the candidate or group (as the case requires) for the purposes of Part 13A in relation to the election.

8—Amendment of section 130Q—Payment not to be made or to be reduced in certain circumstances

This clause makes an amendment of a technical and consequential nature.

9—Amendment of section 130U—Entitlement to and claims for special assistance funding

Subclauses (1) and (2) amend the section to allow the amount of the half yearly entitlement as defined in the section to be a greater amount prescribed by regulation than that currently in section 130U(2). Subclause (3) amends section 130U(3)(a) to change the period in which a claim under subsection (1)(c) is to be submitted from 7 days to 30 days.

10—Insertion of section 130UA

This clause inserts a new section as follows:

130UA—Entitlement to and claim for one-off payment of special assistance funding

The proposed section sets out the circumstances in which a registered political party may be entitled to a one-off payment of special assistance funding in respect of prescribed administrative expenditure. *Prescribed administrative expenditure* is defined as administrative expenditure incurred by a registered political party for the purpose of complying with Part 13A that is in excess of the administrative expenditure incurred by the party in relation to which a payment of a half yearly entitlement to special assistance funding has been paid. The proposed section also sets out the amount of the funding (subsection (2)) and the time periods for submitting a claim for such funding (subsection (3)).

11—Amendment of section 130V—Making of payments

These amendments are consequential on the amendment in clause 10.

12—Amendment of section 130Z—Expenditure caps

This clause amends the reference in section 130Z(1)(b)(i) to the number of electoral districts in which the party endorses a candidate to be calculated from the hour of nomination instead of from the start of the capped expenditure period.

13—Amendment of section 130ZF—Returns by candidates and groups

The clause amends the prescribed times for furnishing a campaign donations return.

14—Amendment of section 130ZN—Returns by registered political parties

The clause amends section 130ZN to provide that the agent of each registered political party must, at the prescribed times, furnish to the Electoral Commissioner a political party return in respect of each prescribed period, in a form approved by the Electoral Commissioner. The clause makes a number of consequential amendments and defines the prescribed periods in respect of a political party return and the prescribed times for furnishing the returns.

15—Amendment of section 130ZO—Returns by associated entities

The clause amends section 130ZO to provide that the financial controller of an associated entity must, at the prescribed times, furnish to the Electoral Commissioner an associated entity return in respect of each prescribed period, in a form approved by the Electoral Commissioner. The clause makes a number of consequential amendments and defines the prescribed periods in respect of an associated entity return and the prescribed times for furnishing the returns.

16—Amendment of section 130ZP—Returns by third parties

The clause amends section 130ZP to provide that the agent of a third party must, at the prescribed times, furnish to the Electoral Commissioner a third party return in respect of each prescribed period, in a form approved by the Electoral Commissioner. The clause makes a number of consequential amendments and defines the prescribed periods in respect of a third party return and the prescribed times for furnishing the returns.

17—Amendment of section 130ZV—Audit certificates

The amendment in subclauses (1) and (2) are consequential in nature. The amendments in subclauses (3) and (4) allow an extension of time for submitting an audit certificate in respect of all returns required to be submitted under Part 13A. Subclause (5) inserts new provision to allow for the provision of 2 audit certificates relating to the periods outlined in proposed subsection (2a)(a) and (b) to be furnished to the Electoral Commissioner in respect of all returns furnished during the designated period. The certificates must be furnished at times prescribed in proposed subsection (2b).

18—Amendment of section 130ZZE—Offences

The clause inserts a new subsection (9) which provides that in proceedings against a person for an offence under Part 13A, it is a defence for the person to prove that the person exercised all reasonable diligence to prevent the commission of the offence.

19—Amendment of section 130ZZF—Non-compliance with Part does not affect election

This amendment is consequential on the amendment in clause 4.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Chapman.

RELATIONSHIPS REGISTER BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 22 September 2016.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:06): I rise to speak on the Relationships Register Bill 2016, introduced by the assistant minister to the Premier on 22 September this year.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: As lead speaker?

Ms CHAPMAN: As lead speaker, yes. The contents of some of the bill have been floated in various bills, including by the Hon. Tammy Franks in another place, but they have ultimately culminated in this bill to address a number of what I would suggest are outstanding issues for different reasons.

I can indicate that parts of this bill of which we have received notice are likely to be severed into a separate bill before the vote at second reading; nevertheless, they are more controversial. The opposition has taken the view that we will not have a party position on the bill and accordingly, as is consistent with our side of politics on every bill, each member will vote according to their conscience. We have the right on our side of the house for that to occur as a matter of our party rules. It is something of which we are immensely proud and, even if we do have party positions on bills, each member has the right to reserve their position and the right to present that to the parliament.

I want to address, however, a brief background to this bill together with areas that I think are relatively uncontroversial, although some members may take the view that all of this is unacceptable

to them in progressing, but I think that, in fairness, we can place the areas of contentiousness into two major areas. Let's be clear about what is to occur here: this bill allows for the registration of relationships of couples in any relationship—however, still between consenting adults.

To demonstrate their status when dealing with other agencies, they will have the opportunity to register those relationships, and it also allows for the recognition of interstate and overseas relationships in certain circumstances, in particular where the jurisdictions are similar in respect of the marital relationships, where a civil partnership or same-sex marriage is recognised and where a registered domestic relationship law prevails.

Members would be aware of the rather distressing case that occurred earlier this year involving two male cohabiting partners who considered that their marriage in another country ought to have been recognised; one of them died whilst visiting South Australia. The unpleasant result (as best it can be described) was the rejection of the recognition of the partner for the purposes of dealing with agencies in South Australia, and I suppose that brought it to a head. It ought be noted that, notwithstanding that event, in January 2015 the South Australian Law Reform Institute was given a reference to inquire into and report on South Australia's laws about discrimination on the grounds of sexual orientation, gender identity and intersex status. Accordingly, it has prepared a number of reports.

In June this year, the SA Law Reform Institute released its report on exceptions to unlawful discrimination on the grounds of gender identity and sexual orientation. This bill has encapsulated most of the reforms that were recommended. A substantial report was published at that time, entitled: 'Rainbow families: equal recognition of relationships and access to existing laws relating to parentage, assisted reproductive treatment and surrogacy'. As I say, a good part of the recommendations has been the basis upon which the bill is presented for our consideration.

The main areas consistent with what I have outlined include the formation of a relationships register and the rules and circumstances where that can be accessed and how the process will operate in part 3. There is also the recognition of interstate and overseas relationships in part 4, and then there are perhaps the more controversial elements, when we look at amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act in part 5, the amendments to the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act in schedule 1, part 2, and changes to the Family Relationships Act in schedule 1, part 6.

Let's consider first the formation of the relationships register, which is to be administered by the births, deaths and marriages registrar, who is already operating in South Australia. The registration will be voluntary. Key features of this will be the provision that the relationship will be able to be registered where two parties are in a relationship as a couple, they are adults, and at least one resides in South Australia. Incidentally, there is no actual requirement for couples to live together; perhaps that is a safe way of making sure the relationship prevails.

I can remember one case in South Australia, which is well known probably to most members and which involves the then premier of South Australia, the Hon. Don Dunstan. On his second marriage, he elected to live separately from his wife, who, sadly, died not long after they were married. Nevertheless, they elected to live in separate residences, and perhaps that makes for a happy relationship; I do not know. There is no requirement to cohabit. I remember having debates in this house about domestic cohabitation.

The former member for Hartley was a great warrior and champion of the importance of recognising co-dependants. Sometimes they might be a brother or sister living in a household together and the like and have some financial interdependence. I remember the former member for Hartley saying, 'The important thing to remember here is that, when we have a domestic relationship, we are really talking about couples who have a sexual relationship between each other.' I said that that might rule out a lot of married couples. Nevertheless, today we are recognising the importance of adult relationships.

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order! I have to give the deputy leader some protection here. Stand back everybody.

Ms CHAPMAN: That completes the anecdotal matters. Can I say that we are recognising here adult relationships when they choose to live in a relationship that is not necessarily male and female. The significance of this should not be overlooked when we consider that other members of this house have proffered civil union options under a registration procedure. In Tasmania, the option was ultimately taken up some years ago now to recognise the consenting cohabitation between adults who have a personal commitment to each other.

Different jurisdictions have dealt with it in different ways, but what is being proposed here is that they will have the opportunity, if they wish, to register that for the world to know that they have made that commitment. We are going to have a cooling-off period, which may seem a little odd, but let me remind members that, even when one marries under the Marriage Act, notice must be given of the intention to marry not less than one month and not more than three months before the proposed marriage.

The old shotgun weddings, when you eloped and got married on the weekend, have not been able to occur in Australia for a very long time. Sometimes they do that and then realise they have to actually come back and marry properly and give the notice for it to be valid. However, it is not unusual that we actually indicate to the parties who are going to make a commitment to a marriage that they have to give notice of their intention to do so.

There is a time limit, both a minimum and maximum. You cannot just say, 'I am giving notice that a might marry X in 25 years' time,' you have to actually give notice not less than one month and not more than three months prior to the actual commitment. The time frame is designed to ensure that the relationship is a considered one, and that should also apply to those who are committing to a process that is going to tell the world that they are in a close personal relationship.

Similarly, the revocation allows for automatic revocation of the registration if one of the parties dies or becomes married to another person or, indeed, them under the Marriage Act. Those decisions will be made by the registrar. However, if you revoke on the basis of separation other than by death or marriage then, again, there is a cooling-off period. In this case, it is to be for a 90-day revocation cooling-off period. That is apparently consistent with the New South Wales register procedures and follows the SALRI recommendations.

I also remind members that, under the Marriage Act, if you make an application for a decree of nullity—for example, on the basis of prohibited relationship or one of the parties already being married—there are certain processes one has to go through for the declaration of nullity to be made and then to become a final order. If it is a dissolution of a marriage, then an application is made for what is commonly known as a divorce.

The dissolution of the marriage has to be evidenced by 12 months' minimum separation, evidencing the irretrievable breakdown of the relationship. That also has a period from which the court will make a decree nisi, which is essentially the preliminary order for recognition of the dissolution of the marriage. However, there is an expiry period (I think it is still 30 days), where there is a requirement for that time to elapse before the decree will become absolute.

So, in a way, it is a bit like a cooling-off period. There have been known cases of an application for a decree nisi being made, the decree nisi being made and then, for one reason or another, the applicant determining that they were under some misunderstanding about their party being unfaithful or whatever caused the separation and the breakdown of the relationship as the basis for that application and, therefore, wanting to revoke that.

They have an opportunity to do that. They have to be quick, but they can have the decree nisi validly overturned. However, once it becomes absolute, that is it. If they discover that the other party was not so bad after all, after the decree absolute, they have to marry, but it is reasonable to have a cooling-off period in that process. I for one have certainly had some inquiries from my colleagues and others as to why we need to do this, but I just remind you of the significance of the relationship and, therefore, the importance of us recognising that as we do under the Marriage Act.

This bill also asks us to consider accepting a proposal where we recognise interstate and overseas relationships. In short, this will allow for the laws of other states or territories or other countries to be registered under the bill by a provision being made, which would have dealt with the David Bulmer-Rizzi case, which I referred to earlier this year. Corresponding relationships must meet

the general requirements of South Australian relationships—i.e. a consensual relationship between two persons not in a union recognised under the Marriage Act, etc.

In this regard, I am advised by the proponent of the bill, who has kindly made available officers for consultation on this matter, that it is intended that regulations will be prepared to identify countries and jurisdictions that will be recognised. May I say that I would prefer that there be a stipulation of specific countries that have laws similar to us, whether that is in South Australia or the commonwealth, and that ought to be committed to a list.

They have done this in Victoria. As at 1 July this year, they have listed a number of countries and jurisdictions that they recognise. Again, their broad parameters were that it had to be a civil partnership or a same-sex marriage. They have listed the Australian Capital Territory, New South Wales, Queensland, Tasmania, New Zealand, Canada, including Québec and Nova Scotia—I assume that qualification is there because there may be some differentiation between those two areas, but both are recognised—Hawaii, California, New York, South Africa, the Netherlands, the United Kingdom and Scotland.

Again, I am not sure why they have separated Scotland from the United Kingdom. I thought they were still part of the UK. I know they had a referendum, but it is possibly because Scotland has its own legislature and actually has a register while, separately, the parliament of Britain in London, which has representatives from the Scottish jurisdiction, has also passed a procedure. I do not know the answer to that, but I would urge the government, in preparing the supporting material to this, to draft a schedule, which of course can be updated by regulation.

I should say that I have no objection to this process. I think it has been a long time coming. We have had that example earlier this year which is unfortunately an event that occurs when we do not ensure that our legislation remains contemporary. If we have jurisdictions—all of the examples I have listed—which have the same recognition we do, then I think we should ensure that our law is updated.

Next we have changes to the Equal Opportunity Act, and I point out here that the SA Law Reform Institute actually went further in this area. They are keen to look at some other amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act which have not been adopted for the purpose of this bill. This bill has confined its reform to amending the definition of 'domestic partner' to match those on the relationships register, removing the exemptions on fertilisation procedures from the definition of 'service', and extending the protections for those who identify as intersex.

Quite possibly, most of the people in this house will accept that if we are going to have a register there ought to be consequential amendments to the Equal Opportunity Act. That may be acceptable to most. What I suspect will attract some differential in our members' approach will be this question of the fertilisation procedures, and similarly in our Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act reforms, which will allow for the use of reproductive treatment if they are unable to become pregnant, with consideration of their circumstances only.

We have been asked to amend the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act a number of times in the house since I have been here, and it has had a very substantial upgrade, I suppose. It was interesting to read the very controversial debate on the introduction of assisted reproductive treatment laws to accommodate what was the very pioneering area of infertility treatments available. It is fair to say that IVF in the 1980s was a very controversial topic, and there was a feeling at the time, in some of those discussions and debates, that there would be ethical challenges to the application of this new medical technology, which would be confronting and which would be controversial.

Even at that stage, some highlighted that ultimately this may give an opportunity for people of a same-sex sexual orientation to become parents, and here we are today, 40-odd years later, dealing with just that issue. Again, I expect there will be some who will not be happy with this, but for those couples who are in a same-sex relationship who have either had children from prior relationships who now are part of that household or who have had the use of a donor sperm or egg for the purposes of having children within that relationship but with the assistance of a donor, it is time, in my view, that we deal with how that is to be accommodated in a practical way.

I say that not just because of the importance of recognising that we are allowing people to cohabit and respectfully be registered to have that recognised, but if they are going to have children, and clearly they do—sometimes with a willing donor, it may be a male person who is happy to support two females in a personal relationship to become the sperm donor—the processes that are affiliated with that, we have heard in debates in this house, are not even clinical, they are ugly. I think that we need to address that. That is the reality, and I think the way in which people have effective fertilisation needs to be brought to the 21st century.

On the other hand, if a male couple wishes to have a child, we then move to the use of a donor female partner, usually through a surrogacy arrangement. I think that it is time we address that, and I will be supporting that part of the bill. Then there were changes to the Family Relationships Act, which essentially moved to change the surrogacy agreements to allow a single person to commission agreement, rather than two parents, and permit access to domestic partners.

The amendment to the term 'qualifying relationship' is to include a relationship between two people who are partners regardless of their sex or gender identity. This is a necessary and appropriate development in the law, but I have to say that my concern is that we are not dealing with other important issues in relation to surrogacy. In Australia, essentially we do not let the surrogate carrier be paid other than a reimbursement for fixed costs or disbursements, medical costs and the like.

We have to deal with what was a very confronting image of a twin being left in an overseas country because they had been born with a disability and the harrowing circumstances that have been published since then of one sibling residing in a family in Western Australia, where the male party was later found to have had a history of paedophilia and the abandoned child left with its mother in an overseas country, destitute. We have to deal with the resolution of what I think has been a tragic and totally unacceptable industry that uses women in poor countries, exploits them and, in that case, in a very real sense leaving them with the baby.

Whilst a payment is made in those circumstances, they are outside of our jurisdiction and it is extremely difficult for us to have a set of laws that is going to protect them. We have Australian laws which allow for prosecution of men, for example, who go overseas and have sexual relationships with children. We have achieved that, and that is a great thing. I remember that the Hon. Robert Hill in the Senate was a great advocate of that, and it took a long time for the Australian government to actually say, 'Yes, it is going to be hard but we will change the law and we will make sure that we do try as best we can. It is our international responsibility to do with that.'

We are not dealing with all the issues that go to surrogacy in this bill, and I think that is a shame. I think we need to, and the sooner we do the better. My personal view is that to do it we are going to have to actually except the fact that if we are going to ask a female person to undertake this role and responsibility—which is a major sacrifice—then a fee ought to be able to be paid for that purpose. Otherwise, couples in Australia will continue to go to other countries, exploit other people, pay the fee and not be required to sign up to levels of responsibility that I think we should insist on here.

Let us make that an area of reform that we do address, and that we do try to make sure we protect women in exploitable circumstances in other countries, that we do not allow a situation to prevail in Australia where it is prohibitive for many to undertake this role, just to be repaid their expenses.

I remember that when I was in early adulthood sometimes my sisters—and I have plenty of them—would say to me, 'What would you do in this situation? If one of us couldn't have children would you have a baby for us?' As a sister I said I would, I would do that; if I were fertile (which I happened to be) then that would be something I would do. It was a personal commitment, but not everyone has an available sibling or friend who is prepared to do that.

I think it is important that we have a chance to have control over the terms and conditions the women are in so that they are not exploited, so that the children who are born are protected against circumstances of either abandonment or exploitation. It is time we addressed that. I know it is very hard to get things through without government approval supporting things in this parliament, because it has to go through two houses of parliament, but we do try—and I have a list of bills

tomorrow for private member's bills. Every now and again we get one up, but the point is that we do need the government's blessing.

In an area of comprehensive reform such as this, I think it is a missed opportunity for the government to fix it. It is well known. It is an issue that other jurisdictions are starting to deal with, but it seems that the government has had a bit of a hands-off approach to this, other than dealing with a certain group in the community who are seeking status and recognition, which of course is our LGBTIQ community—not unimportant, but it is not the only thing that needs to be fixed. We do need to address this matter.

It is important that we address the issues in this bill, and the government has left a few hard things out in respect of equal opportunity exemptions for employment in schools, for example, religious schools and things of that nature. That has been put to one side. There is another whole area of surrogacy that needs to be fixed, and as a jurisdiction we are on notice that it needs to be fixed. Someone needs to address it.

The SA Law Reform Institute has the capacity to be instructed by the Attorney-General, and I think it is about time that he got on and did it. With that, I indicate that I will be supporting the bill. I note that the government proposes to ultimately separate the contents of this bill into two areas, and I indicate that I will be supporting both.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (12:36): This is obviously the next in a series of conscience issues that this parliament has been asked to deal with over the course of this year, and I assume we will have to deal with things going into next year. When dealing with these issues, I think there are some people who are conservative and therefore understand what it is that they believe by their belief in themselves as a conservative. There are some people who are progressive and therefore say, 'I'm progressive, therefore I would naturally vote for or against a piece of legislation based on my identification as being someone who would think in that manner.'

Interestingly for some, I am actually neither. I do not necessarily say, 'Well, a conservative would vote against this, therefore I will.' I actually look at a bill on its merits and say, 'Well, what do I think?' and I vote then with my conscience, and if that happens to mean that I end up more on the conservative side of the argument than the progressive, then it is that way around as opposed to the other. When I come to a piece of legislation, I am certainly not dogmatic about it. I seek to get to the heart of what we are trying to do, although some could look at conservatism as being an extremely practical ideology.

When looking at this bill, I can see that there is a chief mischief that is seeking to be remedied. If that is around recognising relationships on a death certificate in order to lessen the pain and suffering of a surviving member of a couple, then I think that is a mischief that is right to be fixed. If there are some issues around ensuring that people who are effectively parents of a child, whether or not that is in a biological situation, can effectively look after that child, then again I think that is a mischief that we need to deal with and something that is extremely important.

I would like to refer to the member for Reynell's second reading speech because there is a line in it that I like. Indeed, in the debate that we continue to have on gay marriage, this line is something that I can agree with wholeheartedly. The member states:

This register provides an important avenue for all couples to express their commitment to each other in a dignified and legally recognised way.

When two people want to come together and make a declaration of the love they share, and have that love recognised, and make a monogamous commitment to each other to the exclusion of all others, then I think that is important and worthy of recognition and it makes people feel that they are inclusive members of society. Also, that commitment is deepened by having a more formal aspect to it.

At its very basic sense, when I married my wife, essentially it was her and I making a declaration in front of our friends and family that we were going to be together for life to the exclusion of all others. It is the act of doing it in front of your friends and family that carries as much import as the piece of paper, which I am sure my wife has tucked away somewhere.

Without wanting to have an argument about the definition of what marriage is and what relationships are, where two people want to be able to say, 'I am making a commitment to another person,' I think that that is important to recognise and, to the extent that this bill seeks to provide an avenue for that, I am wholeheartedly in favour of it. The concept of a relationships register is one that I am extremely comfortable with and will be supporting. I know that this bill is looking to be split off into a number of parts, and I am happy to support the part that allows for the recognition of relationships in this way.

Fortunately, or unfortunately, in this series of bills there has often been a palatable part of the bill which seeks to address a chief mischief, which happens also to include some other things that are not necessarily related to the central mischief that is seeking to be fixed, which tends to make the bill more complicated. In this instance, it is extremely wise of the member for Reynell to flag that she is going to split the bill so that we can have this parliament all agree with the chief mischief that is seeking to be redressed whilst more contentious and, in my mind, separate arguments around different issues are put off to one side.

With regard to the relationships register and the ability of people to make a commitment to each other and to have that recognised by Births, Deaths and Marriages, I say fantastic. In relation to issues around assisted reproductive treatment and surrogacy, they are issues that are separate from the concept of a relationships register. I certainly have concerns with those, and I am extremely likely not to support that. Without having seen the split bills, I assume that, if that is parked in the second bill, we can deal with it as a separate issue when the time comes. I am more than comfortable to vote for a second reading to allow that splitting to occur at whatever stage it needs to occur.

The only concerns I have at this stage—and I will put on the record now that I will be asking these questions in committee—are around what rights are actually conferred upon a couple who seeks to have their relationship registered. In the second reading speech, and again I will quote a couple of small parts, the member refers to the South Australian Law Reform Institute's report, saying:

The report encapsulated SALRI's review of equal recognition of relationships and parenting rights...

The speech goes on to say a number of other things. In another part, the member says:

This bill, when passed, will create an option for couples in any relationship to more easily demonstrate their status when dealing with various bodies, including government agencies and service providers, in order to have their relationship rightly respected and to access their rights and entitlements.

That is quite a broad statement. When I tried to ask questions in briefings, such as, 'What are the increased rights that this register will confer upon couples?' that was a question I did not feel I got a fulsome answer to. If it is in relation to how a death certificate is served, then that is good. Again, if it is relation to parenting rights and ensuring that a child has somebody who has some sort of legal status to make decisions on behalf of that child, if that is done in appropriate circumstances, again that is good, but I did have questions around what other rights are being conferred.

Given that the member has referred to it in her second reading speech, I will certainly be asking questions elaborating on that—for instance, in relation to how we are going to recognise overseas marriages, how we are going to safeguard against where, say, in other countries polygamy or child marriage is legal and how we are going to be able to deal effectively with those things and be sure that we safeguard the very important values we hold dear, that is, that we believe marriage to be between two people and not more than two people and that we believe marriage to be between two consenting adults. Certainly, I am not sure that is a debate the member for Reynell would like to have. I look forward to seeking some clarification on those issues.

If there is some ambiguity in this bill around what rights are conferred, potentially we should look at ways to ensure that we are more prescriptive about what rights are conferred to be sure that those appropriate safeguards are in place so that we can fix the mischief we are seeking to fix whilst not having unintended consequences that lead to some perverse outcomes. I look forward to getting further clarification through the committee stage of the bill.

I understand that our society is changing and that it is extremely important for us to reflect that change. There are some cultures around the world that are stagnant and traditional, and I think that those cultures by and large have been stuck in a time past. That has deleterious effects on the

people who live in those cultures and exercise those beliefs. I am proud of the fact that we live in a society that can respond to the issues at hand and deal maturely with them. While we fix these issues, we need to make sure that, number one, we understand what it is we are fixing and also what it is that we need to protect.

There are fundamental reasons and fundamental cultural norms that have helped us to get to where we are today, and those norms need to be protected. We live in such a lucky state, in a lucky country and in a lucky time to be alive on this earth. The things that helped us to get here in a positive manner are the things we need to protect whilst balancing them with helping to make a more perfect culture and a more perfect society. I think that all members should look at these issues with that balance in mind.

I look forward to the next stages of the bill, when we can hopefully use our parliamentary process to seek out the truth and in the end enact into law a bill that does exactly what we would like it to do but not do what we would not like it to do.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (12:47): I rise to make a contribution in regard to the Relationships Register Bill 2016. If it goes through, the bill will allow for the registration of relationships of couples essentially in any relationship and therefore demonstrate their status when dealing with other agencies. In regard to that, a friend of mine and her partner used to live in my electorate of Goolwa. They have moved out of my electorate, but I ran into them socially. They were concerned about their status (they are a little bit later in life), and she was concerned about recognition if either of them passed away. I said, 'Yes, let's see what we can do about that.' I believe this bill essentially addresses that issue.

It was interesting that I wrote to the Attorney-General and got a reasonable response. He said there would be legislation forthcoming. Representing a conservative electorate, my issue is that it has expanded to represent what could be a qualifying relationship—that is, it could be a man and a man, a woman and a woman and, somewhere in this, intersex. The bill also allows for the recognition of interstate and overseas relationships. I note that the South Australian Law Reform Institute released a report in regard to exceptions to unlawfully discriminate on the grounds of gender identity and sexual orientation.

There are five key areas to the bill: (1) the formation of a relationships register; (2) the recognition of interstate and overseas relationships; (3) the amendment of the Equal Opportunity Act; (4) the amendment of the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act; and (5) changes to the Family Relationships Act. It is noted that the register will be administered by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages and registration will be voluntary. It is interesting that in these recent bills we have been talking about a lot of changes to the Births, Deaths and Marriages register, but it took me so long to get results in regard to Finn's Law. It took me 19 months, but I am pleased we got there in the end, and I salute the house for supporting it.

As I said, the intent of the relationships register is that a relationship will be able to be registered where two parties are in a relationship as a couple, are adults, and at least one resides in South Australia. As has been indicated, there is no requirement that these couples must live together. Obviously, there is a cooling off period of 28 days after the relationship is registered. This time frame is designed to ensure that the relationship is a considered one. The bill allows for the automatic revocation of the registration if one of the parties dies or becomes married under the Marriage Act. Those applications will be made to the registrar.

In relation to the revocation, there will be a 90-day cooling-off period, and this is consistent with what happens in New South Wales. I have concerns that people could register and deregister as they flit from relationship to relationship. As long as they comply with the relevant legislated cooling-off periods, if it does go through this house, I assume it will be legal. I note that clause 26 allows the laws of another state or territory of the commonwealth or of another country to be registered under the bill. That concerns me as well because it starts to get very broad, especially when we are talking about relationship matters. I believe they are probably better dealt with at the federal level.

We have had a debate in relation to whether or not there is going to be a plebiscite. I note that Malcolm Turnbull and the Liberals and the National Party took that to a federal election, which

they won, although it was close. However, it looks as though that position has been sabotaged. It is interesting where you can end up, even if you win an election. We have heard about the issues relating to the partner of a man who passed away in South Australia. His partner was a male who resided in the United Kingdom.

Corresponding relationships must meet the general requirements of South Australian relationships, that is, two persons in a consensual relationship not in a union recognised under the Marriage Act, is the explanation here. In specific countries that have laws similar to ours and those of the commonwealth, it is extremely broad.

Regarding the changes to the Equal Opportunity Act, the definition of 'domestic partner' would change to remove exemptions relating to in vitro fertilisation procedures. There are protections for those who wish to identify as intersex, and there are changes to the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act, which also include the use of reproductive treatment if they are unable to become pregnant, with consideration of their circumstances only.

In regard to the Family Relationships Act, the amendments make changes to surrogacy arrangements to allow a single person to commission an agreement rather than two parents and permit access to domestic partners. In the same changes, I note it amends the term of qualifying relationship to include a relationship between two people who are partners, regardless of their sex or gender identity.

I commend the work of the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place in regard to surrogacy and his tireless effort to get better surrogacy outcomes for South Australians. We have seen unfortunate circumstances in regard to what has happened with people accessing overseas surrogates and children. We dealt with this in the Social Development Committee many years ago. A lot of South Australian couples were heading interstate at an extreme cost of around \$50,000, from memory, to have a surrogate child. That was remedied to a fair degree and perhaps there are some improvements that can be made, but I know the Hon. John Dawkins did not intend for same-sex couples to be part of surrogacy arrangements.

Going through the contribution from the member for Reynell, she was very keen to achieve the implementation of the recommendations as set down by the law reform people. She also brought up the fact that some of these registers are in place already in the ACT, New South Wales, Victoria and Tasmania. As I have said, under this bill unmarried couples, whether in heterosexual or non-heterosexual relationships, will be able to register their relationships.

It is interesting to note that provisions regarding de facto relationships will not be altered by this bill, but I do know that, in respect to the people I was talking about earlier in my contribution, there was an issue about their rights being acknowledged as the partner if one of them passed away. This bill in its unamended form does recognise the freedom of individuals to choose to enter relationships in diverse forms and provide legal recognition and support for that choice. I have already talked about the cooling-off periods and the proposed recognition of interstate and overseas partnerships. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 12:59 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The SPEAKER: I welcome to parliament today year 7s from Cleve Area School, who are guests of the member for Flinders.

Ministerial Statement

EUROPE DEFENCE MISSION

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:00): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: The South Australian government has been a strident advocate for the state's capacity to lead Australia's sovereign naval shipbuilding industry. It is almost two years since the federal defence minister told the Senate that he doubted if the Adelaide-based shipyard of ASC could be trusted to 'build a canoe'.

A lot of water has gone under the bridge since the days when Australia considered buying and building all of its future submarines in Japan, its future frigates from overseas builders and Army combat vehicles which were to be sourced without any local industry content. The 2016 defence white paper and the industry policy statement set out a plan to renew the Royal Australian Navy in partnership with Australian industry and international designers. It was a plan that signalled a great victory for South Australia.

Two weeks ago, South Australia stood tall with a major stand and presence at Euronaval—one of the world's greatest naval expos, based in Paris, and in fact the world's biggest exhibition for naval shipbuilding, prime contractors and supply chain companies. The Defence South Australia stand hosted 22 businesses from Adelaide and was visited by the world's leading buyers, builders and bidders. The Premier; Defence SA Advisory Board chairman, Sir Angus Houston; Defence SA Chief Executive, Andy Keough, and his team; and I met with the designers of Australia's future submarines, DCNS, and began the process of planning for infrastructure builds, cross-industry engagement, workforce planning and settlement of advance teams in Adelaide.

We met with bidders for the future frigate program at the exhibition, and I then took part in separate visits to their shipyards. The BAE shipyard hosted the SA delegation in Glasgow, Italian shipbuilder Fincantieri hosted us in Genoa and Spain's Navantia hosted the delegation in Ferrol. The consolidation of relationships with these companies has been most valuable. For the businesses who joined us, it was a very effective opportunity. Just yesterday, I received a note from Simon Kennedy, the owner of local shipbuilding company Smart Fabrication, which read:

Without the support from the state government, travelling to one of the world's biggest maritime expo's would only have been something I would normally had the opportunity to read about.

Instead, now I can talk about opportunities that will come from meeting face to face with some of the key contract administrators from some of the largest shipyards in the world.

The ability to spend an hour building a relationship and explaining firsthand what we can offer to international primes is the equivalent of about a years worth of emails and still not actually meeting the contact.

Simon says he returned from Euronaval in Paris buzzing with enthusiasm and excitement over the key contacts he had made. This view was echoed by other defence industry companies that took part. Simon added, and I quote:

For a smaller SA shipbuilding and heavy engineering company, we have several European companies wanting to come to SA and visit our shipyard with the possibility of forming long lasting business ventures. Just the meeting I had with DCNS alone made the trip totally worthwhile not to mention the several others that showed great interest in working together.

He concluded:

This was truly the best opportunity I've had in 18 years as a company director to showcase our capability on an international stage. A huge 'well done' to the state government and all the support team for an outstanding job in making this happen. Jobs surely will flow from this amazing experience.

The Euronaval exhibition and subsequent trade missions demonstrated that the South Australian government is leading the way to ensure Australia's sovereign capability and that major naval shipbuilding infrastructure is done for Australia in Australia by Australian workers—just as the federal government eventually promised at the last election.

On that note, I draw to the attention of the house that, during last month's mission, federal defence minister Marise Payne in Senate estimates would not recommit to the 90 per cent local content promised by the defence industry minister, Christopher Pyne, in April this year in the lead-up to the federal election.

There were also media reports proposing moving the sustainment of the Collins class submarine from Adelaide to Perth, along with 1,000 jobs attached to that program. It makes no sense to create 2,900 jobs in SA on new submarines while at the same time losing 1,000 jobs in SA when

it is clear that we have the space, the capacity and the enthusiasm to build new ships and sustain the Collins class at the same time.

I advise the house today that the state government will be as strident on these two issues as it has been on the need for an Australian build of new ships. We will fight for South Australian jobs and South Australian industry, and I would call on those opposite to stand with all South Australians in demanding that the promises made in the lead-up to the election are kept. There are thousands of jobs at stake for decades to come.

Finally, I thank the expert team at Defence SA and Sir Angus Houston for their efforts in lobbying for South Australia and its businesses at the highest levels in international markets over the last three weeks. Led by former submarine commander Andy Keough, and including experienced maritime executive Richard Price and marine engineer David Eyre, we have the best representation in the world's biggest markets through our own agency, Defence SA. South Australia is setting the agenda on Australian jobs and industry participating in defence projects and we are proud to be doing so.

Parliamentary Procedure

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure (Hon. S.C. Mullighan)—

Australian Crime Commission, Board of the—Annual Report 2014-15

Protective Security Act 2007—Annual Report 2015-16

Witness Protection Act 1996—Annual Report 2015-16

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:07): I bring up the 77th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier stop referring to the vacant Gillman land as a 'swamp' and instead commit to a positive public process to maximise value for the people of South Australia?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:08): We have had—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Let's go back to the start of this project.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: That's right. Let's go back to the start—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier has not yet said anything provocative, apart from going back to the beginning. May he be heard in silence. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —December 2013. Did the proponents meet with the Leader of the Opposition and explain the project and did the Leader of the Opposition offer no—

Mr Marshall: I did explain the project.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Oh—didn't explain, just met. I see.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What was said over the course of this coffee? I can tell members of the house what happened: there appeared to be a political opportunity. The difference between that meeting, where all was fine when they were explaining their proposal, and where we are today is there is a political opportunity to talk down a project in South Australia's interests. As we seek to rebuild the South Australian economy after the federal Liberal Party chased Holden out of this state, with the connivance of the Leader of the Opposition—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: standing order 98. The Premier is debating and not responding to the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to the Premier. It is hard to hear him because of the racket being made by the Leader of the Opposition. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Mr Speaker, the question was about the value of the land. Let's talk about the value of the land and the proper role that should have been political played by everybody in the political process here. What should have happened is that the Leader of the Opposition's first instinct, that is, to get behind this project and to support it and give it every chance of success. He should have been standing with us presenting a common face to international investors about the importance of investing in South Australia for the future of South Australians.

We assembled this land because we wanted to provide for employment lands in the north-western suburbs of the State of South Australia. When a group of young proponents come to us with an entrepreneurial idea about developing a piece of South Australia and creating jobs for South Australians, when it is brought to us by the Economic Development Board—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order and so is the member for Morialta.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: When it is brought to us by the Economic Development Board and they recommend it to us, we are going to pursue this every single time.

The Leader of the Opposition has three approaches. He talks down projects. When it is a project which is actually underway and ready to go, like the old Royal Adelaide Hospital site, he threatens to block it. He either talks it down or he threatens to block it. I think the people of South Australia have woken up to him. Certainly, the business community have woken up to him.

We have the highest level of business confidence in three years despite the efforts of those opposite. The most common thing that is said to me by businesspeople is that they grieve the way in which the opposition goes about prosecuting its case. They see it as negative. They see a Leader of the Opposition with no ideas and no vision for the future of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Adelaide, Kavel, Hartley, Colton and the deputy leader. I warn the leader, the deputy leader, the member for Hartley and the member for Morialta, and I warn, for the second and the last time, the leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:13): My question is to the Premier. Will the government now accept the advice from the Renewal SA CEO that the Gillman site should be built up using fill from other public building sites to add value to this site?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:13): I thank the leader for his question about the potential future uses for—

Mr Pengilly: How are the Muppets going, Stephen?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The Muppets? The two behind you, Statler and Waldorf there? Is that who you are referring to? Is this now embarrassing for you? You didn't realise this interjection

was going to cause this embarrassment. Is that what's happened, Michael? How dreadfully embarrassing.

The SPEAKER: If the Minister for Transport referred to the member for Finniss as a Muppet—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: If the minister referred to members—any members—as Muppets, he will withdraw.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do not believe that I did, but, in any event, I withdraw and apologise to those members sitting behind the member for Finniss.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): My question is in fact to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development. Now that the minister has had 24 hours to gather the detail, can he confirm the total cost to taxpayers of the failed Gillman land deal, including the state's own legal fees, legal fees paid for or covered by the state for third parties, as well as other settlement costs?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:15): I thank the leader for his question. I did undertake yesterday to follow up this advice, and I have sought some advice. What has been provided to me verbally, so I have not had this yet confirmed in writing, is that in addition to the settlement costs, which were to be paid by the state to external parties, in particular ACP and IWS, as part of the settlement deed, that total sum is \$2.2 million.

Yesterday, I made reference to the fact, as the leader just referred to, that there were costs incurred internally by Renewal SA throughout these processes, principally engaging the services of crown law officers, which are billed to Renewal SA. While this figure may not be complete, the initial advice that I have received is that the sum is likely to be in the order of \$1.6 million between Renewal SA and the Crown, but I have asked for a full reconciliation of costs, in particular whether there were any other further ancillary costs which may be attached to that.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Supplementary: can the minister provide details to the house of the split of the \$2.2 million between ACP and IWS?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:16): I will endeavour to, as long as it is provided for within the terms of the deed of settlement as agreed between the three parties: the state, ACP and IWS.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:16): Can the minister confirm the additional payments the government is obliged to pay, and expects to pay, to ACP and IWS respectively in respect of the Gillman deal?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:17): I thank the leader for his question. My advice is that the \$2.2 million that we have referred to both yesterday and today comprises the total amount that we are obliged to pay to both ACP and IWS.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:17): Supplementary: can the minister confirm that that \$2.2 million has in fact already been paid?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:17): I can't confirm whether all of it has already been paid. My recollection is that a portion of that \$2.2 million was required to be paid dependent on

whether there was a settlement yesterday or not. Given that there was not a settlement yesterday, and that that further payment within that \$2.2 million may then need to have been paid, I am just not sure whether that payment has been made at this point in time, but I will confirm that for the leader.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): What was the value of that additional payment out of the \$2.2 million, in other words, the amount that wouldn't be payable if the deal had actually gone ahead?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:18): I thank the leader for his question. That question goes to, I think, the leader's earlier question about how much may be payable to each party. I just need to take some advice as to what the government is able to release depending on the requirements of that deed of settlement. If I can make that information available to him, I will.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:18): Supplementary: can the minister now confirm how much the state government has paid to the Adelaide City Council in respect of the Dean Rifle Range?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:18): I thank the leader for his question. I think yesterday I said it was either \$20.6 million or \$20.7 million. Unfortunately—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —neither was right. My understanding is that it is \$20.63 million.

GILLMAN LAND SALE

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Finally, can the minister confirm the total cost of crown law advice to the government in relation to the Gillman deal to date, as well as total expected costs for this deal?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:19): I thank the leader for his question. I have actually interpreted that question as the same one that he asked me earlier about the total costs incurred, if there were additional costs above that \$2.2 million.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am happy to provide that detail of any further expenses to the house.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is warned.

BUCKLAND PARK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Why did the minister approve an extension to commence substantial work on the Walker Corporation's Buckland Park development to 31 October 2017, following multiple extensions since the 2010 announcement?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:20): I thank the deputy leader for her question. As people would be aware, some time ago, there was a rezoning of some considerable parcel of land known as Buckland Park to most people, but I think now known as Riverlea. But anyway, Buckland Park.

The SPEAKER: Riverlea is the estate name, isn't it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I believe so.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is probably named after an area in the electorate of MacKillop, I suspect. Anyway, just so the parliament understands what the context of this is, in about 2008 or 2009, there was a decision taken that there would be a rezone of a large area. The whole area was rezoned. There were, as part of this, a series of conditions attached to the rezoning, and these conditions were conditions which related, in particular, to infrastructure because, as members who have been following this matter at all would be aware, there are issues about roads because there has to be a—

Ms Sanderson: Schools, libraries, stormwater, electricity, gas.

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There are issues about roads and I understand the Department of Transport and the developer have been in conversations about that. There is also the other necessary infrastructure you would require with any greenfield development site, like electricity, gas, water, etc., and, of course, there were issues about potential inundation because it is near the Gawler River and it is a low-lying piece of land and there were certain engineering works that were required in order for that work to be done.

As it has turned out, as I understand it, the developer has not been able to progress all of the works that they had hoped to within the original envisaged time line. That said, they have invested a significant amount of money already in this development, and I am talking here in the order of tens of millions of dollars that has been invested already in terms of infrastructure and other development costs. When—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: If I were you, I wouldn't go there. I really wouldn't. I really wouldn't. Anyway, the situation is—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is warned for the second and the final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The situation is that I have a person who is the holder of a large area of already rezoned land, who has the benefit of an existing approval with triggers in the approval. That person, or that corporation, has invested a significant amount of money in moving forward and wants to have the opportunity to have an extension of time to complete that work so that they can get the development up and running. It seemed to me, given that the developer has no control over the demand for land, particularly housing, in that area and the developer has sought to have an extension, that it was, in all of the circumstances, a reasonable request.

BUCKLAND PARK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary: if the Attorney, in granting the approval, was satisfied that substantial work has been undertaken, can he explain to the house what it is that they have spent millions of dollars on that you say is the basis of giving them another extension?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:24): I understand that we are talking in the tens of millions of dollars. I will—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is on two warnings: he has not yet been offered any provocation by the Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Just for the sake of clarity so that those opposite, in particular, know what we are talking about here, this was a major project development which was approved, and the land rezoned in 2008, or thereabouts. This developer is already sitting on land that has already been rezoned. They are sitting on that land and have been for some time.

There were certain conditions attached to the development going forward, and they had some triggers which were time related. They had some triggers which were time related. I was requested by them to grant an extension, which I thought in all the circumstances was reasonable. If those opposite would like me to try to obtain further information about the extent to which there has already been investment by this—

Mr Pisoni: Perhaps we'll see it on Google Maps.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am happy to seek that information. I could—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, I have been led to believe there is a certain number of dollars—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is warned for the second and the final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think, Mr Speaker—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Adelaide is on two warnings.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Can I come back to the point again, Mr Speaker, which I think might be helpful, is that—

Dr McFetridge interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: We are not dealing here in a case where the proponent is requiring a decision of government to rezone this land. The rezone occurred some considerable period of time ago.

Mr Marshall: But what has that got to do with this?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: What we are talking about is the question of triggers within the agreement—

Mr Marshall: You have been asked about the extent of that—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Mr Marshall: —what was the basis of that—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Mr Marshall: —and you said tens of millions of dollars have been spent—

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes.

Mr Marshall: —and that was the reason—

The SPEAKER: The leader, if he makes another utterance outside standing orders, will be leaving early.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It's evident to me, Mr Speaker, from the interjection that the leader does now understand what I'm saying, and I don't think I need to answer this any further.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is called to order. The member for MacKillop is called to order—the least I could do for the member for MacKillop.

BUCKLAND PARK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:28): Supplementary, sir: when the Attorney-General as Minister for Planning approved, on 29 September 2016, the extension of time for the terms of the development for the Buckland Park development—

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order, Mr Speaker: the member for Bragg has not sought an explanation. She hasn't asked her question.

The SPEAKER: Can the deputy leader ask a question?

Ms CHAPMAN: When the Attorney signed and approved the application, had he received a submission from Walker Corporation upon which he based the decision to grant the extension and, if so, will he make that available?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:29): The answer is that the way this normally happens is that when people wish to have decisions made by the Minister for Planning, whoever that might be—

Ms Chapman: It's you, isn't it?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: It is me presently, yes. When somebody wishes the Minister for Planning to make a decision, the collection of the material and analysis of the material occurs by, as you would expect, officers of the department. They consider whatever has been put forward and they make recommendations to the minister based on the material that they have. My normal practice is to sit down with the relevant departmental officers and discuss with them verbally what the issues in the—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Strangely enough, the Attorney-General never has to do this sort of thing; it's the planning minister. We have one of these meetings and we have a discussion about the issues that might be—

Ms Chapman: Did you do that in this case?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Yes, and so there is a discussion. I form an opinion at the end of the discussion and I make a decision, and that's what happened in this case. This happens to me as planning minister roughly once a week. Sometimes it is less frequently, sometimes it is more frequently; it just depends on what is going on. Whilst I do recall that there was one of these conversations about this matter, and it was in September, I don't presently recall exactly what was sitting in front of me and what wasn't.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader seems to be defying my ruling that he make utterances only within standing orders. Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think that basically covers off the process.

BUCKLAND PARK

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:32): Supplementary to the Attorney-General, if I may, sir: has the government received a request from the Auditor-General's office to provide cabinet documents available for inspection in respect of the Buckland Park development and the Festival Plaza Precinct?

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister

for the City of Adelaide) (14:32): The answer is that even if I did know, which I don't, I'm not sure that I would be in position to say. Happily, I have no idea what the answer to that question might be.

RECREATIONAL FISHING REGULATIONS

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (14:32): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you inform the house how the educational awareness campaign to inform recreational fishers of the new regulations will be conducted?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:33): I thank the member for Giles for the question and acknowledge his interest in rec fishing. He represents a wonderful electorate, with some fantastic snapper and other fish in his area. During the past almost a year, we have been out consulting with many, many South Australians about the future of fishing in South Australia.

I want to firstly thank the 800 people who turned up to the meetings that we held around South Australia to have discussions and hear people's input about how we can continue on in a sustainable way with our fisheries. To all those people who gave their views, they were listened to. I also want to thank the 900 people who made submissions, including the 1,550 people who fed into the RecFish SA submission. We did get to hear from a lot of people from right around the state and have come up with some decisions that we think are the fairest way forward in terms of looking after the recreational aspect of fishing, the commercial aspect of fishing and the ecological aspect of fishing. It is a real balancing act, and there were a lot of compromises made by all sides along the way.

These changes will come into effect on 1 December, so we have a month now to get the message across to people about what these new rules mean and what people will be allowed to do. Some of the ways we will communicate to the recreational fishers are:

- obviously through the PIRSA website, which includes downloadable flyers;
- Fishcare volunteers, who do a tremendous job right around our state, and I would like to congratulate them on the great work they do. They will help distribute information and inform fishers about the changes at events and during regular patrols over coming weeks;
- posters will be provided to tackle shops across the state to raise awareness about incoming changes;
- a digital advertising campaign will commence next week;
- the Fishwatch call centre has information on the changes and will direct people to the PIRSA website for details;
- through social media, with Twitter and Facebook accounts of PIRSA and other government agencies helping to spread the message;
- commercial fishing associations, RecFish SA and other key stakeholders will be notified directly;
- e-newsletters will be issued, including PIRSA's FISHFACTS e-newsletter, which goes to thousands of recreational fishers; and
- all signage across the state will be updated at popular fishing spots, jetties and boat ramps.

In terms of informing members of parliament, we have some briefings—one this afternoon, I understand, and one again tomorrow—so that people can ask questions directly of those officers who have been out there doing all the work in compiling these changes so that people have the facts, and our office is only too willing to help people.

The member for Goyder came over and had a chat with me this morning. I thank him for asking those questions, and we hope we will get him a briefing that will inform him. He has a

tremendous electorate that looks after not just the residents of Yorke Peninsula but also so many visitors to his wonderful area. I thank those members who came along to—

Mr Marshall: What is this?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: It's called government. You want to stay over there and whinge and complain.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: We get in and we look after the fishers of South Australia and the fish stocks of South Australia while you just—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Mate, you're all rod and no reel.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton.

An honourable member: He likes to fish.

BIRKENHEAD BRIDGE

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:37): I do. My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on what the South Australian government has done to renovate the heritage-listed Birkenhead Bridge, a bridge I have travelled over many, many times?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:37): I thank the member for Colton for his question. The South Australian government's commitment to improving Port Adelaide has been evident in one of our latest projects, the restoration of the heritage-listed Birkenhead Bridge.

Officially opened on 14 December 1940, the bridge brought the Birkenhead side of the river closer to the heart of Port Adelaide, facilitating industrial expansion and further housing developments along the Lefevre Peninsula by providing an opportunity for traffic to flow freely over the water. Prior to this, the only way of crossing the inner harbour at Port Adelaide was by oar-driven or motorised ferries.

The bridge has an interesting history. The Birkenhead Bridge was the first double bascule-designed bridge built in Australia, and it is listed on our state heritage register due to cultural and engineering significance. In February 1942, Australian Army engineers drilled holes in the bridge to enable placement of explosive devices to demolish the bridge in the event of an invasion, and in the 1960s electric trolley buses ran across the bridge to Largs and to Semaphore.

More recently, in 2012 concrete repairs and installation of a cathodic protection system to protect the bridge piers were undertaken at a cost of \$1.6 million. In 2014, two of the bridge's lanes were converted into a shared pedestrian and bicycle path as part of the state government's Outer Harbor Greenway initiative at a cost of \$760,000.

Last Friday, along with the member for Port Adelaide and the mayor of the Port Adelaide Enfield council, I unveiled the South Australian government's most recent investment in the area, the completion of the \$1.1 million heritage upgrade and maintenance project undertaken on the Birkenhead Bridge. I would like to thank AFL Services Pty Ltd, a local company based in Wingfield and employing residents of the Lefevre Peninsula, which undertook the project. The handrails were removed from the bridge, taken away and the paint blasted off, before being painted in the original pewter colour.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Ivan would have fixed it.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Unfortunately, the former member for Schubert did not tender for the works, which was a great disappointment to the government.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That's right, he certainly would, yes. The streetlights underwent the same refurbishment process off site, while being upgraded to LED lamps, and returned the design of the lights to their original heritage twin head design.

These works gave us the opportunity to remember a terrible tragedy that happened on the bridge 38 years ago. On the night of 22 August 1978, Mr Geoffrey Wayne Martin lost his life in a horrific collision involving a petrol tanker and Mr Martin's vehicle. Despite the efforts of emergency services, Mr Martin was trapped in his vehicle due to the collision and incinerated. As part of the heritage works, a plaque was installed on one of the bridge's pedestrian shelters as a memorial to Mr Martin and as an acknowledgement of his wife, Elaine, and his two sons, Ben and Josh. On Friday, it was very humbling to see so many of Elaine's friends and family attend the unveiling, including one of those officers who first attended from the emergency services.

This is an important bridge in South Australia's history, but it is also an important bridge to the community of Port Adelaide and to the communities on Lefevre Peninsula. It was a wonderful thing not just to see this heritage bridge restored to its former glory but also to take the opportunity to recognise what was one of South Australia's most horrific traffic incidents and to remember Mr Martin and also his wife, Elaine, and family.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:41): My question is to the Minister for Planning. Has the government or any government agency received any advice in relation to the potential issues with the timing and delivery of the proposed redevelopment of the Adelaide Casino?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Davenport is called to order and so is the member for Hammond.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:42): One of those interjectors I was allegedly referring to earlier, Mr Speaker. It is clear that there has been some delay in the delivery of SkyCity's redevelopment of the Adelaide Casino because clearly they have not yet redeveloped the Casino according to the original time line they outlined. Would that mean that there would be some advice across government departments alerting different agencies, let alone ministers, to that fact? I am sure there is.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary, deputy leader.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): In respect of the advice that you think you are sure has been received, when was it received and who was it given to?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:43): I guess, as I was trying to allude to earlier, given the fact that there is likely to be more than one government agency with an interest in SkyCity's proposed expansion of the Casino, it would perhaps assist the government if the deputy leader was a little more specific in which advice she was interested in. Was she interested in, for example, advice provided by the Independent Gambling Authority? Was she interested in advice received by Renewal SA? Was she interested in advice received by other agencies? Perhaps the deputy leader could narrow her search.

ADELAIDE CASINO

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:43): Further supplementary to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development: when did you last receive advice on the time frame and time line for the Casino redevelopment and from whom?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:43): I will have to check, but I would assume—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: You either want specific advice or you don't—which is it? I would assume—

Mr Pisoni: Give us a month.

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I would assume that that advice would have come from Renewal SA, which has been intimately involved in the discussions concerning the redevelopment of the Festival Plaza, which of course concerns the expansion of the Adelaide Casino that SkyCity has proposed.

As the deputy leader would be well aware, it is a necessary part of the Festival Plaza redevelopment project that services and some construction footings are provided for to enable the future expansion of the Casino. But if she is asking me exactly when the advice was received and from whom, then I will provide that to her.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): A supplementary to the minister: from the advice that you have received at a time for which you will get the date for us, can you tell us what that advice was, and are you satisfied that this project is progressing and that it's on time?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:45): From my first response to the house, I don't think we can consider from anyone's perspective that SkyCity's proposed expansion of the Casino is on time because, of course, it has not yet occurred according to their first mooted time frame, so in that respect the answer would be no.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:45): A supplementary to the same minister: are you satisfied that the Casino development is progressing according to the revised time frame?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:45): What we certainly do have from SkyCity is a commitment to undertake a package of capital works, called an 'early works' package, which is being integrated into the first phase of the Festival Plaza redevelopment. These are some necessary service-type and footing works which will provide the capacity for SkyCity to proceed with their proposed expansion of the Adelaide Casino according to their ability to proceed with the project.

They have released various statements over recent years about their intention to proceed with the development but also some of the challenges, particularly, as I understand it, off the top of my head, procuring the necessary funding for them to proceed with that development. To the extent that I can provide some more information to the deputy leader beyond those comments, I will.

FESTIVAL PLAZA REDEVELOPMENT

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): A supplementary to the Minister for Planning: is he aware whether the Adelaide Casino project is progressing on time and have all necessary planning approvals been granted?

Mr Bell: You've got such a good track record.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is called to order.

Mr Marshall: Don't say anything.

The SPEAKER: The leader will depart the house under the sessional order for the next hour.

The honourable member for Dunstan having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:47): There is a demarcation here between the responsibilities of the Minister for Housing and Urban Development and the Minister for Planning.

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley will depart the house under the sessional order for the next hour.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I think there may have been some misunderstanding on the part of the deputy leader about where the division of those actually sits because, at a point in time about a year or so ago, I actually did hold both of those roles, but one of them is now being very capably undertaken by my colleague the minister. So, I will direct myself to the planning element of the question, which is basically: how are things progressing? The answer is, as I understand it, things are progressing well. There are a number of planning approvals that—

Mr Bell interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Rezoning, for example, has already been—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The rezoning of the area has already been attended to.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Like Olympic Dam?

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

Mr Pederick: It used to be to hell and back; now it's to Gillman and back.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond is warned.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: Will it be in the gulf?

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Was that warning for bad humour or their noise?

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned for the second and final time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: As far as I am aware, there is no delay, hold-up or any impediment to the proceeding of these various works in any way connected with planning decisions.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned for the second and the last time. Deputy leader.

STATE ADMINISTRATION CENTRE

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:49): My question is to the Premier. Given that the State Administration Centre sale was due to settle on 30 March, 30 June, 31 August and 25 October 2016, when will it settle?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order: the member for Bragg—

The SPEAKER: I am prepared to allow the deputy leader this preface provided a question follows immediately.

Ms CHAPMAN: When will it settle, Premier, and what assurance do you give that it will not be further delayed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:50): On behalf of the Treasurer, I will take the question on notice.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT RELOCATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:50): My question is to the Attorney-General. When did the Attorney agree to relocate the Attorney-General's Department to the proposed new building on Franklin Street, and when does the current lease expire?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:50): As the deputy leader may be aware, the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure manages commercial office accommodation—indeed, many other forms of building accommodation on behalf of other government agencies. My understanding is that the government approached the market through a tender call for accommodation for the Attorney-General's Department, and out of that response the proponent which was subsequently awarded the leasing arrangement was the one which enables the next stage of the GPO precinct development to occur. As part of those arrangements, not only will that—

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

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

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —proponent be required to construct that building and fit it out, which will obviously occur over a period of some years—in fact, I think it is approximately three years plus a fit-out period—that has required the government to continue our lease arrangement at 45 Pirie Street. The length of that lease arrangement to continue AGD's tenancy at 45 Pirie Street while that future premises is being constructed and fitted out, I just can't quite recall off the top of my head. but I will come back and provide that to the deputy leader.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT RELOCATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary: what was the term of the proposed lease agreed to in the GPO facility at Franklin Street and what is the annual rental to be paid?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:52): I don't have that detail with me, but I will come back to the chamber with it.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT RELOCATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary: will the government be paying rent in advance for the Attorney-General's Department for the tenancy similar to the up-front fees paid to the Walker Corporation for the Festival Plaza development?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:53): The deputy leader persists with her misrepresentation of the structure of the arrangement entered into by the government and the Walker Corporation for the Festival Plaza arrangement calling it an 'up-front rental payment' when, in fact, what it is is purchasing a long-term right for a number of car parks to service the Festival Centre as well as this building, and I know how keenly and acutely concerned she is about the latter interests of that—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is on thin ice.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: —but to say that this is some form of new government policy of paying rent in advance for our commercial leasing arrangements is a misrepresentation of what

we are doing. If she wants the detail of the leasing arrangements for this building, I have undertaken to provide that to the house already.

ATTORNEY-GENERAL'S DEPARTMENT RELOCATION

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): A further supplementary: what is the cost of the fit-out estimated for the top half of the new 20-storey building to accommodate the AGD and who will be paying for it?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:54): That will comprise part of the lease details and that will comprise part of the answer I will provide to the deputy leader.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton.

CRAB BAG LIMITS

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:54): Goodness me, I'm up again. My question is to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries. Minister, can you inform the house about the decrease in blue swimmer crab limits for recreational fishers?

The SPEAKER: The Speaker intends to go spotlighting for crabs off Tennyson soon and will brook no interruption in this answer.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:54): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I wish you well in your endeavours. I thank the member for Colton for the question, too. Obviously, he is a World Police and Fire Games double gold medallist in fishing but, also, someone who has been a fierce crusader for the recreational crab fishers he represents, not just down in his local area but the whole state. From 1 December when these changes come in, there will be a reduction in the bag limit for blue swimmer crabs. It will go from 40 crabs down to 20, and the boat—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Forty to 20.

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I think you are out of your place with your interjection. As normal, you are out of your place.

The SPEAKER: I am watching the member for Chaffey, who has moved to the member for Unley's seat, a very dangerous place.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: South Australia is recognised for having very well-managed fisheries where we look after the interests of the recreational fishers as well as the commercial fishers, and we look after the ecology of our wonderful pristine waters and all those great fish that we have in those waters. We just have to look around the world at some other countries and how they have decimated their fishing stocks, and we do not want to follow them down that road. We want to ensure, just as we have for generations, that grandparents can take their grandchildren fishing and be assured that they will be able to get a fair catch.

This is a resource that is owned by all South Australians so, for those who can't get out and catch a fish or a crab, we also want to make sure that they can go to the markets or a restaurant and have access to the best seafood anywhere in the world.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Wright is warned.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: In the media recently, there was an erroneous claim about the commercial blue swimmer crab industry and it was claimed that the commercial sector had been able to take an extra thousand tonnes of blue swimmer crabs. That claim was not right. What I can say is there was no secret deal in relation to the management of the commercial blue crab fishery.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned.

Mr Bell interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Member for Mount Gambier, I said it is an erroneous claim. It wasn't me making the claim. Some fishers made—

Mr Pengilly interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: If you stop interrupting, I will get onto it.

The SPEAKER: The member for Finnis is called to order. The minister will cease his provocative silence.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: There was no secret deal in relation to the management of the commercial blue crab fishery in Gulf St Vincent. PIRSA runs an annual process to set the total allowable commercial catch for the commercial fishery using a harvest strategy contained in the management plan for the South Australian commercial blue crab fishery. The management plan includes proportional catch allocations to the commercial, recreational and traditional sectors, which is 70 per cent commercial, 29 per cent recreational and 1 per cent traditional. These catch allocations are established to provide certainty to all user groups about their level of access to the resource and are based on the best available information at the time a management plan is developed. This is a requirement of the Fisheries Management Act 2007.

CRAB BAG LIMITS

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (14:58): Supplementary, sir: given the minister's answer that there is a reduction in recreational catch for blue swimmer crabs, can the minister inform the house why he has actually increased the quota for professionals from 196 to 245 tonne?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (14:59): It was a fishing expedition. Thank you for putting out the bait; thank you for coming in, spinner.

The SPEAKER: That is a mixed metaphor, minister.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I love a mixed metaphor. Joh Bjelke-Petersen was the best at them—like feeding the chooks. This is a bit like feeding the chooks.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Newland is warned for the second and final time.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Schubert, he's an expert on everything.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Google it. Where is it?

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Okay, so—

The SPEAKER: The answer?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, the answer, my friend, is that there is a baseline level of 245 tonnes when stocks are healthy. A few years ago, when stocks weren't healthy, the level went down and now, when stocks are healthy, it has returned to its level. We haven't increased—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mount Gambier is warned for the second and final time. The member for Stuart is on two warnings.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The baseline hasn't changed: it has always been 245 tonnes. But when the stock status concerns were identified in 2013, the government acted. They reduced the commercial catch of blue swimmer crabs by 20 per cent to 196 tonnes in Gulf St Vincent. To maintain the allocated catch shares, the individual recreational daily bag limits for Gulf St Vincent were reduced from 40 to 20, and the daily boat limit was reduced from 120 to 60. So—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes. We get back to this share thing, and the member for Schubert is really interested in this. It's not 29 per cent that the rec fishers are taking: they are taking 39.5 per cent. What we need to do is get them back to that 29 per cent. You are absolutely right that we need to maintain those percentages—so you are with us. We are all together on this, that it can't be 39.5 per cent because they are allocated 29 per cent, so by bringing them—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The recreational blue swimmer crab fishers are taking more than they are allocated. If you have any resource that you are allowed to fish 100 per cent of, it makes no sense to allow people to fish 110 per cent of it. We know that the commercial people aren't exceeding their quotas; the recreational fishers are. We know that when the compliance officers go out there, the statistics from 1 July last year show that one in five people who were spoken to by Fisheries officers either had undersized crabs or they were over their bag limit. What we need to do is make sure everyone plays by the rules. These new rules come in on 1 December. It will be 20 per person and 60 per boat.

SEAFORD RAIL LINE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure.

Ms Bedford interjecting:

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

Mr SPEIRS: Is the independent investigation into the 28 April breakdown of the Seaford rail line complete and, if so, when will it be released to the public?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:03): I thank the member for Bright for his question. Yes, he's right—there has been an ongoing investigation; in fact, the Rail Commissioner engaged an independent expert to examine the issue and provide a report. As to the status of that report, given it has been some six months since the incident occurred, we will be looking to release that as quickly as possible. Where that is up to, I will come back to the house. I did commit at the time that we would be releasing it.

I have continued to update both the community and the house as to what we believe the issue to be, that is, that it was a faulty piece of equipment which was provided to the government by the contractor and that there has been a very extensive process that has been undertaken in order to determine the cause of this because, as the manufacturer has advised the department, this is a piece of equipment that they have never had fail anywhere globally, and so of course there has been an enormous amount of consternation about why this piece of equipment has failed.

In any event, as I prefaced my comments by saying, we did engage an independent expert consultant to produce a report. We will make that available as soon as we can.

SEAFORD RAIL LINE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:05): Supplementary to the Minister for Transport: given that the minister claimed on 30 April, 'We are not expecting to encounter this problem again', is he now, six months later, able to guarantee that the problem won't happen again?

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE: Point of order: the member for Bright does not have leave to make an explanation.

The SPEAKER: That's right. The member for Bright did not seek leave. Can he just ask a question without making an impromptu speech? Can you repeat, member for Bright, the question part?

Mr SPEIRS: Yes, Mr Speaker. Is the minister able to guarantee to the house that this problem won't happen again?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:05): I thank the member for Bright for his question. Given that we have been let down by a piece of equipment supplied to the government by an external supplier, and the external supplier has said to the government that they have never had this fail previously, then it is clear that, from time to time, unfortunately, things do go wrong which cause these sorts of interruptions to services. If we were in a position to guarantee that there would never be any interruption to any service that we provide on a particular rail line, let alone across all our rail lines, that would be highly unusual. Instead, what we do is we seek to minimise the risks of any services being interrupted.

SEAFORD RAIL LINE

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (15:06): Supplementary to the Minister for Transport: did the minister receive an interim report and will he release that?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (15:06): Have I received an interim report? I can't recall receiving an interim report, but I will check that, bearing in mind that, as we now know of course, this unfortunately has not been the only issue the Seaford train line has encountered in recent times. We have also had the incredibly disappointing circumstance of a South Australian contractor using contaminated materials in constructing switch rooms for the Seaford line, which has also required a very lengthy and extensive investigation, this time by a different person and, indeed, a different agency, which was led by SafeWork SA. So, as I answered those previous questions that I undertook in my previous responses to the member for Bright, I will go back and check that and I will provide that advice in due course.

MINING REVIEW

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:08): My question is to the Minister for Agriculture. Does the minister support the current time line for the mining review, given that the consultation is right in the middle of harvest and arguably a farmer's busiest time?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:08): Yes.

Mr Williams interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for MacKillop is warned.

Grievance Debate

BUSHFIRE ACTION WEEK

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:08): As you may know, this week is Bushfire Action Week. Launched on Sunday 30 October, a series of events will be held in many parts of South Australia throughout the week, providing an opportunity for people to engage with the CFS and learn more about how they can make a contribution to their personal safety and that of their community.

Bushfire Action Week is a timely reminder for all South Australians that bushfires will happen and that individuals, households and businesses need to plan what they and their family should do when it does. The long wet winter, that does not seem to want to end, should not distract us from the very real threat of bushfires. Indeed, all the rain we have experienced in recent months has created lush growth in our neighbourhoods that can become fuel for bushfires.

In recent years, many South Australians have been devastated by catastrophic bushfire events, with 2015 bookended by the Sampson Flat fire in January and the Pinery fire in November. Both fires illustrated the damaging consequences of bushfires, with the Sampson Flat fire burning

uncontrolled for days and destroying homes, businesses, forests, grazing lands, vineyards, livestock and properties across 12,600 hectares. The Pinery fire was even more destructive, burning an estimated 82,500 hectares, resulting in extensive property damage and, sadly, the loss of two lives.

Bushfires can escalate very quickly, and they move rapidly. 'Plan to survive' is the key message for Bushfire Action Week. The CFS is encouraging everyone to plan for their personal safety and that of their families, their neighbours, their pets and livestock. This involves preparing your home and property to withstand a bushfire and developing a bushfire survival plan. My own electorate is a very big bushfire-prone area, and many residents are at risk. It is essential that every household makes a contribution to community efforts to prepare for the bushfire season.

Fires are spread and fuelled by flammable grasses, weeds and bushes. We can all help reduce fuel loads by cutting grass, clearing away fallen leaves and dead undergrowth, emptying gutters, pruning lower branches and removing hazardous materials away from your house. The CFS strongly encourages every household to also have a written and practised bushfire survival plan, as it is the most important part of preparing to survive a bushfire. A plan allows you to identify the triggers to leave early or prepare to actively defend your property, to make major decisions in advance and keep your focus to make better decisions in the event of a bushfire threat, to know where family members are and what they will be doing and to identify the resources you need.

It is also highly recommended that you have an emergency kit, with insurance papers, photos and other valuables ready for a quick exit. Keep a phone charged throughout summer and know where to access bushfire information. Know where to go: identify your closest bushfire-safe place and last resort refuge. There are five last resort refuges in my electorate, that is, Flinders University oval, Bellevue Heights oval, Blackwood Hill Oval, Hewett Sports Ground, and Weymouth Oval at Coromandel Valley.

The CFS works hard to protect life and property, but they cannot always be everywhere. More than 3,500 firefighters responded to the Sampson Flat fire, including support from the New South Wales and Victorian authorities. Over 1,700 firefighters responded to the Pinery fire, with support provided by the Victorian fire authorities as well. The simple actions I have outlined to prepare you and your home included in the bushfire survival plan may help save your life or that of a loved one this bushfire season.

Bushfire Action Week includes the launch of the 2016-17 Fire Danger Season awareness campaign, as well as activities such as bushfire safety displays, barbecues, information sessions and opportunities to interact with the CFS through open days at several local brigades. Just this last Sunday, I had the pleasure of attending the Blackwood CFS open day, and I had the chance to speak to Captain Darren Cock and his crew regarding the bushfire preparedness of his brigade.

I would like to acknowledge the important role of the CFS, especially the hardworking volunteers within the Sturt CFS group, and the local branches. They have worked tirelessly through our winter, assisting SES volunteers to respond to storm damage and help protect life and property. I welcome their continued efforts and extend my thanks ahead of the 2016-17 bushfire season.

RSL VIRTUAL WAR MEMORIAL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:13): Following its hugely successful Don't Forget Me, Cobber fundraising lunch at Adelaide Oval on 6 October, I would like to inform the house about more of the work and activities of the RSL Virtual War Memorial and the great works the dedicated staff here in South Australia are undertaking.

The lunch was attended by hundreds of supporters, who had come to hear, amongst other things, a panel discussion led by Jane Doyle. On the panel were Air Chief Marshal Sir Angus Houston; the Hon. Dr Brendan Nelson, a former Modbury High School student; Warrant Officer Class 1 Wayne Weeks; and John Schumann, well known for his Redgum *I Was Only 19* song. Guests were also treated to a presentation by Robert Kearney, who is an OAM, veteran, storyteller and historian, with the RSL Virtual War Memorial.

The war memorial tells a community story begun by the RSL's Tributes of Honour database compiled by the late Will and Jacqui Clough of Riverton, South Australia, between 2002 and 2007. Comprising more than 1,700 South Australian and Northern Territory war memorials and more than

48,000 names from all conflicts that appear more than 100,000 times, it was a remarkable undertaking for which a debt of gratitude is owed to them. Jacqui, along with Steve Larkins, continues to act as a development partner in the war memorial.

It now enjoys support throughout South Australia and the Northern Territory and is being recognised more broadly. It is a sort of Wikipedia for anyone who wants to research, study or contribute to this commemoration of service and socio-military history from the Boer War to today. It was my pleasure to co-host a function this morning with the member for Morphett to invite members to see a bit more about what goes on with the Virtual War Memorial in the presence of Sharyn Roberts, who leads it, Elsa Reuter, Julianne Ryan and, of course, Bob and Nicholas Egan.

There are four key foundation principles to the Virtual War Memorial: education, which provides local content for school students studying under the national curriculum, and there are wonderful fact sheets available for them; commemoration, which gives greater depth of meaning to our memorial infrastructure; community engagement, including crowd-sourcing of community, family and personal information; and accessibility for anyone to connect 24/7 anywhere with internet access via mobile devices. I quote Steve Larkins' message at the war memorial site www.rslvirtualwarmemorial.org.au. He states:

This site is unique in its ambition, scope and reach. There are other similar sites, but none as 'joined up' particularly through memorial infrastructure. It complements and will interact with others sites such as the Australian War Memorial and National Archive of Australia sites with whom we are actively collaborating.

The RSL Virtual War Memorial (RSLVWM) has the capacity to present a web page for every service man and woman who has gone in harm's way in the country's name since the Boer War. The [ambitious] task will be ongoing...The system architecture and the data model is extremely robust and comprehensively structured.

The...War Memorial is both a repository and a resource for students, family, researchers, teachers, historians, genealogists and communities. It is the research project that will never end, as we strive to make stories as complete as we can.

Contemporary veterans will have the opportunity to tell their story first-hand...[There has been] a lot of interest in this facet of the site. It complements RSL objectives in veteran welfare by providing an audience for men and women who have historically 'not talked about' their experiences.

The...Virtual War Memorial is to be the definitive resource and repository for anyone wanting to research, study...[the history of their loved ones]...This site puts a life behind the names inscribed on memorials that we walk past every day.

Every 'person' has a web page—and we want to put a story on every page. It is populated as a minimum with data from a substantive source—official records or rolls.

It retrieves and cross-matches data from official sources such as the AWM, National Archive and resources such as the RSL's own Membership...It will connect those names with key places, organisations and events to add context to the story.

Bob Kearney is well known in the veteran community and is truly passionate about veteran history. He has compiled a wonderful volume called *Fallen Saints*, which is the story of the soldiers who went to war, from St Peter's College. Bob is ably assisted by Nicholas Egan, and they stand ready to assist all members as they get behind this wonderful initiative in all the South Australian electorates by engaging with schools and individuals who may have known or are descendants of our fallen heroes.

Adding your own story to the virtual memorial is easy. Members of the public can sign up and log onto the Virtual War Memorial and update their own friends' and family's stories. The ability to add service history, stories and personal photographs is the legacy of our armed service men and women that will never be lost.

NAIRNE INTERSECTION

Mr GOLDSWORTHY (Kavel) (15:19): The last time the house sat, I spoke about the magnificent benefit that the newly constructed and recently opened Bald Hills Road freeway interchange has brought to that part of the Adelaide Hills community. I want to talk this afternoon about another important road infrastructure project that needs attention.

I have raised this issue in the house on quite a number of occasions over the years; however, given the need and the focus on the funding required and the approval and construction of the Bald Hills Road interchange, I have not spoken about this particular issue for some time. I am

referring to the major intersection in the middle of the township of Nairne, being the intersection of Woodside Road and the Old Princes Highway. That intersection carries a significant volume of traffic, particularly given the progressive residential development that the township of Nairne has experienced over the last 15 or so years, particularly the land adjacent to Woodside Road.

I have seen that area pretty much built out over the time I have been the local member. In 2002, when I first ran for parliament, I went out and campaigned there and doorknocked. There were a number of houses but, over successive terms here in parliament, that land has been pretty well consumed by housing. Obviously the population level has grown and there has been a subsequent increase in traffic volume as a result, and that impacts on the particular intersection I am raising here.

Quite a number of years ago (I think it was back in the Liberal government days), some consultants were engaged to view the issue of that intersection and the traffic congestion. As I said, over the last 15 or so years the volume of traffic has obviously increased, to the point where there is significant congestion at the intersection at certain times the day, particularly at school drop-off and pick-up times. The local primary school is situated on a road very close to that intersection, really only a few metres from what could be described as a T-junction.

The Rolls-Royce option, if you would like to call it that, that came from the consultancy was to make that intersection into a crossroad—that is, with the road that runs up to the primary school (Saleyard Road), there would have to be some property acquired, but make it into a crossroad and put a set of traffic lights at the intersection. We know that is a costly exercise and that there was significant money spent on the interchange, and I am a realist and know that you cannot have everything at once; however, it is time that the government, the Minister for Transport and the Minister for Road Safety refocused their attention on this particular intersection.

I understand that probably nine years ago the school crossing was moved from the western side of that intersection to the eastern side. The traffic engineers were of the opinion that that would assist in dealing with the congestion at the intersection and the traffic volumes coming to and from the school at drop-off and pick-up times. There are also plans to build a ring route from the school's Saleyard Road and loop back into the centre of the town, but I think that traffic will eventually come back and end up at the intersection.

I raise this issue in the house now so that the government is aware that it is alive and going, that we need to refocus our attention on it and that work needs to be done on that particular part of the road system.

Time expired.

JOB ACCELERATOR GRANT SCHEME

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (15:24): I rise to report to the house on some of the travel around regional South Australia that I did last week as part of my role as assistant minister to the Treasurer. I spent three days driving around, in particular, the Yorke Peninsula, Mid North and Riverland areas of the state last week, and it was a fantastic opportunity to get out and meet lots of the businesses in South Australia as well as local governments in those regions.

One of the key reasons I embarked on this travel was to highlight the government's Job Accelerator Grant Scheme that we established in the last budget, which of course provides grants for each new job created by small and medium-size businesses. Grants of up to \$10,000 each per new job have been provided, which have been very strongly welcomed by the business community both in the city and around the regions of South Australia. We need to ensure we are getting the word out to as many people as possible to make sure that those people who are eligible know about the program. Hopefully, this program can help tip the balance when they are deciding to hire an extra person or two in their businesses.

Across the time of my travel, I went to Balaklava, Kapunda, Port Hughes, Moonta, Kadina, Wallaroo, Loxton, Berri and Renmark. I had significant travel across different areas and visited four businesses that are putting on extra people, including The Dunes at Port Hughes, the Kapunda Medical Practice, JMA Engineering and Cash's Cabinets at Loxton. All those businesses are hiring extra people thanks to the new Job Accelerator Grant Scheme.

I was able to meet some of those people who have been hired recently, particularly at JMA Engineering just outside Berri. They are a very significant contractor for the wine industry. Not only are they hiring up to 13 extra people through these grants but they have also recently bought some new equipment, with some support through one of the government's innovation grants, that is going to increase their ability to export their equipment for the wine industry to not just South Australia but also interstate. They have also recently started exporting for the first time overseas. Thank you to Jeff and Mark for the tour around JMA Engineering.

I also visited the Kapunda Medical Practice. It was great to meet Sandra and Kylie, who was a new employee who has just started there with the Job Accelerator Grant. I also visited Cash's Cabinets, where I got to meet Karyn Greenham, who has recently been employed as a new employee. There was also another apprentice who has recently been employed there. They are also doing work on the new Loxton Research Centre, which is another investment by the state government. They are installing all the cabinetry into that new facility through PIRSA, which is great to see.

The other business I visited was at The Dunes, where I got to meet Bayden, who is a young school leaver who has just been hired as an extra groundskeeper, so it was great to see additional employment that was happening. I also held two business breakfasts—firstly, at the Goyder Street Cafe at Kadina and, secondly, at the Renmark Club in Renmark. Thank you to both those premises for putting on a great spread for us.

We had over a dozen businesses attend both those events to talk about some of the initiatives in our budget that they might be eligible for and also to talk through some of the issues and opportunities that they face running businesses in regional South Australia. Certainly a lot of those businesses are looking to employ extra people and are very interested in all the details about how they can apply for our grants.

It was also great to meet with local governments across those regions. Firstly, I met with the Wakefield Regional Council, and thank you to Mayor Rodney Reid. I also met with Mayor Ray Agnew from the Yorke Peninsula council. I met with Mayor Paul Thomas from the Copper Coast council. I also met with Mayor Bill O'Brien and the Kapunda Business Alliance at the Light Regional Council. In the Riverland, I had a joint meeting with all three councils, including Mayor Leon Stasinowsky, Mayor Neil Martinson, Mayor Peter Hunt and CEO David Beaton.

They were all very enthusiastic about a lot of the opportunities for all those respective regions across South Australia. They also gave me a few follow-up things that they would like for me to work with relevant ministers on. I think all those councils do see great opportunities, and they all have a number of exciting projects underway in their areas. They are looking forward to the ability for the regions to grow and they are quite excited about the future of the South Australian economy.

ICE ADDICTION

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:29): I rise to talk about an issue affecting regional South Australia, that is, the increase in the use of ice or crystal methamphetamine. A report out this week has indicated a 150 per cent increase in the use of ice in rural and regional areas. Research undertaken by the Flinders University has shown that ice usage has more than doubled over a six-year period, with young males being the main users. It is deeply concerning to me to read those reports.

In representing the region of Mount Gambier and the seat of Mount Gambier, I am calling on the government to work in a bipartisan way with our federal colleagues and the state opposition to find solutions to this problem. The research shows that men aged between 18 and 24 are the most frequent users. Interestingly, in regional areas, ice use is most frequent among those from a trade background or those actually in employment, as opposed to the city areas, where a larger representation are unemployed.

This first came to my attention when I first got into my role as the member for Mount Gambier. A lady by the name of Karen Judd came and spoke to me in detail about her son Jay's fight with ice. Unfortunately, he lost his battle a couple of years ago, and she has continued the cause. From her firsthand perspective, the reality is that our current measures are not working. She related a story to

me that locking up her son actually extended his network of suppliers and also clients going forward, so I do not believe that putting young addicts in gaol is the answer.

On the Limestone Coast, we have only one full-time equivalent from Drug and Alcohol Services South Australia. That person is expected to cover the entire Limestone Coast region, from Keith and Bordertown right down to Port MacDonnell and everywhere in between, from the coast to the border. It is simply not enough. The federal government has committed \$300 million to tackling this issue, and I would like to call on the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse to report to this parliament, instead of some of the questions that we get from the government side, on what we are doing as a state to look after our young people who are afflicted by this epidemic. It is calculated that 200,000 Australians have used the drug ice, and we need to be doing a lot more than we currently are.

I believe that the federal government has \$4 million to put towards a solution in the regional areas, but we need to have that being worked on and tabled as a plan that works. Sweden has a very successful mandatory drug rehabilitation program where it is mandated that those affected by ice, instead of going into the prison system, go into mandatory rehabilitation. I would like to see that expanded.

We have very few options for those families who come to my office and talk to me about this drug ruining their family unit and their young person's life. I call on this government to start making sure that some of the deals on proceeds of crime, particularly those from drug dealers, go into paying for these rehab centres, or at least contribute to the federal government's \$300 million to put a solution in place. I do not have the solutions, but I am willing to work with the government to facilitate this in the best interests of our young people in regional South Australia.

CIVICS AND CITIZENSHIP

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (15:34): There are many things that make the job of being a member of parliament the wonderful job that it is. Just as one example, most of us would attend over the years many citizenship ceremonies. To attend these events is an honour, to be able to participate in the ceremony is a privilege and to see the happiness of those making their commitment to Australia and its people is an absolute joy. Citizenship ceremonies are simply but importantly a celebration.

In every speech I have ever made at these events, I attempt in the strongest way to encourage all who are taking the pledge at the end of the ceremony, if they have not already, to visit our friends at the back of the hall from the Australian Electoral Commission and to sign up so that they can vote in future elections. It is important to remember that, at each citizenship ceremony, there are many candidates who have come from a variety of countries—some where people are being killed fighting for the right to vote and some are from other countries that are corrupt and do not have a political or government structure that is anything even remotely resembling a democracy.

Here in Australia, we have a robust and healthy democratic system and tradition—perhaps not perfect, but I would venture that it is as good as it gets. It is a participative democracy. All eligible persons are compelled to participate in it. Some might be thinking, 'Where are you going with this, Caica?' Well, I will get there.

Another task that I love participating in, and one that brings me a lot of joy, is Parliament House tours. I like all the tours, whether it be the local University of the Third Age or the Probus Club, but in particular I really enjoy showing school students around Parliament House. I am very pleased that today we see included in our national curriculum a component relating to civics. This has resulted in there being a significant increase in the number of requests from the primary schools in my electorate to conduct tours of Parliament House for their year 6-7 students.

On each of these occasions, whether it be the primary school students of Grange Primary School or St Francis or Star of the Sea, or any of my schools, including high school students, a couple of things are obvious from the outset; one is that the students are being properly and well prepared for the visits, and to this end I congratulate and thank the teachers.

The second thing that becomes apparent is how keen they are to ask questions and to learn from the experience of visiting parliament in the context of their civics education, whether it be how governments are formed, South Australia's proud role in women's suffrage, the establishment in

South Australia of the secret ballot (now used throughout many parts of the world), who sits on the crossbenches and what those sitting on the opposition benches want more than anything else in the world—and, amongst the many other things discussed, is the role of the Speaker and how the Speaker maintains order.

I enjoy conducting these tours, and in fact I like to believe that the students enjoy themselves as much as I do. When I was at school, unless you had a teacher who may have been a bit of an activist (and we did in the early seventies have many teachers who could be categorised as that), there was little teaching or education on our political system or the democracy that underpins it, or is it the reverse order? Nonetheless, we had little that helped any of us be properly prepared for participating in our democratic system, and this is why I welcome the introduction of civics in our national curriculum.

What this means is that students, just like those who toured Parliament House this year and previously, throughout their schooling year after year will build on their knowledge of how our political system works and what it means to them and, by doing so, be properly prepared for active participation in that system. That can only be a good thing, not just for those participating but also for our community and, most importantly, for the health and robustness of our democracy. Just have a look at what is going on in the United States at the moment with respect to the knowledge and the level of knowledge of those people who are participating.

As I said earlier, it is a participative democracy and one in which all Australians are required to participate. I just want to finish off by again congratulating and thanking those teachers who are taking an active role in the area and component of civics within our primary schools and also those high school teachers. I bring many students from St Michael's and Henley High School, and others who are doing legal studies, here to Parliament House. There is no doubt they are going to be far better prepared than any generation before them with respect to participating in our democracy. So, I congratulate those teachers.

With respect to St Francis of Assisi, a school that visited here last week, I was even honoured to have the principal, Rick Favilla, come on the tour. He was a very valuable contributor, along with the students, during that tour. I think it is a good thing and we are going to see very, very good and beneficial outcomes from the inclusion of civics in our national curriculum.

Time expired.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You must take Muriel there one day.

Bills

BIRTHS, DEATHS AND MARRIAGES REGISTRATION (GENDER IDENTITY) AMENDMENT BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:41): Introduced a bill for an act to amend the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (15:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

On 4 August, the Births, Deaths and Marriages (Gender Identity) Amendment Bill was proudly introduced into this parliament. This bill was the next step in a suite of legislative reforms aimed at removing discrimination experienced by lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex or queer (LGBTIQ) South Australians. In particular, this bill sought to provide a simpler, more direct and less invasive process for people to change their registered sex or gender identity on the formal record. This bill was the product of recommendations made by the South Australian Law Reform Institute and the Legislative Review Committee of this parliament.

Unfortunately, on 22 September 2016, the bill was defeated by a vote in this house during its second reading. Despite this, my commitment to LGBTIQ people and removing discrimination remains steadfast. It is to this end that I seek to introduce a revised bill, the Births, Deaths and

Marriages Registration (Gender Identity) Amendment Bill 2016, to ensure these reforms are progressed. This revised bill is a result of strong consideration of the diverse views previously expressed by members of this parliament and the broader community.

The revised bill remains predominantly consistent with the earlier bill, but I refer all members to the original speech made when this bill was introduced into the parliament. Unlike the earlier bill, this revised bill features the following amendments:

- Magistrates Court approval must now be sought for a child under the age of 18 seeking to register a change of sex or gender identity (previously, it was proposed that magistrate approval was only required for children under the age of 16); and
- the requirement that the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages must retain all historical information preceding a change in sex or gender identity on the register in addition to limiting access to this historical information as a privacy protection measure.

It is my hope that the passage of this bill will see vast improvements for South Australians seeking to have their gender identity appropriately recognised by our laws. This recognition is a fundamental step to ensuring their inclusion in their community is validated, valued and secured. I commend this bill to members. I seek to have the explanation of clauses inserted without my reading it.

Leave granted.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

Part 2—Amendment of *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996*

4—Amendment of section 3—Objects of Act

The objects of the Act are amended to reflect the scheme for changing sex or gender identity.

5—Amendment of section 4—Definitions

The definition of registrable event is amended to reflect the scheme for changing sex or gender identity.

6—Insertion of Part 4A

New Part 4A is inserted:

Part 4A—Change of sex or gender identity

Division 1—Preliminary

29H—Preliminary

Definitions and an interpretative provision are inserted for the purposes of the measure.

Division 2—Applicants born in South Australia

29I—Application to change sex or gender identity

Persons 18 or older born in the State may apply for registration of a change of their sex or gender identity.

The regulations will recognise kinds of sex or gender identities that may be registered.

29J—Application to change child's sex or gender identity

A parent or guardian of a child under the age of 18 years may apply for registration of a change of the child's sex or gender identity.

29K—Material supporting application

An application must contain evidence from a medical practitioner or psychologist certifying that the person is receiving or has received appropriate clinical treatment in relation to the person's gender identity or specified evidence from another jurisdiction.

29L—Change of sex or gender identity

The Registrar may register a change of sex or gender identity.

29M—Special provision relating to access to Register and issue of extracts and certificates

Provision is made in relation to access to the Register and issue of extracts and certificates from the Register after a person has had a change in their sex or gender identity registered. Historical entries in the register will be maintained but access to those will be strictly limited.

29N—Use of old birth certificate to deceive

An offence is prescribed (in relation to a person whose sex or gender identity has changed) of producing a birth certificate that shows a person's sex or gender identity before the registration of a change to deceive.

Division 3—South Australian residents born outside Australia**29O—Application for identity acknowledgement certificate**

Persons 18 or older born outside Australia whose births are not registered in another State or Territory and who are resident here may apply for an identity acknowledgement certificate.

29P—Application for identity acknowledgement certificate in respect of child

A parent or guardian of a child under the age of 18 years born outside Australia whose birth is not registered in another State or Territory and who is resident here may apply for an identity acknowledgement certificate.

29Q—Issue of identity acknowledgement certificate

The Registrar may issue an identity acknowledgement certificate.

29R—Effect of identity acknowledgement certificate

It is provided that a person issued an identity acknowledgement certificate is of the sex or gender identity specified in the identity acknowledgement certificate.

Division 4—General provisions**29S—Registrar may limit number of applications**

The Registrar is authorised to determine a limit on the number of applications that may be made in respect of a person under the Part.

The Registrar may refuse to deal with an application in excess of the limit. An appeal against the refusal is provided for.

29T—Entitlement not affected by change of sex or gender identity

A person who has an entitlement under a will, trust or other instrument does not lose the entitlement only because of a change in the person's sex or gender identity or the issue of an identity acknowledgement certificate (unless the will, trust or other instrument otherwise provides).

29U—Change of sex or gender identity—interaction with other laws

An interpretative provision is included to the effect that a person who has changed their sex or gender identity or has been issued an identity acknowledgement certificate under the Part will be taken to have satisfied a requirement under another Act or law that the person provide details of their sex if the person provides details of their sex or gender identity as changed.

Schedule 1—Repeal and transitional provision**1—Repeal of *Sexual Reassignment Act 1988***

The *Sexual Reassignment Act 1988* is repealed.

2—Transitional provision

A provision is included that continues in effect a recognition certificate issued under the *Sexual Reassignment Act 1988* before its repeal (so that those certificates may continue to be registered).

Debate adjourned by Mr Pederick.

RELATIONSHIPS REGISTER BILL*Second Reading*

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (15:44): I rise to continue my remarks in relation to the Relationships Register Bill 2016. This is one in a suite of bills, and we have just had one introduced again on gender identity, since the last one spectacularly failed when the Premier was not in the house. This is another bill that attempts to take out gender and introduce provisions for everyone to be called 'person', and it changes issues around parentage and giving access to IVF for gay couples.

Certainly, in regard to surrogacy legislation, it will entitle same-sex couples, or single persons, to be involved in surrogacy. As I indicated before question time, I was a proud supporter of the bill from the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place regarding surrogacy, but he certainly did not have these amendments in the original legislation, which I thought was good legislation in amending a wrong that was causing people to spend tens of thousands of dollars to access surrogacy in other states. As I indicated earlier, it also caused people to go overseas, with adverse outcomes for some who used surrogates overseas.

I do have some concerns about revocation orders and the fact that we are not talking about marriage but about a registered relationship. People could decide they are in and out of a relationship, they go through the 90-day revocation period, and that is it. They can then have another relationship and do that down the track. I guess that cuts out all the chaos with the divorce court and everything else that can happen in a marriage these days.

In this legislation, you can be in a registered relationship irrespective of your sex or gender identity. We hear a lot about discrimination and equality in these debates, and quite frankly I think a lot of these debates discriminate against the values that people have grown up with over the years. They discriminate against the values of people who recognise that marriage is about a man and a woman, that those partnerships are about a man and a woman, and that family values are about raising children with a father and a mother.

I know that is not always possible, but I also know that you have to have some ideals so that society actually functions. Currently, there are 3,200 children in care, and I believe there are many advances that could be made so that we do not have that number of children in care. I think we need to try to build our society and have some higher ideals. In this house, multiple bills have been pushed by the left on gender identity—essentially gay marriage, which is a function of the federal parliament—at a time when we have massive issues in this state.

We have massive issues with power supply to the state. We had 'black Wednesday' most recently, when the whole state's power supply went out. Only this morning, I was talking to someone involved in the mining industry who said that when they come off contract to their power provider, on the days when electricity will cost the most they will actually be shutting down because it is more viable for them to shut down operations and not pay an outrageous amount for power. I have people involved in all sorts of industries in my electorate who are expanding their interstate operations, sadly, because it costs so darn much to operate here.

There are other issues we should be dealing with in this state. We have health issues. EPAS, the electronic patient administration scheme, is a complete disaster. We have spent almost \$500 million and we see it implicated in a Coroner's Court hearing at the moment where allegedly people could not get the information up on time. It is part of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital, which is not built strong enough for paper records. I find that outrageous when we have spent at least \$2.2 billion on a hospital that has had so many repairs it is completely out of control, and it is a new building. If I was in the private sector and was having a shed built on my farm like this, I would absolutely be dismayed at what was going on.

We have massive issues with child protection in this state. I indicated earlier in my contribution that we need to be doing more to look after the children of this state and get better outcomes, instead of having endless report after report. We should be doing something about helping these children so that they have a better future, instead of having poor outcomes where, sadly, some turn into quite recalcitrant people over time or, sadly, lose their lives. We have SA Water—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Hammond, I just need to draw your attention to standing order 128, which is the relevance to the actual bill we are debating.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, absolutely.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am finding it difficult to understand SA Water's relevance to the Relationships Register Bill, and you only have a minute left, so let's get right back to the nub.

Mr PEDERICK: No worries. Yes, thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. I refer back to the Relationships Register Bill, which is part of a suite of legislation that we are debating, instead of the big issues of state, like the Gillman sale debacle—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, member for Hammond. I did call you to order and if you seek to defy the ruling, I will have to confer in the next 30 seconds how we might bring you back to the nub of the bill, which is the Relationships Register Bill.

Mr PEDERICK: Yes, I am all over it, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: No, you are not all over it.

Mr PEDERICK: Thank you, Madam Deputy Speaker. With the few seconds I have left, I indicate that I will not be supporting this legislation and that we should be debating the real things to make this state great again.

Ms WORTLEY (Torrens) (15:52): I rise to contribute to the debate on the Relationships Register Bill. If passed through this parliament, this bill will see the introduction of a relationships register, coupled with the establishment of a new legal category of relationship—a registered relationship—which will be recognised in the definition of 'domestic partner' in the Family Relationships Act 1975.

The expansion of the term 'domestic partner' will remove the discriminatory impact that can be caused through the current requirements of cohabitation for qualifying for domestic partnership status. The bill would bring South Australia into line with Victoria, New South Wales, the ACT and Tasmania, where relationship registers are already in place. It would have the effect of allowing two people to register their relationship, regardless of the gender of each person.

The relationships register would also ensure that South Australia is in line with the federal government's moves to remove discrimination of unmarried people in relationships. The commonwealth has amended its Acts Interpretation Act 1901 to define a de facto partner in its legislation to include partners in registered relationships under a prescribed law of a state or territory.

I understand that, if the bill is passed by this parliament, the state government will work with the commonwealth to have it added as a prescribed law. It would mean that unmarried couples in South Australia, whether in heterosexual or non-heterosexual relationships, will be able to (1) register their relationship; (2) receive a certificate of registration; and (3) know that their relationship is respected and recognised in South Australia.

The register not only provides an important avenue for all couples to express their commitment to each other in a dignified and legally recognised way but also makes it simpler for them to seek to access entitlements and to assert their rights as a couple. The significant aspect of this section of the bill will result in:

- a relationships register being established in South Australia;
- relationships being registered interstate also recognised in South Australia;
- marriages being recognised overseas also recognised in South Australia with appropriate limits;
- the registrar being provided with the power to register these relationships;
- the Domestic Partners Property Act 1996 being amended to reference the new legal category of 'registered relationship';
- the Family Relationships Act 1975 being amended, along with any other necessary consequential amendments to other pieces of legislation to reference the new legal category of 'registered relationship'; and

- the Equal Opportunity Act 1984 being amended, along with any necessary consequential amendments to other pieces of legislation, to reference the new legal category of 'registered relationship'.

The administration of the relationships register will be carried out by the Registrar of Births, Deaths and Marriages and, importantly, registration will be voluntary.

A relationship will be eligible for registration where both parties are: in a relationship as a couple; are adults; at least one of the parties resides in South Australia; neither party is married, in another registered relationship, or in another relationship as a couple with another person; and also where they are not related to each other than, possibly, through marriage.

The effect of clauses 8 and 9 is that on receipt of a valid application, and after a 28-day cooling-off period, the registrar must register the relationship. The cooling-off period is designed to ensure that the decision to register a relationship is a considered one. Either party may withdraw his or her application during the cooling-off period. This has similarities with the Marriage Act 1961 whereby at least one month's notice must be served before a marriage can be lawfully solemnised.

There is also a provision to revoke the registration of a relationship in cases where a relationship has broken down. The registrar can revoke the registration of a relationship on the application of one or both of the parties. If only one partner wishes to have the registration revoked, he or she will have to demonstrate that notice has been served on the other party. The registrar can dispense with that notice requirement if satisfied that it is not reasonably practicable to give notice as required. I think this particular section of the Relationships Register Bill 2016 has been a long time coming, and I will support it.

Debate adjourned on motion of Hon. T.R. Kenyon.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 1 November 2016.)

The CHAIR: It is a formal set-up, so you need to stand to ask questions and to respond. We would like you also to cite where you are looking at in the report. Member for Davenport.

Mr DULUK: I refer to Part A, Executive Summary, page 54. Has the government extended Deloitte's contract to work as the Transforming Health implementation partner for another 12 months?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, we have.

Mr DULUK: Was a review of Deloitte's performance completed before the contract was extended, as the Auditor-General expected? If so, who conducted the review and when was it completed?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It was an internal review and, yes, it was completed.

Mr DULUK: Given the Auditor-General's criticism of SA Health's failure to obtain cabinet approval prior to entering into the original contract, was cabinet approval obtained before the contract extension was finalised?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, it was.

Mr DULUK: Can you advise whether the value of the contract extension was more or less than \$11 million?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: My advice is that it was less, but I will check. If it is wrong, I will come back and correct it, but my advice at this stage is that, yes, it was less.

Mr DULUK: Can you also come back to us to let us know how much the state would have to pay Deloitte for a disengagement cost if the company had not been retained as Transforming

Health's implementation partner at the conclusion of the first three months of the contract in early 2016?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I will have to get advice on whether I can release it. It might be commercial-in-confidence, but if there is no obstacle to me releasing it I will; there may well be an obstacle to me doing so.

Mr DULUK: Can you also let us know the total spending on all consultants for the last 12 months, including Deloitte?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is in the financial statements.

Mr DULUK: I refer to page 44. How much was the Transforming Health program projected to save in 2015-16?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I have to get advice on that. We do not have that to hand. I will get some advice on that, and if that is something that we are able to provide then we will.

Mr DULUK: I am just confirming that you are not aware of how much Transforming Health was meant to save you in the year 2015-16 to hand.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We have total savings, obviously, for the department in the budget papers, but we do not have to hand a breakdown of how individual programs are going to achieve those savings. What I would say is what I have said publicly before: we obviously hope to achieve efficiencies for Transforming Health, but the first priority of Transforming Health is to get better patient outcomes. If patients get better sooner and spend less time in hospital because they are better sooner, that obviously is going to create efficiencies in the system. That is the way Transforming Health works. I will see what information we have, and if we can answer the question we will.

Mr DULUK: What are the projected financial savings flowing from the Transforming Health program across the forward estimates?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Likewise, I would have to get that information.

Mr DULUK: Can you confirm that the Southern, Central and Northern Adelaide Local Health Networks failed to achieve their savings targets in 2015-16?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: That would be correct, but I make no apology for that. Obviously, we put patient care before meeting savings targets, as every other health minister would. We achieve savings where we can, but they are very much predicated on the demand, presentations that we have. If we have significant growth in presentations that obviously significantly restricts our ability to deliver on savings. There is nothing new in that, that is something previous health ministers have had to grapple with.

We do everything we can to meet the savings we are given through the budget process, but our ability to realise those savings are very much dependent on the number of presentations we have. We make efficiencies everywhere we can, but it is not unusual, under any health minister on either side of politics, to have difficulty in realising those savings.

Mr DULUK: On those savings, when you took the Transforming Health submission back to cabinet in regard to keeping Deloitte, were any savings tabled to cabinet in the documentation?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am not going to go into what information is in the cabinet submission; no minister would.

Mr DULUK: Going back to each of the local area health networks, what were the savings targets and why were those targets not achieved, obviously in addition to just looking after patient outcome as the primary reason?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: What did you want to know, what were the savings targets?

Mr DULUK: Yes.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Per LHN? We have not got a breakdown of savings targets per LHN. There are different methods the department has. Once we get a savings task through the

budget process we then allocate those savings to different units within Health, and I think generally that is done on a pro rata basis. Sometimes there might be a particular initiative that will have savings attached to it; however, you could generally expect it would be allocated between different units within a Health department on a pro rata basis.

Mr DULUK: Are you expecting those units, on a pro rata basis and the LHNs more broadly, to make up the shortfall in savings in subsequent years going forward that were not achieved this year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Are you talking about this year or previous—

Mr DULUK: Going forward, the savings—

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: In terms of previous years, which is what the Auditor-General's Report is about, no. That is why there was supplementary funding as part of the budget process.

Mr DULUK: What steps has SA Health taken to improve the quality of the reports that local health networks produce to identify the risks arising from the Transforming Health changes?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Do you want to give me what you are referring to? Where in the Auditor-General's Report—

Mr DULUK: About quality of risk reporting, on the bottom of page 43.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The Transforming Health delivery support office will work with the respective LHN risk leads to improve the quality of Transforming Health risk management reporting. SA Health will establish the revised role of the THOMC in monitoring LHN risks with the aim to improve oversight of Transforming Health risk and escalation to the Transforming Health implementation committee where required.

Mr DULUK: At the moment, how are these risks documented and to whom do the LHNs provide these reports?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: The documents are an established risk reporting system and they are sent to the Transforming Health operational committee.

Mr DULUK: Moving to Part B, page 142, why did the health department employ 520 FTEs over and above the number it was funded to employ in 2015-16?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is important when looking at these things to remember that they are only a snapshot at a point in time because the staffing in health will fluctuate according to different seasons, different presentations and how many beds we have to open. The number of employees or FTEs that we have in the health department will fluctuate quite a bit. What I think you are looking at is at a point in time but, if you look at 30 June 2016, we are actually 210 under our FTE cap. That is in the supplementary report for the year ended 30 June 2016, page 37.

Mr DULUK: But at some point there were extra staff employed, so how much did it cost the department to employ these additional staff?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: As I say, the reason sometimes we will be over is because of seasonal factors and the number of presentations. We open and close beds according to presentations to the hospital. We do not turn people away at the door. If someone requires admission and we need to open additional beds to admit that person, then we will do so and, under the enterprise agreement with the nurses federation, we have to employ a certain number of nurses per bed. We are not in a position to strictly control how many FTEs, but over time we make sure that as far as possible we are living within our means.

We have what we call 'flex' beds. We will close those flex beds, particularly over the summer months when we do not require as many beds because we do not have as many presentations. Given that, where we are over, they would be for relatively brief periods of time and it would be fairly minuscule amounts of money relative to the overall wages budget for the health department. These would be relatively small amounts of money relative to the overall wages bill for the health department, and we do the best we can to make sure that we recover at those times when we have fewer presentations.

Mr DULUK: Sticking with these FTEs, these extra 500 FTEs over those budgeted for in the 2016-17, are they not for head office staff?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: No, they are not.

Mr DULUK: It is 2,036 for Department for Health and Ageing FTE, not health sector FTE.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: You have 2,036 for 2016 and 2,096 for 2015, so you have seen a reduction in 60 staff. In fact, for 2014 it is 2,175, so you have actually seen a reduction in staff.

Mr DULUK: Correct, but in your 2016-17 budget papers, you have 1,516 budgeted FTEs.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: There will be staff who actually work in the local health networks, such as finance staff, workforce staff—those sorts of staff—and procurement staff. For budgeting purposes, the way that they are reflected is by including them in those head office numbers. What that figure shows is the total number of staff, even though they might be posted out within the LHNs. What the budget papers are showing is, strictly speaking, the people actually physically working within the building in the city. There has been no increase of 500, I can assure the member for Davenport of that.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the Auditor-General's Report, Volume 2, page 478, Country Health repairs and maintenance. There was \$22,299,000 spent on repairs and maintenance. Minister, can you tell the committee if that was for capital upgrades to meet health and safety compliances?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It would be for a range of things including that, among other things.

Dr McFETRIDGE: The repairs and maintenance issue is obviously a significant one now with Transforming Health, so I will go to page 282 of that same volume. Under 2.23, valuation of existing Royal Adelaide Hospital land and buildings, it states that 'management have decided to value the buildings and site improvements at nil value'. Can you explain to the committee why it is nil value? Can you tell us what previous valuations were in previous Auditor-General's Reports?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: At that stage, we did not know what the outcomes of the Renewal SA process would be. It certainly will not be of value to us as a hospital site, obviously. Depending on what happens with the Renewal SA process, then that is something that might be valued back up, if the advice is that there is value to those buildings that we should have on our books. This is just a conservative approach that was taken for the purpose of valuing those buildings.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same topic, minister, I recall from having been in this place that a valuation of about \$1 billion was put on that site down there for the buildings, the equipment and certainly the land. When did that change?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do not know about the \$1 billion—I will have to check that—but given that it is used at the moment as a hospital site, that in the very near future it will cease being a hospital site and the uncertainty of what it will be following that, then the appropriate accounting approach is to give it zero value is my advice.

Dr McFETRIDGE: I refer to the same reference, minister. If we go back in budget papers and in auditors-general reports, would we see a change in the balance on the government's books with having that valuation of that hospital altered?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, it would have a net operating balance effect. So, if we revalued the capital improvements to that property based upon future use, then, yes, that would have the effect of creating an improvement to the net operating balance, is my advice.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Minister, can you come back to the committee with the changes on the state of the books because of the change in valuation of the hospital? Can you come back to the committee with the changes in the monetary amounts in the Treasury balance with respect to the change in the valuation of the hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Yes, I think that we do it every year, so it will be reflected in the budget papers. Yes, we can do that.

Dr McFETRIDGE: On that same issue, how is the equipment at the existing Royal Adelaide valued, and how will out-of-date and surplus equipment be disposed of; and, if there is any sale, do you have any idea of what will be recouped?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Is this with respect to the valuation of the new RAH site?

Dr McFETRIDGE: No, the valuation of the current equipment in the existing Royal Adelaide Hospital.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: So, of the equipment that is at the old RAH that can be used, that equipment will be moved up to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital. Other equipment will be used elsewhere in our health system. So, a lot of it will be moved and used in other hospitals, and then there will be equipment that we will not be continuing to use, and I am advised that the accounting treatment of that is to write it off to zero value should that happen.

With regard to the question about a disposal process, I think that the work on that is continuing. But I know that I have had approaches from organisations looking to use equipment, to send it overseas and so on. I am open to that where it can be safely done. We are going through that process at the moment.

Dr McFETRIDGE: Page 283 of the same volume refers to 'Class of assets' and 'Depreciation and amortisation of non-current assets'. Under 'Class of Assets' it has 'Buildings and improvements' and then 'Useful life (years)'. It refers to 'Buildings and improvements 1-80' years. Minister, what is the useful life expectancy of the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Under the contract with SAHP we have 30 years, and then the contractual requirement of SAHP is then to give it to us in an 'as-new' condition. You would expect that you would have at least another 30 years out of that, so I would have thought that it would be close to the 80-year mark that is intimated in the report there.

Mr DULUK: Looking at page 301, Volume 2, can you confirm, minister, that, over the last four years, the government has reduced the total amount of funding it provides to not-for-profit organisations by more than 60 per cent?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: My advice is it is just a change in the way that we are paying NGOs for services. Whereas, previously, it would have been done as a grant to an organisation, now the way we do it is purchase of services. A good example, I am advised, is RDNS. Previously, we would have, in an accounting way, treated it as a grant. We now treat it as a purchase of service. No: there has not been a reduction, certainly not a reduction of that quantum, but just a change in the accounting treatment of those payments.

Mr DULUK: Can you provide a comprehensive breakdown of the funding provided to not-for-profit organisations last year and the purpose for which this funding was provided?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I am very happy to do that.

Mr DULUK: Within that, can you also provide a breakdown for each of the generic items in the list on page 101, including the name of each organisation and the amount they received? For example, \$490,000 was provided for mental health support. Obviously, that is to a number of organisations.

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: We can do that.

Mr DULUK: Looking at pages 301, 360 and 363, did the \$440,000 provided to the Health Consumer Alliance of South Australia in 2015-16 include any funding to meet the costs of the work it is undertaking in relation to Transforming Health; and, if so, how much?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I do not think so. I think what happens with the Health Consumer Alliance is they have a regular grant that has been there for some time to basically support them as an organisation. I will check, but I do not think we have any sort of fee-for-service type arrangements with them. I think they operate within the grant that is provided to them by the Department for Health and has been for some time.

Mr DULUK: Is the chief executive of the alliance considered to be a government employee and, if not, why is he not remunerated for the work he undertakes as chair of various SA health committees and groups?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I would have to find out. He is not a government employee. I will double-check, but I know with local government, where we have chief executives of local government and councils serve on government boards, often we do not pay the remuneration to the chief executive but we pay the remuneration to the council for the time of their employee. It is not unusual for us not to remunerate someone for their work on boards, and so on: we may well be remunerating the organisation. I am happy to check and find out. But he is not a government employee.

Mr DULUK: How much funding did the department provide to the Australian Nursing and Midwifery Federation and the Public Service Association in 2015-16 to support their involvement with Transforming Health?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: I think it was in the vicinity of \$100,000, but I will check that.

Mr DULUK: Where is this money accounted for in the Auditor-General's Report?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: It is probably under 'other' on page 301. It is pretty small, relatively, in the scheme of things, \$100,000.

Mr DULUK: Going back to Part A, Executive Summary, page 68, looking at contractors, how does the department's heavy reliance on contractors and temporary staff impact on its overall costs and savings targets?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: Those contractors include nursing agency staff. While obviously we do rely on agency staff to give us flexibility with regard to workforce, we think there are opportunities to achieve savings. If my memory serves me correctly, some of our LHNs have been very successful in reducing their reliance on agency staff. While they are important, there is plenty of scope to improve our reliance on nursing agency staff as we rely more on staff who are employees of the department.

Mr DULUK: So, you do have a plan to reduce how much you spend on contractors and temporary staff?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: All agencies are looking for those opportunities, and certainly it is one of the first things we look to. Where there is an opportunity to reduce expenditure on contractors and agency staff, then we do so.

The CHAIR: Unfortunately—

Mr DULUK: One more?

The CHAIR: One more, only because we were not quite ready on time.

Mr DULUK: Thank you, Chair, you are very kind. In 2015-16, head office spent more than \$30 million on contractors and temporary staff. How much do you expect to spend on these items this year?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING: That includes IT projects as well, but we would expect it to be considerably less.

The CHAIR: The time having expired, we thank the minister and his advisers and call the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure and the Minister for Housing and Urban Development for 30 minutes of examination of the Auditor-General's Report.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will be asking the minister questions in respect of the urban renewal authority, and I commence on page 11 of the Executive Summary, Part A. The Auditor-General suggests that there has been a tax equivalent loss for the 2015-16 year of \$153 million. Has the minister received the annual report from the urban renewal authority for this financial year?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Page 11 of the Executive Summary?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Part A?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes, at about point 2 on that page: 'The URA made a loss before income tax equivalent in 2015-16 of \$153 million,' under Accumulated Losses.

The CHAIR: That is 2.3.2.

Ms CHAPMAN: Correct. My question is: has the minister received the annual report yet for the urban renewal authority for that financial year and, if so, does it record the same amount of loss?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that the annual report has been submitted to my office. Whether it records the same amount or not, I cannot recall and do not have those details here.

Ms CHAPMAN: When do you plan to table it in the parliament?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sorry—I am advised it does record that same amount of money.

Ms CHAPMAN: The Auditor-General has identified that he will be preparing a further report in respect of the Festival Plaza development, expected before the end of the year. I have written to the minister and requested that he make himself available for 15 minutes upon receipt of that report for questioning on the Auditor-General's Report on that. Does he agree to do so?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will be available much more than that. I will be available each sitting day after the receipt of that report at the time designated by the house for question time.

Ms CHAPMAN: I take it then that the minister declines to make himself available specifically for the purposes of dealing with the Auditor-General's Report on that issue, other than at question time, which is for all government business.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will make myself available for any matter the opposition wishes to raise with me for the duration of question time at the time set aside by the house, unless, of course, for some other reason, I am paired from the house.

Ms CHAPMAN: I will take that as a no. Point 7 on that page commences with the words 'Over the past two years the URA,' etc., and refers to the review being undertaken 'obtaining independent expert advice on the value and marketability of the URA's entire land portfolio to help formulate an achievable land sales strategy'. My question is: who did provide that independent expert advice?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that the firm is MacroPlan Dimasi.

Ms CHAPMAN: Have they provided a report?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, I am advised that they did.

Ms CHAPMAN: Will the minister make that available and public?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I think our initial reaction is yes, unless, of course, there is something in it that might provide some sort of obstruction to any sort of sale process that we might be entering into because, of course, part of URA's activities is to hold properties and sell them from time to time. Barring that, our default position would be yes.

Ms CHAPMAN: When was the report received?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: We are not sure exactly when it was received, but we think it was certainly last year, perhaps in the earlier part of the second half of last year, but I will come back with a particular date.

Ms CHAPMAN: On page 12, there is reference to the Gillman site transaction. Events have subsequently indicated that that arrangement will not be proceeding. My question is: when was the Auditor-General first informed of the Gillman settlement option deed not being progressed?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do not have that date, but I will endeavour to find it out and bring it to the attention of the house.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of that proposal, can I ask when the minister first became aware of the proposal submitted to the Premier by ACP, apparently received on Tuesday of last week, to propose an interim payment arrangement change from \$45 million to \$15 million payments?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: To correct one thing in your question, my advice is that a proposal from ACP to change the arrangements for the settlement on the land was received last Monday, 24 October, and I am advised that there was a meeting between the State Coordinator-General on the immediately preceding Friday, 21 October, where ACP flagged with the State Coordinator-General that they would be seeking to put to the government an alternative settlement arrangement and then, as I have just said, that was received the next working day, on the Monday.

Ms CHAPMAN: My question was—

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, sorry. The State Coordinator-General then advised my office, the Premier's office and Mr Hanlon of that, and I was informed the evening of the Friday that they were seeking revised settlement arrangements.

Ms CHAPMAN: So, the meeting with the State Coordinator-General and ACP was without your knowledge?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Until I was subsequently advised of what occurred at that meeting after the fact.

Ms CHAPMAN: Was the meeting known to the Chief Executive of URA, Mr John Hanlon?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Before it occurred? I will find out.

Ms CHAPMAN: In respect of the Part B: Agency audit reports, the URA is specifically dealt with commencing on page 542. I am sure that the minister is aware of the significant number of concerns that have been raised by the Auditor-General, and his recording of what claims the URA management has responded to in respect of a number of issues. Apart from his summaries on page 544 of the number of frameworks which have not been prepared, drafted, delivered, etc., he goes on in respect to the finalisation and approval of a framework on page 545 and states:

It is of particular concern that the URA has operated without an approved ownership framework for more than four years.

In respect of the response from the URA on this question of the ownership framework, which has also been the subject of recommendation by the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption, he goes on to say at the bottom of that page:

The URA responded that...recommendations were submitted to the Minister to address the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption's recommendations.

My question is: when did you receive those?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I do not have the exact date, but there are two separate issues to which I think you are referring; one is the establishment of the government over the ownership framework, which is usually established between the government, via the Department of Treasury and Finance, and the agency in question, particularly public non-financial corporations. I understand that this has been a matter that has been unresolved for some time. I think you have used the term of 'four years', which certainly would not seem to be inaccurate, given how long this matter has been unresolved.

My understanding is that matter is to be resolved once a matter arising from the activities of this year, that is, the transfer of TAFE assets to the urban renewal authority, is finalised. That will put both the urban renewal authority and DTF in a position to get on with finalising that framework. You went on in your question to talk about some recommendations from the commissioner's report about governance arrangements separate from the government ownership framework. Those governance arrangements have been discussed with me. Indeed, the chief executive has developed and raised with me a manner in which those concerns about governance can address the commissioner's concerns.

I have discussed that particular way of dealing with those issues that the commissioner raised with the commissioner himself, which occurred only a relatively short period of time ago. Once cabinet resolves its position on the matter, I will be in a position—depending on cabinet's decision of course—to put into practice the way in which the government chooses to resolve those issues the commissioner highlighted.

Ms CHAPMAN: I was going to come to page 546 in relation to the board of management policies and the recommendations in that regard. If I go back to the ownership framework, and I was referring to the Auditor-General's comment of being four years in arrears, my question is: has that ownership framework, which you say was held up because of the TAFE transfer issue, been resolved and has it been put cabinet?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sorry, I did not mean to imply, if you took my previous response, that the reason that it has not been resolved for four years is because of the TAFE transaction because, of course, it only happened in the recent period. Has it been resolved? No, it has not. Has cabinet considered it yet? That would be a matter for the cabinet to consider, whether it has appeared on its agenda, and it certainly would not be for me to reveal that to you or anyone else.

Ms CHAPMAN: It is just that it says, minister, at the bottom of this page that the ownership framework will probably be submitted to cabinet in November 2016. I am asking you whether it has happened, not what the deliberation or determination was.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, and as you know, we do not disclose what goes to cabinet let alone how that might be considered if and when it goes to cabinet.

Ms CHAPMAN: In relation to 'Negotiation and acceptance of offers' on page 547, the Attorney-General highlights some of the deficiencies in respect of the person who can authorise a sale below market valuation. He states:

However, the policy does not indicate who can negotiate and accept counter-offers from buyers that are below the authorised price...

Who has that responsibility, or have all offers below the market price only been approved by the chief executive?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My advice is that for dealing with general property transactions, not the specific ones that you refer to, there exists a delegation framework depending on the value of the transaction. I think the URA recognises the criticism of the Auditor-General about the lack of policy, or perhaps an unclear policy, about the management of offers below market value and is reviewing that policy, which will set out who is able to authorise a below market-value offer. Was your question: who currently does that now?

Ms CHAPMAN: Yes. I am really asking who does it now, or who has approved it now? If it has not, if it is only the chief executive who has done that, I just want a reassurance that that is what has happened.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I have to take that on notice and come back to you.

Ms CHAPMAN: While you are taking it on notice, could you identify who has done it, if there is anyone else other than the chief executive, and on what proposals?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sure.

Mr PISONI: I refer to Volume 3, page 636. What is the status of the Passenger Transport Research and Development Fund at the moment?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I might have to take that on notice.

Mr PISONI: Could you also advise where the income has come from? There is \$11,000 sitting in there now. There have been no outflows or inflows for 2015-16. Are you able to advise the last time there were outflows and what they were for?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sure.

Mr PISONI: Will the new taxi and chauffeur vehicle industry reform package that was in the budget supersede the role that the Passenger Transport Research and Development Fund is now playing? I notice, in that, that the Auditor-General has said that the purpose of the fund is for carrying out research into the taxicab industry, for the purpose of promoting the taxicab industry, and any other purpose considered by the minister to be beneficial to the travelling public, in the interests of the passenger transport industry, and the appropriate application of money standing to the credit of the fund.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: With the funding arrangements for the industry assistance package, which has been developed as part of the reforms to the taxi and chauffeur vehicle industry, it is not my understanding that those moneys are designed to flow through that fund—albeit, as you point out, that that fund seems to have a related purpose. As to which account administered by the department that those appropriations from Treasury and expenditures to those different parts of the industry flow, I will come back and provide you an answer.

Mr PISONI: Are you able to rule out whether any of the funding that is raised from the \$1 levy will be used to deliver any of the services that the Passenger Transport Research and Development Fund has delivered previously?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: That is a bit of a difficult question for me to answer, because I am not sure what service it has delivered previously. Perhaps to refresh our memories about what the revenue from the \$1 levy collection is to be used for, it is to be used for revenue to the government to offset the very substantial decreases in fees being applied across the industry and a low-cost environment for new participants in the industry. It is also designed to fund the costs of some improvements to disability taxi services, to the Access Taxi regime, principally by introducing a new lifting fee, which is payable to the taxi driver and also, of course, to pay some compensation to those people who have invested in the taxi industry either as plate-owners or operators.

It is estimated by the industry and by government that there is roughly, within taxis themselves, about eight million trips a year. We would expect a number of additional trips from the chauffeur vehicle industry—obviously nothing in the order of eight million, like in the taxi industry—and we will wait to see what happens in the new entrants area.

Given that the total value of the expenditure that will be required of government in order to pay those different elements over the coming four years, over the budget forward estimates period, we think is approximately—and off the top of my head—about \$64 million, it will take many years before we get to the point where the government has generated sufficient revenue from the \$1 levy to offset its increasing expenditure for the industry. That may change if there is an increase in the number of trips, and hence revenue from that levy.

Mr PISONI: That \$64 million that you mentioned, does that include any subset to the government or any replacement income for the five-year freeze on taxi plate sales?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, it does.

Mr PISONI: I now take you to page 304 of Part B. In 'Other matters raised' the Auditor-General refers to not all contracts being published on the SA government's tenders and contracts website, as required by DPC Circular PC027, Disclosure of Government Contracts. Are you able to give assurances that that will be corrected, that all government contracts will, in fact, be published on the SA government's tenders and contracts website? If so, when can we expect to see that?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My advice is that DPTI is responsible for a large number of contracts across government, as you could imagine, but not all. For the ones that we are responsible for, I am advised that, as the Auditor-General has pointed out, there was an administrative oversight where a small number of the total number that DPTI is responsible for were not put up. However, steps have now been taken to ensure that all of them, from our perspective, are being put up.

I am also advised that the DPC circular that you refer to refers to all government agencies and it is beyond the control of our department to ensure their adherence to the requirements of that DPC circular.

Mr PISONI: I notice on that government contracts page that not all entries have the contract attached. Is it a requirement that the contract must also be available to view through that DPC circular?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Without having the circular in front of us, the advice I have received is that we understand it to be a requirement of the DPC circular to make the contracts available online. Sometimes, given the size and the nature of the contracts with DPTI managers, it is not feasible to make those contracts available online. However, we do make them available upon request.

Mr PISONI: Is that a request through FOI or is that a request simply through the department?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Just through the department.

Mr PISONI: Perhaps you can give me the number, minister.

The CHAIR: Was that a question?

Mr PISONI: On notice.

The CHAIR: Are you still on the same page?

Mr PISONI: No, now we are onto page 303. The Auditor-General here has referred to instances where lease arrangements and memorandums of understanding were not executed. He goes on to say:

The risk of not appropriately documenting and signing agreed terms and conditions is that lease disputes with tenants may be difficult to resolve, potentially resulting in financial loss.

Are you aware of any lease disputes with tenants at the moment and what the potential total value of those lease disputes might be?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Yes, I am. Certainly the member for Morphett has a constituent who is a voluble complainant about his leasing arrangement with DPTI. I am sure, given the Auditor-General has made note of this as an issue, that that may not be the only instance. If you are after the details of those other instances, I am happy to bring that back to you.

Mr PISONI: I do not want to know who it is, I am just interested to know how many and what the total value is. On that same page, debtor follow-up was not operating for the full financial year and there were a number of debtor accounts with unexplained credit balances, and some of them for several years. Are you able to advise what the total value of those unexplained credit balances were and how many debtors have those unexplained credit balances?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Given the nature of the question, there is likely to be a fair bit of detail, so I will have to come back to you on that.

Mr PISONI: Are you aware of how many purchase cards are held by DPTI employees?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I am advised that there are approximately 800.

Mr PISONI: That is more than one-third of all employees, so one in three staff have debit cards. The Auditor-General has identified irregularities with the administration of purchase cards, and my understanding is this has been going on for quite some time. Are you able to advise whether there is a value on those irregularities in those purchases for the 2015-16 year that the Auditor-General is referring to?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: I will do my best to see if I can find that out. As the member may be aware, there has been a significant transition away from invoice-based purchasing and payment processes to the use of credit and debit cards to reduce the administrative burden and costs to government, but I will try to find a response to his question.

Mr PISONI: I will move on to another issue, which is on page 300. 'Improvements in the administration of authorised officers remain unresolved.' Firstly, how many authorised officers are there in the department and what are they authorised to do?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: Sorry, just to correct an answer I gave you previously, I said approximately 800. The Auditor-General cites 700 purchase cards, but I will come back to you with—

Mr PISONI: I was looking at the same thing. I was saying the Auditor-General got it wrong. I did not think you would have got it wrong.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: The member for Unley is too kind to me. Officers can be authorised for a variety of different purposes. For example, we have authorised officers in public transport services who are able to undertake specific things. Before we run out of time, did you want to be a bit more specific? Are you talking about authorised officers for financial delegations or purchasing decisions?

Mr PISONI: The Auditor-General is referring to authorised officers period, and he also makes a point about them not being appointed in accordance with delegations and that documented policies and procedures for appointing and approving authorised officers were inadequate. I was hoping to get an idea of who they are so we can have some understanding of the size of the problem, if there is one.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN: My understanding is that there are different types of authorised officers who, as their name suggests, are able to undertake specific activities on behalf of the department. Perhaps I can provide to the member for Unley who they are and what they do, how many of them there are and then how many of the problems the member for Unley alludes to there are in each of those different categories.

Mr PISONI: Thank you.

The CHAIR: The time having expired for this particular examination of the Auditor-General's Report, I thank members and the minister and his advisers for their attendance and diligence, and call on the Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion and lots of other things to take her place with her advisers. Did you want to just give us an indication, member for Adelaide, what page you are looking at?

Ms SANDERSON: Page 393.

The CHAIR: In which book?

Ms SANDERSON: Part B: Agency audit reports.

The CHAIR: This is housing. Would someone like to step forward?

Ms SANDERSON: All my questions relate to housing, if anyone wants to have a coffee. I refer to page 393 regarding the Proof of Income, the new POI. Firstly, can the minister confirm that the POI is the replacement of the HOS, which was the replacement of the HOD (Housing Occupation Declaration) and whether this includes the incomes of all occupants of a house?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: With respect, member for Adelaide, I think that you are getting the two things confused here. Obviously, the Proof of Income is something that we ask for in April and October of each year. I think that the Auditor raises some concerns about the timeliness of the reversion of the letters to the tenants who failed to provide their POI information in October 2015.

Obviously, we have tenants who are paying a reduced rent, and they are asked to provide details of their income either through the Centrelink Confirmation Service or by providing hard copy proof. We know that there are a high number of households that are on Centrelink income, and their eligibility for reduced rent is reviewed within a short period. If they are required to provide hard copy proof, they are sent a form and asked to complete and return it within 14 days.

Ms SANDERSON: Given the minister's answer, why did it take 4½ months for the reversion notices to be sent out for the November round, which means that it was only a 1½ months before the next notice would be sent out? How many households completed the POIs for both November 2015 and March 2016?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I thank the member for Adelaide for her interest in this area. One of the key things we are looking ahead at, obviously, is our Business System Transformation project, and I think that what we will find is the ability for people to change their details more effectively.

Just like you and I can look up our Telstra bill online to see our usage and change our plans online, that is what this Business System Transformation project will look up. We will always be concerned about proof of income, and obviously people need to talk to us about their housing occupation, the HOS. We feel that in the future this will be much more efficient and effective, and I see that happening in the near future.

Ms SANDERSON: Can the minister confirm how many households completed the POI for both November 2015 and March 2016 and why it took the 4½ months for the reversion notices to go out?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Member for Adelaide, my apologies, we do not seem to have that number. We will take that on notice. You talked a little about household occupancy, and I think that you and I have talked many times about our occupancy rates and looking at our 1000 Houses in 1000 Days, and our intention to renew 4,500 public houses, because we know that under-utilisation is an issue.

We have had some interesting politics around this in other states about a bedroom tax, etc. We are not interested in that, but we do want to work with our tenants, many of whom live on their own. About 60 per cent of people live on their own. We also encourage people to downsize to make sure that the number of bedrooms in their home matches their lifestyle.

You talked about our Housing Occupancy Survey. We have just done that, on 4 October 2016, and we sent letters to all tenants. It includes current household occupancy details and it is recorded on our mainframe system. Tenants who need to update their details have been asked to contact Housing SA, and tenants receiving a Housing Occupancy Survey are reminded that it is a condition of their tenancy to advise Housing SA whenever their household circumstances change, including occupancy and income details. Tenants are only required to respond if their household details are different from those in the letter. When a tenant contacts Housing SA following the receipt of the Housing Occupancy Survey, then a Proof of Income form is posted to the tenant and is processed upon return.

At this point, we do not follow up tenants who do not make contact. I think this has been raised in the past. Obviously, we look at the risk management within Housing SA, the time it would take and the number of staff if we were to follow up with every one of the tenants, but we have sent that letter to 31,000 tenants this year.

Ms SANDERSON: To confirm that, the Housing Occupancy Survey is sent to all tenants; however, only those with reduced rates of rent are expected to send it back. That was sent out in October, and in November and March each year you also do a mail out for the POI. Would you not save a lot of money, given that it is \$1 per stamp, if you just included them both in the one envelope?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I actually think the thing that would save money the most is an email. I would look through the Business System Transformation to see whether we can be far more proactive with people and send them messages. One of the things we have done in regard to debt is send people text messages and remind them that they have outstanding debt. It is that instant communication that is really important.

What I really would like people who are our Housing SA tenants in public housing to do is proactively disclose. With the new system, I would expect that they will be able to log on themselves and update those details. So, those costs should be able to come down, and then we will have details that every week we can update and have that clear documentation. I think you and I are on the same page. What we would look to do is be more efficient and as effective as possible.

Ms SANDERSON: Given the issues in the paper last year regarding people owning their own properties who were also tenants of Housing Trust properties, does the POI (proof of income) or the HOS include any assets or cash at bank held (for example, houses or bank accounts), bearing in mind that people could receive an inheritance throughout the term of their rental agreement, other than just at the beginning, when I know you do check?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Member for Adelaide, what is the reference?

Ms SANDERSON: This is regarding the POI on page 393. My question is: does either the Proof of Income or the HOS allow for people to notify you whether they actually own property or have received an inheritance?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think this was very clear when we talked about this last time. We crack down on people who do own property, and it is not acceptable. That is part of our conditions. We made some further clarifications in April last year, if I recall accurately, for people who have done that. We have a particular dedicated team in our compliance group that focused on people who own private property. Some of those people are in some very vulnerable situations and the risk is very high, and we are working with them and supporting them to encourage legal advice on how they can extract themselves.

I think we are talking about two separate issues because we have already addressed that private ownership aspect of it. Of course, we must be diligent, and we expect people to let us know, but we have that as a key part of our compliance. It was a separate group; now it is a core part of what we do in the compliance area.

Ms SANDERSON: Following on from that, my belief was that, at 25 August 2015, 377 investigations regarding 799 properties had been made, but this was an audit and an audit is a small portion. I do not believe that all of your 30,000-plus tenants were actually investigated to see whether they own property. I believe that you have a new policy that when new people enter the list you check it, but I am wondering whether you have checked everyone on the existing list. What if things change throughout the year? A parent or a grandparent could die and leave them a house. How do you find that out?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: One of the things we do is write to people every year about their staying on the waiting list and we ask a series of questions. In the rare circumstances that people have an inheritance that enables them to buy a house, we welcome that and we encourage them not to be on the list anymore. I think we are being very clear now, when people apply, about their need to tell us information about their income, about the make-up of their family and about some of the other issues that might be there. We have had a particular focus on this. You mentioned more than 300 who did have that issue, and my executive director is probably going to tell me exactly how many people that is now.

As I recall, we did a significant data-matching exercise with SAILIS, the South Australian Integrated Land Information System. We did a particular project on that, and that is where that figure came from. We have gone through each of those 300-plus groups and now we are going to talk to them. I think a few people left because of that—I think more than a dozen tenancies, if I recall accurately, are no longer with us—but of course other people have relinquished that ownership. Usually it was a part ownership, to be honest. In many circumstances it was a DV situation or land that perhaps might not have been valued, but we still asked people to relinquish their ownership.

Ms SANDERSON: Just to be clear for the record, it is more than 377. So you have actually investigated the whole 30,000-plus tenants and you have done a crosscheck with their names against the Lands Titles Office?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: That is my understanding. It was a significant data-matching exercise we went through. I am happy to report back to the house those people who are now still being reviewed by our compliance area, which is significantly less than that 300 because we went through with them and had individual case management, I guess, individual understanding of their situation. I am happy to report back to the house.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to private rental assistance payments on page 394 and 395. What is the number and the value of bonds that were lost in the 2015-16 year due to Housing SA not validating claims within the required time frames?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: When we talk about private rental assistance, it is really important to understand its role in supporting people in South Australia for social housing. When most people think about Housing SA they think about the house, but in fact it is actually equal levels of support, as in equal numbers of people who we support through an actual home based on 25 per cent of their income, and of course those who we support with private rental assistance and a bond.

Sometimes it is a bond, and sometimes it is rent in advance or support with hotel or motel accommodation if necessary. In 2015-16, we had 49,387 assistances, of which 22,819 were bonds. I think the focus of your question was actually about challenging those bonds and seeing where they are. That was part of our debt blitz that we looked at. We looked at many areas, not only for Housing SA tenants but for those people in the private rental space, and we challenged those bonds. Now we have put on two extra compliance officers.

Also, once the business transformation system goes up, and our PR Connect system, for which we are doing a soft launch this month, people will be able to apply online, and we think that the transaction will be much quicker. We have done quite a bit of work with Consumer and Business Services. I understand that the Auditor-General talked about where Housing SA staff had not validated all bond claims received from Consumer and Business Services within 18 days. In that case, it is automatically forfeited to the landlord. When we have a look at that, we will look at some of the challenges that we have in here.

Recently, I did a 90-day project on private rental assistance and found there is a really big gap in regard to education, both tenants and landlords knowing their rights and their responsibilities. Part of our concern is to make sure people understand the bond claim process. Often, when private rental tenants do not agree with the amount claimed by their landlord, we can undertake an investigation on their behalf. Where the bond claims are found to be legitimate, Housing SA will pay the landlord agent and then raise a debt against the customer, which may be repaid in full. However, where there is insufficient evidence for a claim, Housing SA will dispute the bond claim through SACAT.

As I mentioned, we had two additional bond claims officers commence in May to increase our ability to investigate and dispute bond claims against SA Housing Trust bond guarantees. We are also working with Consumer and Business Services and SACAT to improve our processing and validation of bond claims. As I mentioned, we are launching PR Connect, and that will make it a lot easier when we are assessing people's eligibility and our ability to be in that time line.

Ms SANDERSON: I welcome that there are two new staff. You have given me the number of people and the number of bonds, but what was the value of the bonds that were lost due to them not being done in time?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will have to take that on notice.

Ms SANDERSON: You mentioned the PR Connect system. In response to the Auditor-General, it said that that would be implemented in October, so it sounds like you are ready to implement that this month?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Yes. What we do usually is a bit of a soft launch and then we will go a full launch, and you will receive a media release from me about that. I always think it is good to make sure we have our ducks in a row and it is working effectively, and we will do that. I am happy to provide you with some more information about PR Connect. We might have some information here to provide to you. I will endeavour to brief you on that.

Ms SANDERSON: When do you envisage the full launch? How long are you testing it for with the soft launch?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think it will be ready to go by the end of this month.

Ms SANDERSON: Has the minister or her department now established a process for assessing a customer's capacity to contribute all or part of the bond and, if not, do you plan to in the future?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think your question is about the customer liquid assets limit when assessing their eligibility for assistance, and this will be part of that PR Connect. We want to be very open and very clear with people and, particularly if you have an online application, we can provide some examples of what should be included and not included. I think that will go a long way to doing that. PR Connect will ask the customer to declare if they have any interest in a residential property, which was an area of concern for you before. Of course, they will be ineligible for assistance without a social assessment conducted.

Ms SANDERSON: You answered before about the number of bonds, which I believe was 22,819 for the 2015-16 year. How many of these were for first-timers, so those who have never had a bond from the government before?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I will have to take that on notice. It is really important that we have our bonds. I know there has been considerable interest in people who have had more than one bond and, when we unpacked it, we looked particularly at the top 20, and most of them have had significant domestic violence/family violence situations.

This is one of the key things when we consider why people need our support, and it is often that they are in very complex and vulnerable situations. When we see repeat bond users, we might see someone who perhaps might be in a boarding house for a short time, and that does not work for them. They might then go on to a different level. We try to provide that wraparound support for them but, particularly if you have some complexities in your life, that is quite difficult.

Definitely, one of my challenges has been about debt, not just for the tenants but non-tenants, predominantly being people with bonds. We have done a lot of work in that. We have increased the amount that people can come back—I think it is now up to \$15 per fortnight. We are also making sure that people are aware, if they are leaving one of our properties or private properties, of what will incur them expenses: things that they have not fixed, if they leave rubbish behind—these are the things that will impact on that bond.

The bond is a guarantee, and if someone has to use that bond to go back to a landlord that is then a debt against their name. As far as who are first-time users, I will have to come back to you with that figure.

Ms SANDERSON: What does the minister plan to do to stop multiple abusers of bonds? I know you now have the \$15 a fortnight rather than \$10, but your own staff have contacted me about people who continually do this and just rack up the next debt, the next debt and the next debt, and they are still given multiple bonds with no capacity to ever pay it off.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I go back to my other conversation about people who are coming to us with multiple bonds. I think what they are asking for is help, and they are saying to us, 'We are not able to sustain a tenancy.' That is why we utilise the risk identification tool when people come in. Initially, we rolled out Connecting People to Place primarily about Housing SA tenants, but we are now using that to assess people who are also coming in. What other supports do they need? Can we put them in touch with other services as well?

My concern is shared with you in the fact that we have had people who use bonds many times. I reiterate my issue and my concern about people who live very complex lives and are in very vulnerable situations. What we need to do is help them, and I think they are showing us with multiple bonds that they are not sustaining their tenancies, so we need to support them in other ways. A risk identification tool will really assist with that; it will understand some of the complexities and perhaps the supports that they need around them to maintain tenancies, whether it be in Housing SA or in the private rental market in the future.

Ms SANDERSON: It states in the Auditor-General's Report that \$16 million was spent on private rental assistance—so that is not bonds, I assume. How many weeks' rent can somebody receive in advance?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Two weeks.

Ms SANDERSON: I am now moving on to a new topic, page 400, the Business System Transformation program. In May 2014, TIBCO, which supports 34 of the Trust's 38 mainframe-based business systems, confirmed it would provide software support until the end of December 2015 with limited extended support until December 2017. This increases the risk, as stated by the Auditor-General, of system failure and business interruption, which would carry significant legal, reputational and financial implications. My question is: what was the cost to extend the service agreement for two years until December 2017, and has the government negotiated a further extension? If yes, what is the cost?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Member for Adelaide, you should refer that question to the Minister for Housing and Urban Development.

Ms SANDERSON: Does that mean all of this page 400 is a different minister?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I think that is how we should take that.

Ms SANDERSON: So last year it was you, but this year it is not?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: No, that is not correct. In fact, I think I said very clearly to you that I was not able to respond to that question, and he will have carriage of that.

Ms SANDERSON: In that case, we will have to go back to pages 394 and 395. Given that Housing SA does not check that a customer's weekly rent is less than the average weekly rent for accommodation in the area before they provide rental assistance, how would you know whether you are getting value for money for the taxpayer and whether the rents are being inflated and kickbacks being made to the tenants?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: As we have expressed before, that is validated and confirmed through the POI and also the Income Confirmation Service from Centrelink. The vast majority of our tenants who are in Housing SA properties receive Centrelink support, so we can check that money. While I understand that we must always be diligent—and I certainly support that—I think that Housing SA is a privilege and not a right. People should respect the conditions that give them a tenancy that is based on their income, and it is 25 per cent, so that is what we do. I will say to you again that we have a proof of income review in April and October every year.

Ms SANDERSON: Sorry, I might have explained that poorly. I believe that Housing SA still administers the PRAP payments. I am not sure whether it is the commonwealth or state that would be checking it, but obviously when someone has a private rental and they approach Housing SA for the bond, and possibly the two weeks' rent in advance, it would be from the commonwealth that they get the CRA money, which is a separate thing. Before working out whether you would give them the bond and rent in advance, is there any checking mechanism? It was mentioned by the Auditor-General that there is not.

For example, I have helped people with private rentals in my electorate. From my own research, I would say that you calculate that in North Adelaide \$110 per bedroom would be the rough estimate of a house, and in Prospect you would work out the rent for a house based on \$100 per room. If somebody is renting a house in North Adelaide with the equivalent of \$150 per room, is there a checking mechanism to ensure that the taxpayers are not subsidising a house in North Adelaide with a swimming pool or tennis court and that it is actually appropriate accommodation?

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: When you are looking at appropriate accommodation, obviously when someone comes in to ask for private rental assistance we would look at their income, we would look at their situation. One of the things I see—and I see it in my electorate in Salisbury all the time—is when our private rental liaison officers say to someone, 'You can't afford this property.' When they support them through that private rental scheme and through Housing SA, of course they would potentially be eligible for the bond and the two weeks' rent in advance you are talking about. One of the key conversations with people is about what is affordable.

We know that if people are paying more than 30 per cent of their income each week it means that they are in housing stress. Whether you are paying back a mortgage or renting, the advice you should receive is about what is sustainable going forward. In terms of where people rent, I do not think there is a restriction on whether they rent something in Adelaide or North Adelaide. My concern is their ability to sustain the tenancy and whether they can continue to live there. We are about to launch PR Connect, which will have an online ability, and it will check a few other things—liquid assets, for example. The key thing for me is sustainability.

On Friday, I am heading off to the national meeting for housing and homelessness ministers. We have some pretty big things to talk about on the table. We know that COAG is talking about affordable housing. This is a national issue. We need to continue to ask ourselves what is sustainable for people going forward. If you lock yourself into a private rental that you cannot sustain, I do not think that we are going to help you by giving you a bond and two weeks' rent in advance. When we look at this assessment, we look at the person, and when we are connecting people to a place we

have a risk identification tool. We can unpack that with people, and we can ask more questions about that.

I am not sure if I agree with your claim about how much a room is worth in whatever suburb. This is about that person, that individual and their family, the family they are responsible for, what they can afford and what is their income. Will they then be eligible for the bond and potentially some rent in advance? We will have to do that analysis.

The CHAIR: Time having expired for examination of this portion the Auditor-General's Report, I would like to thank the minister and her advisers for their attendance today, as well as the member for Adelaide for her questions.

Progress reported; committee to sit again.

Bills

RETIREMENT VILLAGES BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Amendment No 2 [Wade-1]—Clause 18, page 14, lines 8 and 9 [clause 18(2)]—Delete subclause (2)

No. 2. Amendment No 3 [Wade-1]—New clause, page 14, after line 12—

After clause 18 insert:

18A—Self incrimination

A person may refuse to comply with a requirement of an authorised officer under this Division to provide information if the information might tend to incriminate the person of an offence.

No. 3. Amendment No 1 [Darley-2]—Clause 19, page 14, after line 33 [clause 19(2)]—

After paragraph (c) insert:

- (ca) detailed information about who will be responsible for repairing or replacing the fixtures, fittings and furnishings provided in the residence and how the cost of repairing or replacing such fixtures, fittings and furnishings is to be funded;

No. 4. Amendment No 6 [Wade-1]—Clause 21, page 16, lines 7 to 11 [clause 21(c)]—

Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

- (c) if the contract relates to a retirement village already established—
- (i) the financial statements presented at the last annual meeting of residents of the village, including a written statement of any subsequent change in the affairs of the village and the operator that may significantly affect the resident's decision to enter the village; and
- (ii) a copy of the minutes of the last 2 annual meetings of residents of the village (if 2 or more such meetings have been held) or of the last annual meeting (if only 1 such meeting has been held);

No. 5. Amendment No 2 [Darley-2]—Clause 22, page 16, line 23 [clause 22(2)(a)]—Delete '(an item)'

No. 6. Amendment No 3 [Darley-2]—Clause 22, page 16, lines 25 to 26 [clause 22(2)(b) and (c)]—

Delete paragraphs (b) and (c)

No. 7. Amendment No 8 [Wade-1]—Clause 26, page 18, lines 6 to 10 [clause 26(2)(b)]—

Delete paragraph (b) and substitute:

- (b) either—
- (i) a period of 18 months has elapsed since the resident ceased to reside in the retirement village; or

- (ii) a period of not less than 18 months has elapsed since the resident gave the operator a notice in accordance with subsection (3) (being a notice that has not since been withdrawn in accordance with subsection (4)(b)) and a period of not less than 3 months has elapsed since the resident delivered up vacant possession of the residence; or

No. 8. Amendment No 10 [Wade-1]—Clause 26, page 18, after line 21 [clause 26(3)]—

After paragraph (b) insert:

; and

- (c) any previous such notice given by the resident to the operator was withdrawn at least 6 months before this notice was given to the operator.

No. 9. Amendment No 1 [SusEnvCons-1]—Clause 26, page 18, line 38 [clause 26(5)(d)]—

After 'the retirement village' insert 'within the prescribed period'

No. 10. Amendment No 1 [SusEnvCons-2]—Clause 26, page 19, after line 11—

After subclause (7) insert:

- (7a) In considering an application under subsection (7), the Tribunal must have regard to—
 - (a) the financial hardship likely to be suffered by the operator if the order were not made; and
 - (b) whether the operator has taken reasonable steps to fulfil the conditions specified in the residence contract for the payment of the exit entitlement.

No. 11. Amendment No 11 [Wade-1]—Clause 26, page 19, after line 17 [clause 26(9)]—

After paragraph (b) insert:

provided that the charge only operates to the extent of the ingoing contribution paid by the resident.

No. 12. Amendment No 2 [SusEnvCons-1]—Clause 26, page 19, after line 25—

After subclause (12) insert:

- (12a) If the Supreme Court approves the enforcement of the charge in a case where the operator is not the village land owner, the village land owner may, subject to any order of the Supreme Court, recover the amount of the charge so enforced from the operator as a debt.

No. 13. Amendment No 12 [Wade-1]—New clause, page 23, after line 30—Insert:

30A—Rights in relation to remarketing

If—

- (a) a residence contract includes conditions that make the payment of an exit entitlement, or any part of an exit entitlement, contingent on the subsequent sale of a right of occupation of the premises; and
- (b) a period of 9 months has elapsed since the resident—
 - (i) ceased to reside in the retirement village; or
 - (ii) gave the operator a notice in accordance with section 26(3) (being a notice that has not since been withdrawn in accordance with section 26(4)(b)),

the resident (or a person claiming under the resident) is entitled to participate in the remarketing of the premises in accordance with the prescribed scheme.

No. 14. Amendment No 17 [Wade-1]—Clause 55, page 38, line 5 [clause 55(1)]—

After 'scheme' insert 'to an eligible person'

No. 15. Amendment No 18 [Wade-1]—Clause 55, page 38, line 8 [clause 55(2)]—

Delete 'the exit entitlement owing to a' and substitute:

either the former resident consents (in accordance with any requirements prescribed by the regulations) to the lease, or licence or the exit entitlement owing to the

No. 16. Amendment No 4 [Darley-2]—New clause, page 41, after line 13—Insert:

65A—Review of Act

- (1) The Minister must, 3 years after the commencement of this Act, undertake a review of the Act.
- (2) The Minister must cause a report on the outcome of the review to be tabled in both Houses of Parliament within 12 sitting days after its completion.

No. 17. Amendment No 2 [SusEnvCons-2]—Schedule 2, page 45, lines 18 to 21 [clause 10(2) and (3)]—

Delete subclauses (2) and (3)

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

CHILD SAFETY (PROHIBITED PERSONS) BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Amendment No 1 [Police-1]—Clause 44, page 24, lines 31 and 32 [clause 44(1)]—

Delete ', date of birth'

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

RELATIONSHIPS REGISTER BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (17:41): As members would know, it is intended that the Relationships Register Bill we are discussing at the moment be split into two, which means that there will be two bills. The first bill will cover the fairly straightforward task of setting up a relationships register so that anyone who is in a relationship may seek to have that relationship registered. Of course, there are a number of definitions and requirements around that and everything else.

I must say that I am not particularly fussed by the first part of the bill. There are many states that already have a register. If people seek to have their relationship registered for the purpose of recognition by the state, I am not necessarily opposed to that; in fact, I am not really opposed at all. This part of the bill is formalising a number of arrangements without going as far as marriage in some cases and provides a formalisation not otherwise offered for other relationships.

Hopefully, the house will agree to go into committee and, if we do, I have a few questions. Having listened to the member for Schubert today, I think that it is unlikely my questions will differ much from his questions. In fact, I will probably just listen to him and, if anything else comes up that

he has not asked, I will then ask my questions along with his. However, as it stands now, it is unlikely that I will be opposing that part of the bill and more likely that I will support it.

When the bill is split into two, what will become the second bill is, from my point of view, a little more difficult. I am actually quite grateful that the bill has been split into two, and I thank the member for Reynell for that because it allows the house to progress very quickly with that bit of those arrangements that are uncontroversial and it allows us to have a more fulsome discussion on those bits that, for my part, are more controversial.

This is probably the first of a number of bills that will come up in the next few weeks, and I will be applying the same principles to all of them. The principle I will be applying is basically this: from my point of view, no-one has a right to a child. Children are not accessories, nor are they commodities, and the rights of children, who are unable to speak for themselves, should come first in the consideration of the parliament, which is now charged with the responsibility of protecting them, either children who are already alive or children people may seek to create.

I understand that a child is not always born into or grows up in the best possible relationship, and this is for a number of reasons. This is through no fault of the child's nor is it through any fault of the parents in many cases, as they find themselves in circumstances that are not the ideal, but I think there is a body of evidence that shows that the ideal environment for children to be brought up in is where there is a mother and a father, a male and female role model, who are married and love each other—that is the ideal environment for the child.

Of course, this is not always possible, but where the state is involved in placing children into an environment, then that should be the ideal that the state is striving to meet, in my view. That will be the principle that I will be using to make determinations about how I will vote on this second bill, when the bill is split, and also future bills that we are going to be discussing in the next week or so. With those few comments, I look forward to the committee stage and answers to questions we might have, which I think will be fairly routine on the first bill. I look forward to debate on the second bill and urge all members to give both bills earnest consideration.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (17:46): I wish to place on record my thanks to all of the members who have contributed to this important debate. However, in doing so, I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

ADOPTION (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 21 September 2016.)

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (17:48): I notify the Deputy Speaker that I will be lead speaker on this bill. I rise to speak on the Adoption (Review) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill was the result of a long process. Associate Professor Lorna Hallahan provided the adoption review in November 2015, and this information was then also included in the Nyland royal commission to be considered for future use of adoption through the child protection report.

The Hallahan review was to consider the specific areas, the six main areas, that are also considered by this bill that, in the main, reflects both Professor Lorna Hallahan's recommendation and Commissioner Nyland's recommendation. These areas include, firstly, the removal of adoption vetos. I will go further into discussion on each of these topics. The veto has been removed since 1988 so we have open adoptions, but people who were adopted or gave up a child prior to that time have, every five years, had the ability to complete some forms and request that that veto continue. This bill seeks to remove that right of veto after a further five-year time period.

The second main part covered by this bill is the adoption of a person over 18. The third part is the retention of a child's birth name. The fourth part is same-sex couple adoption, which will be a conscience vote for the opposition. The fifth part is a single person adoption, which will also be a

conscience vote for the opposition. The sixth part discussed and considered in this bill is the discharge of adoption orders in certain circumstances.

This was really rushed through. The opposition was notified that this bill was being presented on a Thursday or Friday the week before a sitting week. It did not leave us any time for consultation, or to really consider the paper fully and give it the justice and the consideration that it deserved. However, luckily we have the member for Bragg who, being a lawyer, was able to pull together a party room paper very quickly and help me out on this difficult legal topic, so we were able to discuss this in our party room.

Luckily, it has been deferred for a number of weeks, so I have had time. I had a SurveyMonkey online survey and 150 people completed that survey, which gave me a bit of an understanding of how my community was feeling about these topics. It also meant there was time for me to hear from and follow up with people who had been notified that this bill had now been brought to parliament. Luckily it was deferred, because I had calls from at least six adoptees, or seven I think it was in the end, who were very, very distraught about the thought of the removal of the veto.

After considering the bill and all the feedback that I received, particularly the impassioned pleas of the people who felt very disturbed that this ability and this right could be removed, I had parliamentary counsel draft some amendments, which I discussed with both Lorna Hallahan and the minister, Susan Close, to explain why I felt that we needed these amendments. I do hope that the minister will consider them, because they really are reflective of the views of the people who will be affected. Their lives will be affected.

Actually, there were eight adoptees who contacted me, and to whom I spoke at great length personally, who wanted their right of veto to remain in place. One of the reasons that Lorna Hallahan gave me for including the removal of the veto was that based on the Tasmanian model, which was regarding the discharge of an adoption, so a slightly different area but the same outcome, she felt that, when people were counselled about their wish to extinguish an adoption order, once they had spoken to someone about it most of them did not go ahead with it.

Her thoughts were that, with the counselling of people who are worried about having the veto removed, many of them might change their mind. That is why there are counsellors available. However, for the people I spoke to, that clearly was not enough, and it was really causing them great concern and a lot of upset. I did still pursue the amendments, and I hope that we are able to discuss those and really work through them. I will give you some further background, as we have a few more minutes. The first one relates to the removal of all adoption information vetoes within five years. The survey states:

Currently vetoes only exist for adoptions prior to 1988 and they are renewed every 5 years. This enables all parties, the adoptee, the biological parents and the adoptive parents to choose either to release part or all information, or no information.

Over 150 people responded to the survey, and 65 per cent actually agreed with the removal of the vetoes. However, it is my opinion that the only views that really count in this instance are the views of those people whose lives will be affected by it, namely, the adoptees or the people who have given up a child.

So, although 65 per cent responded, only 30 people out of 150 marked that they were personally affected and, as I mentioned earlier, eight people contacted me directly, and I had long conversations with them. I could really feel the emotion and the stress that they were feeling. I will read some of the responses that were on the SurveyMonkey form:

I believe that my daughter should be able to maintain her right to anonymity. I relinquished her. Whether she wants to know me is entirely up to her.

Another quote is as follows:

I strongly disagree with the removal of vetoes. As an adopted person who has a veto, this proposed amendment has caused me significant distress and anxiety.

Another quote:

The only people whose opinion is valid is the adopter or the adoptee.

Another response is:

I strongly disapprove with retrospective legislation.

Another quote:

This has caused significant distress and anxiety.

Another quote:

I have chosen to veto for 50 years. This is now being taken away. The veto must stay.

Another quote:

I have no desire to be contacted by my biological parents. This law is bloody unfair and does not respect my right to privacy.

You can see that there is a lot of emotion involved in that right. I would be happy to discuss with the minister whether there should be, at least for the first renewal of veto, the compelling or encouragement of someone to actually speak to a counsellor because, as Professor Lorna Hallahan suggested, the fear of the removal of the veto is often bigger than when it is actually done. Like ripping off a bandaid, it is not as bad once it is done. She actually believes that it might be better for them in the long run. However, given the concerns, I think I still will pursue the amendment to retain the right of veto just for the adoptee.

When I was speaking to some of the adoptees, I said to them, 'Don't you want your birth mother or father, because some of them are getting older, to have at least died in peace knowing where you are and that you are safe and that you are well? If you don't want to have contact with them, do you think it would be nice or just kind of you to let them know how your life was, whether you had children, etc.?' That is already available and many of the adoptees I spoke to, who did not want to have contact with their birth parents, have at least put on file that they had a happy childhood, that they are now married with however many children and that they have had a good life, but that they have no interest in getting contacted by their birth parents.

The second part of the bill is regarding the adoption of a person over 18 years and this is anticipated for young people who have been in stable long-term care of a foster family. The survey showed that 65 per cent, or 78 people, agreed with this and it was pretty unanimous. Obviously, if you are over 18, you are an adult and you can make that decision, so I cannot see anything controversial about that.

The third point is the retention of the child's birth name. This refers to the first name being maintained, unless considered offensive or the same as another child in the family, in which case the middle name may be used. 72.6 per cent of people agreed with that idea, so, again, it does not seem that controversial. However, I would like to read into *Hansard* a few of the comments that came back regarding this section. I quote:

It is never okay to change a child's name, unless the child requests it. Children will acquiesce to adults when they think they have to for their own security, but that does not mean it is in their best interests. When step families form, nobody changes the names of the children if there are two names the same. Families learn to live with it in their own way and sometimes with pet names or use of a middle name.

Another quote:

This should be situation dependent.

Another comment:

This really is dependent on the age of the child. If the child is under six months, you should be able to change the name. A name is an important part of a person's identity.

Another quote:

Why does the adoptee have to change their name if another child in the family has the same name? Consider the child in the existing family changing their name, if necessary.

Another comment:

Again, it makes the child feel they are not really part of the family. My five year old wants our surname and has not seen his birth mum for four years.

That is a person really saying yes to keeping the surname.

Sitting suspended from 18:00 to 19:29.

Ms SANDERSON: I continue my remarks. Regarding point 4 of the changes to the Adoption Act, same-sex adoption, as I indicated earlier this will be a conscience vote for Liberal Party members. However, 55 per cent of respondents to the survey agreed with same-sex adoption.

A lot of people did, however, question the minimum of five years that the relationship needed to be established for. They also questioned the five-year requirement for single-sex adoption. I believe the reason for the five years is that a married couple is also required to wait five years. There could be consideration at a future time but, whether it be a married couple, a same-sex couple, or a single person, five years is quite a long time.

Also worthy of note, given the number of letters I have received, and I am sure many other members of parliament have also received, are the impassioned pleas to consider same-sex couples and the endorsement of other people of their relationship and that they would be wonderful parents. Unfortunately, this bill does not allow a single extra child to be adopted. Currently, in South Australia there are only a couple of adoptions a year. You cannot adopt any of the 3,300 children who are under the guardianship of the minister who have been removed from their parents; even those under the guardianship of the minister to age 18 orders cannot be adopted at this point.

So, whilst I appreciate all the letters from people recommending same-sex couples whom they know who are keen to adopt, the changes that are being made to the legislation open up the possibility for more people to be able to adopt. However, it does not open up more children to be adopted. That is certainly something I think we should consider in the future because there are certainly over 3,000 children who will never return home and who many would say deserve the right to a long-term stable relationship. Other Person Guardianship certainly could be considered a good substitute at this point, and that is certainly where the government seems to be headed.

The fifth point is the single person adoption, which I have also briefly mentioned. In the survey, only 40 per cent agreed with this, with 22 per cent being unsure. However, many were unsure because of the time period of five years and whether that should be required because that is a very long time for somebody to purposely be single in order to adopt a child. Again, that is also a conscience vote for the Liberal Party. The sixth point is the discharge of adoption orders. This allows an adopted person to restore their birth certificate to only reflect their biological parents. There is some contention about whether there should be a requirement to prove a psychological reason or whether it should be a tick-box form.

In the survey I prepared for online, I gave the choice of, 'Agree with the discharge of an adoption order only with proof of a psychological reason,' and 13.6 per cent of people agreed with that; 'Agree with the discharge of an adoption order with a tick-box form,' and 57.6 per cent of people agreed with that; 'Disagree' was 12.7 per cent; and 'Unsure' was 16.1 per cent. Overwhelmingly, people agree that you should be able to discharge an adoption order and therefore restore your birth certificate to what some would say was your true biological birth and your heritage.

I did speak to Professor Lorna Hallahan on this issue. Her reason for needing to meet with someone and discuss it I did briefly mention earlier in my speech—that is, when people did speak to a psychologist or a counsellor, many of the fears or reasons for wanting to discharge the adoption order were not relevant anymore. Once they had spoken to somebody, many of them did not end up going ahead, so following the Tasmanian model.

Many have reason to believe that they would be happier in their life without any recognition of their adoptive parents on their birth certificate. Many changed their mind when they had the ability to talk that through with someone—their fears were bigger than the reality. It is only done once, so it does not seem that it could really hurt to continue that. Even though, from the survey, more people were happy with a tick-box form, there is not a lot to be gained by removing it, so I have not adjusted it.

Another issue that was brought up a few times was the right of veto, for which I have already submitted amendments, to allow the adoptee to continue their right of veto. For the adoptive parent from whom the veto will be removed—and I am not challenging that it all—instead of the five years,

as is the case at the moment, from now that will last five years. There is the ability to have counselling and talk that through, but in five years' time the adoptive parents will not have the right to veto.

Some people are asking, 'What if the parent dies in that time period?' and saying that perhaps a veto should end on the death of a parent, rather than in five years' time—for example, if there are property settlements or, if before they die, somebody says that they want to split their wealth between all their birth children, yet one child has not been notified of the parent's death because there is a veto that lasts another five years. Perhaps that issue could be considered. I did have that drafted; however, I have not sent it through, but I suggest that the minister perhaps considers it.

The Hon. S.E. Close interjecting:

Ms SANDERSON: Yes, maybe we can discuss that because it does seem quite sensible. It is a bit late to find out five years later that there is a property settlement or that there was a funeral to attend. I certainly have welcomed the minister's ability to take my call to chat about my amendments. I look forward to working on what I think is an important piece of legislation in the future.

Ms COOK (Fisher) (19:37): I thank the minister for bringing this really important piece of work to the house. I rise today supporting the adoption review bill. It is an issue that is very near to my heart, as I am a person who was adopted as a newborn. This bill, as I see it, will allow more flexibility for the rights of adopted persons, so I wholeheartedly support the measures, particularly around the information that will become available to people who are adopted and the importance and focus that we place these days on knowing one's life journey and story and the ability to pull that together.

I will not repeat discussions about all the areas in the bill that are changing. Rather, I will focus on three, which have been pointed out by the member for Adelaide also, that are particularly difficult to understand or deal with and may create some issues for people moving forward, and I will just speak to those. The first part I will talk about is the veto section, the repeal of section 27B, which provides for the issuing of vetoes.

Under current arrangements, vetoes are available to each party to the adoption—the adoptee, the birth parents and the adoptive parents—who may place the veto that can be renewed. The bill provides transitional arrangements, including that all existing vetoes will continue for five years from the commencement of the amendments. I do understand this timing. After that five-year transition period, all vetoes will expire and cannot be renewed. I support the member for Adelaide's discussion around this question of five years and wonder whether we should have some more debate on that moving forward, which we could do during the committee stage.

I want to talk about my experience in relation to the issuing of vetoes and provide a little bit of a different perspective as a way of raising awareness of the impact that the veto provision has had, historically and moving forward. Throughout my whole childhood, I had a sense of difference. I always felt during any time at family functions that I was searching for someone who might be there or was not there. To clarify that, I am going to tell you that I was never told that I was adopted. As a child, I had this feeling of not fitting in and of being very different.

It is difficult to hide the fact that you are built a bit more like a Viking or an Amazon when you are in a family of English roses who are very small. As I grew older, and continued to become more and more athletic—and I can say these things now because my parents, my adoptive parents, are not around to hear them, although, depending on what you believe, I might have a terrible night's sleep tonight—I used to have to manipulate some bits and pieces of the truth as a teenager in order to perhaps attend the netball trials rather than the library, or compete in the swimming carnival rather than catch up on some homework, if that makes sense.

That is about all I will share on that little venture, but you understand that I was a very different person from the family I was living with, even though I was incredibly loved and provided with absolutely the best childhood I could have had. I knew there was something different. Moving ahead, when I was 29 and already had had my own child, by chance—and this could be a comedy routine or a very serious book—I ended up at my mother and father's house to drop off some items because

they were going to pick up my son for school. They were to be wrapped and given to my husband for a birthday, that whole babysitting situation.

Even then, my parents were a little bit older. I was out at the car, ready to head off to work after dropping off said presents, and the phone rang inside the house. I said to my mum and dad, 'Just wait, I'll run.' I ran into the house and picked up the phone, and the story could take an hour, but basically the consequence was that it was my birth family trying to track me down. It was, 'Do you know your sister?' 'Yes, my sister, Julie.' 'No, your sister, Melissa.' I said, 'Well, I don't have a sister Melissa,' so you can see that this story could take some time.

If anyone wants to sit over a late sitting dinner, perhaps I could share more, but the crux of it is that I did not know that I was adopted. I was 29. I always felt like I was not quite fitting in, the square peg in the round hole, even though life was perfect. I paid my husband out for having half-sisters and brothers all over the place and my family was supposedly normal. I found out that I had been adopted. My parents had not told me.

When the act was put into place around vetoes, my mother became the 'sitting on the esky protester' outside the member of parliament's house because how was her daughter to put a veto in place when her daughter did not know that she was adopted? Her daughter did not know that she could put a veto in place—and that daughter was me. With confidence but without any empirical data, I would say to you that I am not the only person in South Australia who has no veto on their name and who is an unknown love child, very loved by a family, although not their birth family.

I would say that there are many other people in the same situation. I have had friends who did not find out that they were adopted until they were well into their 50s or older. That type of person exists. This removal of the veto will not affect that type of person either. My point is that you cannot please everybody, or comfort everybody, within a bill, within a piece of legislation. I am just saying that there is another group of people who perhaps did not see your survey and possibly have not given input to that.

From my point of view, while the veto seems like a nice shield for something that is too difficult to talk about, particularly for older people who have given up their children, out of love and nothing else, who want to protect their children who are now much older, I actually think that there is a time in our community when we need to face that the right thing to do is to know your life journey. A piece of work needs to happen in the department (I love to use those words 'the department') that will support and contact those people who may be in the same boat. There is another piece of work that needs to happen, and I am just saying that I do not know what amendments might benefit. At this point, I would say that I support how it is written, but again I would be interested in hearing further debate.

The second part I would like to refer to is the provision for single people to adopt on a par with couples, providing for a prescribed period for the amount of time a couple has been in a qualifying relationship or the amount of time a single person has not been in a qualifying relationship, that tangled piece of discussion. I want to say up-front that I support that absolutely, 100 per cent. I will absolutely be supporting it because it is very difficult for me to stand here in judgement of a single person who, again out of love—and adoption is a huge commitment—will care for and give so much time to a child they want to bring into their care and make that different just because they are a single person versus a couple.

Single people do not make this decision lightly. We currently have provisions for single people to adopt children who have a disability, so this is already allowed in South Australia. We already have that. Disabled young people are extremely vulnerable, some of the most vulnerable people in our community, and this is already allowed, so why would there be any question that we would not put in a provision to allow a single person to adopt and find a loving place in their home for a child without a disability who just needs a family?

What is a family? A family can be made up of a whole range of different combinations. I have some beautiful friends who are single out of choice because they may have tried relationships and have not found the right person. I know that there are people in this house who are single because they just have not had luck or do not want to have a partner. Why should they be excluded from

being a loving parent to a child who needs a place in their home? I would absolutely fight for that and hope that people can understand that.

The third part I would like to talk about relates ostensibly to the capacity for same-sex couples to adopt. Again, I find it difficult to stand in judgement of a couple who are committed, dedicated and loving and able to provide a stable home to a young person who needs a family. I hang in those circles where people are in same-sex relationships and would like to offer a home to a child and they have jumped hoops in order to be able to parent a child.

I think that we are now more open-minded towards diversity in sexuality, gender and family forms than we ever have been, but there is still a portion of society that philosophically has difficulty grappling with the notion of same-sex couples, let alone allowing and encouraging same-sex parenting. I am not one of those.

I encourage people to take the time to meet with, talk to and watch parents who are parenting in same-sex relationships. I particularly refer to people such as Penny Wong and her amazing partner, Sophie, whose children's names are Alexandra and Hannah. There is also the beautiful story of Elise and Sally, whose son, Tadhg, has visited this very chamber many times. I also have dear friends, Leah and Sam, who are the most amazing parents to Will, who has Down syndrome, and Noah. I sit and watch their parenting practices and I am absolutely gobsmacked by their patience and their ability to communicate without talking about the needs of their children in that situation.

I cannot for one minute wonder why we would not want people who need a loving home to be able to be formally adopted into the home of a same-sex couple. I want to quote something I read online. Dr Simon Crouch, from the University of Melbourne, did some research and found that families with same-sex parents, both men and women, were tighter-knit than traditional family units. 'Family cohesion is actually better in these families,' he said. One-third of Australian women in same-sex relationships have children and 11 per cent of gay men are dads.

'Children can be raised successfully by gay parents but still we face social stigma,' a Brisbane mum of two, Suzanne Michaels, said. Miss Michaels married her partner, Shannon, in Canada and they have two daughters. She said:

In our home there is no gender division of chores.

Hallelujah for that. She continues:

We parent equally, we share the care of our girls. The nurturing role is doubled up and the kids are very much loved but there is no doubt that we have to constantly talk to our children and prepare for the social reaction to them having two mums. We try to instil in our girls that families come in all shapes and sizes and that's okay. Anyone who thinks that lesbians and gay men are raising their children to be gay have no understanding that you cannot influence a person's sexuality or identity. Neither Shannon nor myself are particularly feminine in the traditional sense—ditto that—

but our daughter is a real princess who loves all things girly. It's just how she is.

A civilised society should not stand in the way of same-sex couples adopting or being recognised as adoptive parents. Again, I say those lines about all these progressive choice issues: it may not be your choice and you might be a bit uncomfortable about it as well, but please do not obstruct the capacity of our parliament to make a sensible and sound choice based on fact, based on evidence, by pushing views that have no empirical foundation at all.

I understand, and I feel very sad for people who have that philosophical belief. It must be frustrating for them to have that view and to have progressive things happen around them. But, please, that is okay for them, but do not stop children from being loved by the appropriate parents. With that soapbox, I conclude my remarks.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (19:53): I rise to speak to the Adoption (Review) Amendment Bill 2016. I want to make a few comments about adoption generally before I go to the heart of the bill. I note that between 1990 and 1991, 103 adoptions took place in South Australia. This figure includes all known international figures and local figures. In 2014-15, there were only 17 adoptions; however, the statistics indicate that 14 of these were intercountry adoptions.

Australia's total adoption numbers for 1990-91 were 1,142 and in 2014-15 this figure was 292. I know there is a big population difference, but if you compare us with adoptions in all states of America the number of adoptions for 2015 was 5,647.

In South Australia, as of 31 July the number of children under 18 years of age in out-of-home care was 3,249; children in foster care was 1,276; children in kinship care 1,451; residential care was 276; independent living was 34; commercial care was 212. The total number of children placed on orders for 2015-16 was 1,480, the total number of children placed on 12-month guardianship of the minister orders was 469, and 2,529 children were placed on an 18-year order.

Adopting a child in South Australia is a four-step process and may take up to two years from the initial expressions of interest. The steps are as follows:

- step 1—you have to go through an initial screening and expression of interest;
- step 2—you have to make the formal application and assessment;
- step 3—allocation and placement; and
- step 4—the time after the adoption order is made.

There is also quite a range of fees associated with adoption. If you want to lodge an expression of interest it is \$551; an application for registration as a prospective adoptive parent is \$725; a family assessment report is \$705; and placement of a child is \$352. This totals \$2,333. Many people who make applications do not become successful due to the lack of children.

The point I want to make here today is that there are obviously issues with child protection, but there are also issues of people in this state already—before we change the adoption legislation, as we are looking at doing here today—who are seeking to adopt children, but you can see that the numbers have greatly decreased over the years from what was happening over 25 years ago.

There have to be some reasons for that, but I happened to have a conversation in the hairdressers, of all places, when an ex-customer came in and was quite open about what they had done. They were talking to the hairdresser and included me in the conversation (I identified who I was). They said they were so keen to go through an adoption process in this state but there was just no child available for them to adopt. They managed to find a lovely child from Thailand, but they were willing to do something here in this state.

When we look at the numbers and issues we have with children in state care, children in foster care, children in kinship care, children with other person guardians, I think there is a lot of work that we need to do as a state to get adoption right. Some of it gets back to what happens around child protection issues. I know there is a policy to keep children with their families and their parents. It is a noble policy, but so many times it falls over. I know there have been apologies made in regard to the forced removal of children from their parents, and I do not think that is the right way either. However, I think there has to be some middle ground where we see children growing up in an environment that is very damaging to their upbringing. I think they get left too long, quite frankly, with the natural parents and they are damaged for life.

I state that I am not a child expert, but picking the time when perhaps it may be better for that child to be placed into a loving home, when I am sure there are thousands of people willing to give that child a loving home, must be a very delicate matter—a very, very delicate matter—if the department and minister were to go down that path. I know for a fact, from people who work in the education department as school services officers, that their job is to just supervise one of these poor damaged children. It is their full-time job to look after them.

When something goes pear shaped—for example, when the child assaults other children or assaults the school services officer—there is a real problem and a squad of department people go out and see what is going on. I am not saying that it is not difficult, but we need to find a way to get some equity in the system so that these children have the opportunity to grow up around some love and care. Yes, it will be difficult perhaps to find that, and it might take some courage, but I think we need to find a way. I am a bit stunned at the lack of children who have been available for adoption because there are obviously a lot of people who would like to adopt children in this state.

In regard to the Hallahan review into adoption, some of the key recommendations talk about children's rights. The recommendation was that the act should incorporate a wider statement of principles and objectives about adoption being about the best interests of children, to emphasise children's rights. Absolutely, every day of the week, I agree with that.

Then we have same-sex couples. The recommendation is that the Adoption Act should change so that same-sex couples can apply to adopt a child. I think this is clause 12, which is a conscience vote on our side of the house, and I will not be supporting this. I do not support same-sex marriage and I do not support same-sex adoption. I know some good people who have children who are in same-sex arrangements but, in the broader principle, I think we have a lot more work to do in the field of a man and woman adopting a child before perhaps we head down this path.

Obviously, when we are very much in single digits in a year (I think it was three), we have a lot of work to do in getting more children into adoption. In regard to the recommendation around single people applying to adopt a child, I note that the recommendation states:

Single people can already apply to adopt a child, but the report recommends that the rules about single people being placed with a child only in special circumstances should be removed.

I do not support this either, as a conscience matter. I represent a conservative electorate and I think that we have a long way to go as far as a man and woman as partners and that we should be making a better regime around them having the ability to adopt, rather than venturing further. The recommendation on adoption information vetoes states:

Adoption information vetoes prevent the release of identifying information to another party to the adoption. The report recommends that adoption information vetoes be abolished and phased out over 5 years and that contact vetoes are not introduced.

I must say that I have had correspondence either way with regard to this, and I am interested in more of the debate around vetoes. It is obviously a very personal issue and I certainly respect the comments from the member for Fisher on vetoes, having been personally involved. I think unless you are personally involved, you probably do not really know the full extent, especially if you do not even know that you have been adopted.

In regard to the recommendation to the adoption of adults, the Adoption Act does not currently provide for adult adoptions. The review report recommends that adoption of adults should be allowed. This would mean that adults may be adopted by people who brought them up for most of their childhood, such as foster parents and step-parents. In regard to a recommendation around keeping a child's original first name, the report recommends that when a child is adopted, the court that makes the adoption order should ensure that the child's original first name is kept except in exceptional circumstances.

In regard to birth certificates, the report recommends that an adopted child's birth certificate should provide the truest possible account of the biological parentage of the child. If this recommendation is acted upon, it would mean that in most cases, an adopted child's birth registration details will include both their parents and their adoptive parents. Any certificates issued would ensure that it is clear that the adoptive parents are the legal parents of the child. In regard to the recommendation around the discharge of adoption orders, the report recommends that a law is introduced to enable a court to discharge or undo an adoption order in certain circumstances, such as where the adopted person has been abused in their adoptive family.

In regard to the legislation, this comes about after Associate Professor Lorna Hallahan provided the review a report in November 2015. The Nyland royal commission also considered the future use of adoption by means of child protection, and the Nyland report came down in August 2016. The government have indicated that they have incorporated all recommendations from the Hallahan review except one. Recommendation 7, which was not included, deals with parental consent in respect of children in care and thus is likely to be considered in response to the Nyland royal commission and rewrite of the Children's Protection Act 1993.

I think we have a long way to go in regard to adoption and there is a whole range of issues that need to be debated. In regard to the replacement of the definition of 'marriage relationship' with 'qualifying relationship' throughout the bill, according to the minister's speech when this was introduced:

Qualifying relationship means 'the relationship between 2 persons who are living together in a marriage or marriage-like relationship (irrespective of their sex or gender identity)'. This supports the adoption of children by same-sex couples, which will be subject to a conscience vote by Government members.

I will certainly not be supporting that. I spoke earlier today about the Relationships Register Bill. I think everyone needs to have a serious look at this legislation. As I indicated earlier, we need to do a lot of work in relation to adoption. We need to cut red tape and we need to make it far more accessible. We need to assist foster parents.

I take my hat off to foster parents. You have to be courageous in a range of ways to be a foster parent. I have spoken in this place before about constituents who have come to me who have had infringements of the law placed against them by foster children years later. It is a very distressing situation for foster parents, when they have done their best for so many years, bringing up many children for decades, to be picked up from their property like common criminals and placed under arrest, having to wait for two years for a court case. Whether you are innocent or guilty, it is far too long to have that hanging over your head when you have been doing your best for the state and the community.

It is a scary scenario that I have seen several times too many. It is a scary situation for people to be in, especially if they feel that they should not be in that position. We have certainly had some wins in here in the past. With Finn's Law, I worked for 19 months to try to get better arrangements around the rights of foster parents, to get their name on the death certificate of a child in their care and also to get some rights around the burial of a child. I reflect on the time it took to do that piece of legislation and put it through this place, and I appreciate everyone who negotiated with me, especially several ministers and the senior ministerial staff I work with. I really appreciate it.

However, I see other bills that we have been debating recently in which, if they go through—and it seems they will go through much more quickly—there will be changes to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. It makes me wonder. Early on in the debate and negotiations in relation to Finn's Law, a lot of barriers were put up: 'No, we can't do this and we can't do that,' but obviously things can be done. I salute everyone who assisted me, and certainly the current Minister for Education and the Attorney-General were a great help in that regard.

I think there is a lot that we can do when it comes to foster children, whether it is other person guardians taking that next step or the like, but I think we certainly need to take a much bigger step when it comes to adoption so that we can help many more children. There is obviously a need for that in society. We need to make some courageous decisions at times. We need to do the best we can for our children because they are the future of this state, our community and our country and I believe we owe it to them.

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (20:13): I would like to make a small contribution to this debate. In doing so, I would like to acknowledge that I have relied on some work undertaken by my eldest son, Raffaele, who has actually had some experience in this area as a law student. One area of the bill that I am particularly interested in commenting on deals with the discharge of adoption orders. One of the things we have been grappling with as a nation over the last few years at a state level, in Victoria and in other states, and also nationally, is the issue of sexual abuse of children, and a number of inquiries have been established to look into those matters. My son points out in his publications on this topic:

...the shared objectives of these inquiries is to ensure that those who have been victims of sexual abuse are provided the recognition and support necessary to rebuild their lives; physically, mentally, and emotionally. The critical question [he poses] faced by these inquiries is: can the law help or provide for healing.

The role of the law in remedying these situations can provide criminal sanctions, but for many this does not produce the sense of healing they seek. Sometimes the law can only go so far.

The issue is whether it is within the capacity of a child to have an adoption order discharged when the relationship with the adoptive parents has broken down, in particular in those situations that involve sexual or other abuse, and whether the law can be used to enable that person to heal further. He expresses the view that in some circumstances:

...there may be scope for the law to have an active role in providing for that healing that people seek. This may particularly be the case for those who have been the victims of sexual abuse perpetrated by adoptive parents.

He states that under the current law:

At present the law provides that a court may discharge an adoption order if the order was obtained by fraud, duress or other improper means. Unless an adopted child can demonstrate to a court that the adoptive parents acted in such a manner so as to obtain an adoption order, then it cannot be discharged at a later date.

This is regardless of how important the discharge of that order may be to that adopted child. Also, the forced continuing relationship between the adopted child and adoptive parents can be damaging to that person's healing and ongoing growth. He goes on to say:

The adoption law of South Australia as it stands curtails the healing process of those affected by the sexual abuse of their adoptive parents. While the law is not often analysed in terms of its scope of healing, a unique opportunity exists for it to take on this role. Where possible, the law should be amended to lessen the pain, and promote the healing of people.

I believe that in relation to this part of this bill that can be achieved. The bill does provide for an adoption order to be discharged, and a couple of questions arise when an adoption order is discharged by a court, which is provided for in this bill, and I would seek some clarification from the minister in the committee stage. I am aware that under the provisions for the discharge, from memory the bill says that when a court orders a discharge it can basically put the situation as if the order had not been put in place.

One of the things the New Zealand Law Commission recommends when an adoption order is discharged is that the court shall be required to state the effect of the discharge, choosing between and adopted person becoming parentless according to law, or otherwise a member of their birth family. It will be interesting to see how this will be acted upon in this jurisdiction, given that, as I understand the provision, it is left open to the court to decide how far it goes with any further orders. It is very important that in discharging an order we do not make a person parentless because that certainly would not be helpful to them.

The recommendation of the review that has given rise to this bill will go some way to better enabling the healing of those who were sexually abused by their adoptive parents. It would also offer them an opportunity to break the remaining legal links that would otherwise bind them to a traumatic past. Why would we enable a discharge between adoptive parents and adopted children when you cannot if you are the birth child and the birth parents? Associate Professor Hallahan makes it very clear.

My son made a submission to this inquiry before Associate Professor Hallahan. Where the state has blundered in effecting an adoption, that places a child at grave risk and the state should have the power to undo such arrangements. In other words, the reason that the state intervenes in enabling an order to be discharged is essentially that the state intervened to have the order created in the first place. The new provision for adoption orders to be discharged by the court on the ground that it is in the best interests of the adopted person takes into account their rights and welfare, and I think this is worthy of support.

While there is a whole range of other areas which I am sure will be ventilated in this place, I do not intend to repeat all the provisions. As I indicated, my interest in this bill has been motivated by my son's involvement and his submission to the inquiry and also his ongoing interest in this matter. It arose from a case he dealt with when he was a law student, when he assisted a young woman who had been sexually abused by her adoptive parents. Under the current law, she was bound to them. With those few comments, I look forward to the committee stage of this bill.

Ms HILDYARD (Reynell) (20:21): I rise this evening to offer my wholehearted support for this bill. In doing so, I thank the minister for bringing it to this house, and I also acknowledge all the speakers on this bill. It has been wonderful to hear them all talk about their desire to make sure that this bill is absolutely focused on the provision of loving care for all our children. I really hope that that is what unites us, that sense of purpose of wanting to ensure loving care for all our children, particularly our most vulnerable. I hope that unites us through this debate and helps to bring us to a very positive resolution in relation to this bill.

The Adoption (Review) Amendment Bill builds on the important work that was implemented by the Adoption Act 1988. At the time of its introduction, this legislation was crucial to reinvigorating and commencing a new discussion and, from that discussion, developing a more nuanced and

deeper understanding of what adoption means within our society. Making the shift from closed adoptions to open adoptions was a watershed in terms of identifying and responding to the rights of the child and to refocusing how adoption should be undertaken to improve the wellbeing of our children. This of course marked the beginning of that journey, but it is a road that we still have a distance to travel upon.

The original act, as we have heard, allowed for individuals whose adoptions had been completed after the act had come into force to access identifying information when they reached the age of 18. For adoptions that occurred prior to this act, there was a provision to access information under specific circumstances, although vetoes remained in place. These changes represented the beginning of how we as a society started to lift the veil of secrecy that had surrounded adoption policies in South Australia. The Adoption Act also allowed for the expansion of who could adopt. It included and allowed for those in heterosexual de facto relationships to adopt, as previously only married heterosexual couples could adopt. So, I repeat that this piece of legislation represented an important beginning of a journey that is not yet complete.

Whilst there are provisions for the review of sections of the act via public consultation processes, this last occurred in 1997. I also reiterate the minister's comments on the importance of the report on the national inquiry into the Commonwealth Contribution to Former Forced Adoption Policies and Practices that was tabled in the Senate in 2012. The contents of this report spoke to an important exercise in reflection both federally and in South Australia. I was incredibly moved when our Premier delivered an apology in this house on the 18 July 2012. I was equally moved when our then prime minister, the irrepressible Julia Gillard, apologised on behalf of all of us for these past forced adoption practices.

In short, the times, they are a-changing. This is a shared journey of developing an opening-up and an honesty around the adoption practices within our community. It is for this reason that our state government commissioned an independent inquiry in 2014. Associate Professor Lorna Hallahan undertook this inquiry. She is a prominent academic from our very own Flinders University who consults on ethical practice related to vulnerable people reliant on complex human services.

Her research encompasses child protection and adoption practices, and only last week she presented a paper reflecting her findings to our community sector at the Australian Centre for Community Services Research's annual Research to Practice Forum, which this year had a focus on the Nyland report and child protection. Through Associate Professor Hallahan's review, which incorporated far-reaching community consultations, a number of recommendations were developed that have informed this bill.

I am proud to support the proposed amendments to the act. Whilst the minister has detailed the key amendments to the act, there are a number of amendments I would like to speak to specifically. As part of realigning how we consider adoption as being part of a whole-of-community response to child wellbeing, I am immensely proud to see amendments that speak to qualifying relationships and single person adoption and amendments that seek to protect the identity formation of adoptees.

On the first point, the replacement of the definition of 'marriage relationship' with 'qualifying relationship' means that we are making the important step of supporting same-sex couples who wish to adopt. Through 'two persons who are living together in a marriage or marriage-like relationship (irrespective of their...gender identity)', we are fulfilling not only an important recommendation of the review but we are also presented with the opportunity to progress further down the road of inclusivity and openness that we tentatively began in 1988.

By embracing this path, we are rightly embracing and including many loving same-sex couples whose rainbow families should absolutely be included in every aspect of community life. This journey, which started with the expansion to de facto relationships in 1988, is about how we can best represent the interests of children in our state, particularly vulnerable children. We need to do all that we can to promote inclusivity and a sense of belonging in our society. These are concepts, along with openness and an acceptance of diversity, that work hand in hand with developing and improving child wellbeing within our communities.

By making this change, our state government is yet again reaffirming its commitment to removing all discrimination from South Australian legislation on the basis of sexual orientation, gender, gender identity and intersex status. This will also bring our state in line with other jurisdictions across Australia. On the second point, allowing single people to adopt equally, extends adoption practices to reflect the diversity of family and family formation in modern-day South Australia. Families in our community are a rich tapestry that represent a diverse constellation of different formations. Our adoption laws need to be equally representative of this richness that already exists within and across our community.

Having been brought up largely in a single-parent family that, despite some of the most difficult circumstances, was strong, loving and resilient, and working with and for so many similarly comprised families in my own community, it is crucial that we include these families, that we give them equal respect and dignity and that we recognise their deep capacity for love and loving environments. It is worth repeating the minister's comments that, with the passage of this bill, same-sex couples and single people who wish to be considered for adoption will need to pass the same extensive suitability requirements as different-sex couples.

On my third point, on the importance of identity formation for adoptees, it is heartening that there will be provisions for the retention of a child's original first name. There will be exceptions for name changes in specific cases, but the overall intention is to retain an anchored sense of identity. This is something many of us take for granted. Part of our sense of being and belonging is informed by where we come from and who we are born to, and it is only right that we put in place amendments that will limit secrecy around an adoptee's earliest formations of identity and belonging.

Repealing section 27B, which will result in the expiration of information vetoes after a five-year transition period, is an important part of this. Whilst undoubtedly this may be a difficult process for some members of our community, it is terribly important that we move towards a more open adoption process with the needs and wellbeing of the child at the centre. Associate Professor Hallahan made it quite clear in her review that closed adoption practices exacerbate 'lifelong identity informing impacts'. Indeed, as part of her presentation at the Australian Centre for Community Services Research last week, she drew on article 21 of the United Nation Convention on the Rights of the Child, which states:

...the paramountcy of all children's best interests in all adoption arrangements and details minimum requirements for adoption procedures.

Paramountcy means that the child's best interests outrank and trump all other considerations; it is a non-negotiable consideration. To quote Associate Professor Hallahan:

Adopted children have the right to know that they are adopted and to know the identity of their biological parents.

Herewith lies the foundation for open adoption. It is evident that we have travelled a long road to get to where we are today. We, in this house, can now move to vote for this bill and to bring this journey, if not to an end, at least to a most significant of milestones.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A quorum not being present, ring the bells.

A quorum having been formed:

Mr WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (20:33): I have some concerns about this bill. A number of issues with the bill concern me, but let me first of all apprise the house of the attitude towards adoption in South Australia in the last period, and when I say the 'last period' I am talking probably about the last 20 years.

A constituent some years ago was endeavouring to adopt a baby out of China, and they came to me because of the frustration they had encountered over a number of years. The frustration was with the relevant agency in South Australia that seemed hell-bent on preventing this couple from adopting a child. Eventually, after some intervention by me as their local member I would like to think (whether or not that was the case, I do not know), they were able to adopt a little girl from China. A couple of years later, they endeavoured to adopt another child from China and things were back to square one.

The reality is that it appears that very few children come up for adoption in South Australia. I suspect that there is a significant number of families who want to adopt children, people who are incapable of having children themselves, which was the case for my constituents. The reality is that in this day and age, with the medical technology that is available, families do not necessarily come to the point where they see adoption as the only opportunity for them to have a family until quite late in their life.

One of the excuses used by the agency in South Australia to this particular couple was that in this case the husband was considered to be too old; from memory, he was 47 and his wife was a little younger. Again, in the way that our society operates these days, a lot of couples do not choose to have children of their own until they are well into their mid-30s or early 40s. Things have changed. When I was a young man, I left school and went to university, and in growing up and making my way in life, most of my peers and I married in our early 20s to mid-20s and then had a family and probably completed having a family at least by our early 30s. There has been almost a 10-year shift at least in the time frame that young people and not so young people choose to have their family.

The plight of this particular couple brought to my attention, in the first instance, the fact that very few children in South Australia are available for adoption and that there seem to be many more families who wish to adopt children. On thinking about this matter, and on thinking about the bill, I might be howled down on this attitude, but I look at the evolution of our species in a very fundamental way. As a species, we have been incredibly successful. A significant part of that success is the way that we have been able to organise ourselves in social units, particularly in family units.

The one thing that separates the human species out from every other species on the planet is that the human baby needs to be nurtured for a considerable period of time. I am not talking days or weeks; I am talking years. I am not talking just one or two years; I am talking about many years. There is a correlation between our success as a species and the amount of time it takes to nurture a human to become viable on their own.

The reality is that the reason we are so successful is that we have a huge brain compared with the rest of our body. The reason it takes so long to nurture and the reason it takes many years to grow and develop and mature is so that a child can actually support its head. No child will start to crawl until they are at least 12 months old. They cannot actually hold themselves up. They cannot learn to walk until they are over 12 months old because they physically cannot hold up their head.

So, a child needs the total support of the parent for at least 12 months before a child can even sit up or crawl, or even attempt to walk, but you need many more years of nurturing before a child can become viable on their own. It is the social structures that came hand in hand with the growth in the brain size of the human species that enabled us to evolve into the species we are now, so in my opinion the social structures that enabled that to happen are very important. Without those social structures, I do not believe we would remain viable as a species.

Some would contend that there are more important things, that being able to have a good time is much more important, but the experience of my life has taught me that every species on the planet has designed its life cycle to promote itself as a species. It seems that our super intelligence has almost gone too far, where as a species we think we can manipulate the way we operate as a society to the point where we can increase our personal pleasure, or instantaneous pleasure, without threatening the ongoing existence of our species. I do not accept that premise.

Let me just pause for a moment in my argument to say that we do not have everything right, in spite of our incredible intelligence, and we need to do some serious things. The most serious of these is to curtail the growth in our population as a species on this planet to sustain ourselves into the future. Notwithstanding that, to maintain ourselves as a viable species we need to be cognisant of the reality that the social set-up we have developed over hundreds of thousands or millions of years has been incredibly important; in fact, we would not have developed into the species we have without that social structure.

We come in here today and suggest to ourselves that the fundamentals are not that important, that we can play with the fundamentals that underpin the development and sustainability of our species, that we can play with them because of the wants and desires of some and not threaten our society or our species. Again, I cannot accept that premise.

People will argue, and hold up as an example, that there are many families who have produced offspring where one of the parents, through accident or disease, becomes deceased and the remaining parent has to raise that offspring. That happens. As the old saying goes, it takes a village to raise a child, and until quite recently the village did raise the child; not just the parents but also the grandparents were intimately involved in supporting the babies that were brought into the world.

In today's age, we have people, through the vagaries of life, having to raise a child as single-parents, etc.; there are all sorts of families now. I think for us to suggest that that is ideal is a nonsense. To my mind, the ideal situation is that a child has the opportunity to be raised and taught by both a mother and a father, whether the child is a male or a female. I think that is important. I believe we have created problems in our society because, even in our primary schools, we have a preponderance of female teachers and not an even balance.

A number of our children go all the way through primary school never having had the experience of having a male teacher. I think that is an indictment on our society. I think every child—every child—should have the opportunity to interact in every facet of their learning with both men and women. Obviously, there are problems, and that is a different argument, that have mitigated against particularly young men putting themselves forward to be primary school teachers. In my opinion, that is very sad because it detracts from the opportunities the children of our society have.

This legislation promotes a situation where we would have children, for a myriad of reasons, grow up without the opportunity of being raised by their natural parents, without the opportunity of being raised by their biological mother and father, but they may have the opportunity to be raised by a loving mother and father, a loving couple, who want to take them on as their own. For us to suggest that those children could just as easily be raised by a single-sex or a same-sex couple I think denies the reality of where we have come from as a species and denies the reality of the importance of children being influenced by a mother and a father. I think that gives the best opportunity to children in our society.

For us to put children who are already disadvantaged because of the circumstances of their biological parents at a further disadvantage by being taken up for adoption by a same-sex couple and denying them the opportunity to be raised by a loving mother and father is a travesty. I started by saying that my experience suggests that there is a paucity of children available for adoption in this state when compared with the number of families, loving couples, males and females, who would want to adopt a child for us to turn around and open the door for same-sex couples to adopt these children who, as I suggested, are already suffering a disadvantage.

I can only imagine the psychological disadvantage that those children suffer as they go forward in their life and come to the realisation that for some reason their biological parents gave them up for adoption. In many cases, I suspect that those particular children are disadvantaged because their parents find themselves in a situation of total dysfunction and are not capable of raising them. It is my belief that as a state we should indeed give those children the very best opportunity that we can.

I do not believe that there is a shortage of loving male-female couples who would be desirous of taking on those children as adoptive parents and raising them in a loving household. I am not suggesting that same-sex couples might not provide a loving household; do not get me wrong. What I am saying is that, by adopting this legislation, we would deny those children the opportunity of having a mother figure and a father figure in their life, and that does concern me. It concerns me that we would accept this principle for no other reason than to try to be seen as progressive. As I said, I do not believe there is any shortage of potential adoptive parents for the children who would find themselves in need of such a family. I cannot support this particular piece of legislation.

Let me now turn to the part of the legislation that would remove the veto powers that have been in existence in this state for I think close on 30 years. I have never been a fan of retrospective legislation. If this was brought on as a prospective measure I might have some sympathy for it, but as a retrospective measure, I have no sympathy for it. We find that there are a number of people, both parents and children, who for one reason or another find that they have either as the parents

given up a child or as the child been given up by their parents. They have had a different path in their life than might otherwise have happened.

The circumstance in many cases—I would suggest in most cases—were tragic. I cannot imagine a couple having a child that they willingly gave up, but I can imagine many situations where a young mother has found herself absolutely incapable of taking on the responsibility of raising that child. In my experience, I think the power for people in that situation, whether it be the adopted child or the parents who gave up the child, to have a veto is very important. Because of the retrospective nature of this particular measure, I certainly cannot support it either.

Parliamentary Procedure

VISITORS

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I call the next speaker, I would like to acknowledge we have a very distinguished guest with us this evening. In the gallery, we have been joined by The Rt Hon. the Baroness Royall of Blaisdon, who is visiting us from the House of Lords at Westminster. We welcome her to parliament. She is the guest of the member for Ashford and we do hope she has enjoyed her time here this evening. I also acknowledge the other special guests on my left, who are obviously guests of the members for Bright and Unley.

Bills

ADOPTION (REVIEW) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (20:53): I rise to support much of what is in this bill. I think in many respects it is a very purposeful and important bill, but I indicate that there are some aspects that I will not be supporting. I commend the guiding principles and objective of the bill outlined on page 3, and in particular 3(1)(a) which provides:

- (1) The objects of this Act are—
 - (a) to [look to] the best interests, welfare and rights of the child concerned, both in childhood and in later life, must be the paramount consideration in adoption law and practice;

I think that is a very purposeful and appropriate object. It goes on:

- (b) to promote the principle that adoption is to be regarded as a service for the child concerned;

For the child concerned. I think that is the second most important object of the act. That is why I think later on in the act it loses sight of those two objects, particularly in respect to questions about same-sex adoptions by LGBTI couples or single people, rather than requiring that the adoptions be directed towards a man and a woman, which of course is being removed from the act by certain amendments outlined in clause 12(1) and I think later in clause 12(4).

I want to address those general principles because, although the other matters addressed in the bill warrant full support, those particular clauses and parts of the act clearly, listening to members earlier, have created some interest in the chamber and are unlikely to be supported by many and need to be dealt with separately. I want to deal with some of the questions that arise from those propositions.

One question about the rights of the child outlined in the object of the bill is: what is in the best interests of the child? It is my view that the best interests of the child are served in the case of adoption by seeking adoptive parents who are a man and a woman so that the child has the opportunity to experience being brought up by loving parents who include a man and a woman. My fundamental view as a conservative is that every child has a right to be known to parents, one of whom is a man and one of whom is a woman, one of whom is their father and one of whom is their mother. I think that is a fundamental right.

I completely reject the proposition that to hold that view is in any way discriminatory or not equal or denying equality to others. I just think that when it comes to children, ideally they have a right to know who their father is and they have a right to know who their mother is. If that is not possible, and you have either lost your parents or for one reason or another are up for adoption, I think you have a right to be adopted into a situation where you have an adoptive mother and father and an opportunity to at least start from that baseline.

There will always be cases where children are born and raised in loving arrangements by parents of the same sex, or by single parents. The law does not propose to interfere with arrangements when they evolve in that way for family reasons or by agreement between or within families or by dint of circumstance. There are lots of occasions when those outcomes arise. However, this act seeks to amend the law to require it or make it so. That tends to create a whole lot of unintended consequences.

For example, a couple dies in a car crash but their child survives. The child finds itself in an adoption situation. The parents indicate, either in their will or by some act, that, in the event of their death, they would like their child to be adopted by a heterosexual couple—a man and a woman. The effect of this clause could well result in that not being the outcome, that their child could be adopted either by a single person (either male or female) or by a same-sex couple. Is that right or wrong?

The effect of this bill would be to make it, if not illegal, certainly outside the law to indicate as a parent that you would like your child to be adopted by a couple who are a man and a woman. I just do not think that is right. I think you do have some rights as a parent in the event of your death to set out your wishes in writing, or through instruction in some form, to whom your children should be adopted.

A risk with this bill is that that right is taken away. The government system says no whether you like it not, or whether your wishes were in one direction; the government says it knows better, and your child could be adopted out to a same-sex couple or a single parent. I just do not think that is right. I respect the fact that many other members in the house think it is okay. No-one is right and no-one is wrong on these issues—I think we just come from fundamental philosophical positions and moral viewpoints. I am not in any way critical of those who would not hold that view, but to me it is true.

The broader issue of whether, by disagreeing with this measure in the bill, you are discriminating against same-sex couples, is one that I reject. I think most of us in the chamber, certainly in my case, are extremely open and accepting of same-sex relationships. They are part of the human diaspora, they are part of who we are as a community, and I think quite an interesting and vibrant and important part of who we are, and they always will be.

There will always be an LGBTI and same-sex community in every community on the planet, and in many senses that is a fantastic thing for the colour, for the life and for the vibrancy of that community. I would be the first to say that there should be no acts of unpleasantness in any form, or offence directed to anyone in the community based on their diversity, particularly in regard to sexuality.

It does not hold that by rejecting a notion of adoption of children to same-sex couples that you are in some way denying equality, or denying rights to same-sex couples, and I believe it does not imply that you are discriminating. The fact is that children are born to a man and a woman, unless there is some medical intervention, and I do not think it is out of order to hope to ensure that this parliament passes laws that in the case of adoptions sees that continuing so that the children have the right to a father and a mother as they grow up in an adopted situation.

Another argument that comes into play whenever these issues arise is the issue of faith and Christianity. People are either in heated argument accused of being religious fanatics, or they are accused of being told what to think and told what to say by church officials or by religious leaders, or else they are told they are terrible people because they are discriminating against gay people, and there is all this heat that comes in the direction of those who argue for family values, and for children to have the right to be brought up by mother and a father. I reject all of that. I reject all of that completely.

A lot of us in this chamber are people of faith who have religious convictions. That does not mean that every utterance and every thought we have has been dictated to us by anyone, or a member of the clergy, or any one church, or any one individual. It is just a silly proposition, in my view, and it is one that is used by those who want to bash the churches, bash faith in principle, and who are agnostic and hate anything to do with religion. That is another right that people have—a right to a religious view—and they should not be belted up for having them. In fact, without such faith and without such principles it would be a very different world, indeed. So, I reject that as a criticism for opposing those specific measures in the bill.

Essentially, I think this is a good bill, except inasmuch as clause 12, subclauses (1) through to (4), includes changes to the law that mean that children will be adopted into family situations that are other than a man and a woman. I add that I also have some issues with single person adoptions. That is not to say that there are not millions of examples of successful same-sex adoptions that come about simply through family circumstances—there are.

I remember having an employee, when I was running childcare centres and in the childcare industry, who through IVF managed to have children as a single woman. It was the first time that it really made me stop and think about what I considered to be right or wrong about that. She had a child through IVF, and then later got married and had two children as a married woman; I think she finished up with three children. She was a fantastic person, but it did get me thinking about whether that is right or wrong.

It is interesting the way these changes to the law—and this is one we are considering today—are changing the way society thinks, acts and lives. I am not sure that is a good thing that now, through IVF as a single person, to have a baby whenever you want and not have to go through the tacky process of having a relationship, having to go through the awfully inconvenient process of actually meeting somebody and having to get along with them, and maybe love them and maybe set up a family environment where there is a man and a woman bringing up the child—awfully inconvenient. It is so nice if you can run off and through IVF, or some other process, or through adoption, get yourself a child without having to go through that awfully inconvenient process of having a partner.

Mind you, most of us would probably ask ourselves why our partners put up with us in the first place and consider ourselves to be extremely lucky to have one. It does make me stop and think. I think as a parliament we ought to be encouraging people to actually make babies and have babies together through developing deep, meaningful and loving relationships with another person and setting about the business of having child or, being a couple who are childless, adopting a child and finding the joy of family, parenting and having children through that process. I think that is what we should be encouraging, rather than creating legal devices whereby people can just, if you like, check out of the relationships business and start having children.

With a lot of this legislation I see from time to time in parliament, and I think that this particular clause in this particular bill is an example, I often get the sense that it is really about the adult and not the child. It is really about me, me, me. It is, 'I want a child, and I am single and I don't want to have a relationship. I want a child, so I'm going to have one, and I want the law to enable that,' or, 'I'm in a same-sex relationship. I can't have a child naturally because I'm in a same-sex relationship and that's not the way that nature has worked it, so I want a legal device where I can either adopt one or I can have one through IVF. It's all about me. I want, I want, I want.' That's how it seems to me.

I come back to the object of the bill, which is a very good one, when it says that it is not about the adults, it is not about the parents. It says that the main principle is 'that adoption is to be regarded as a service for the child concerned'—for the child concerned, not for the parents. It is not about what the parents want; it is about what the child wants, and it is about the rights of the child both in childhood and in later life. That must be the paramount consideration, not what we adults want. We are not here to make laws for ourselves as adults. We are here to make laws for the kids.

How are we to know what the child will think when they are an adult about the system having adopted them out to a single parent or to a same-sex couple? They may be quite relaxed about that, or they may sit down as an adult and look back and say, 'I'm really sorry that the system did that to me because I would like to have started from the baseline of having a mother and a father, male and

female, and then make up my own mind about whether I want to embrace other lifestyles or other sexualities'.

For all those reasons, I think that particular aspect of the bill is one I cannot support as a conservative. I understand that the minister is going to rearrange the bill in a moment so that we can vote on the other good measures and wonderful aspects of this bill separately to the questions I have raised in my short address. That is a good thing, and I commend her for that. I look forward to voting on both measures shortly.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The member for Newland appears to be standing up trying to attract attention to himself.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (21:10): I am. May I have the call, please?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You have.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: Thank you. I do not intend to hold the house for long because I think I am the last person standing between here and home, so I shall not take longer than necessary. I start this bill, as I said earlier on the Relationships Register Bill and a couple of others that are either before us or about to be before us, from the same point; that is, the rights of the child are paramount here because we are making a decision on behalf of the child.

When the state authorises adoption, we are making a decision on behalf of the child on who their parents or parent will be—effectively forever, in terms of adoption, but, for the purposes of efficient decision-making, at least until they are 16 in some cases and 18 generally. If we are going to do that, then I think it is incumbent on us as a state to ensure that we place them in the best possible circumstances. There is a substantial amount of research that states that the best possible circumstances for a child are in a house where a mother and a father are married and love each other.

The minister is quietly raging in front of me—it is very polite raging—but that is the evidence. Where the state can ensure that it can place children into those circumstances, it should, because adoption is already difficult enough. It is not that you have an adoption into a great family and everything is happy families afterwards, because it does not work like that. It brings its own trials and tribulations that are unique to those adoptive relationships. We put up with that, we take these positions of accepting adoption because we know that in the long run, despite those difficulties that may arise down the track, it is still better for the child.

That is why I am very grateful to the minister for agreeing to split this bill. I think the bulk of the bill, as the member for Waite has pointed out, is quite run of the mill and makes useful administrative changes to the arrangements around adoption, and there is no argument from me on those. In many ways, the arguments around both single parent adoption and same-sex couple adoption are the same, that we are making a deliberate decision as a state to put children into a position that we know is not the ideal position.

That is not to say that children are not brought up every day in circumstances that are less than ideal; we know that is the case. It is definitely not to say that same-sex couples do not make great parents, because they do. I know any number of people who are in a same-sex relationship who are great parents and they have wonderful children. We cannot ever pretend that that is not the case, but we know that the ideal arrangement is where a mother and a father are married and they love each other—not an unhappy marriage, which in general can be damaging for children. That is the basis of my objection to same-sex and single parent adoption. There is no discrimination in it.

The current arrangements allow some single parent adoptions, and I think on a practical level it is very sensible. If we ever get to the point where there are a number of children who need to be adopted and we run out, as it were, of adoptive parents who would meet the sort of criteria that I outlined earlier of the ideal family, then I actually would be prepared to revisit the situation because often the circumstances from which children in state care are coming—and I know they are not the only people who ever get adopted, but they are my particular focus in this case—are very difficult circumstances and in the current arrangements it is very difficult to have a child who is in state care or under state supervision get adopted. Maybe whether it should be made easier to adopt children

who are in state care is something that needs to be looked at in the future because, by the time they get into state care, things are usually pretty bad. I think I am right in saying that, minister?

The Hon. S.E. Close: Yes.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: So, if they are in state care, something has gone horribly wrong and getting them into a safe loving environment is a higher priority than necessarily the case of the sexuality of the parents at that point, but I do not think we are at that point yet. For those reasons, I will be voting against what will become the second bill, or the bill that is split off, which I assume contains just a few clauses around those issues, and I will be supporting the first bill, which is the bulk of the changes that we are making. With those words, I urge the house to give earnest consideration to what will become two bills.

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (21:16): I will be very brief.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: I've obviously provoked him.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I have been provoked, but not necessarily by you, just the collective. I was not going to speak, but I feel compelled to say a few words on this particular matter. I will be supporting both bills that are being presented here and will certainly be supporting the bill that has been split off that supports same-sex adoption.

I do not necessarily want to provoke or upset anyone, but I say how dare anyone believe that it is only in a relationship with a man and a woman, a husband and wife, that a child can be properly looked after, that that child can only be looked after under that type of relationship. I say how dare people believe that.

In a different time, I was a minister and I acted on behalf of those ministers who were responsible for families and communities. I can tell you right now that some of the files that I witnessed during that period of time were quite horrific. I did not necessarily like acting in that position because there was always something awful bubbling underneath the surface that was always going to find its way up to the surface. A lot of that related to the circumstances under which children suffered in those relationships that some people are saying in this house are the only relationships that can deliver a safe and happy life and outcome for children. So, I say how dare people think that is the only way it can happen.

I know quite a few people who have been brought up with same-sex parents, and I can tell you that those people today have children, a happy life and are happy people, and their life became so much happier and more loving under the relationship that existed in the same-sex relationship that the parents—and I say parents because they were both parents of that child—provided for those children. So it is not mutually exclusive to believe that the only way in which children can be brought up is under what others opposite might say is the traditional or most appropriate way for children to be raised. I say how dare they think that way. How dare they think that way. It is not mutually exclusive, as I said, to the best outcomes of the child.

I do not want to ramble on, as some others have tonight. The diatribe I have heard tonight is why I am up here speaking now. I want to do it succinctly, and I also want to close this debate and get on and urge this house to do what is the right thing to do—that is, to pass both components of this bill and allow those circumstances that apply to the rest of society to apply to same-sex couples and individual people who may want to raise a child. Again, it is not mutually exclusive to perceived traditional relationships that a child being brought up by single parent is brought up in a loving, balanced household environment. With those words, I urge everyone in this house to support this bill and let's do the right thing.

Debate adjourned on motion of Ms Wortley.

At 21:20 the house adjourned until Thursday 3 November 2016 at 10:30.

*Estimates Replies***HEYWOOD INTERCONNECTOR**

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The Heywood Interconnector is currently being upgraded to increase the bi-directional flow capacity from 460 megawatts (MW) to 650 MW with testing and commissioning due to be fully completed by March 2017.

The Australian Energy Regulator approved the upgrade contingent project for ElectraNet in March 2014. The Australian Energy Regulator determined a cost of \$47 million (nominal) for the South Australian component.

The \$47 million (nominal) will be recovered through electricity bills paid for by all South Australian electricity consumers.

The Australian Energy Regulator advised that on average transmission tariffs will increase by around 1 per cent. The Australian Energy Regulator also indicates that on average the overall effect of these costs on residential retail bills will be very small, less than a 0.1 per cent increase, because transmission network tariffs typically account for about 9 per cent of residential retail bills in South Australia.

ELECTRICITY GENERATION

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy): The South Australian Government held an Energy Industry Roundtable on the 15 December 2015.

At the roundtable the role of small scale modulated nuclear reactors was raised by stakeholders. As the South Australian Government has committed to investigating issues raised by stakeholders, the work program developed by the Department of State Development following the roundtable included research into small scale modulated nuclear reactors.

The Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission provided its final report to the government in May 2016. The Department of State Development is considering the information provided in the report to address stakeholder feedback at the Energy Industry Roundtable and to assist in the development of the government's response to the royal commission's recommendations.

The government is also currently undertaking extensive and ongoing community consultations with all South Australians on all elements of the royal commission's report before any decisions are made about the recommendations. The Government wants to ensure all South Australians have the opportunity to consider the risks and opportunities associated with the Report's recommendations.'

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The Educator consists of 50 positions structured into three teams providing information, advice and support.

The three teams are:

- Workplace Advisory Services;
- Customer Services; and
- Communication and Education Services

Each team includes a manager.

Workplace Advisory Services includes:

- Seven mobile work health and safety (WHS) advisors who provide tailored, practical advice and support at an individual workplace level. These advisors are experts in WHS with practical experience that span all industries.
- Four principal industry advisors who are responsible for developing industry action plans to identify and, in partnership with industry and unions, address agreed high risk priority issues. The industry advisors cover specific priority industries, which are:

- construction
- primary industries
- manufacturing, transport, wholesale and utilities
- community, retail and business services (including health care industry)
- public sector

Customer Services includes:

- Nine positions in the customer service centres located across the state who can provide resources, information and advice. Centres are located in Adelaide, Port Lincoln, Whyalla, Mount Gambier, Port Pirie and Berri.
- Seven positions within the help centre who take notifiable injuries, dangerous incidents and complaints, as well as provide information and advice over the phone.
- Eleven staff dedicated to high risk work licensing services, which includes, processing new applications and renewals, as well as providing support and information regarding licensing enquiries.

Communication and Education Services includes:

- Nine positions that provide information and advice to all industries and the broader community regarding work health and safety matters.

REVIEW OF CHARACTER PRESERVATION AREAS

In reply to **Mr GRIFFITHS (Goyder)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The Character Preservation (McLaren Vale) Act and the Character Preservation (Barossa Valley) Act require a five yearly review. Both Acts came into operation in 2013 and as such the review is not required until 2018.

BUS SERVICE

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The bus service cost State Records \$840 (excluding GST) for 2015-16.

SALES, GOODS AND SERVICES

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The decrease is mainly due to a reduction in records management training revenue. This revenue is now reflected against Other Income.

INSPECTION ACTIVITY NUMBERS

In reply to **Mr DULUK (Davenport)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

Authorised officers have conducted 226 inspections in July 2016, with a key focus on Casino Inspections, as follows:

- 195 Casino Assessments
- 15 Wagering Inspections
- 11 Liquor Inspections

- 5 Gaming Inspections

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The current estimated cost of prosecuting this case so far is approximately \$78,000, which includes legal fees and expert witnesses.

SAFEWORK SA

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

SafeWork SA has no records of any formal complaints made to the agency. Out of the 5,613 visits for the last financial year, there were no visits conducted at the Supreme Court, nor the Sir Samuel Way Building.

CABINET DOCUMENTS

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

Cabinet documents that have been transferred to State Records custody are stored at the Gepps Cross repository.

LICENCE SUSPENSION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

In the past 12 months Consumer and Business Services has suspended one licence as follows:

Licensee: Fantasy Fulfillment Pty Ltd

Premises: Lavish Club Lounge (Volt)

A Public Order and Safety Notice was issued under section 128B(1) of the Liquor Licensing Act 1997. The licence was suspended for a period of 72 hours.

WORKFORCE SUMMARY

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The decrease of 74.4 FTEs comprises the following movements:

	FTE
FTE reductions associated with:	
Nuclear Fuel Cycle Royal Commission (ceases)	-16.2

	FTE
Child Protection Systems Royal Commission (ceases)	-15.0
Decrease in outposted lawyers (subject to renewal in 2016-17)	-13.0
Medical Panels SA (abolished)	-6.0
ODPP Project Management System finalisation	-6.0
Savings	-5.0
Reclassification of budget from salaries to supplies	-5.0
Justice Reform Unit (correction)	-5.0
CSO Children in State Care	-4.5
Forensic Science SA Laboratory Information Management System	-3.0
Other	-4.2
FTE increases associated with:	
ODPP efficient progression and resolution of major indictable matters	4.5
Independent Commissioner Against Corruption	2.0
Other	2.0
Total	74.4

CHESSEY HOUSE

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The building is owned by Chesser Properties Pty Ltd.

Approximately 65% of the current fit-out is 18 years old and is at the end of its useful life. Funding of \$2.969 million will be used for a significant upgrade of the fit-out across 3.5 floors of the building.

The lease incentive from the building owner will help offset this cost.

LEGAL SERVICES COMMISSION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

As at 30 June 2016, the Legal Services Commission (the Commission) had a cash balance of \$12.3 million which comprised both Commonwealth and State reserves.

The message conveyed to the Commission is that savings targets should provide a trigger to challenge the status quo and consider more contemporary business practices—something the government is keen for all Justice agencies to adopt.

REBOOT PROGRAM

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The Reboot Intensive Intervention Trial has a budget of \$495,000 in 2016-17.

REHABILITATION SERVICES

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The Attorney-General's Department does not fund any programs specifically for prisoners. The 2016 Crime Prevention Grants included a strengthened requirement for initiatives to be place-based or family-based in line with justice reinvestment principles which include working with communities to address the underlying causes of crime. Successful programs included:

Recipient:	Victim Support Service
Amount:	\$97,690
Program:	Safely Together Program—Supporting Children and Mothers after Domestic & Family Abuse
Purpose:	The Safely Together Program will augment existing adult services, promoting a 'one-stop-shop' response with collaborative, wrap-around services for children and their families who have experienced Domestic Violence and are at risk of future contact with the criminal justice system.

Recipient:	Football Federation SA
Amount:	\$76,083
Program:	African mentoring program
Purpose:	The program will deliver a football program 3 times per week over 40 weeks. The target group is young people aged 16–30 engaged in alcohol use and anti-social behaviour. The project will promote physical health, life-skill development, community connections and meaningful opportunities.

Recipient:	City of Salisbury
Amount:	\$99,980
Program:	A Better Future
Purpose:	The City of Salisbury will champion a 'whole of community' approach that focuses on preventing domestic violence. The project will provide both preventative and targeted early intervention based educational workshops for primary school students within the Salisbury Local Government Area focusing on respectful relationships and gender equality.

Recipient:	Ceduna Youth Hub—Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation
Amount:	\$100,000
Program:	Ceduna Youth Hub Youth Mentoring Program
Purpose:	To contribute to reducing and preventing youth offending, the Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation through the Ceduna Youth Hub proposes to pilot an after-hours youth engagement mentoring program on Thursday and Friday evenings and Saturday afternoon/evening. The Hub is a welcoming, safe space, with proven capacity to offer opportunities for youth engagement and community-connected mentoring and support.

Recipient:	HYP A—Helping Young People Achieve
Amount:	\$80,675
Program:	Indi—Healthy Relationships Program
Purpose:	Gender inequality, power imbalances and controlling behaviours can lead to violence in relationships. In partnership with other local community service providers, HYP A will pilot a group program, Indi, to address these attitudes and behaviours and respond to the unique experiences of family and partner violence for young people living in and around Mt Gambier. Through the development of interpersonal skills and positive pro-social connections, Indi aims to build young peoples' capacity to reflect on their experiences, develop respectful relationships and make positive lifestyle choices. Indi supports reductions in family and relationship violence and offending, resulting in a safer community.

Recipient:	Umoona Tjutagku Health Service Aboriginal Corporation
Amount:	\$65,000
Program:	The Fresh Project: Reducing offending & reoffending among young Aboriginal people
Purpose:	The project will engage young Aboriginal people at risk of offending in diversion activities including athletics, bush skills and bike adventures. The project aims to increase the connectedness of Aboriginal youth (aged 12-19) in Coober Pedy and Oodnadatta through healthy activities that connect them with peers, culture and community, improve relationships with police and other agencies, and increase understanding of the effect of crime on offenders' families and communities.

The Funding Agreement to deliver the Reboot Intensive Intervention Trial was awarded to Helping Young People Achieve (HYPA) following a competitive grants process. HYPA subcontract Red Cross to deliver the mentoring component of the program. The agreement is for \$0.9 million to be paid in five instalments over two years (July 2015-June 2017) with a further \$0.1 million available as a bonus pay-by-results payment. This was the first SA government contract with a pay-by-results component. A further \$0.1 million will fund an evaluation by the Australian Institute of Criminology.

To get the \$0.1 million bonus payment, HYPA must meet the following criteria:

Metric	Comparison population average	Payment
Proportion of cohort to reoffend (police apprehension or family conference) after 6 months of commencing program	46%	\$1,000 for each percentage point reduction beyond 3% (i.e. below 43% of cohort reoffending in first 6 months), up to maximum of \$17,500
Mean number of police apprehensions/family conferences per person amongst those who are apprehended in first 6 months	3.0	\$1,000 for each reduction of 0.1 apprehensions/conferences beyond 0.3 (i.e. below mean of 2.7 per person), up to a maximum of \$17,500
Proportion of cohort to reoffend (police apprehension or family conference) after 12 months	59%	\$1,000 for each percentage point reduction beyond 3% (i.e. below 57% of cohort reoffending in first 6 months), up to maximum of \$17,500
Mean number of police apprehensions/family conferences amongst those who are apprehended in 12 months	4.2	\$1,000 for each reduction of 0.1 apprehensions/conferences beyond 0.3 (i.e. below mean of 3.9 per person), up to a maximum of \$17,500
Individual engagement in education or employment, or to commence/complete accredited training	N/A	\$375 per individual successfully placed Maximum payment \$30,000

The Attorney-General's Department has no other grant programs that incorporate a bonus scheme.

CROWN SOLICITOR'S TRUST ACCOUNT

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The balance of the Crown Solicitor's Trust Account (CSTA) as at 30 June 2016 was \$2.9 million. Total receipts into the CSTA during 2015-16 were \$37.3 million. Total payments from the CSTA during 2015-16 were \$38.9 million.

INDEPENDENT COMMISSIONER AGAINST CORRUPTION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): I have been provided the following advice:

The Independent Commissioner Against Corruption (ICAC) has advised that he has not travelled to the Northern Territory in relation to the proposed establishment of a Northern Territory corruption commission.

The ICAC has also advised that there is, at this time, no arrangement in place for him to act also as the head of a Northern Territory corruption commission.'

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to various members (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2014-15:

Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount (\$)
AGD	Assistant Director Operations	PO5	Attraction	29,300
AGD	General Manager Regulatory Services	MAS3	Attraction	24,920
AGD	Assistant Director, Science and Support	PO5	Attraction	23,776
AGD	Senior Manager Change and Business Improvement	ASO8	Attraction	21,304
AGD	Principal Mining Engineer	PO3	Retention	20,881
AGD	Principal Consultant Media and Government Relations	ASO8	Retention	20,286
AGD	Senior Assistant Parliamentary Counsel	LEC5	Attraction	20,086
AGD	Principal Mining Engineer	PO3	Attraction	18,793
AGD	Manager Financial Services	MAS3	Retention	16,268
AGD	Manager Operational Service Delivery	MAS3	Attraction	15,948
AGD	Project Manager SACAD	ASO8	Attraction	14,952
AGD	Legal Counsel	LEC5	Attraction	14,722
AGD	Legal Counsel	LEC5	Attraction	14,492
AGD	Principal Technical Specialist	ASO8	Attraction	12,166
AGD	Manager Project Delivery	ASO8	Attraction	10,908
AGD	Manager Facilities and Security	MAS3	Attraction	10,845
AGD	Laboratory Operations Manager	ASO7	Attraction	10,609
AGD	Solicitor	LEC5	Attraction	10,006
AGD	System Administrator	ASO7	Attraction	9,968
AGD	System Administrator	ASO7	Attraction	9,968
AGD	Forensic Scientist	PO2	Attraction	8,271
AGD	Assistant Director, Operations	PO5	Attraction	6,515
AGD	Team Leader SACAD Application Specialist	ASO7	Retention	6,256
AGD	Manager Project Assurance SAGRN	ASO8	Attraction	6,061
AGD	Senior Geographical Information System (GIS) Analyst	ASO7	Retention	5,931
AGD	Solicitor	LEC2	Attraction	3,714
AGD	System Administrator	ASO7	Attraction	2,377
AGD	Manager Business Services	ASO8	Attraction	2,232
AGD	Senior Project Officer	ASO7	Retention	2,115
AGD	Senior Project Manager	ASO8	Attraction	124

(b) 2015-16:

Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount \$
AGD	Senior Project Manager	ASO8	Attraction	32,043
AGD	Manager Project Delivery	ASO8	Attraction	30,671
AGD	General Manager Regulatory Services	MAS3	Attraction	23,962
AGD	Assistant Director Operations	PO5	Attraction	21,428
AGD	Senior Assistant, Parliamentary Counsel	LEC5	Attraction	19,791
AGD	Principal Mining Engineer	PO3	Attraction	19,303
AGD	Assistant Director Science and Support	PO5	Attraction	19,002
AGD	Manager Commercial, SAGRN	ASO8	Attraction	16,792
AGD	Manager Operational Service Delivery	MAS3	Attraction	15,335
AGD	Principal Mining Engineer	PO3	Retention	14,817
AGD	Project Manager SACAD	ASO8	Attraction	14,377
AGD	Legal Counsel	LEC5	Attraction	14,377
AGD	Legal Counsel	LEC5	Attraction	14,377
AGD	Principal Consultant Media and Government Relations	ASO8	Retention	14,063
AGD	Registrar	MAS3	Attraction	12,700
AGD	Team Leader SACAD Application Specialist	ASO7	Retention	10,689
AGD	Manager Facilities and Security	MAS3	Attraction	10,686
AGD	System Administrator	ASO7	Attraction	9,585
AGD	System Administrator	ASO7	Attraction	9,585
AGD	Laboratory Operations Manager	ASO7	Attraction	9,311
AGD	Manager Financial Services	MAS3	Attraction	7,684
AGD	System Administrator	ASO7	Attraction	6,518
AGD	Forensic Scientist	PO2	Attraction	5,861
AGD	Senior Geographical Information Systems (GIS) Analyst	ASO7	Retention	5,833
AGD	Senior Solicitor	LEC5	Attraction	5,693
AGD	Business Analyst	ASO6	Attraction	4,294
AGD	Solicitor	LEC2	Attraction	3,004
AGD	Senior Solicitor	LEC5	Attraction	2,684
AGD	Senior Manager Change and Business Improvement	ASO8	Attraction	1,650
AGD	Senior Solicitor	LEC5	Attraction	1,150
AGD	Manager Financial Services	MAS3	Retention	126
AGD	Manager Project Assurance, SAGRN	ASO8	Attraction	47

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to various members (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide): Information on TVSP's can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Annual Report to parliament. There is no budget over the forward estimates and any packages offered are to be funded within existing agency budgets.

HOME DETENTION

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The expected increase in home detention over the forward estimates is as follows:

Financial Year	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
	98	151	207	212

BAIL ACCOMMODATION SUPPORT PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The recurrent budget for the program in 2016-17 is \$1.859m. There is no capital investment in that project.

METROPOLITAN FIRE SERVICE

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service's (MFS) employment conditions are pursuant to the Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005. Accordingly, section 56 of the Public Sector Act 2009 does not apply to the MFS and therefore is not relied upon. The Fire and Emergency Services Act 2005 does not contain a provision to direct employees for independent medical assessments.

FATALITY STATISTICS

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The road fatality rate for South Australia in 2015 is 6.0 fatalities per 100,000 population. For the Greater Adelaide metropolitan area the fatality rate is 3.3 fatalities per 100,000 population. This compares to the rural fatality rate which is 15.5 fatalities per 100,000 population.

ROAD SAFETY

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

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

The Road Safety program provides for policy and investment advice, community information on road safety and the provision of services for safe and sustainable road use and travel behaviour.

The variation of 2015-16 Estimated Result to 2015-16 Budget of \$1.6 million relates to the transfer of the State and National Black Spot programs funding reported against program 6 Infrastructure Planning and Management to program 7 Road Safety. The budget transfer is an accounting treatment, and the budget relates to Road Safety's responsibility for identifying and approving projects under the State and National Black Spot programs.

The transfer of functions reported under program 4 Roads and Marine in 2015-16 to program 7 Road Safety of \$1.1 million relates to the provision of the Rider Safe training program. Rider Safe is a compulsory motorcycle rider training course for all novice motorcycle riders.

FERAL PEST INFESTATION

In reply to **Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

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

I am advised that regional natural resources management (NRM) boards, in partnership with the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources (DEWNR), invested approximately \$9.5 million in feral animal and plant control activities in 2015–16.

Of this, approximately \$5.5 million was invested in pest animal control activities and \$4 million was invested in pest plant control activities across South Australia.

An indication of the amount invested in animal and plant control in each region for 2015–16 is presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Indicative amounts invested in each region for animal and plant control activities over 2015-16.

NRM Region	Pest Animal Control 2015-16	Pest Plant Control 2015-16	Total
Adelaide and Mount Lofty Ranges	\$2,458,907	\$91,227	\$2,550,134
SA Murray-Darling Basin Region	\$765,660	\$856,000	\$1,621,660
South East	\$1,152,500	\$1,574,500	\$2,727,000
Eyre Peninsula	\$292,000	\$292,500	\$584,500
Northern and Yorke	\$32,928	\$8,331	\$41,259
SA Arid Lands	\$507,900	\$319,920	\$827,820
Kangaroo Island	\$217,475	724,000	\$941,475
Alinytjara Wilurara	\$60,000	\$165,415	\$225,415
Total	\$5,487,370	\$4,031,893	\$9,519,263

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to **Mr KNOLL (Schubert)** (1 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

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

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non-ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
1.0	ASO7
3.8	ASO6
1.0	SAW6
2.0	ASO5
1.0	ASO3
3.8	ASO2

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing): Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

Primary Industries and Regions SA

(a) 2014-15:

	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
PIRSA	Career Transition Consult	ASO603	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	ICT Architect Data & Infrastructure	ASO704	Retention	\$18,880
PIRSA	Assistant Director Organisational Performance and Change	ASO803	Retention	\$18,000
PIRSA	Principal Financial Consultant	ASO803	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Manager Market Development	ASO803	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Director Strategic Policy	ASO803	Retention	\$41,200
PIRSA	Manager Business Performance	ASO803	Retention	\$10,000

	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
PIRSA	Manager Crops Commercialisation	MAS101	Retention	\$5,000
PIRSA	General Manager Forestry	MAS201	Retention	\$5,000
PIRSA	Manager Records & Info Manage	MAS201	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Assistant Director Strategy Communications & Engagement	MAS301	Attraction	\$10,000
PIRSA	Manager Budget Strategy	MAS301	Retention	\$14,006
PIRSA	Gen Manager Business Support	MAS301	Retention	\$20,000
PIRSA	Business Manager	MAS301	Retention	\$15,722
PIRSA	Manager Food & Plant Standard	MAS301	Retention	\$21,370
PIRSA	Gen Manager Strategy & Policy	MAS301	Retention	\$21,370
PIRSA	Senior Veterinary Officer	PO301	Retention	\$4,693
PIRSA	Research Scientist Abalone	PO303	Retention	\$8,800
PIRSA	Manager Disease Surveillance	PO404	Attraction	\$22,538
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO503	Retention	\$13,184
PIRSA	Principal Scientist Climate Variability	PO503	Retention	\$22,312
PIRSA	Principal Research Scientist	PO503	Retention	\$33,497
PIRSA	Tech Manager Poultry Food Pro	PO503	Retention	\$19,720
PIRSA	Principal Scientist Reprod Biology	PO601	Retention	\$67,193
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$39,062
PIRSA	Principal Research Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$15,126
PIRSA	Program Leader Fin Fish/GAB	PO601	Retention	\$30,000
PIRSA	Leader Diagnostic Centre	PO601	Retention	\$29,251
PIRSA	Program Leader Environ & Ecology	PO601	Retention	\$26,855
PIRSA	Principal Scientist - Oceanography	PO601	Retention	\$26,014
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$8,000
PIRSA	Principal Scientist-Crop Physiology	PO601	Retention	\$16,000

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
PIRSA	Career Transition Consultant	ASO603	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	ICT Architect Data & Infr	ASO704	Retention	\$18,880
PIRSA	Director Strategic Policy	ASO803	Retention	\$41,200
PIRSA	Asst Dir Org Perform & Reform	ASO803	Retention	\$18,000

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
PIRSA	Manager Market Development	ASO803	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Research Officer	MAS101	Retention	\$5,000
PIRSA	Mgr Records & Info Management	MAS201	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Mgr Budget Strategy	MAS301	Retention	\$16,500
PIRSA	Gen Mgr Bus Supp & Exec	MAS301	Retention	\$20,000
PIRSA	Mgr Food & Plant Standards	MAS301	Retention	\$21,370
PIRSA	Business Manager	MAS301	Retention	\$15,722
PIRSA	General Manager Operations	MAS301	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Asst Director Strategic Comms	MAS301	Retention	\$10,000
PIRSA	Research Officer	PO105	Retention	\$7,500
PIRSA	Snr Veterinary Officer	PO302	Retention	\$4,693
PIRSA	Research Scientist	PO303	Retention	\$8,800
PIRSA	Mgr Disease Surveillance	PO404	Retention	\$22,538
PIRSA	Principal Research Scientist	PO503	Retention	\$34,334
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO503	Retention	\$13,184
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO503	Retention	\$22,312
PIRSA	Tech Mgr Poultry Food Prod Sys	PO503	Retention	\$19,720
PIRSA	Sub Program Leader Fin Fish/Gab	PO601	Retention	\$30,000
PIRSA	Leader Diagnostic Ctr	PO601	Retention	\$29,251
PIRSA	Prog Ldr Environ & Ecolo	PO601	Retention	\$26,855
PIRSA	Principal Research Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$15,126
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$16,000
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$26,014
PIRSA	Chief Sustainable System	PO601	Retention	\$39,062
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$67,193
PIRSA	Principal Scientist	PO601	Retention	\$8,000

South Australian Tourism Commission

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SATC	Nil	Nil	Nil	Nil

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
SATC	Commercial Manager, Motor Sport Group	Exec	KPI Performance Bonus	\$22,000 per annum

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing): Information on TVSP's can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament.

There is no budget over the forward estimates and any packages offered are to be funded within existing agency budgets.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing): I have been advised of the following:

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non-ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
1	AS07
4	AS06
2	AS05
2	AS04
1	AS03
1	AS02

SMALL BUSINESS

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs):

1. 'There are no official statistics available for small business job creation at a state level. In June 2015, the Department of State Development commissioned independent analysis from consulting firm EconSearch to estimate the contribution of small businesses to the South Australian labour force. This analysis was underpinned by the ABS Counts of Australian Businesses – Entries and Exits publication. For methodological reasons, the analysis was based on 2012-13 ABS data. The EconSearch report found that the employment contribution of small businesses in the state was an estimated 242,000 full-time equivalent jobs, representing 34% of the state total. An update to this analysis based on newly released ABS data is being investigated by the department.

2. A range of factors, including the lack of official statistics on state-level small business employment from which to establish a baseline, makes it difficult to produce reliable modelled forecasts of small business job creation. The \$109 million Jobs Accelerator Grant Scheme which came into effect on 1 July 2016 will support small business job creation in South Australia. The Department of Treasury and Finance estimates this scheme will provide grants for 14,000 full-time equivalent positions.

3. The Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation has provided the following advice:

'All the Micro Finance Fund recipients are still operating their businesses, with the final reports on outcomes for each expected later this year.'

4. The Department of Treasury and Finance advises that RevenueSA does not collect information about the number of employees within businesses remitting payroll tax. It only requires businesses to provide the total value of its payroll. For the Small Business Payroll Tax Rebate, small business is defined as those having a taxable payroll of less than \$1.2 million. The extension of the rebate until 2019-20 is predicted to assist approximately 2,300 businesses.

5. All of those 2,300 small businesses will benefit from the rebate, but no data is available, and no modelling has been undertaken, to determine how many of those 2,300 businesses have between 1 and 19 employees.

6. The advice from the Department of Treasury and Finance is that the Jobs Accelerator Grant Scheme requires, in addition to other eligibility criteria unrelated to your question, that:

- (a) the services of the employee are performed wholly or mainly in South Australia;
- (b) the employee is a South Australian resident; and
- (c) the employer pays wages, within the meaning of the Payroll Tax Act 2009, nationally of \$5 million or less.'

TECHPORT AUSTRALIA

In reply to **Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart)** (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): All capital works associated with the Techport Australia Common User Facility have now been completed.

Whilst the CUF has been operational since 2010, a number of residual works have been undertaken since that time to ensure the CUF meets all of the state's obligations under the air warfare destroyer project in an efficient and safe manner. The final components of these works have only been completed in 2015-16 resulting in a delay in Defence SA's ability to undertake a full assessment of the depreciation budget for the CUF.

The final works completed in 2015-16 were:

- Finalisation of construction of Building 12 at a cost of \$0.723m.
- Finalisation of installation of a Cathodic Protection system to protect the wharf and ship lift piling from corrosion costing \$1.876m.

Following completion of these final residual works, Defence SA undertook a review of the budgeted depreciation charge taking account of the final capitalised values and assessed useful lives of all assets. The result of this assessment was a reduction in the budgeted depreciation charge for 2016-17 of \$0.170m and an ongoing reduction in the annual depreciation charge of \$0.160m.

The adjustment was rounded to the nearest \$0.100m for variance explanation purposes.

ATTRACTION AND RETENTION ALLOWANCES

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs):

Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Department of State Development	General Manager, Immigration SA	MAS3	Retention	\$12,000
Department of State Development	Consultant—Jinan		Transport Allowance	Equivalent to \$2,400 pa

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Department of State Development	General Manager, Immigration SA	MAS3	Retention	\$12,000
Department of State Development	Consultant- Jinan		Transport Allowance	Equivalent to \$2,400 pa

Minister for Defence Industries

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Defence SA	Director Workforce	ASO 8	Attraction/Retention	\$8,404
Defence SA	Director Marketing and Communications	ASO 8	Attraction/Retention	\$54,161
Defence SA	Director Strategy Policy and Planning	ASO 8	Attraction/Retention	\$25,620
Defence SA	Director Governance and Regulation	ASO 8	Attraction/retention	\$8,652
Defence SA	Commercial Manager	ASO 7	Attraction/Retention	\$3,783
Defence SA	Maintenance Manager	OPS 7	Attraction/Retention	\$61,392
Defence SA	Maintenance Technician	OPS 4	Attraction/Retention	\$32,580
Defence SA	Maintenance Technician	OPS 3	Attraction/Retention	\$11,302
Defence SA	Maintenance Technician	OPS 3	Attraction/Retention	\$5,697
Defence SA	Maintenance Assistant	OPS 2	Attraction/Retention	\$9,684
Defence SA	Maintenance Assistant	OPS 2	Attraction/Retention	\$13,381
Defence SA	Maintenance Assistant	OPS 2	Attraction/Retention	\$16,437

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
Defence SA	Director Workforce	ASO 8	Attraction/Retention	\$8,456
Defence SA	Director Marketing and Communications	ASO 8	Attraction/Retention	\$22,741
Defence SA	Director Strategy Policy and Planning	ASO 8	Attraction/Retention	\$9,777
Defence SA	Director Governance and Regulation	ASO 8	Attraction/retention	\$7,796
Defence SA	Commercial Manager	ASO 7	Attraction/Retention	\$3,806
Defence SA	Maintenance Manager	OPS 7	Attraction/Retention	\$61,769
Defence SA	Maintenance Technician	OPS 4	Attraction/Retention	\$34,792
Defence SA	Maintenance Technician	OPS 3	Attraction/Retention	\$11,371
Defence SA	Maintenance Technician	OPS 3	Attraction/Retention	\$19,749
Defence SA	Maintenance Assistant	OPS 2	Attraction/Retention	\$13,463
Defence SA	Maintenance Assistant	OPS 2	Attraction/Retention	\$16,538

Minister for Veterans' Affairs

Attraction, retention and performance allowances as well as non-salary benefits paid to public servants and contractors:

(a) 2014-15:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DTF/Veterans SA	Nil	n/a	n/a	n/a

(b) 2015-16:

Dept/Agency	Position Title	Classification	Allowance Type	Allowance Amount
DTF/Veterans SA	Nil	n/a	n/a	n/a

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs):

Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Department of State Development

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$,000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Investment and Trade			
ASEAN Strategy			
Adelaide Festival Centre Trust	30	Sponsorship of the OzAsia Festival 2015 held on 24 September 2015 at the Adelaide Festival Centre.	Y
Export Partnership Program			
Total Electrical Pty Ltd	103	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Aquaessence Pty Ltd	16	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Barossa Vintage Pty Ltd	23	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Byrne Vineyards Pty Ltd	32	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Davroe	13	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Edukated Pty Ltd	10	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Elderton Wines Pty Ltd	28	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Elwa Pty Ltd	15	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Ferguson Australia Pty Ltd	50	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Greenwheat Freekeh Pty Ltd	20	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Growers Wine Group Pty Ltd	18	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Hentley Farm Pty Ltd	13	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Oasis Systems Pty Ltd	30	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Optimal Essentials	25	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Podpac Pty Ltd	29	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Salena Estate Wines Pty Ltd	17	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Simulation Australia Ltd	15	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
South Australia Prawn Co-operative	11	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Steriline Racing Pty Ltd	11	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
The Wood Agency	16	To pursue international market development opportunities.	Y
Greater Europe			

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$,000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Flinders University of South Australia	75	Contribution to the Hellenic Centre for Professor Michael Tsianikas	Y
Tradestart			
Business SA	30	Sponsor the Export Awards 2016	Y
Food South Australia Inc	25	Sponsor the 2015 South Australian Food Industry Awards	Y

Small Business			
Small Business Initiatives			
Aboriginal Enterprises In	10	Sponsor the Aboriginal Enterprises in Mining Energy and Exploration 2015 Conference.	Y
Business SA	53	To support the delivery of the coaching and mentoring program	Y
Business SA	53	To support the delivery of the south Australian Young Entrepreneur Scheme	Y
Corporation of the City of Marion	40	To deliver the Tonsley Small Business Advisory Service	Y
Traded Services			
Mihell & Lycos	15	Sponsorship for Impact Awards	Y
Office of the Industry Advocate			
Steelmaking—Accreditation			
Steelwork Compliance Australia	25	Steel work engineers and fabrications assessment to audit	Y
Steelmaking – Australian Standards			
Australian Steel Institute Ltd	22	Steel Surveillance and Certification Program.	Y

Investment Attraction South Australia

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
NEC Australia Pty Ltd	\$100,000	Completion of Milestone 1, to assist NEC to establish a global security intelligence centre in Adelaide	Y

For the forward estimates, the following reflects grant program operating expenditure budgets as at August 2016.

Department of State Development

International Engagement, Trade, Migration and International Education

Program Description	2016-17 Budget	2017-18 Forward Estimates	2018-19 Revised Budget	2019-20 Revised Budget	2020-21 Revised Budget
Business SA Export Program	300	300	-	-	-
Export Partnership Program	1,726	744	763	782	802

Small Business

Program Description	2016-17 Budget	2017-18 Forward Estimates	2018-19 Revised Budget	2019-20 Revised Budget	2020-21 Revised Budget
Steelmaking – Accreditation	36	-	-	-	-
Steelmaking-Australian Standards	100	100	-	-	-
Northern Economic Plan Small Business Job Creation Fund	3,303	5,836	1,389	-	-
Small Business Initiatives	434	443	452	464	475
Traded Services Strategy	364	373	383	394	406

Investment Attraction South Australia

Name of Grant Program	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	Total
Economic Investment Fund	\$12,775,000	\$11,320,000	\$10,480,000	\$34,575,000
Economic Investment Fund – Defence Industry Attraction	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$2,000,000	\$6,000,000
Total	\$14,775,000	\$13,320,000	\$12,480,000	\$40,575,000

Minister for Defence Industries 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Defence SA

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Defence Teaming Centre	\$515,000	SA Defence Industry Sustainment Project	Y
Defence Teaming Centre	\$387,000	Australian Made Defence Advocacy campaign	Y
Data to Decision Cooperative Research Centre	\$200,000	Industry assistance	Y
ASC AWD Shipbuilder Pty Ltd	\$651,935	Air Warfare Systems Centre Rental Assistance	Y
ASC AWD Shipbuilder Pty Ltd	\$42,123	Maritime Skills Centre Operations Manager and Assistant salary contribution	Y

Forward Estimates

The following provides details of the current approved grant funding in the forward estimates:

Name of Grant Program	Budget			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Defence Teaming Centre SA Defence Industry Sustainment Project	\$500,000	\$500,000	\$450,000	\$450,000
Defence Teaming Centre Australian Made Defence Campaign (1)	\$167,000	-	-	-
Defence Teaming Centre Automotive Transformation Project	\$525,000	\$538,000	-	-
Data to Decision Cooperative Research Centre	\$200,000	-	-	-
AWD Systems Centre Rent Assistance	\$665,000	\$695,000	\$727,000	\$761,000

Name of Grant Program	Budget			
	2016-17	2017-18	2018-19	2019-20
Maritime Skills Centre Salary Contribution	\$132,000	\$135,000	\$138,000	\$141,000
Cyber Industry Attraction	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000	\$200,000
Shipbuilding Industry Assistance	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000	\$250,000
Land 400 Industry Attraction	\$225,000	-	-	-

(1) Approval will be sought for carry over of \$381,000 from 2015-16 to 2016-17 for this program

Minister for Veterans' Affairs 2015-16

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

DTF/Veterans SA

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Returned & Services League of Australia (SA Branch)	\$110,000.00 Including \$10,000.00 GST	Annual grant in support of Anzac Day, Remembrance Day & other commemorative events	Y
Legacy Club of Adelaide	\$110,000.00 Including \$10,000.00 GST	Ongoing grant to Legacy Welfare Fund in support of dependants of deceased and incapacitated veterans	Y
Adelaide Cemeteries Authority	\$22,000.00 Including \$2,000.00 GST	Restoration of Cross of Sacrifice, West Terrace Cemetery	Y
Australian International Pictures	\$11,000.00 Including \$1,000.00 GST	'Paris or the Bush' documentary film on CODS rowing crew from Murray Bridge pre and post WWI	Y
Country Arts SA	\$22,000.00 including \$2,000.00 GST	Management & delivery of artists' residencies in regional SA to engage indigenous communities & capture stories of indigenous diggers	Y
CF Rail Services Pty Ltd	\$10,914.20 including \$992.20 GST	Restoration of the Islington Workshops War Memorial	Y
From Page to Stage Ltd	\$11,206.80 including \$1,018.80	The Front – An Australian Musical Production set against backdrop of 32 nd Battalion at Battle of Fromelles 1916	Y
Freeling RSL Sub-Branch	\$10,560.00 including \$960.00 GST	Establishment of a Memorial Garden and Wall to honour those who served from the Freeling community	Y
History SA	\$10,120.00 including \$920.00 GST	The Great War at Home travelling exhibition highlighting experiences of South Australians on the homefront during WWI	Y
Illuminart Productions Ltd	\$22,000.00 including \$2,000.00 GST	Large scale sound & light projection for Torrens Parade Ground with stories/insights into experience of regional South Australians on homefront during WWI.	Y
Raukkan Community Council Inc	\$10,312.50 including \$937.50 GST	Construction of phase two of Raukkan War Memorial	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Returned & Services League of Australia (SA Branch)	\$22,000.00 including \$2,000.00 GST	Production of Centenary of Service DVD – the role of the RSL over 100 years	Y
Returned & Services League of Australia (SA Branch)	\$49,500.00 including \$4,500.00 GST	RSL Virtual War Memorial – further development of website to enhance community engagement	Y
Returned & Services League of Australia (SA Branch)	\$11,000.00 including \$1,000.00 GST	Anzac Centenary Commemorative Reception for surviving WWII Veterans at Government House	Y

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): Information on TVSP's can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Annual Report to Parliament.

There is no budget over the forward estimates and any packages offered are to be funded within existing agency budgets.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to various members (2 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs): I have been advised of the following:

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non-ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
1.0	ASO7
2.0	ASO6
3.0	ASO5
0.6	ASO3
1.0	ASO2

TARGETED VOLUNTARY SEPARATION PACKAGES

In reply to various members (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): Information on TVSPs can be obtained from the Auditor-General's Annual Report to parliament.

There is no budget over the forward estimates and any packages offered are to be funded within existing agency budgets.

MINISTERIAL STAFF

In reply to various members (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised of the following:

For a list of ministerial staff and salaries please refer to the Government Gazette.

Non-ministerial appointments are as follows:

FTE	Classification
1	ASO704
1	ASO702

FTE	Classification
1	ASO602
1	ASO602
1	ASO504
1	ASO504
1	ASO403
1	ASO403
1	ASO302
1	ASO203
1	ASO202
0.4	ASO203

ACHIEVING WOMEN'S EQUALITY

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

There is not a specific allocated budget for initiatives developed under Achieving Women's Equality.

Achieving Women's Equality provides guiding principles for government departments to achieve positive change for women through its three pillars of action – improving women's economic status, increasing women's leadership and participation, and improving women's wellbeing and safety. As such, it influences and guides a number of other specific budget lines.

WOMEN IN LEADERSHIP

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

At 30 June 2015 women comprised 44.6 percent of all South Australian public sector executives. This figure includes executives in other statutory and constitutional appointments, managers, chief executive officers, professional specialists, medical officers, nurses and legal services officers employed at the executive level across administrative units and other public sector organisations.

WHITE RIBBON ACCREDITATION

In reply to **Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The Equal Opportunity Commission is leading the implementation of White Ribbon Accreditation across 20 government departments, and Agents.

Eleven have obtained their accreditation and nine are in the process of becoming accredited. The initial 11 were selected due to their large size, providing the opportunity for increased cultural awareness on a large scale. The subsequent nine agencies were chosen as an extension of the initial 11, enhancing the program's sustainability and reach across the public sector.

WEDO APP

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised:

The WeDo app involves young people registering with volunteer organisations and then 'banking' the number of hours they volunteered. The organisations then verify the volunteer hours.

The app provides a platform to collate the number of hours banked and accrue reward points. The app allows volunteers access to verified reports of hours and demonstrated competencies. These could then be included in resumes, supporting pathways to employment.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN HOUSING TRUST MAINTENANCE PROGRAM

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (3 August 2016). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON (Ramsay—Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Ageing, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers): I have been advised that in 2015-16, South Australian Housing Trust Maintenance program expenditure was \$121.7 million.

A breakdown of the programs are included in the table below.

Program	2015-16 Expenditure
Responsive	\$43.489m
Programmed	\$25.212m
Vacancy	\$34.724m
Capital	\$13.591m
Double Unit Separations	\$411,000
Other (1)	\$4.273m
Total Expenditure	\$121.700m

(1) Other includes Aboriginal communities, community housing and office maintenance.