

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Wednesday, 15 February 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:01 and read prayers.

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

Parliamentary Committees

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: CHRISTIES BEACH HIGH SCHOOL SPECIAL OPTIONS

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:04): On behalf of the member for Colton, I move:

That the 557th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled Christies Beach High School Special Options, be noted.

The aim of this project is to provide purpose-built facilities to teach 56 students with a wide range of disabilities, as well as a special class of 12 students. The current facilities are not purpose-built and do not meet the needs of the students or the staff. The scope of the works includes the construction of two new buildings that incorporate eight flexible general learning areas with associated outdoor learning spaces and withdrawal areas, art and multipurpose rooms, teacher preparation areas and suitable toilet facilities. There will also be a new covered walkway and entry canopy.

The cost of the project is estimated at \$5 million (excluding GST), with works due to commence early this year and the project to be finalised at the end of 2017. This project falls within the category that the committee has resolved to consider on an individual basis, that is, projects under \$11 million.

Given the straightforward nature of this project and the justification provided for these specific needs facilities, the committee determined that the information provided in the submission was of sufficient detail and that further oral evidence was not required. 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) (11:06): The opposition is totally supportive of this project.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:06): The report is noted with bipartisan support.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: WESTERN ADELAIDE WASTEWATER NETWORK UPGRADE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:06): I move:

That the 558th report of the committee, entitled Western Adelaide Wastewater Network Upgrade, be noted.

SA Water has identified that the Western Adelaide Wastewater Network, which services around 75 per cent of the Adelaide CBD and a large portion of the south-eastern suburbs, is experiencing increased demand leading to hydraulic restrictions and surcharging, as well as odour due to its turbulence. The increase in demand is due to residential infill in the south-eastern suburbs and significant development within the CBD.

To address this, SA Water will install approximately 1.8 kilometres of large diameter pipework from West Terrace to a connection on War Memorial Drive in North Adelaide, bypassing the section of the network that is at or near capacity. This will include open excavation and trenching to ensure hydraulic grades are maintained. However, trenchless technology will be utilised at major road, rail and river crossings to minimise disruptions to commuters and the impact on these key pieces of infrastructure, including West Terrace and Port Road.

The committee was informed that SA Water has undertaken consultation to ensure that environmental and community impacts are minimised and that public amenity is retained where

possible. Native title may still exist over some of the alignment and, as such, SA Water has provided notice pursuant to the Native Title Act 1994 and will continue to consult with the Kaurna people, the traditional owners of the land.

The cost of the new sewer network is \$11.385 million (GST exclusive). Works commenced over the Christmas period to take advantage of less traffic on West Terrace, with the Adelaide High School students being on holiday and less commuter traffic. Over the past few weeks, people may have noticed some of the works being undertaken along West Terrace. Weather permitting, the project should be completed by the middle of this year. 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) (11:08): This is an important part of Adelaide's water infrastructure. It is just a pity that it has taken so long to do any of it, quite frankly. However, that said, any improvement to the system which reticulates water around Adelaide, whether it be good water, wastewater or whatever, is supported by us.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:09): I propose that the report be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: SOUTH EAST FLOWS RESTORATION PROJECT

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:09): I move:

That the 559th report of the Public Works Committee, entitled South East Flows Restoration Project, be noted.

The 2006-10 drought in the Murray-Darling Basin negatively affected the ecological health of the Coorong, Lake Alexandrina and Lake Albert. The low River Murray flows, and lack of flow into the Coorong, resulted in extreme hypersaline conditions developing in the Coorong South Lagoon and, consequently, the degradation of habitat within this ecosystem.

Since the drought, there has been substantial flow into the Coorong but the ecosystem response has been slow, suggesting long-term impacts. This project aims to address this by building resilience and a healthy Coorong ecosystem, as well as providing some environmental benefits to wetlands in the Upper South-East. It will increase flows by an average of 26.5 gigalitres per year, taking the average annual quantum delivered to the Coorong to 42.7 gigalitres per year.

Specifically, the project includes the construction of a new channel from Blackford Drain to the southern end of the Taratap Drain, and the widening of the existing drains from Taratap Drain to the Tilley Swamp watercourse. The water will then flow into the Tilley Swamp and exit into the Coorong South Lagoon via a Salt Creek outlet. Approximately 13 kilometres of new drains will be constructed, and 80 kilometres of existing drains will be modified and upgraded at a capital cost of approximately \$48 million (GST exclusive). The whole project, including land acquisition, consultation, and communication is costed at \$60 million.

Consultation has occurred with a wide variety of stakeholders, including landholders, local Aboriginal groups, and the local council. This has led to the realignment of the drain through Tilley Swamp, which will achieve the additional benefit of providing water to the swamp, as well as being able to better manage the release of water into the Coorong South Lagoon.

The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources is responsible for implementing the project and informed the committee that the project has the general support of the local community. Construction is due to commence in early 2017, with an estimated construction time frame of 75 weeks. The time frame is weather dependent. 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 WILLIAMS (MacKillop) (11:12): As the local member, I am obviously quite interested in this project. Indeed, I am quite supportive of the project. The idea of returning waters to the Coorong from the South-East of the state is one that I have long advocated for and, indeed, since before coming into this place as then an elected landholder member of the South Eastern Water Conservation Drainage Board.

I take issue with some of the report that has been presented to the house today. I refer to the background information, where it refers to the Upper South East Drainage Scheme. It states that it has reduced flooding and resulted in significant agricultural productivity gains. That is a nonsense. The Upper South-East drainage system is certainly designed to reduce flooding, but we have had such dry years since the completion of that drainage scheme that very little water has flowed in the drains that have been constructed. It has had minimal impact, but I think it is a long stretch to suggest that this has reduced flooding and resulted in significant agricultural productivity gains.

The Upper South-East has been screaming out for water in recent years, and I do not think that the drainage scheme has had much impact on agricultural productivity at all. I pointed that out to the committee when I spoke to it during one of its hearings; not that it is of any great import other than the fact that this remains a public record, and I think it is in error. I think I pointed out that the information given to the committee by the department was in error, and I would have liked the committee to have reported that and got the facts right. Some student sometime in the future might come along and take that as fact, and I can assure the house that it is not fact; it is actually an error.

Another chief matter I wish to raise is that on page 11 of the report, under Operating Costs, it is noted that I raised concerns 'regarding the available ongoing budget to manage the operations and maintenance of the project'. I had to leave the hearing because I had another appointment, but I read the transcript and was horrified to learn that, in response to my concerns about the underfunding of the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board and its inability to adequately maintain the assets for which it is responsible, the department told the committee that, because this project would see the replacement of a number of the drainage board's assets, it would save the drainage board an estimated \$900,000 per annum in maintenance costs.

I suspect that is more than the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board spends on maintenance altogether. This is only going to impact on a tiny fraction of the drainage network in the South-East. I would suggest that the committee was misled by the department—by the agency—in giving that information. I think the committee was misled. I do not believe that you can claim that you are going to save \$900,000 per annum in maintenance costs when you have never spent that sort of money on maintenance on the parts of the drainage system that this project is going to impact. That is a nonsense. That is spin of the worst order, and I would suggest that the committee should actually look into that matter.

I ask the committee to call witnesses from the South Eastern Water Conservation and Drainage Board in order to get an exact breakdown of how much is spent on maintenance on those parts of the drains to be upgraded by this project. I will be absolutely amazed if it is anywhere near \$900,000; thus, how can you claim that you are going to save \$900,000? It is bad enough that this parliament receives spin on a daily basis, but we have a government agency making that outrageous claim—again, this ends up in the committee's report—and I am absolutely certain that it is factually wrong and misleading.

I support the scheme. The committee's report suggests that what became known as the 'millennium drought', which occurred seven or eight years ago, caused the hypersalinity in the southern basin of the Coorong. That is wrong. The southern basin of the Coorong has been hypersaline for probably well in excess of 30 years. It has been getting more and more saline over the last 100 years, with the impact of the drainage works, which I think started in earnest in the Lower South-East in 1869. Certainly, by the 1970s, when the last major drain in the Lower South-East (drain M) was completed—I think, from memory, it was 1972—the fate of the southern basin of the Coorong was certainly sealed.

At the time the Upper South-East drainage scheme was conceived, the southern basin of the Coorong was already around three times as saline as the sea. It was certainly well over 60,000 parts per million of total dissolved salts. Either the information given to the committee as background to the project was in error, or the committee unfortunately misinterpreted some of the information it was given. I think the former was the case, to be quite frank.

Notwithstanding all that, drainage works in the South-East have been of huge benefit to this state. They have opened up highly productive agricultural land that has been producing wealth for

this state, as I said, at least since the 1870s. It is the most productive part of the state agriculturally. It has a huge output with meat, grain, fibres—

Mr Treloar interjecting:

Mr WILLIAMS: It is not open for debate at all.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: And wine.

Mr WILLIAMS: And wine.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I thought you would like to mention that most of all.

Mr WILLIAMS: Sorry; my hearing is failing, I can assure you. That has been of great benefit to the state, but I freely admit that the Coorong—and particularly the southern basin of the Coorong—has suffered greatly environmentally because of that drainage in the South-East. I certainly support this project, and hope that not only will we see a stabilisation of the salinity level in the Coorong, but in time I would also like to see the southern lagoon of the Coorong come back to the salinity levels it enjoyed prior to the drainage system being built in the South-East. I conclude my remarks there.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (11:20): I rise to speak to the South-East Flows Restoration Project and concur with the comments made by the member for MacKillop; we do have to get this right. Issues with the Murray-Darling Basin go back for millennia, but they were certainly highlighted with the massive drought we had about 10 years ago that impacted heavily right throughout the basin. It was very stark at the bottom end of the Murray-Darling Basin, where my electorate of Hammond is situated; we could not even get water to cover acid sulphate soils at the bottoms of Lake Albert and Lake Alexandrina. We had a major crisis.

I note that under this project it will take 18 months, weather permitting, to put back an extra approximately 26.5 gigalitres of water annually into the Coorong. I have worked in the South-East for quite a few years as a shearer, and I noticed back in the eighties, especially, that there was a lot more water about, a lot more run-off, and those drains were highly utilised. In my conversations with the member for MacKillop, even with the wet year we have had this year, a lot of the water has drained away through the ground, dissipated and not ended up in the drainage system because of the previous dry years.

If we keep getting wet seasons that will obviously change, but it certainly is weather dependent, and we need to freshen up the Coorong. We need to keep looking at things in a whole-of-basin approach, and in South Australia as well we need to look at ways to make things better right throughout the river and lakes area and the Coorong. We need to have a serious look at the connector from Lake Albert through to the Coorong so that we can get better flows through there to get some better freshwater outcomes.

I also note there has been recent discussion put out a lot in the media by David Paton about a proposal at Parnka Point, which splits the northern and southern ends of the Coorong with a small weir. When people mention weirs to me, and more weirs in the southern end of the river and lakes and Coorong system, the hair starts to stand up on the back of my neck.

We need to be very careful with some of these proposals going forward. My understanding is that that proposal will get due consideration, with a department investigation of about six months into it, but I think that these things, especially the current proposal to put another obstruction in the system, need to be looked at very carefully. The government needs to remember that we are at least 18 months off from whenever this work starts on the South-East Restoration Flows Project to make sure that we get the outcomes we need without putting another obstruction in the system.

I know that fishermen are up in arms about the proposal, as are others who want to see the right environmental outcome. I will be watching where that goes with interest, but we really need to concentrate on the whole Murray-Darling Basin Plan and the outcomes in getting water back into the system that supposedly will benefit everyone, whether you are an irrigator, whether you want it for the environment or, obviously, what we need for critical human needs.

This has to be managed in an appropriate way so that we do not kill off communities wherever they are in the basin. I have always been a big fan of irrigation. Irrigation that is in place

that can have an infrastructure upgrade is a far better way to put water back in the system while still getting irrigated outcomes and food production than simply buying water.

I certainly support this proposal, but let's not start throwing a whole heap of other proposals on top. Let's give this proposal a chance to work and see how much water actually flows. I note the \$60 million cost. It is a significant project, with about 13 kilometres of new drain and 80 kilometres of restored drain work. Let's just hope that in future—though it might not be for at least 12 months—our NRM levies will not just be paying for DEWNR staff to sit in offices when that should be coming out of the general revenue account. But, in saying that, I support the project.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (11:26): I would just like to make a contribution to the debate on the Upper South-East drainage scheme and the extension of the system. As the member for MacKillop said, the drains project started in about 1869, and this \$48 million project directing water into the southern lagoon of the Coorong has been a work in progress up until today. It will take about 70 weeks to implement, as we have said, weather allowing.

I wanted to touch on the fact that this water going into the Coorong will be unregulated flow. It is not going to be a prescribed watercourse that will make a direct contribution into the Coorong; therefore, this adjustment that has been made to the Murray-Darling Basin Plan comes under what is called an 'unregulated adjustment mechanism'. It is used to offset South Australia's SDLs into the river flow for the health of the lower reaches of the Murray-Darling Basin. But, more importantly, it is about keeping what has now become a very saline basin, particularly in the Lower South-East drainage system into the Coorong, into the Lower Lakes.

This means that, with the country that has been drained and that water put into the system, we are seeing less water going into the drains and less water being replenished into the groundwater system because we are seeing an increased use of water. We are also seeing some drying and some water that continually flows out to sea. My concern about the project is that, in its wisdom, the state government has negotiated with the federal government with respect to the implementation of the basin plan.

As I have said, this adjustment mechanism for the South-East drain extension is a good thing, and a good thing for the Coorong, but it is only one small measure in what I think is a very, very small piece of the big puzzle. Here in South Australia we are known as the delta within the Murray-Darling Basin, but the Lower Lakes and the Coorong really are the telltale of the delta within the basin.

What it is showing us is a further increase in salinity. We are seeing salinity slugs move around a lot of the basin area, and particularly the southern end of the Coorong and, to a larger degree, the northern end of the Coorong is now seeing a significant increase in salinity. I know the Coorong is highly renowned for the ruppia grass which is a bit of a telltale as to the health of the Coorong.

Many proposals have been put up, and I want to strongly advocate to the state government that there are proposals that have been put on the table that are continually filed in the bottom drawer and left there. Those proposals are about the diversity of putting environmental water into both the southern lagoon and the northern lagoon of the Coorong.

This South-East drainage project will put water into the southern lagoon of the Coorong, but we cannot forget about the northern lagoon. There is a very simple solution, and it is not just this \$48 million project. It is a project of about \$38 million to connect Lake Albert with the northern lagoon of the Coorong that is needed. To do that requires a regulated connection which will allow flow from Lake Alexandrina into Lake Albert, through Lake Albert into the Coorong and then on, through its path, out to the Murray Mouth.

We all know that the Murray Mouth is the telltale. When the Murray Mouth silts up, we have issues, and that usually means we have low flow, so then we enact water-sharing arrangements between all the basin states. For too long, the state government has ignored some of the great environmental projects that need to be looked at and seriously considered, and not just with a box-ticking exercise.

We continually hear in South Australia that these projects are not cost-effective and not good value for money. I ask minister Hunter: what is good value for a good environmental outcome? How much money do we have to spend to keep our environment in a working, sustainable condition? At the moment, we continually hear from our current water minister who has little interest, other than a political interest, in the River Murray. My concern is we are not looking at some of the other solutions that would be another piece in these puzzles.

Those solutions include the connection from Lake Albert to the Coorong and looking at automating some of the barrage doors so that we reduce the intrusion of salt water into those Lower Lakes. It is about keeping the Murray Mouth open. It is about looking at ideas and proposals. It is about considering a groyne at the Murray Mouth and considering how we can use nature's energy to keep the Murray Mouth open rather than putting an expensive dredge there that costs millions of taxpayers' dollars for the simple reason that it is a visual solution. There are many natural solutions that would be a piece of the jigsaw puzzle for the South-East drains.

I do support the scheme, but it is part of the project and just part of the puzzle when it comes to environmental works and measures below Lock 1 in South Australia. Today, this project is probably one of the first environmental works and measures that is going to help the lower reaches of the Murray. We have seen nothing else happen. There have been a few trees planted below Lock 1, and many of them have died. We have not seen any implementation of environmental works and measures that will have lasting benefits to the environment.

More importantly, this is about being responsible citizens for our environment. It is about being responsible when negotiating with the other three basin states when we have shortages of water because of drought. When we go to them and ask for a bigger share of the pie, their reply is going to be, 'What can you demonstrate that you have done with regard to environmental works and measures in South Australia, particularly below Lock 1?'

We have seen the environmental works and measures around every lock in South Australia. At Lock 6, we have Chowilla; at Lock 5, we have the Pike; at Lock 4, we have Katarapko; at Lock 3; we have Banrock; and at Lock 2 we have small wetlands. They are environmental works that are of benefit. They are really just gold plating the existing infrastructure. A lot of rock walls and earthen banks have done the job. Both the federal and state governments, in their wisdom, have gold plated those pieces of infrastructure. They have spent hundreds of millions of dollars ensuring that those pieces of infrastructure are renewed and gold plated.

However, we are not seeing anything happen below Lock 1. I feel that these are missed opportunities, particularly with the implementation of the Murray-Darling Basin Plan. It is crucial that South Australia stands up and understands that we have to be good and responsible citizens and environmental custodians. At the moment, this current state government is using the Murray as a political linchpin. It is not there for the long-term sustainability of the Murray.

I can assure members that on this side of the house we work for the benefit of the entire river system. We have advocated for good water flows for the Murray-Darling Basin Plan and its initial 2,750 gigalitres by 2019, and then we will look at the 450 gigalitres of up water by 2024. We continually see the Premier and the water minister putting the cart before the horse. They want the 450 gigalitres now. They do not want to deal with what 2,750 by 2019 means to the basin and then address what the 450 means. Again, 450 is on the table.

It is about better managing our river system. The extension of the South-East drainage scheme and drains going into the southern lagoon at the Coorong is one of a very small piece in a larger picture. I am calling on the state government to look at the bigger picture and be responsible environmental custodians instead of using this river, these flood plains, these lakes, as political wedges. Every time we see the Premier looking for an advantage within the river system, he turns it into a political football. We are not seeing any real outcome when it comes to being responsible so that when we have our dry and people ask us what we have achieved we can lay it on the table. At the moment, our credentials are zero. The cupboard is bare of any achievements below Lock 1.

I support the extension of the Upper South-East drainage scheme; \$48 million is a lot of money. It is hard to put a cost-benefit analysis on the environment. The sustainability of the

environment is what we have to put that equation on. At the moment, the government has left me wanting.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:37): This was an interesting hearing. I have listened again with interest this morning to the views of my colleagues. I am particularly concerned about some of the comments that the house heard from the member for MacKillop, who seriously knows what is going on down there. I am sure the Presiding Member is well aware of it as well, but I will raise those matters at the Public Works Committee. It may well be that we have the opportunity to recall or call more witnesses to obtain a little bit more information.

It is a critical part of the agricultural and environmental sectors of South Australia down there, and it needs to be put right and it needs far more investment. Listening to the member for Chaffey about what has not occurred below Lock 1 is very important as well. Having said that, I indicate that the opposition supports the report.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:38): I would like to thank all those who have contributed to the debate this morning: the members for Hammond, Chaffey and Finniss. In particular, I would like to thank the member for MacKillop for the issues he raised and highlighted and the challenge he has mounted with facts presented by the department. As Presiding Member, I certainly will be investigating the issues he has raised today. With that, I recommend that the report be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: ADELAIDE WOMEN'S PRISON REDEVELOPMENT OF WOMEN'S CENTRE

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:39): I move:

That the 560th report of the committee, entitled Adelaide Women's Prison Redevelopment of Women's Centre, be noted.

The aim of this project is to update the current out-of-date, dormitory-style accommodation at the Adelaide Women's Prison that is in urgent need of an upgrade. This correctional facility is the principal female prison in South Australia, with a capacity of 176 female prisoners of all security ratings. Ninety-two prisoners can be located in the secure zone and 84 prisoners in the Living Skills Units. This project affects 64 prison beds. This is a unique project, whereby female prisoners are partaking in the construction project as unskilled labour.

The state government is partnering with the private sector—namely, Totalspace Design, Mossop Construction and Interiors, Meinhardt, and BuildSurv—to upgrade the Women's Centre. This approach will reduce costs but, much more importantly will provide the female prisoners who choose to participate in this project with new skills. They will undergo recognised training, with packages that will allow them to achieve units of competency that can lead to a TAFE SA certificate. When the committee heard evidence last December, 14 prisoners had already commenced training (including their White Card training to allow them to work on site), delivered by Master Builders Australia.

The scope of the project will see the four out-of-date, dormitory-style accommodation units transformed into two distinct contemporary accommodation units containing mainly two beds per dorm, with their own toilet and shower. The 64-bed capacity of the current four units will be maintained. By using this unique approach, the Department for Correctional Services estimates it will achieve a financial saving of 20 per cent. The cost of delivering this project is around \$5 million (GST exclusive) and is to be funded from the department's recurrent operating budget.

Preliminary preparations for the project have already commenced, with some training already underway. The construction works are due to commence early this year, with completion in late 2018. The project will be staged in order to manage the relocation of prisoners during the construction phase. The committee was informed that the prisoners are supportive of the project, with a prototype of the accommodation having been constructed on site, allowing prisoners to have input to the process.

The committee will be visiting the site in the upcoming weeks to view the prototype and inspect the site. Although in South Australia prison labour has been used previously for some prison construction projects, this has not been done to this level of coordinated approach and collaboration

to this extent. This is a very exciting and innovative project, offering opportunity to a number of prisoners I know and I have spoken to, who are really engaged in this whole process.

I commend the Department for Correctional Services for its efforts in undertaking a different approach to this project, and I also commend those private enterprises—Totalspace, Mossop, Meinhardt and BuildSurv—for their commitment to this project and their support for the female prisoners. It was really heartening to hear from them how they are really engaged in this project, and I wish them—as I know every committee member wishes them—every success in this project, and we will watch this innovation with absolute interest.

Given this, and pursuant to section 12C of the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991, the Public Works Committee reports to parliament that it recommends the public works.

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (11:43): This additional accommodation through the prison system in South Australia is all getting rather ho-hum for the house. It is turning into something of a nightmare. I am not sure how many members have been watching *Ice Wars* on the ABC, but that is just horrific and gives an indication of what is happening in New South Wales on a larger scale. Equally, it is happening here, particularly with the number of young men and women who are ending up in custodial sentences over drug-related crimes.

It is not going to go away, and we have to deal with it. It is a disaster for Australia and for the world, more to the point. It is also a disaster for us in South Australia; however, we have to deal with it, and the Women's Prison is part and parcel of that. I have been there a couple of times, and it is not the nicest place in the world, to say the least, but it is functional.

I am pleased that some prisoners will be able to work on this project. I suspect they will be fairly limited in what they can do because of the things that are used, the safety aspects and whatnot, but it is good for them to have something to do. I am a firm believer in getting prisoners doing something, rather than sitting around or lounging around doing nothing all day. For their own wellbeing, they need to be doing something, whether they want to or not. It is going to be okay, so I support the project.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:45): I rise to speak on the Adelaide Women's Prison redevelopment of the women's centre. I thank the committee for their consideration of this project. Whilst I have no objection to the women's centre being upgraded—and obviously they have put a persuasive case for that to occur—I would like to place on the record my concern about two aspects of the Women's Prison that need remedying; one is the need to have extra high-security prison accommodation at the premises now.

Obviously, upgrading the women's centre effectively precludes it financially from in any way utilising that service for accommodation, but we have an overcrowding issue in the prisons and it seems to me that needs to be addressed. There is clearly a lack of prison beds, and one of the reasons has been repeatedly outlined by the Office of the Public Advocate in its 2016 annual report tabled on 1 November 2016. There was found to be a critical shortage of forensic mental health facilities and that the number of women in prison had increased rapidly, with a 79.3 per cent increase over the past decade.

The alarm bells should be ringing for the government that an extra 20-bed facility for the Women's Prison, announced by the Minister for Correctional Services in December last year, will not even address what is clearly a critical shortage. Whilst I accept that upgrading a facility for the women's centre within the prison is an important initiative, frankly, the priority for this prison is that it needs more space and it needs more room for the prisoners.

The second aspect of the increase in number of prisoners is that there is also the problem of the forensic mental health facilities and the critical shortage outlined by the Public Advocate. The findings of the Public Advocate followed the 2015 annual report, which also found that there were not enough forensic mental health beds for the mental health patients in South Australia. The only dedicated facility for women in the state simply does not have enough beds to match the growing increase in the prisoner population.

The third aspect I wish to briefly refer to is that the government has known for some time, and at this stage not addressed, that we are one of the few remaining places in Australia that does

not provide any in-prison facilities for pregnant women who enter the prison and then have their babies. In most other facilities in Australia where women are incarcerated, if they enter pregnant and their child is born, they have the capacity to keep the baby for up to two years.

We all remember the shocking scenes around the Azaria Chamberlain story and her mother being incarcerated at Berrimah gaol in Darwin. Following the course of coronial inquiries and trials, ultimately she was imprisoned before being released after the pardon that was recorded. She had a baby and that baby was able to be held with her for a period of time, even in Darwin. This is not a situation that has always been the case in South Australia. It has been in effect, though, in the last few years in this state, and it is a shameful situation.

I understand the two units at the prison that used to be the facility for mothers and babies in the prison—and I visited them when they were operating—are now being used for another purpose, such as prerelease programs or something like that. It is not unimportant, of course, but it should be understood by the government that, whilst you can upgrade and redecorate, there is a critical need for bed numbers in the secure facility and an urgent need for mental health forensic facility beds so that they are not crowding and using areas in any of our prisons but, in particular, the Women's Prison.

Thirdly, as a matter of basic human right, when these women enter a prison pregnant and if they are going to have that baby whilst incarcerated, they need to have a facility where they can have the child with them, bond with them and have time to make sufficient alternative arrangements for the care of that child pending their release, if indeed they are not released prior to that.

It should be remembered that, of the women who enter prison who are pregnant, quite often they are actually released prior to the birth of the child. So, we have a number of people who enter pregnant and their term, before they are eligible for parole, expires before the birth of their child—fine. However, we are talking about the number of babies who are taken away at the hospital, who are not able to have a chance to live with their mother during that early period. I do not think I need to remind members of the significance and importance of that bonding opportunity of those babies. I ask the government to take note.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:50): I thank the member for Chaffey and the member for Bragg for their comments on this particular project. I do take note particularly of what the member for Bragg has said because mother and baby bonding is a very important time. I appreciate what the member has said, so thank you for that, and I will certainly take that further. With that, I recommend the report be noted.

Motion carried.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE: KILBURN SPORTPLEX

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:51): I move:

That the 561st report of the committee, entitled Kilburn Sportplex, be noted.

The Office for Recreation and Sport is working with the West Adelaide Hellas Soccer Club and the Football Federation of South Australia to build a community football facility on land that was the former Kilburn Primary School site.

The West Adelaide Hellas Soccer Club would like to consolidate its facilities in one location as it is currently using fields across four different locations for home games. Bringing them all together in one location will help build a sense of community both within the club and the surrounding areas, and allow for the junior players to see and aspire to be senior soccer players. It will also assist families who have players in the different leagues—seniors, juniors and women's league—support one another on game days and at practice sessions. The scope of this project includes establishing:

- a floodlit, artificial turf, main football pitch constructed to FIFA two-star standard with covered grandstand and open grassed viewing mounds;
- a floodlit grass football pitch for practice, community use and, as required, temporary car parking; and

- a two-storey multipurpose club building and covered grandstand with public dining room and function centre.

In addition, lighting will be installed as well as onsite car parking. The grass training pitch will be accessible to the public as open space on non-game days, and this will address the lack of public reserve facilities within Kilburn and the surrounding suburbs. The perimeter of the pitch will be appropriately fenced so people can exercise their dogs in a safe environment away from Churchill Road, and the artificial pitch will provide for all year round access.

The state government is contributing \$4.5 million (GST exclusive) to the project and the soccer club is responsible for providing the remaining \$5.4 million. The project is widely supported by the local community as well as the local state and federal members of parliament. Work is due to commence early this year, with the project to take around 12 months.

I wish to thank all my fellow committee members for the consideration of this project. I would like to thank our committee staff for their assistance in reviewing this project and all who came to present to the committee on this project. 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) (11:54): I support the project, ma'am.

Ms DIGANCE (Elder) (11:54): With that, I suggest that the report be noted.

Motion carried.

CRIME AND PUBLIC INTEGRITY POLICY COMMITTEE: ANNUAL REVIEW

The Hon. A. PICCOLO (Light) (11:55): I move:

That the second report of the committee, entitled 'Annual Review of the Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee into public integrity and the Independent Commissioner Against Corruption', be noted.

The Crime and Public Integrity Policy Committee was established under the Parliamentary Committees Act 1991. A key function of the committee is to consider the operations of the following South Australian integrity bodies: the ICAC, whose role includes the investigation of corruption and oversight of the investigation of misconduct and maladministration in public administration; the Office for Public Integrity, which receives and assesses complaints and reports about potential matters of corruption, misconduct and maladministration in public administration; the Ombudsman SA, whose office investigates complaints about South Australian government and local government agencies; the Office of the Police Ombudsman, which provides independent oversight of SAPOL; and the anti-corruption branch of SAPOL, which ensures that allegations of corruption in public administration referred to the police by the ICAC are appropriately investigated.

During the review period from April 2015 until June 2016, the committee considered various annual and other reports tabled in parliament from the ICAC, the Ombudsman, the Police Ombudsman, the Commissioner of Police and the independent reviewer of the ICAC. The committee is charged with examining these reports while also inquiring into and considering the operation and the effectiveness of the ICAC Act. In particular, the committee must consider the performance of functions and exercise of powers by the ICAC and the OPI, inquire into and consider the performance of functions and exercise of powers by the Ombudsman and report to parliament on any arising matter of public policy.

During the review period, the committee heard evidence from the ICAC, Commissioner Bruce Lander; the independent reviewer of the ICAC, the Hon. Kevin Duggan; the Acting Police Ombudsman, Mr Michael Grant; the Ombudsman SA, Mr Wayne Lines; and SAPOL, namely Commissioner Grant Stevens; Assistant Commissioner (Crime) Linda Fellows; and Chief Superintendent Doug Barr, Ethical and Professional Standards. The committee made nine recommendations relating to matters of public policy. Overall, the committee found:

- There should be an obligation on a person executing a search warrant to provide a copy of that warrant to the occupier of a place or the owner or driver of the vehicle to which the warrant applies.

- The penalties under the ICAC Act may be too low to provide an adequate deterrent, specifically in the new section 54 confidentiality provision and schedule 3 procedure for resolving legal professional privilege claims. These penalties should be reviewed.
- The local government code of conduct should be revised to address various concerns expressed by the ICAC and the Ombudsman.
- The Criminal Law (Sentencing) Act 1988 should be amended to allow the ICAC, as a law enforcement agency, to be able to make submissions in sentencing proceedings where the person has cooperated with the ICAC's investigation.
- A detailed analysis should be performed in accordance with the terms of reference of the independent reviewer to ascertain the efficacy of the ICAC.
- The potential overlap in the jurisdiction of the Ombudsman and the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner should be reviewed and clarified.
- Given that the ICAC will no longer be empowered to issue direction to the Ombudsman, consideration should be given as to whether the ICAC should remain empowered to examine practices, policies and procedures of the Ombudsman. It may be more appropriate for an independent reviewer to fulfil this function.
- In accordance with the recommendation made by the Ombudsman, the public interest test in the Freedom of Information Act 1991 should be clarified.

I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

SELECT COMMITTEE ON THE SACA PREMIER CRICKET MERGER DECISION

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (11:59): By leave, I move:

That the time for bringing up the committee's report be extended until Wednesday 29 March 2017.

Motion carried.

Bills

HISTORIC SHIPWRECKS (MISCELLANEOUS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 14 February 2017.)

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (12:01): I rise to support the amendment bill in relation to historic shipwrecks. The original act was dated 1981, and the intention of the amendments to this act are to bring it in line with current-day practices, and also keep in mind the current-day situation, particularly in relation to how popular these historic shipwrecks have become with recreational divers.

What is a historic shipwreck? Any wreck in South Australian waters that is 75 years old is automatically protected under the Historic Shipwrecks Act 1981. Under this act, significant shipwrecks and their relics are protected to prohibit the removal of or damage to these sites. Around 270 historic shipwrecks have been declared under the act in South Australia. Depending on where the information is coming from, there are between 400 and 800 shipwrecks in total around South Australia.

The remains of these shipwrecks are important educational, recreational and tourism assets. As such, people are encouraged to visit them on a 'look but don't interfere' basis. In 1976, the commonwealth government acknowledged the need to protect significant shipwreck sites and relics with the introduction of the commonwealth Historic Shipwrecks Act for commonwealth waters extending from the low-water mark to the edge of the continental shelf. Complementary South Australian legislation followed a few years later, with the South Australian Historic Shipwrecks

Act 1981. The primary intention of the act is to protect certain shipwrecks and relics of historical significance.

The amendments are being proposed to this act because the Offshore Ardrossan Marine Park Sanctuary Zone has been an area of focus since the fishing restrictions commenced. We all remember how passionately the sanctuary zones were debated in this place. As well as the sanctuary zone, the area immediately around the old wreck of the historic shipwreck *Zanoni* is a protected zone under the act. This zone protects the 135-year-old wreck, which is the most complete 19th century merchant vessel shipwreck in South Australia, and potentially in all Australia.

Spencer Gulf and Gulf St Vincent claim most of the shipwrecks in South Australia, with Kangaroo Island of no less significance. I note the deputy leader spoke yesterday with some passion and knowledge about the wrecks around Kangaroo Island. Many hundreds of vessels have been lost since the appropriately named *South Australian* was blown ashore in a gale in 1837—in fact, it was just the second year of settlement of this colony. I will speak later in this contribution about one wreck that was even prior to that.

The inlet and river discovered in 1831 became the site for the city of Adelaide and, within a few years, was accepting vessels of up to 500 tonnes. It was a busy little port down there at Port Adelaide; it quickly became quite busy. The prosperous cultivation of wheat and other grains on the Yorke and Eyre Peninsulas in the 1870s saw the construction of several huge jetties—and, I might add, many smaller ones—in the gulfs and on the West Coast to provide access for grain ships to load their valuable cargo for English and Australian ports.

Several of these 1,000 tonne plus sailing vessels were lost, some off Wardang Island in Spencer Gulf. These sailing ships took grain from South Australian ports primarily to Great Britain right up until World War II; in fact, a couple of vessels sailed from Port Victoria on Yorke Peninsula as late as 1946, before the engine age finally took over.

South Australia has more than 800 shipwrecks along its coastal and inland waters, and the first recorded wreck—and I want to relate this back to my own electorate now—occurred when Matthew Flinders charted the coastline in 1802. It was not Flinders' vessel *Investigator*, the very famous vessel he used to quite accurately chart the South Australian coastline, but rather the small cutter used by a landing party, which fell prey to unpredictable surf at the tip of Eyre Peninsula. Eight offshore islands now bear the names of the seamen lost.

On 20 February 1802, *Investigator* met a north-east running tide, causing great discussion on board as many thought this to be an indication of proximity to a passage through the continent to the Gulf of Carpentaria, as there were unsubstantiated reports of a ship sailing through such a passage. They were at the mouth of Spencer Gulf and, being uncharted, they were hopeful they would find a way through the continent. Ultimately they sailed north and charted the gulf and came, of course, to the site near where Port Augusta is now and discovered, probably with some disappointment, that it was not a navigable passage through Australia at all but, rather, a gulf.

Weighing anchor there was also a pressing need to top up dwindling stocks of freshwater, and Flinders' daily log gives us an excellent insight into the tragic events after he sent his trusted ship's master to search for water. This story has gone into folklore in South Australia and, more particularly, into Eyre Peninsula's history. I quote from the log of Sunday 21 February 1802:

Mr Thistle was sent over with a cutter to the main land, in search of an anchoring place where water may be procured...at dusk in the evening the cutter was seen returning from the mainland; but not arriving in half an hour, and the sight of it having been lost, a light was shown and lieutenant Fowler was sent in a boat...returned soon afterward but alone.

Sadly, those men were lost. It was not unusual for seamen of this era to be poor swimmers, many believing a swift death in any catastrophe would be a blessing. Reading from the log again:

...no more than two out of the eight people being at all expert in swimming, it was much feared that most of them would be lost.

With night falling, there was little that could be done, but in the morning the search continued, without any success.

The area was named by Flinders Cape Catastrophe, even though the search continued along the shore. Observation of sharks nearby—so nothing has changed there—and a 'strong rippling of tide', which almost capsized another cutter, suggested this was how the lost crew had met their fate. The need for Flinders to take on water became ever more pressing and so, with the obvious loss of the crewmen, he decided to continue his voyage on 24 February. That is 215 years ago, and in the next few weeks we will be very proudly unveiling a statue of Matthew Flinders on the foreshore area of Port Lincoln. I will speak more about that in this parliament at a later date.

Before departing, the crew went ashore one more time to an area Flinders named Memory Cove. Here, in the words of Peter Good (a seaman on the ship), he 'caused to be fixed on shore a plate of copper commemorating this melancholy and disastrous event'. That plaque, which is now on display in the South Australian Maritime Museum at Port Adelaide, read:

Memory Cove

His Majesty's ship *Investigator*—Matthew Flinders, Commander—anchored here Feb 22 1802

Mr John Thistle...Mr William Taylor...and six of the crew unfortunately drowned near this place from being upset in a boat. The wreck of the boat was found but their bodies were not recovered.

Before leaving Cape Catastrophe, Flinders ensured that nearby islands were named in tribute to each individual sailor lost: Thistle, Taylor, Smith, Lewis, Grindal, Little, Hopkins and Williams. This is rather a tragic story from the very earliest days of European exploration and settlement in South Australian waters. I wanted to relate that particular story from my electorate and relate it to this act that is dealing with historic shipwrecks. The amendments essentially bring the act into line with current day expectations.

From recent prosecutions, it has become apparent that existing compliance provisions and penalties under the Historic Shipwrecks Act are outdated and have not been renewed since the act came into operation in 1981. This amendment provides that opportunity. The government recognises the importance of South Australia's shipwrecks, as we all do, and anticipates that increasing penalty amounts will help to deter illegal activity, which will help to safeguard and preserve historic shipwrecks for future generations.

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (12:11): I rise to support the Historic Shipwrecks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016 to better protect South Australian shipwrecks and relics of historic importance. The act was originally introduced in 1981 to protect South Australian shipwrecks and their relics from removal, damage and exploitation. Currently, any wreck in South Australian waters which is at least 75 years old is automatically classified as 'historic' and protected under the act. The minister may also make a declaration regarding a shipwreck that is less than 75 years of age.

With the South-East having such a rugged coastline, places like Danger Point and Carpenter Rocks have seen many ships meet their fate along the bottom part of South Australia. It is estimated that there are over 800 shipwrecks across the South Australian coastline with many never having been located. I want to talk about a couple of shipwrecks and mention Carl von Stanke. Carl is a 19-year-old Mount Gambier resident. His dad, Gary von Stanke, is a resident of Port MacDonnell. Carl has a keen interest in shipwrecks and has been a diver since the age of 11. Quite recently, he found the wreck of the *Flying Cloud* which had been under water for 147 years.

I want to congratulate Carl on his enjoyment of diving as well as on the extensive amount of research that would need to go into uncovering some of these wrecks. In Carl's words, it is a 'combination of extensive research but also good luck and good weather' which makes it possible. Carl has also found other wrecks in the area. I think he has found four ships, including the *Corio* and the *Hawthorn*. He has dived on the *Admella* and, recently, the *Flying Cloud*.

Our most famous story is about the *Admella*. The wreck of the SS *Admella* in the early hours of 6 August 1859 was only the beginning of an horrific week for the survivors who remained on board. They were in sight of land, but authorities struggled to rescue them from the stricken steamer. The loss of 89 lives, mostly due to cold and exposure, makes the wreck one of the worst maritime disasters in Australian history. It was the first major rescue incident that involved the cooperation of a large number of organisations and individuals across the newly formed colonies of Victoria and

South Australia. In many ways, it was the basis of joining together these isolated communities into a regional group. It was the beginning of many ongoing organisations across the south-east of Australia.

The *Admella* was sailing from Adelaide to Melbourne when it struck Carpenters Reef on the southern coastline of South Australia. A design fault in its iron hull caused the ship to break into three after only 15 minutes, leaving passengers and crew clinging to the wreckage with minimal food and water. Early attempts to reach land were fruitless. People were swept out to sea or drowned in the boiling surf. It was nearly two days later, when two seamen, Knapman and Leach, made it to shore and walked 20 miles to the Cape Northumberland lighthouse to raise the alarm.

The lighthouse was without telegraph, so the lighthouse keeper, Mr Germein, whose own horse had died just a few days earlier, had to trek to a nearby farm to borrow a horse in order to reach Mount Gambier to inform authorities in Adelaide (450 kilometres away) and Portland (150 kilometres to the west). The *Corio* left from Adelaide and the *Ladybird* from Portland, but due to poor information, both rescue vessels had difficulty locating the now desperate *Admella*.

Meanwhile, the wreck was battered by heavy swell. Captain McEwan shared out what little food remained and had to prevent survivors from drinking salt water, which had begun to take the lives of those who drank it. Others, exhausted by their ordeal, simply slipped into the sea to their death. In the words of one lifeboat captain, they were:

...more like statues than human beings; their eyes fixed, their lips black, for want of water, and their limbs bleached white and swollen through exposure to the relentless surf.

In Adelaide, the news of the disaster brought hundreds of people to the telegraph office to hear the story as it unfolded, and both houses of parliament were adjourned. With that story, I will conclude my remarks and commend the bill to the house.

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (12:17): I delight in rising to talk on the Historic Shipwrecks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016, which is obviously an important bill that has been introduced to better protect South Australia's shipwrecks and relics of historic significance. It is something that I am obviously interested in, given the electorate of Kaurna, which I represent, contains quite a lot of Adelaide's coastline, where there is a number of shipwrecks. In fact, the Kaurna electorate is home to several protected wrecks, namely the *Glenelg*, *Solace*, *Tigress*, *Nashwauk*, *Maid of the Valley*, *Star of Greece*, *Albatross* and the *Maid of the Mill*, which was wrecked in the Onkaparinga River. All these shipwrecks of course have a story to tell. Each reveals something different about who we were then and thus who we are today.

While the maritime industry has always been recognised for its role in our commercial and trading history, it is also crucial in understanding our social history. I will just touch on a couple of the shipwrecks in the Kaurna electorate. One of the most famous is the *Nashwauk*, which was shipwrecked south of the Onkaparinga River. It is now a very heavily associated with the Moana area, where there is a Nashwauk Terrace. The Moana Pioneers Hall has a dedication to the *Nashwauk* at the front, which the community centre lovingly put there recently.

The *Nashwauk* was shipwrecked in 1855. It was an immigrant ship that I understand was carrying some 300 of the 4,000 Irish women who migrated to South Australia in the 1850s. Obviously, it is an important part of that migration story to South Australia as well. The ship was wrecked south of the Onkaparinga, and luckily its passengers were rescued. I understand that they were taken to what was then the township of Noarlunga (now Old Noarlunga), and the Horseshoe Inn (now the Old Noarlunga Hotel), and they were cared for there.

I understand there are quite a lot of different stories about what exactly happened to the *Nashwauk* and a number of different conjectures as to whether or not it was because of smugglers, drunkenness aboard the ship, or misleading shore lights that ran the vessel aground. However, I understand the official conclusion was:

The *Nashwauk* was wrecked on the coast near the mouth of the Onkaparinga on the 13th of May. All the immigrants were safely landed and taken to the township of Noarlunga, from which place some were taken by the steamer *Melbourne* to Port Adelaide, and some [went] overland in drays to Adelaide.

An investigation was ordered by his Excellency the Officer Administrating the Government into the treatment of the people by the master and surgeon-superintendent of the ship. The Immigration Board sat for this purpose on

the 2nd June when it appeared to the Board that there was no foundation for any complaints against the surgeon-superintendent during the voyage. The Board was adjourned until the following Tuesday on purpose to investigate conduct of the master of the ship, but the information having in the interval been received that he had died in Adelaide, the inquiry of course was terminated.

Of course, that was the official reading of it, and I understand that all the passengers made it safely to shore. The women and children were taken to the Horsehoe Inn, where fires were lit, straw was spread as bedding and the locals slaughtered and roasted eight sheep to feed the distressed. On the following day, the passengers were assembled in the market square of Noarlunga, which is still there today in Old Noarlunga, to be advised that the *Thomas Melbourne* was to convey them to Port Adelaide.

They returned to the beach to make the boarding but, due to rough seas, the decision was made to sail the *Melbourne* to the mouth of the Onkaparinga, thereby forcing the assembled passengers to make the four-kilometre trek along the clifftops from Harriott's Creek, where they assembled at Gray's store. By this point, it was dark and only 70 of the passengers were willing to make the attempt to board.

Obviously, this is one of the significant shipwrecks in my area. Because this is a significant part of South Australia's maritime history, we know that many of the Irish migrants, who were predominantly women, settled here and went on to get married and have children, and many descendants of the women who were on the *Nashwauk* still live in South Australia today. So, it is an important story for the descendants of those people who were on that ship.

The other significant area in my electorate that is home to many shipwrecks is, of course, Port Willunga. The most famous of those is the *Star of Greece*, which is also the name of a very good and very popular restaurant at Port Willunga with an incredible view. I highly recommend it to everybody in the parliament to go and visit.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Do you have a view of the wreck as well?

Mr PICTON: I believe you can, if the tide is right. As the member for Newland says, you can see the wreck as well from the *Star of Greece*. The *Star of Greece* wrecked off Port Willunga 125 years ago and lies within the Encounter Marine Park. It is a visually iconic part of the South Australian coastal landscape and a very accessible snorkelling and scuba-diving site.

This was a cargo ship that was wrecked across the South Australian coast and, very sadly, 18 sailors lost their lives as part of this shipwreck, so it was really quite a tragedy for the young colony at that time. While this is now part of metropolitan Adelaide, at that time Port Willunga was very far away from settlements, and part of the issue was that it took a very long time for help to get those who were distressed as part of the tragedy.

I am told that only 200 metres away from shore the ship broke in two at 2am. An alarm was raised at 7.20am by a young boy taking his morning walk. The Willunga telegraph station, which was therefore required to send for help, did not open until 9am, so it was not until then that help could be contacted.

The Hon. T.R. Kenyon: Good old government bureaucracy.

Mr PICTON: Yes, it would have been good if the opening hours were longer. This is, of course, something we would love for Australia Post today. Even with the 9am help being made through the government bureaucracy at the time, it was not until 4am that useful help had arrived. By that time, all the survivors were ashore and others who were aboard had already drowned in the roaring surf. It is really quite a tragedy that probably more people could have been saved if help had arrived sooner or if people could have been alerted sooner of what had happened.

Local residents did their best to assist and took people to the nearby beach. I understand that the then hotel in the Port Willunga area was used to look after survivors. I have a historic picture of that hotel, which is now a private residence, in my Parliament House office at the moment. It is a very tragic event that happened in South Australia's history, and I understand that newspapers and the media were highly critical of the marine board and its rescue operations. The later coronial inquest was equally damning of what had occurred.

This is obviously an important site that needs to be remembered, and it is used by people as a great snorkelling area. The government has established a number of trails and signs marking the *Star of Greece* wreck along Port Willunga so that we can better understand what occurred there, which is really what this bill is about—trying to make sure that we better protect our historic shipwrecks right along the coast.

I know that people in my electorate will be very glad that this is happening to protect all those shipwrecks, some of which have not yet been found. We want to make sure that they are all protected for the future as important historic sites so that future generations can still remember what occurred in those times. I commend the bill to the house.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (12:26): I would like to make a small contribution and speak on the Historic Shipwrecks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill, which will further help protect South Australia's shipwrecks and relics of historic importance. The reason I am making a contribution is that I have had the pleasure of diving on some of South Australia's historic wrecks and it is a great experience.

We have seen a number of the wrecks taken advantage of. Sadly, we see people who prey on anything of value, anything of significance or anything that can be an artefact associated with these historic wrecks. We have to also understand that there are many other ocean-going vessels that have been sunk, whether on purpose or through nature—through fire or storm. This has shown us that the waterways take no prisoners when it comes to ships in distress.

I have noticed over time that historic shipwrecks that have sunk in the ocean are protected by the ocean because they sink—and that is what preserves them, compared with a lot of the historic waterway wrecks in the River Murray, which in many cases have sunk primarily through fire or snags. Many have sat on the bottom of the river but are still partially exposed, and that has meant they have not been preserved as well over time and become part of a long history.

As has already been stated, about 800 wrecks in South Australian waters are listed as historic. The development of scuba diving equipment in the fifties led to the discovery of more shipwrecks and gave people the opportunity to understand exactly what those wrecks were and what state they were in, but it also gave people doing the wrong thing the opportunity to exploit them and the wrecks were pillaged for souvenirs. Some of them were blown apart to make way for other boats to proceed. That has been an issue of significant concern.

South Australia currently has two protected zones: one for a recreational dive site, the HMAS *Hobart*; and one for the *Zanoni*, a 135-year-old vessel, which is the most complete 19th century merchant shipwreck in South Australia. The HMAS *Hobart* is a decommissioned Navy destroyer that was sunk off Yankalilla in 2002 as a dive wreck and an artificial reef. In relation to the artificial reefs, I would like to see diving on an historic shipwreck or being allowed to dive on an historic shipwreck—and those divers do that with proper care and due diligence—be seen as one of the great adventures of our waterways. Sadly, however, people who do the wrong thing are the people who make some of these shipwrecks outlawed to dive on.

I know sanctuary zones and marine parks also add a layer of complexity around being able to dive in certain areas. A permit is required to enter these zones, either by vessel or by other means. Historic shipwrecks are very old and delicate, so simply dropping an anchor can cause damage. I have seen it happen on screens where anchors hook up on shipwrecks or other underwater structures, and that causes huge amounts of damage. With the responsible use of technology nowadays, you can see the anchor when you drop it and you can see your ropes and chains. If people are anchoring anywhere near structures, they should use that sort of technology so that they do not ruin the opportunity for the next person who is going to come along.

The introduction of marine park sanctuary zones has made government departments more aware of illegal activities, particularly around fishing. It is pretty widely known that any structure at the bottom of our ocean creates a safe haven for fish habitat, and that also attracts people with fishing rods, fishing lines and the like to take on what every man, woman and child loves to do, and that is to catch fish. Last year, a Seacliff Park man was fined \$200 in the Christies Beach Magistrates Court for entering the HMAS *Hobart* exclusion zone in Yankalilla without the required permit.

This amendment to the bill will strengthen that requirement and ensure that people are given the appropriate fines for what could be perceived as wrecking part of our history that can never be repaired and never be reinstated. The amendments include increasing penalties, introducing more expiation fees, increasing current expiation fees, amendments to the power of authorised officers, administrative changes to enable the minister to transition classifications to the declarations of those historic shipwrecks, amendments to be able to delegate powers and also to register those shipwrecks.

On the issue of authorised officers, it is all very well for governments to introduce increased penalties, to increase fines and to put in more regulation and red tape around these sites, but are we going to implement more compliance officers? Are we going to give more people the power to actually enforce these new laws? That is something that will be of interest to me. I do support any regulation to crack down on those who are noncomplying. As we get older, so do the shipwreck sites. They need further protection so that we can have them as part of our history and so that our children, their children and future generations, can experience the grandeur of these shipwrecks on the bottom of our ocean.

It is interesting to know that there are many river vessels in my electorate of Chaffey on the great River Murray that are also of significance. In the Riverland, one of the paddle-steamers, the *William R Randell*, sank near Waikerie. This wreck is also protected under the act. It sank in 1939 due to flood conditions. Looking further into listed historic wrecks in the electorate, there are also the two Chowilla iron ferries that were used to barge both livestock and supplies through the Chowilla water network.

The paddle-steamer *Bunyip* was built in Mannum and lost in 1866 after a fire near Chowilla Station. As they were steam driven, many of these river vessels did catch on fire. Sadly, with the way things used to be, a lot of river vessels caught fire and sank to the floor of the river. Another river vessel still exposed is the *Jessie*, a barge built in Echuca and lost in 1877 after it caught on a snag under tow and sank at Woolenook Bend just north of Renmark, and you can see parts of it close to the bank. Another barge is the *Wardell*, which was abandoned and sank in 1959 in the Millewa Creek.

The *Albermarle*, a barge built in Goolwa, was lost in 1932 at the Millewa Creek entrance. It was abandoned 54 miles upstream from Lock 5 in 1931. It is believed that it was sunk while being moored and wrecked at Renmark. The *Jolly Miller* was a paddle-steamer built at Goolwa and lost in 1944 after being wrecked near the Pyap pump station. We have quite a well-known paddleboat, the *Canally*, built in 1907 at Echuca. Its primary use was to cart wool out of Echuca up through the Murrumbidgee river system. It was then brought into private hands and used for construction, building the locks and weirs right up and down the Murray River in South Australia. I understand that it now resides at Morgan, having been taken to Berri to be restored and repaired. It is now under the ownership of the Mid Murray Council.

There are a lot of historic vessels and structures still intact both in our oceans and in our inland waterways that need to be protected. I stress to anyone who has the opportunity to dive on a structure, shipwreck or any form of a water vessel to have a go. Go down and have a look because it is about looking not only at the shipwreck but also at the habitat that survives and lives in and around it—and some of them are truly spectacular. In most instances, it really is a great life experience. Without further ado, I support the amendments to this bill.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (12:38): I, too, rise today to say a few words about the Historic Shipwrecks (Miscellaneous) Amendment Bill 2016. I do so because I come from a community with a proud history of shipping and also of shipbuilding—namely, Whyalla. As members are aware, there are two ports: one at Whyalla and one at Port Bonython. They are major shipping ports in this state. I believe that the inner harbour and the outer harbour at Whyalla are probably the largest port in South Australia by tonnage. Of course, at Port Bonython we have the gas fractionation plant and the hydrocarbon export facility.

One of the interesting things is that in contemporary times, from the start of these particular ports in the Upper Spencer Gulf, the Northern Spencer Gulf and further down the gulf, none of those vessels has met tragic circumstances. The vessels that have sunk in the Northern Spencer Gulf have been ones that largely predate the 1900s—so, the ketches, the barques and the launches and a

number of other vessels—but they are not great in number compared with those in the rest of the state.

Some members have open ocean systems in their electorate. As people are aware, Spencer Gulf is an inverse estuary, and the further north you go, the more tranquil the waters become, not that the areas south of Point Lowly (Ward's Spit) are not stormy at times in a tricky way, because the amplitude of the waves is different from the open ocean environment. Fortunately, not many vessels have gone down in that part of the world and, as I said, the ones that did largely predate the 20th century.

A number of vessels that have a connection with Whyalla have been sunk. The initial vessels that serviced Whyalla came from Port Pirie to collect the iron ore mined at Iron Knob—there was a jetty at the foot of Hummock Hill—and that iron ore was sent over to Port Pirie to be used as flux in the smelters in those early days. Importantly, vessels came over from Port Pirie transporting water to Whyalla. Whyalla being a semi-arid environment, there was little in the way of water, and that used to happen until a desalination plant was built in Whyalla to supply water and then subsequently the pipelines from the River Murray.

During the war years, Whyalla was turned into a shipbuilding port. A number of their vessels that were built in Whyalla saw service around New Guinea and elsewhere. The first vessel, HMAS *Whyalla*, did duty when it came to mines, both laying mines and protecting our ships from mines. Members are aware that the *Whyalla* now stands proudly on the highway from Port Augusta to Whyalla, adjacent to the steelworks, and that nearly became a wreck because a lot of people in Whyalla thought we could save a lot of money by getting the *Whyalla* back, sinking it and turning it into a snapper wreck. I think some sense prevailed because we now have an important piece of tourism infrastructure that reflects a very important part of our history.

The *Whyalla* was not sunk during the Second World War obviously, but a number of vessels that serviced Whyalla in those days were sunk. They took iron ore from the blast furnace to the Eastern States as part of that war effort to be turned into steel to be used in armaments. Those vessels that plied the waters between Whyalla and the Eastern States were sunk. The *Iron Knight*, the *Iron Chieftain*, the *Iron Crown* and a number of other vessels were sunk off the eastern coast of New South Wales with a tragic loss of life.

Indeed, the merchant seamen refer to those iron ore vessels as death ships. Most of them were sunk by submarines, and they sank very quickly. The seamen's union estimates that about 12 per cent of Australia's merchant seamen died during the Second World War. The official record indicates about 5 per cent, but there is significant conjecture because a lot of it was covered in secrecy at the time for various reasons.

None of those vessels sank in the Spencer Gulf, so I am drawing a very long bow there. As a child, I came out to Australia, following the route of a lot of the vessels that brought people and goods to South Australia in the 19th century, going from Britain, around the Cape of Good Hope to Adelaide. A number of those vessels sank in tragic circumstances. Fortunately, the Northern Spencer Gulf does not have that tragedy or that drama when it comes to the vessels that have sunk in our waters, so that is a good thing.

However, a number of vessels did sink. I will put on record some of the ones I was able to find. The *Angler* sank in 1939 after breaking up during a gale, and that was to the north of Whyalla and to the north of Point Lowly. That particular vessel was a launch. The *Apollo* was an iron-hulled barque of over 1,000 tonnes, built in 1884. That also sank in the waters north of Point Lowly. There was also the *Alpha*, which was a cutter, a wooden vessel of 12 tonnes built in 1879, which was lost in 1921. Its ultimate resting place is uncertain.

Another vessel was the *James and Margaret*, a cutter that was lost in 1878 as a result of a cooking fire that spread to some paper. That was not in my electorate; it was across in the member for Frome's electorate, at Telowie Beach. That vessel was completely lost. The *Mary Ann* was a cutter, also a wooden vessel, that was lost in 1885. It sprang a leak in 11 fathoms of water, but I do not think there was any loss of life there. I reckon it might have been one of the vessels that serviced an area called Murninnie, which has an interesting history. It is just a little fishing shack community these days. I think the former member for Giles has a shack down that way.

Murninnie used to be serviced once upon a time by the Chinese coming to get sandalwood from the area, and I think there are actually graves of some Chinese people who were lost in those days. To the west of the of Murninnie, up in the escarpment, there was a bismuth mine. That would have been a real challenge in those days. There were quite extensive diggings with shafts and tunnels. That mine operated for a few years, and the product was shipped out at Murninnie, as far as I know. So the *Mary Ann* sank off Murninnie.

One vessel that sank almost directly at Whyalla was something referred to as *Mo 38*, but there is absolutely no information about that. I imagine it would have been one of those little vessels that just did work around the port of Whyalla that ended up ultimately being lost. Mention has been made on a number of occasions during some of the speeches opposite about the *Hobart* to the south of Adelaide, a destroyer that was sunk as a dive wreck. I am a great fan of getting some more of these dive wrecks in South Australia.

Last year, I encouraged the Premier to put in a formal expression of interest for the *Tobruk* and the *Sydney*, which had been decommissioned. We did, as a state, put in a formal expression of interest in those vessels. I went to Sydney with a couple of people from DSD and a company with a history of sinking these ships, to a look at the *Tobruk* and the *Sydney* to see if we could secure one of those vessels for the north of Whyalla, specifically north of Point Lowly.

The advantage would have been not just a dive wreck, but a dive wreck that would have been far more accessible than the *Hobart*. So we went over, and I have to congratulate the Navy on the way that was all handled in an incredibly professional and detailed way. At the end of that process, we thought the *Sydney* would be the better of the two vessels because it could be modified to fit into the depth of water that we had north of Point Lowly.

Unfortunately, the price tag was something like \$8.5 million. I can fully understand it not being the responsibility of Defence, but it would make these processes easier if the commonwealth government came to the party in a more fulsome way. If no state wants to secure one of these vessels, they will be taken away to be shipwrecked either, as in the *Sydney's* case, back to the United States or, in all probability, as with the *Tobruk*, to India. It is an incredibly irresponsible way of wrecking our vessels.

The price tag and all the unresolved risks we had to address in a very short period of time meant that we did not secure that vessel. I think it is something that we should really look at in the future. We need to do the preliminary work as a state to reduce some of the risks involved, because I think it would make a fantastic dive attraction north of Point Lowly and would fit in well with the cuttlefish aggregation and a number of other interesting dive sites around Whyalla. With those few words, I commend this bill.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Minister, are there any shipwrecks in your area that you want to talk about?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:51): I think some people were trying to include Clipper Ship *City of Adelaide*, but there is indeed a graveyard of ships around Torrens Island, and people can see them—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: But not for today.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Not for today. Thank you for bringing me back to the matter at hand. I thank the honourable members who have provided input into the discussion on this bill. In fact, I have learned quite a lot by listening to people. Some excellent research has been done and a great deal of passion and interest has been shown about shipwrecks. This bill is about being able to better protect our shipwrecks and relics of historical significance.

I would also like to reiterate that encouraging support was received throughout the consultation process that occurred in relation to the proposed amendments. The government invited submissions from the community, stakeholders and relevant state and commonwealth government agencies. Feedback was received during the five-week consultation period held across May and June last year, and it has been documented in a report that has since been made available via the government's YourSAy website.

The proposed amendments to the Historic Shipwrecks Act aim to make the operation of the act more effective and efficient, thereby ensuring South Australia is well placed to protect its important historic shipwrecks and relics. Shipwrecks, including their relics, are a non-renewable resource by definition and must therefore be protected for future generations. I commend the bill to members.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (12:53): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (UNIVERSITIES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 30 November 2016.)

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (12:54): As shadow minister for education, I am very pleased to speak on behalf of the opposition in relation to the Statutes Amendment (Universities) Bill. This bill will reduce the size of university councils, will extend the tenure of student representatives on the councils from one to two years and will allow the tabling of annual reports in the parliament by the Minister for Higher Education and Skills instead of by the Governor. It will strengthen statutory liability protections for council members and senior officers, it will include provision for the establishment of common investment funds, and it will expand the delegation powers of the university councils.

It will change the name of the Flinders University of South Australia Act 1966 to the Flinders University Act 1966, which I am sure will reduce confusion immensely for all the alumni of the University of South Australia and Flinders University of South Australia (soon to be known as Flinders University). It will also make associated consequential amendments. These are changes to the act that have been sought by the administrations of the two universities.

For a number of reasons, they have argued that these measures will improve the functioning of those universities, and I think some of the measures are clearly and unambiguously of benefit, whether it is changing the name or strengthening protections and dealing with funds. The issue that has caused anxiety amongst some members of the university communities is, of course, that of reducing the size of university councils.

In relation to this matter, the bill specifies that, notwithstanding the flexibility around the number of independent members, the University of Adelaide council will be changed from 20 to 21 members as it is at the moment to between 12 and 16 members, and Flinders University will change from 20 to 21 down to between 15 and 16 members. To put that into context, the University of South Australia currently has 15 to 16 members on its board.

Regarding the make-up, the chancellor is one of those members at each of the universities, as well as the vice chancellor and the presiding member of the academic board. The universities have independently appointed members, eight in the context of the University of South Australia. For Flinders University, the bill would reduce that from 10 to eight. At Adelaide University, it is currently seven, and under the new proposal it will become up to seven; there would be some flexibility for fewer than seven to be appointed.

In terms of staff representation, the University of South Australia has one general and one academic staff member, and Flinders University currently has two general and two academic staff members, which would be reduced to one general and one academic member. The University of Adelaide has two general and two academic staff members, and that would be reduced to one general and one academic staff member.

In terms of student representation, the University of South Australia has one undergraduate and one postgraduate member, and Flinders University currently has three, of which at least one must be an undergraduate and one a postgraduate. That is also the case for Adelaide University. This bill will reduce that to one undergraduate and one postgraduate, so it is a reduction of one student representative.

In terms of graduates, only Adelaide University currently has graduates as automatic members of the council. It currently has three, and that is proposed to be reduced to one. I suppose I should declare a conflict of interest here: as a graduate, I will have my opportunities for representation reduced by two-thirds, although I should indicate to the house that I had no plans to attempt to become one of those graduates, so perhaps it is not such a conflict.

Regarding co-opted members, all universities have the optional position of one co-opted member. It is proposed that stay, although I note that at the University of Adelaide, certainly at the moment, in his endeavours to keep the size of the University of Adelaide council more manageable, the chancellor does not exercise that prerogative. So they currently have 20 and not the opportunity for 21.

Obviously, the views of the administrations of Flinders University and Adelaide University were sought by the opposition. I can confirm that Flinders University has advised that the proposed changes to the Flinders University Act would create a contemporary governance structure, one better suited to addressing the major strategic challenges faced by the university in a rapidly changing environment. Similarly, Adelaide University is also in favour.

Regarding the implementation of this matter, council appointment procedures have already taken place at Flinders University, so these changes will not impact on the Flinders University council until January 2019. Similarly, Adelaide University board members are also set to see out their terms, so if the bill passes as it is new members would take their places in 12 to 18 months. Otherwise, the council would be unaffected.

Fundamentally, the question posed by the challenging parts of this bill is whether the universities wanting to run more efficiently, with more manageable councils, is worth the reduction in breadth of representation from impacted stakeholders. Are they best considered as businesses operating in a competitive environment, albeit with tens of millions of dollars of commonwealth government support, or are they traditional institutions with ingrained cultures and expectations of accountability that need to be maintained? I will answer that question after the lunch break. I seek leave to conclude my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:00.

Parliamentary Procedure

ANSWERS TABLED

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

Ministerial Statement

HOMELESS FUNDING ARRANGEMENTS

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) (14:01): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: The current National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA) nationally provides almost \$1.5 billion, of which \$94 million is directed to South Australia for a wide range of essential housing and homelessness services. It should come as no surprise that the state

government is extremely concerned by reports in *The Australian* newspaper last Friday that the commonwealth government is considering walking away from the NAHA.

More than two-thirds of all homelessness funding in South Australia comes from the NAHA. Any change to this agreement places at risk South Australia's specialist homelessness services system. This system responds to homelessness all year round, provides domestic and family violence services right across our state and is the same system that provides additional services during times of extreme weather.

The sector includes 40 providers who coordinate 75 programs across the state, including three telephone gateway services. This decision has the potential to affect 22,000 clients per year and some 800 staff that these services employ. As an example, we provide \$8.8 million of funding for agencies such as Hutt Street, Catherine House and Uniting Communities to provide essential homelessness services to rough sleepers and other people at risk of homelessness in the inner city. Another example is the Murray Mallee region, where we provide almost \$1.6 million in funding for homelessness services.

This funding is utilised to provide services including crisis accommodation, outreach programs and support for women and children experiencing domestic and family violence. Cuts to this critical system would lead to a substantial increase in demand for services. Other activities supported by the NAHA funding include private rental assistance programs, public housing services, regulation and oversight of community housing providers, Indigenous housing and affordable housing.

I am also concerned about the future of the National Partnership Agreement on Homelessness (NPAH) and the National Partnership Agreement on Remote Indigenous Housing (NPARIH), which conclude on 30 June 2018. I urge all members to join with the government in sending a message to Canberra. We need to tell them that there are real people in South Australia who are impacted by their decisions.

Mr Pisoni: Another \$750,000?

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

The Hon. Z.L. BETTISON: Our most vulnerable communities need their support, not be abandoned.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is called to order.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader is called to order.

OAKDEN MENTAL HEALTH FACILITY

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:05): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: Late last year, I agreed to an independent review, led by the Chief Psychiatrist under the Mental Health Act 2009, into services and care provided at the Oakden older person's mental health facility. This review was initiated in response to feedback from a family about the treatment their relative had received while a patient at the Oakden campus. I spoke about this previously, at the commencement of this review. I wish to update the house about the actions and interim steps that my department has taken as this review continues.

The review commenced in mid-January this year. Its terms of reference cover areas including the service's model of care, the staffing model and cultural practices, risk management and risk mitigation practices and restrictive practice guidelines to ensure SA Health standards and national best practice are met in a contemporary framework. While families have reported many positive experiences and good levels of care at the Oakden facility, I am advised that initial investigations

have found indications of some instances where patient care within the facility are not consistent with the high standard we would expect.

I am advised that the Northern Adelaide Local Health Network has taken immediate steps to ensure the treatment of consumers and quality of care at Oakden is one of the highest standard. These steps have included introducing further senior clinical support at Oakden seven days a week, engaging additional senior clinical nurses to provide focused clinical leadership after hours and on weekends, ensuring there is senior support on site for staff, patients and their families 24-hours a day seven days a week and the recruitment of a mental health clinical pharmacist.

I am advised that the Oakden consumers' families have been contacted as part of this review and informed about the review's investigations to date, the measures introduced to ensure appropriate care for their relatives and to seek any further feedback they may have about the care that their family member receive is ongoing at Oakden. I am expecting the final findings of the Chief Psychiatrist and the review's recommendations to be delivered to the government and to be considered at the end of March. I will ensure that the review's findings are shared with patients' families and staff.

Parliamentary Committees

LEGISLATIVE REVIEW COMMITTEE

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:07): I bring up the 39th report of the committee, entitled Subordinate Legislation.

Report received.

Question Time

ENERGY MARKET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:08): My question is to the Premier. Which contracts is the state government considering breaking in nationalising the state's energy grid?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:08): The Liberal Party returns to the scene of the political crime of the sale of ETSA. What an extraordinary question! Much of where we are at the moment in the South Australian energy market can be directly attributable to the decision by those opposite to sell our electricity assets. The truth is that most South Australians—

Mr PENGILLY: Point of order: I ask you to rule as to whether the Premier is indeed debating the question, not answering it.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to the Premier. Thank you to the member for Finnis.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: An important bit of background about the current state of play in relation to our electricity assets is that most South Australians regard the supply of electricity as a public good. So, therefore, they expect the government to underwrite the supply of electricity. That's why they get so angry when electricity is not available when they need it.

That is why we believe electricity should be in the hands of the government. That's why we opposed the privatisation of the Electricity Trust of South Australia, an essential public service that lies at the heart of the needs of the community and, indeed, our businesses. It's at the heart of South Australia, as the gentleman here recognised all those years ago when he decided to nationalise the Electricity Trust of South Australia.

As we have become aware in recent days, and we expect will become even clearer—even clearer—we have a Prime Minister who has abrogated his responsibilities in relation to South Australia. We also know that we have a Prime Minister who is prepared to engage in economic sabotage by talking down an essential part of the Australian economy—the South Australian economy. It is extraordinary. It is extraordinary that you could have a Prime Minister—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and a Treasurer talking down and almost encouraging the a lack of investment or the people ceasing to—

The SPEAKER: A point of order. I presume the member for Stuart is as indignant as I am about the Leader of the Opposition's continual interjections?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: No, sir, that's not it.

The SPEAKER: No? Yes, what is it then?

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Standing order 98: after over two minutes, the Premier has still not addressed the substance of the question.

The SPEAKER: He's got two to go. He may approach it soon.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The contracts that were entered into by the former Liberal government to privatise the Electricity Trust of South Australia are of long standing. They involve either the complete sale or disposal of critical elements of the South Australian electricity supply system—the transmission assets, the distribution assets, the generation assets, and the retail business. Every single element of the South Australian electricity supply system now is in the hands of a private operator, a private for-profit operator, and what we—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order, sir: since my last point of order, the time hasn't been restarted.

The SPEAKER: It has started again. Splendid.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. You can see that each of the elements of the South Australian electricity supply system is now in the hands of a private company. Indeed, the National Electricity Market itself can't be controlled solely by South Australia. There is no decision we can take that can influence the supply of energy in South Australia through exercising our own independent authority.

What that means, in the light of what the Prime Minister has said about abrogating that national responsibility, in the light of the resistance that we are receiving from the Prime Minister in relation to changing the rules of the National Electricity Market, is that we have to consider all our options, and one of the options that is firmly on the table is intervention in the market. That intervention, if it is not handled carefully, can have negative, unforeseen consequences because intervention in part of the market will have an effect in another part of the market. Any intervention has to be carefully calibrated.

One way of resolving that is an attempt to take back control of the whole of the market, but that represents very substantial and complex issues, being the very substantial long-term contracts and the way in which they have been entered into and the questions of sovereign risk, the extraordinary financial burden associated with them and also the fact that this is an interconnected market. Increasingly, we have an ambition to play our abundant renewable energy into the rest of the market. They are all considerations for the South Australian government.

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Mitchell having a colloquy with himself or is he interjecting?

Mr WINGARD: Sir, your ears are a little bit off. You got me yesterday when I wasn't speaking and now I'm not even moving my lips and you are accusing me.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is transferring blame to his colleague the member for Chaffey.

An honourable member: The member for Mitchell wasn't moving his lips, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell was pointing at the member for Chaffey.

Mr WINGARD: I turned my head, sir, and my hands and my lips. I'm not sure you can see this far.

The SPEAKER: The leader.

ENERGY MARKET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:14): Has the Premier sought advice as to the type and extent of sovereign risk that South Australian taxpayers will be exposed to if these contracts are broken?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:15): Absolutely, we have, and that is a very live issue. That is a very live issue, but the only reason that we are asking ourselves these extraordinary questions is because the guilty party opposite privatised our assets. Every single South Australian understands that the reason we are in this position is because of the decision—

An honourable member interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Let's test that. Every single South Australian knows who sold our electricity assets and that's the Liberal Party of South Australia. Not content with selling those assets to private companies, they also did their very best to sever something which would have entirely changed the pattern of industrial development in South Australia in relation to our electricity industry—they killed the interconnector with New South Wales. Instead of us having a different pattern of development in relation to our electricity supply industry, which would have protected us at this time, they sought to pump up the price of the assets by severing the connection with New South Wales, which was already underway. We know there was a debate inside the Liberal Party room because we have a lot of information from inside the Liberal Party room back in those days.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Is the deputy leader making a point of order?

Ms CHAPMAN: If the Premier has not finished his answer, I will.

The SPEAKER: Has the Premier finished?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: No.

Ms CHAPMAN: Then I would ask you to rule on how the Liberal Party has anything to do with the management of sovereign risk, which is irrelevant to the question.

The SPEAKER: Before I rule on that, I call to order the members for Chaffey, Davenport, Finniss, Stuart, Hammond, the Minister for Transport and the Treasurer. I warn the leader, the deputy leader, the Treasurer and the members for Stuart and Chaffey. I suppose that, given the Liberal Party has been in opposition for just over 15 years, it is hard to ascribe a sovereign risk.

Mr Gardner: Just under, sir.

The SPEAKER: Just under, thank you.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I think that's fair, sir. We need to compare the risks associated with the renationalisation of the electricity assets against some of the other risks. We have heard some interesting ideas that have been promulgated recently, such as the idea that the Leader of the Opposition came up with of reopening a coal-fired power station. Let's leave aside the fact that it is half dismantled. How is a private sector operator who owns a coalmine and a partly dismantled coal-fired power station somehow going to be encouraged to reopen that? Let's put that against that risk. Let's set aside sovereign risk against that risk. Let's also—

Mr Marshall: What about the question?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I am answering your question. Let's set aside sovereign risk against the risk of a ban on gas in South Australia, while the Leader of the Opposition agrees with us that somehow gas is part of our energy future. Let's set aside the question of sovereign risk against the idea of a new nuclear power plant in South Australia from the same Leader of the Opposition who says we can't look at nuclear waste, but somehow we can look at nuclear power. Let's compare the sovereign risk of those matters.

Let's compare the sovereign risk of cutting a renewable energy target, which has almost already been achieved, when you have existing renewable energy projects already being planned

and operated in South Australia. If you want to talk about sovereign risk, let's look at those opposite and the sovereign risk that their energy policy and its chaos—

The SPEAKER: Point of order, member for Stuart.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: The Premier is debating the substance of the question, rather than answering it.

The SPEAKER: He is talking about sovereign risk. Has the Premier finished?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Yes.

The SPEAKER: The Premier has finished. Leader.

ENERGY MARKET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:19): Given that the Premier has told the parliament that he has both sought and received advice regarding sovereign risk, can he outline to the parliament who provided that advice to the government, when was it provided and can he table that advice and tell the people of South Australia what that sovereign risk is?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:19): I said nothing of the sort. I said we had sought advice. In relation to sovereign risk, in relation to all of those matters—the reopening of a coal-fired power station, banning gas, implementing a nuclear power station and cravenly cowering to the federal government when it said to cut our renewable energy target. I wouldn't mind if this was just the product of an overactive imagination by the Leader of the Opposition, but what it was the product of was just cowardice—

Mr Marshall: Have you sought advice?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —cowardice and incompetence—white-knuckle panic about Nick Xenophon in the South-East with their ban on gas. Cravenly laying down in front of the Prime Minister when he and his mates were handing around lumps of coal, and then, of course, when the list of donors send their open letter in *The Australian* criticising the Leader of the Opposition about nuclear power and shutting down the day, what does he do? He throws them a fig leaf about nuclear power. What on earth was he talking about?

Mr Wingard interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: And finally, Mr Speaker—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: the Premier is debating the substance of the question. He is not answering it at all.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I think he is debating the question. Does he have any information to offer?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will wrap up with this, Mr Speaker, and what we need here. The greatest risk, the greatest sovereign risk that exists at the moment in South Australia is from a Leader of the Opposition who is engaging in the most chaotic and incompetent policy formulation on the run that we have ever seen.

Members interjecting:

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the Premier is defying your ruling once again.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the members for Morialta, Newland and Mitchell. I warn for the second and final time the member for Chaffey, the deputy leader and the Treasurer, and I call to order the member for Wright whose offence was that much greater for interjecting out of her seat. The leader.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:21): Thank you very much, sir. My question is to the Premier. Given how reliant South Australia currently is on interconnection with

other regions in the NEM, how will, and I quote, 'going it alone', as the Premier has promised to do, lead to greater reliability and more affordable prices for South Australians?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:22): You will soon see, Mr Speaker, and this will be the product—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: This will not be the chaotic white-knuckle panic of those opposite responding to the various political pressures they feel under, but it will be the product of a sensible, methodical and well-researched policy response. It will be informed by South Australian state interests. It will not be capitulating to Canberra's political interests.

We have an opportunity in this country to take a national approach to energy policy. We have on the table a sensible proposal for an emissions intensity scheme which would do all of the three things the South Australian system needs—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The deputy leader is on a full set of warnings.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —each of the three things that our system needs. It would provide cleaner power, it would provide more reliable power, it would provide more affordable power by bringing additional competition into the South Australian—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is on a full set of warnings.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Almost every informed commentator in relation to the energy market knows that this is the case. Every informed commentator in relation to the energy market knows that the single most important diagnosis of the problem is a lack of investment, and almost every single informed commentator recognises that the reason that lack of investment has occurred is that there has not been an appropriate price signal in relation to carbon because everybody knows that a carbon price is coming but governments have been unable to actually organise themselves to put a price on carbon.

An honourable member interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The leader's camarilla will cease interjecting.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It is as simple as that, and people can make fun of it and they can make slogans about it and they can ridicule it, but it is the truth and it is widely seen as the answer, and we know about the increasing number of the broader business community, indeed, the whole of the community.

We saw the extraordinary situation a few days ago where we had almost every element of civil society represented who called for national action in relation to a national energy policy, and there is only one credible policy which has been promoted at the moment. It has been advocated by the Chief Scientist. And because we have federal politicians running around with lumps of coal and seeking to actually play the sectional interest rather than the national interest, we are being precluded from a solution. That is why South Australia has to go it alone. That is why South Australia is going to take charge of its own energy future.

ELECTRICITY PRICES

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:24): Supplementary: given that the Premier has indicated that he has a new plan on the table, can he tell us how much more this new plan will cost the taxpayers of South Australia over and above the support package that Alinta called for to keep the Northern power station operational?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:25): The thing about the Alinta power station, which the Leader of the Opposition romanticises, is that it wasn't a long-

term solution for South Australia. The reason it wasn't a long-term solution for South Australia is that the private operators of that operation weren't making money. South Australians weren't buying Alinta contracts. I would like to see members table their electricity bills, so they can show us how many of them were with Alinta. I can tell you who was with Alinta: the South Australian government.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: just a point of clarification. I am a customer of Alinta.

The SPEAKER: That's a very powerful point the member for Stuart makes. It is a bogus point of order, and he will leave the chamber for the rest of question time.

The honourable member for Stuart having withdrawn from the chamber:

Members interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Sir, I would also ask the member for Unley to withdraw his remark. He said I make things up in the parliament. I have never misled the parliament.

The SPEAKER: I am afraid I can't insist on a withdrawal because it is not of itself unparliamentary.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: In a media release by Alinta in June 2015 stating that the Leigh Creek mine would close, the then chief executive, Jeff Dimery, stated that the Flinders operation had become increasingly uneconomic. On 11 June, the chief executive stated:

Throughout the four and a half years that we have been running the business we have investigated all possibilities to find a viable economic solution for its continued operation.

There being a disturbance in the strangers' gallery:

The SPEAKER: Treasurer, would you be seated. Under no circumstances is there to be flash photography in the house. Could the attendant please remove the item that was used for flash photography. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: On 11 June, the chief executive stated:

Throughout the four and a half years that we have been running the business we have investigated all possibilities to find a viable economic solution for its continued operation. During this period the company has incurred operating losses in the vicinity of \$100 million whilst at the same time investing an additional \$200 million to extend the operating life of the Flinders business.

Flinders closed because it wasn't making money. It was an economic decision. If the opposition wanted to do a cost-benefit analysis of an intervention into a loss-making operation at Flinders, it makes no sense. The reason the coal-fired power generator wasn't making money is that it can't react to market signals the same way gas can. When it comes on, it has to stay on.

Mr Pederick: It's that thing called base load.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Well, if it's base load energy, why wasn't it on 12 months of the year? Could the opposition, instead of interjecting, give us a reason, if this was so important to the state's sovereignty, why they sold it? Why did they sell the mine? Why did they sell the generator? It's so important to the state's future, and they sold it. You have to ask yourself, Mr Speaker: if two companies could not run this thing successfully—

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker: you do not have to answer any questions about what has been asked. We are asking the minister to answer a question about the difference in the cost, not rant about what questions you have to answer.

Mr Marshall: You shouldn't have to answer those questions, sir.

The SPEAKER: I will listen carefully to what the Treasurer has to say.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The facts have a way of getting in the way of ramblings by members opposite. The truth is that any cost-benefit analysis done by the private sector in maintaining its operation found that it was wanting—let alone that eight other coal-fired power stations around the country have closed. This romantic view about Port Augusta—

Mr Marshall: Answer the question!

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Shouting at me doesn't change the facts. If this is so vital to our economic sovereignty, why did the Liberal Party sell it? Why did they sell it? If it's so important to South Australians, why did they sell it to the private sector? I voted against it; I said no. The Speaker voted against it. The member for Playford voted against it. The shadow treasurer—the architect of the privatisation of ETSA—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —still sits in their caucus, yet they have the audacity to blame us.

The SPEAKER: I am not going to warn anyone for interjecting during that flourish, but the members for Heysen, Adelaide and Mount Gambier did interject before that flourish, and accordingly I call them to order.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:30): My question is to the Premier. Will the Premier confirm that, while the state's renewable energy target was still 33 per cent, the South Australian government was warned about an increasing risk to the power network's reliability from managing the intermittent nature of wind generation?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:31): Those opposite can continue their campaign of railing against renewable energy all day and all night, but the South Australian government's position is that we believe that renewable energy is an essential part of our future. Indeed, don't take my word for it. Take the Prime Minister of Australia's word for it, the Hon. Malcolm Turnbull, the man who said that we are going to have to have zero net emissions in relation to our energy system by 2050.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: The Prime Minister of Australia, who is a good friend, I understand, of the Leader of the Opposition, said that this is the future for South Australia. If you think that those remarks that were made back in 2009 represent the old Malcolm Turnbull, and that somehow he is now a different man because he has had to—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —sacrifice some of the things that he has believed in in the lead-up to becoming Prime Minister, let's have a more recent update of his views, a more recent update of the Prime Minister of Australia's views in the lead-up to the last federal election campaign. Indeed, in a campaign speech in South Australia, he praised South Australia for its leadership role in relation to renewable energy. This is the simple truth. Everyone understands that if we are to meet our international commitments that we signed up to in Paris—that the Prime Minister of Australia, Hon. Malcolm Turnbull, signed up to in Paris—we have to have a renewable energy future.

The commonwealth government's own federal renewable energy target is 23.5 per cent; we are only at about 18 per cent of that. We would be nowhere near that renewable energy target without the contribution of South Australia.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There have been a lot of revisions of history by various commentators who hate renewable energy and who love coal. That is what has been happening. The coal club has captured a substantial proportion of the federal caucus, who in turn have captured the Prime Minister.

It's sad, but it's true. That is why you have a man who had devoted so much of his career to promoting a change of this topic sacrifice everything he believes in to save his own skin. It's sad, and

that is why, in South Australia, we can no longer rely upon a Prime Minister who no longer stands for those things in which he believes. That is why South Australia needs to go it alone and take control of its own energy future. When we do present our plan to the South Australian people, I look forward to bipartisan support from those opposite because it's absolutely clear they have no plan of their own.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the member for Schubert, I warn the members for Adelaide and Wright, and I warn for the second and final time the member for Morialta. I hope he makes a careful note of that in his ledger.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGET

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): A supplementary, sir: given that the state government was repeatedly warned against becoming too reliant upon intermittent generation, why did the Premier decide to increase the state-based renewable energy target from 33 per cent to 50 per cent?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:34): If the Leader of the Opposition is saying that a renewable energy target has put South Australia's economy at risk, it is not really a criticism of the state government: it is a criticism of the commonwealth. Our renewable energy target has no mechanism. There is no mechanism in place for our renewable energy target. The only renewable energy target that has a mechanism that operates in South Australia—

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will be heard in silence. He hasn't actually offended yet in terms of relevance.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Could we hear something from the Treasurer first, before the opposition seeks to shut him down?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The Leader of the Opposition is trying to characterise our renewable energy target as if it has a mechanism in place that incentivises renewable energy, much like the commonwealth's renewable energy target or the ones proposed in Queensland and Victoria. Our renewable energy target has no market mechanism. The reality of having no market mechanism behind it means that the South Australian renewable energy target used, as its mechanism, the commonwealth one. So the criticism that the Leader of the Opposition is levelling at us really is a criticism of his Prime Minister.

Quite frankly, I think that is where the hypocrisy in this debate has got out of control. These are complex issues, and yelling and shouting slogans and passing pieces of coal around don't give us a solution. This is the fundamental issue: South Australia is blessed with abundant resources, abundant resources of gas, abundant resources of sun and wind. We don't have—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Schubert is warned.

Mr Knoll interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We don't have vast and abundant resources of economic coal, so it is no mistake that South Australia has always relied more on gas generation than it has on coal. Of course, as that renewable energy target in Canberra was implemented, the market did what the market does best. They took its \$6 billion and went to where the sun shines the longest and the wind blows the most consistently and they built their infrastructure here in South Australia. That created nearly 1,000 ongoing jobs here in South Australia.

If you want to criticise the renewable energy target, the truth is that you are really criticising the commonwealth government—

Mr Whetstone interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Chaffey is reminded, for the second time, that he is on a full set of warnings.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The question needs then to be asked: if the commonwealth government is incentivising renewable energy, why is it doing that if it is causing harm? Of course, the reality is that the Prime Minister is trying to walk both sides of the street. He has signed an agreement in Paris committing this country to complete decarbonisation of our electricity system; that is, all our energy will be renewable. If what the Leader of the Opposition is saying is true, the Prime Minister is being reckless.

If you play the Leader of the Opposition's question to its ultimate end, all renewable energy in this state will do harm, including a solar thermal plant, which is by nature intermittent, because if the sun is not shining you can't cause storage and you have intermittent energy.

We have these contradictory arguments by the opposition, saying, 'We don't support intermittent energy, but we support solar thermal. We don't want a renewable energy target, but we support the market mechanism the commonwealth has,' even though that mechanism is the one that has built all the renewable energy in South Australia. He doesn't support a dump, but he supports a nuclear power plant, but you can't build a nuclear power plant without a dump. He wants more gas-fired generation, but he wants to ban the mining of gas.

Any way you look at it, there is a word for that kind of behaviour and it is hypocrisy, absolute hypocrisy. This takes a considered, methodical approach to policy change. I will give the Prime Minister credit. He had the answer in 2009, and the Labor government at the time should have implemented Senator Xenophon's and then leader of the opposition Turnbull's plan of the energy incentive scheme. It was the right one then and it is the right one now.

NORTH-SOUTH CORRIDOR

Mr PICTON (Kaurna) (14:39): My question is to the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. Can the minister update the house on the progress of projects on the north-south corridor and the benefits from future upgrades to the corridor?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:39): I thank the member for Kaurna for his question and ongoing interest in these projects. Last week, the \$896 million Torrens Road to the River Torrens project—the project that the leader and deputy leader promised to scrap at the last election—reached a significant milestone, with now more than half of all works on the project complete.

Local residents in Croydon, Dudley Park, Ridleyton, Renown Park, West Hindmarsh and Torrensville are all currently experiencing the benefits of this great project even while it is still under construction. Residents in these suburbs and beyond are experiencing better traffic flow, greater access to their communities, improved traffic management and safer conditions. More than 50,000 trucks and cars use this section of South Road each day, on top of the tens of thousands of motorists each using Torrens Road, Port Road and Grange Road. The benefits of this project are being felt by hundreds of thousands of residents in the western suburbs.

Works are also progressing well on the \$620 million Darlington upgrade project. Major construction works have commenced at Darlington, with the intersection of Main South Road and Flinders Drive realigned, piling works for the Main South Road bridge underway and construction of a new bridge over the Sturt River on Main South Road to commence next month. The benefits of this project will be experienced by hundreds of thousands of residents in the southern suburbs.

Works are also progressing on the \$985 million Northern Connector project, with early works having so far realigned Kings and Bolivar roads. The benefits of avoiding six sets of traffic lights on Port Wakefield Road will benefit residents, businesses and freight operators across the northern suburbs and beyond.

Given the commonwealth's commitment to deliver the upgrade fully over a 10-year period of the north-south corridor, the government is continuing our discussions with both Infrastructure Australia and the commonwealth on the next stages of the South Road upgrade. Remaining sections

between Tonsley and Torrensville will mean residents in adjacent suburbs like Ashford, Everard Park, Clovelly Park, Melrose Park, Edwardstown, Clarence Gardens, Glandore and Kurralta Park will get faster, safer travel and better traffic management in their communities. It will also mean a better road network for hundreds of thousands of South Australian motorists across the inner and outer southern suburbs.

This government is committed, along with the federal government, to continuing the upgrade of the north-south corridor and its completion over a 10-year period, a period we are approximately a quarter into with just under a third of the necessary funding already committed and being spent on this upgrade. There will be a choice between continuing these works and the better roads, safer communities and better access for all the residents in these areas in seats like Elder, Badcoe, Black and Gibson, or there will be a choice for a different project, and that's a \$3 billion to \$5 billion sandbag for three Adelaide Hills safe Liberal seats, which are due to be protected by what the Leader of the Opposition and his shadow transport minister call Globe Link.

We know where our priority lies, and it lies with the hundreds of thousands of South Australians who will benefit from the north-south corridor rather than an uneconomic, unviable and logistically impractical project as touted by the opposition.

ICE ACTION STRATEGY

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (14:43): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse. Minister. What is the South Australian government doing as part of the national ice strategy?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:43): I thank the member for Little Para for his question and interest in this topic from firsthand in his community. While most drug use in South Australia is decreasing or remaining static, methamphetamine use continues to rise, hurting individuals, families and communities. Alcohol and drug problems affect many people in our community, as many of us know in this chamber. That is why the Premier has created a task force to consider different ways we can reduce supply, demand and harm of this drug. Latest estimates show that approximately \$5.7 million of SA's health budget is allocated to prevention and provision of treatment for people suffering from methamphetamine use issues.

As part of the National Ice Action Strategy and the South Australian Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy 2017-2021, the South Australian government is taking action to support families and communities by providing clinical services for people affected by drug problems. South Australia Health funds Family Drug Support to provide family support services to families in the Adelaide metropolitan area directly affected by substance misuse, and I have had the pleasure of hosting them in parliament last year.

Services include group meetings, telephone support and training programs. There are also plans to implement peer support programs to prevent harms from injecting and non-injecting use of methamphetamines for priority populations, including youth, ATSI communities and LGBTI communities in South Australia.

The South Australian government is also working on new guidelines on the management of acute methamphetamine-related presentations for our front-line clinical staff in South Australia's public hospitals. Having spoken with RAH emergency department physicians recently who have encountered this, the importance of this can't be stressed highly enough. It is vital we have coordinated responses across government agencies to ensure effective prevention, early intervention, law enforcement and treatment responses.

South Australia, along with other jurisdictions, supports the commonwealth's effort to address the ice scourge moving forward, but we have had little follow-through from the commonwealth which is making it hard for us to do the work we need to do. The South Australian government is willing to work across all departments and all levels of government to tackle the issues of alcohol and drug problems. I call on the federal minister Greg Hunt to provide some certainty about this issue as we move forward, to clarify exactly what their task force will be recommending and how they will implement it more thoroughly.

DRUG AND ALCOHOL TESTING

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (14:46): Minister, can you explain to the parliament any of the drug testing through water surveys here in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: Is the member for Chaffey seeking a supplementary?

Mr WHETSTONE: Yes, sir.

The SPEAKER: Can you state it again, please.

Mr WHETSTONE: Minister, can you please explain to the parliament any drug or amphetamine use through water testing in regional South Australia?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:47): We know that the commonwealth government recently announced they were moving to an additional number of trial sites and wastewater treatment sampling of their own. The South Australian government, through SA Health, has been working with the University of SA for a number of years, sampling metropolitan Adelaide wastewater every two months at various sites for a variety of drugs, and we have recently announced we will be sampling for alcohol. We have actually asked the commonwealth government to work with us to tell us which sites they will be sampling at as well but, at this time, we haven't had a response from them, I am advised.

ONE COMMUNITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:47): My question is to the Premier. Why did the Premier deny to the house yesterday that he gave personal approval for One Community to receive \$757,500 of taxpayers' money when the funding agreement between the Premier of South Australia and One Community SA was signed by Kym Winter-Dewhirst for and on behalf of the Premier?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:48): I think the answer to the question is contained within the question, and I don't think I have anything else to offer.

ONE COMMUNITY

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): A supplementary: is the Premier able to identify to the parliament if there are any other documents that have been signed, in agreements between the Premier and another party, by Mr Kym Winter-Dewhirst on your behalf, of which you say you have no personal approval?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:48): You have to listen very carefully to the Deputy Leader of the Opposition because she reformulates her questions, and I don't accept the premise of that question. I don't accept that my answer gives rise to the way in which she has reformulated the question, because there is a trickiness—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: There is a trickiness about her reformulation. The essence of it is this: I can assist—

Mr Marshall: Yesterday, you said you didn't approve it.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Well, in plain sight—on 10 February the federal cuts task force meets, including AnglicareSA, SACOSS and other non-government organisations. I announced that money is likely to be spent on a campaign resisting the cuts. That is, I announced in front of all of the media these things. Peter Sandeman, who is the chief executive of Anglicare, suggests that One Community can be the vehicle for a community-driven campaign during the meeting. I committed—this is 10 February—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I committed to spending that money and asked my office to follow up with Peter and One Community and to progress the proposal. The reason we know that this was said publicly is because on that day, on 10 February, Lauren Novak, a political reporter with that journal of record, *The Advertiser*, in an article, called 'Premier Jay Weatherill says taxpayer money could be spent to fight future Federal Government to health, education'—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: It states:

MORE taxpayer money could be spent fighting Federal Government cuts to promised...health and education spending, Premier Jay Weatherill has said.

Mr Weatherill held a meeting this morning with education, health, union and business leaders at Parliament House to discuss escalating a campaign against [the] \$80 billion of funding cuts outlined in the 2014...Budget.

The State Government has already allocated about \$1 million to a 'Federal Cuts Hurt' campaign—

Mr Picton interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: I will continue:

—which included television advertisements.

Mr Weatherill said some of that funding remained and would be directed to an escalated campaign, which could include more television advertisements in the lead-up to a federal election expected later this year.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Leader, if you continue, I will have to throw you out.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: What we do know is that negotiations did occur prior to the date when the formal application was put forward to the government seeking funding approval. So, all of the things that I said yesterday are true. We said we would do it. We then did it, and then we told everybody we did it because it was on a website. It was all about protecting this state from the—

Mr Wingard interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Mitchell is warned.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —cuts to health and education proposed by the federal Liberal government.

POLLING BOOTH STAFFING

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): Supplementary: will the Premier be approving the expenditure of taxpayers' money to spend in respect of staffing at polling booths at the next state election?

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier) (14:52): No, I don't think we will be doing that.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:52): My question is to the Minister for Health. Who appointed the insolvency firm McGrathNicol to the NRAH project? When were they appointed and what were they appointed to do?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:52): My understanding is that McGrathNicol haven't been appointed by the government; they have been appointed by the financiers to the project. They haven't been appointed by the government.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): A further question to the Minister for Health: who are the parties to the out-of-court settlement that the government signed last week in relation to the new Royal Adelaide Hospital?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): SA Health Partnerships and the government of South Australia.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Supplementary: did the builder sign the out-of-court settlement?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): No.

ROYAL ADELAIDE HOSPITAL

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (14:53): Further supplementary: how is the government going to ensure that technical completion is achieved if the builder is not a party to the out-of-court agreement?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:53): Because the builder has a contract with SA Health Partnerships to complete the building in a timely manner. If they were to in any way slow down or frustrate technical completion, then SA Health Partnerships, I presume, would take action against them.

CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (14:53): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. Can the minister inform the house of the proportion of children in out-of-home care who were the subject of a substantiation where the person responsible for that substantiation claim was living in the household providing the out-of-home care? With your leave and that of the house—

The SPEAKER: No, I have an arrangement with the Leader of the Opposition not to have explanations in order to expedite question time, and I have told the member for Adelaide that before. The Minister for Education.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (14:54): That is a detailed question, and I will seek whether we have information, if we capture information that can answer it and, if so, provide it to the house.

EMERGENCY DEPARTMENT STATISTICS

Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (14:54): My question is to the Minister for Mental Health. When does the minister expect the government to achieve its 1 January 2016 goal of having no mental health patients waiting more than 24 hours in an ED, considering that this morning there were 15 patients waiting at the Royal Adelaide Hospital for a bed, and—

The SPEAKER: Yes, this is an explanation without seeking leave. Minister.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:55): Improving access to mental health services and reducing our waiting times has been a concerted area of work that we have had increasing success with across all of our emergency services and ED teams. In fact, I have recently visited the RAH team to thank them for the efforts that they have made in improving their ED times recently.

It remains a priority as we address these issues, and I am committed to ensuring that no mental health patients wait more than 24 hours in the emergency department. Many of the clinical teams I have been speaking to across our mental health services are, in fact, looking towards our second and third round of targets and how we can increasingly improve them. From January 2016, mental health consumers should not wait 24 hours in an emergency department—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order, sir: standing order 98. The question was: when is the government going to achieve their promise?

The SPEAKER: I think the minister is working up to it; I can feel it.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS: In fact, the average waiting time has actually been reducing, from 18.5 hours in October 2014 to 8.5 hours in December 2016. In the past 28 days, the average waiting time has decreased to 7.9 hours. We continue to make significant inroads in this space, and all our clinical teams are committed to improving the access for our consumers, as fast as possible.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:56): My question is also to the Minister for Mental Health. When will the Action Plan for People Living with Borderline Personality Disorder 2017-2020 be made available publicly, given that it is February and the Mental Health Commission website still states that it will be released in late 2016?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:57): We know that people living with borderline personality disorder face many challenges as they intersect with health care, and housing, and general lives. It's an important area that I am very committed to working on. I won't be rushed in making a policy decision about this without consulting consumers and clinicians appropriately. The plan will be released in the near future.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:57): A supplementary question: has the commissioner provided the minister with a copy of his plan?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:57): I am considering the report currently.

BORDERLINE PERSONALITY DISORDER

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:57): A further supplementary: when did the commissioner provide a copy of the report to the minister?

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (14:57): I will seek advice from my department about the exact dates.

DENTAL SERVICES

The Hon. J.M. RANKINE (Wright) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Health. How will the recent announcements made by the federal government regarding funding for dental services affect South Australians?

The Hon. J.J. SNELLING (Playford—Minister for Health, Minister for the Arts, Minister for Health Industries) (14:58): I thank the member for Wright for her question. Can I extend my congratulations to the Hon. Greg Hunt MP, who has recently been appointed federal Minister for Health. I am looking forward to working with him in the future, and I hope that he continues in the encouraging manner in which he has begun managing his portfolio. In the short time that he has been the Minister for Health, he has already made a contribution by backflipping on plans announced by his predecessor, the Hon. Sussan Ley MP, to slash dental assistance for children.

Just a week before Christmas, the Turnbull government announced its string of cuts to health services. In addition to scrapping the \$2.1 billion Child and Adult Public Dental Scheme and reducing funding provided through the National Partnership Agreement on Adult Public Dental Services, funding for children eligible for the Child Dental Benefits Schedule is to be reduced from \$1,000 per child over a two-year period to just \$700.

When these announcements were made, I warned that they could cause waiting times for public dental services to blow out, as well as leaving already financially stressed families under even more strain. At the time, I recall a deafening silence from the opposition as they yet again failed to stand up to their colleagues in Canberra. This was yet another example of the Liberal Party showing no mercy when it comes to supporting everyday Australians.

Fortunately, it seems that the Turnbull government has now heeded the warnings from the South Australian government and the Australian Dental Association, at least in part, as an announcement was made last week that the benefits cap would be kept at \$1,000. Nevertheless, this needs to be considered in light of recent criticisms that, while this entitlement has been available since 2014, they have been hesitant to advertise or make parents aware that they are actually eligible to receive it. This has reportedly resulted in only a third of the millions of children eligible for this rebate across Australia actually receiving it.

In South Australia, despite the best efforts of the South Australian Dental Service to promote the scheme as widely as possible, it is estimated that less than half of eligible children have accessed it. In addition to this, the federal government still hasn't provided South Australia with a copy of the new National Partnership Agreement on Adult Public Dental Services, so we are not able to adequately plan how to provide public dental services over the coming years. However, we do know that the funding will be less than we have previously received and that the commonwealth will pay us a lower rate than present. This will obviously do nothing to improve waiting times for public dental services in South Australia and, if anything, creates a very real risk that they will increase.

I call on the federal minister to break with the decisions made by his predecessor and commit to an appropriate amount of funding that will allow the South Australian government to provide the level of public dental services that our community deserves.

ALCOHOL AND OTHER DRUG STRATEGY

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Substance Abuse. Will the minister acknowledge that the government's Alcohol and Other Drug Strategy 2011-16 has failed to reduce demand and the harms associated with substance abuse in light of the police commissioner's view to budget and estimates last year when he said:

I think it is also fair to say that there is an increased incidence of the presence of illicit substances within the community...

The SPEAKER: If you ask a question as rhetorical as that, you will probably get a rhetorical answer. I hope there won't be any objection to that.

The Hon. L.A. VLAHOS (Taylor—Minister for Disabilities, Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:01): Considering I wasn't present and I haven't had the opportunity of reading the *Hansard* that you have quoted, I would like to think about that before I give a more fulsome answer, but I would be happy to say that the vast majority of the strategies put forward under that document were met. We looked at them and I have told the house that before. The member for Davenport repeatedly misrepresents the outcomes of that strategy and selectively reads.

EDUCATION AND CHILD DEVELOPMENT DEPARTMENT STAFF

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:02): My question is to the Minister for Education and Child Development. How many attendance officers are currently working in the education department and how many of the 60 behaviour support coaches, promised to be engaged by the end of last year, has the department, in fact, employed?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:02): I believe elements of that question have been asked previously, but I am happy to answer them again. There are 22 FTE attendance officers, 19 of which are known as attendance officers and the other three are senior social workers who manage the attendance officer program. When the honourable member refers to 60 behaviour coaches, there are 30 behaviour coaches and 60 wellbeing practitioners who were coming in by the end of the year, so I am going to give him the benefit of the doubt and assume that that is what he was referring to. From memory, 57 FTE were employed by the end of the year, with the remainder being in process at present.

HOUSING AFFORDABILITY

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:03): My question is to the Minister for Planning.

Members interjecting:

Ms BEDFORD: Isn't it good to know that so late in question time people are still paying attention? How is the government addressing the issue of housing affordability in South Australia?

The SPEAKER: The anaesthetist.

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) (15:04): I thank the member for her question because this is a very important issue for people in South Australia. All around South Australia, indeed all around Australia—

Ms Chapman: Once upon a time.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: They are not as interested in housing as we are. We are interested. A lack of affordable housing remains a significant challenge for young people and families wanting to enter the property market, particularly for the first time.

With housing prices often many multiples of annual incomes, and the amount of time required to save the average of a 20 per cent deposit for the first-home buyer, often exceeding eight years, the government is acutely aware of the barriers to home ownership in South Australia. But on a positive note, the latest HIA Housing Affordability Report of 31 January this year shows that, despite fluctuations in market conditions during the past 12 months, Adelaide maintains its position as the third most affordable capital city in Australia.

We are consistently being told by the federal government and interstate lobby groups that the perennial answer to our housing affordability charges lie in how tightly we control the supply of land for urban development on the fringes of our cities. Well, this observation could not be more wrong here in South Australia. The journey we set out on in 2010 for the 30-Year Plan for Greater Adelaide ensured that we as a government strategically identified a long-term pipeline of land supply for future urban growth whilst encouraging better use of our existing infrastructure and a more liveable, vibrant city, and that has certainly been happening.

During the past five years, we have seen a substantial increase in the opportunities made available for major infill development in the inner and middle Adelaide areas, including the progression of exciting projects, such as Bowden—

Ms Sanderson interjecting:

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

The Hon. J.R. RAU: —thank you, Mr Speaker—Lightsview and St Clair. Our urban infill agenda continues to make real inroads into unlocking supply and providing a diversity of affordable living options close to jobs and services in places where people want to live. Our progress also indicates that 75 per cent of our housing increase now comes from established areas in metropolitan Adelaide, up from 50 per cent in 2009.

Our extensive structure planning and rezoning programs have resulted in excess of 20 years' supply of development land ready at current consumption rates in residential growth areas. That is 20 years' supply.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, Mr Speaker, I don't normally respond to interjections because I would hope that most members opposite would take a leaf out of the member for Bright's book, who behaves with an exemplary demeanour during question time, and I—

The Hon. J.J. Snelling: Not like the member for Kavel.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Well, he is doing very well today, too.

The Hon. J.J. Snelling interjecting:

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I know. The point, though, the answer to that question—

The SPEAKER: The Deputy Premier is called to order for breaching the convention about the presence or absence of members.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I didn't mention that. I just said that he wasn't interrupting at all.

The SPEAKER: There was an imputation.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: There was an imputation. That's right. I'm trying to put a positive aspect to it. Anyway, in answer to the leader's interjection, the reason why the numbers are changing is that people's preferences in where they wish to live is being expressed—

Mr Marshall: Because you've got no jobs for anyone to come here for—that's why.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the house is that the house note grievances.

Grievance Debate

RATE CAPPING

Mr BELL (Mount Gambier) (15:08): If anyone had any doubt about why we need rate capping, all they need do is to look at today's *Advertiser*. Ratepayers paying for a council CEO's golf membership is outrageous—this on top of payouts to Peter Smith, the Adelaide CEO who was paid almost \$400,000 a year and who was awarded extra payments worth \$15,000 linked to his Land Rover Discovery 4.

With regard to golf membership, the fact that the council did it in secret and that it was not disclosed on the register of interest is disturbing.

Members interjecting:

Mr BELL: A bit of protection, sir.

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

Mr BELL: As John Houlahan, the former chair of the Onkaparinga Resident's Association said, and I quote:

It is out of control. The council is squandering money left right and centre. Someone has to be held to account.

Why do we need rate capping? Because people are hurting. This current government does not seem to care. People are suffering under this Labor government's continual tax grab. We have increases in the emergency services levy, increases in water rates and the most expensive, yet strangely the least reliable, electricity charges in the nation. What I find amazing is that we have CEOs on similar wages to those of the Premier and ministers of the Crown, yet these guys, funnily enough, are responsible for the entire state of South Australia.

I find it interesting to note that some of the loudest opponents of rate capping are those sitting on the other side of the chamber. In fact, a couple of them have been mayors themselves, so I decided to do a little bit of research. The member for Light presided over rate rises of 6.1 per cent on average, when inflation was only running at about 3 per cent. The member for Frome was also a mayor when rates rose 6.7 per cent on average, whilst inflation was only 3.1 per cent. These increases are unsustainable. No-one is standing up for the ratepayers and asking why rates are going up by so much.

I am here to tell you that the Liberal Party is listening to the people of South Australia and that we are prepared to make the tough calls. We are prepared to stand up for all South Australians whether they live in the CBD or whether they live in regional South Australia. The Liberal Party will be putting \$90 million back into people's pockets by reversing the emergency services levy increases. The Liberal Party will be sorting out the power crisis that is crippling South Australia and crueiling businesses across this great state, and we will be capping council rates after 2018.

The SPEAKER: The Mayor of Onkaparinga, Lorraine Rosenberg, was a former member of this house. The memory of her political party escapes me at the moment.

EAST PARA PRIMARY SCHOOL

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:12): On Thursday 9 February, I had the pleasure of showing Parliament House to a group of students from East Para Primary School, led by their teacher, assistant principal, Mr Aaron McPherson. I met ministers Ryan Trandafil, Emmy Murphy, Amy Mykytyschyn, Howra Alyasiri, Taylor Baker, Paige Del Vescovo, Chloe Hutchens and Jenny Sanchez. They spent part of their morning with me looking around this place, where we have the honour of representing our communities. This is not the first time I have had the pleasure of mentioning East Para Primary School, for they are champions in their Australian International Pedal Prix class, another wonderful achievement of this exceptional local public school.

At the end of last year, students at the school, prospective 2017 school captains, delivered their speeches to the staff and students of their respective houses. All the candidates, I am told, did an amazing job and represented themselves with confidence and pride. All the students then voted and, as in previous years, the captains were announced at the first assembly this year.

Last year's year 6s had another student leadership opportunity through the children's parliament model of student government. The nominated year 6s wrote their applications for the role of minister within this model.

There are eight ministers at East Para Primary School to lead the eight ministries, providing support and leading improvements across the school community. This model of student governance links very well with the civics and citizenship topic in the Australian curriculum. The only other school I know where this model is in place is Alberton Primary School, where I am reliably informed the Premier's own daughters attend. Alberton has experienced great success in building a student voice within their community with this model.

At East Para Primary School, the idea is to help make decisions that will benefit the school community. They tell me their visit to Parliament House and the information we shared gave them a better understanding of the processes involved in decision-making within a democratic society and community. This is an important concept, especially for me, one that drives me to continue to energetically represent my constituents. They also said something that resonated with all of them was when we spoke about the role of an MP—that it was to listen to and value everyone's ideas and contributions and that negotiation and compromise are integral to equitable decision-making.

This is particularly relevant to me lately, because my voice—that of a kindy mum who became a community activist and eventually an MP—is only one of the 69 who make laws in South Australia. It is diversity, not only in the origin of candidates, that makes our democracy robust and relevant to people. Imagine if only one professional point of view dominated here, or if, by whatever means, one, or two, or a minority of people, for instance, managed to control policy outcomes or candidate selection.

The East Para Primary School group understood the importance of this concept and the trust that has been placed in them. They said they know their positions are ones of responsibility and that by representing their classes and fellow students with integrity, they know they will gain respect. As they begin their journeys as ministers, they are very excited about what they can achieve—something that I know real ministers must surely feel when they have that opportunity. One can only hope their experience will hold them in good stead and that the compromises they may have to make will not see them have to move too far from their beliefs or values as they learn valuable lessons in life.

I commend Mr McPherson and the staff of East Para Primary School for providing this rich and nurturing learning environment and wish the student ministers the very best for their year of service.

ROAD SAFETY

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:15): I am very pleased to present to the house a petition signed by 571 South Australians, to:

...draw the attention of your Honourable House to the need for improved road safety measures around Highbury Primary School and Preschool. Hundreds of students walk to school daily, including many who have to cross busy roads such as Lower North East Rd and Valley Rd. Students attending Modbury High School are also impacted—whether they walk or catch the bus to school. The roads are unsafe and need improvements, such as:

- A safe crossing across Lower North East Rd, between Dordoy St and Stow Ct;
- A safe crossing across Valley Rd, at either of or between Honeysuckle Dr and Beckman Ave;
- Improved road signage, road markings and student crossings on the roads immediately surrounding the school and preschool.

Request

Your petitioners therefore request that your Honourable House support improved road safety measures as identified.

This is a matter that I first brought to the attention, as a neighbouring member of parliament, of the current Minister for Transport. He passed it on to the then minister for road safety (the member for Light). The member for Light eventually got back to us identifying that the school could have participated in the Way2Go program but did not.

The constituent who first brought it to my attention was Mr Abraham Shuken. It will be two years by the time anything gets done, the way things are going. Mr Shuken has been beavering away at this and working so hard with his school community and the local community. I note, with 571 signatures, that an extraordinarily high proportion of the school community have invested themselves in this process. Mr Shuken wrote back to the then minister (member for Light) in relation to this matter. I quote from his letter:

I am a member of Highbury Primary School governing council and a concerned parent of children attending their local government school.

Mr Shuken goes on to refer to the correspondence that I sent him from the minister, dated 6 August 2015:

Since then no further correspondence has been received, nor at any time was Principal Carol Williams contacted as indicated (she has stated this to me in an email)...

I find it disappointing, no further action has been taken, to my knowledge. The problem still remains, children are expected to cross a four lane, Lower North East Road, with no signage, and the closest crossing 1 km away.

Does the government find it acceptable for children to cross a four lane, major road, with no safety in place, to get to their local, state government school? What is required to get action on this?

Mr Shuken then goes on with some other points of view. Having visited Highbury Primary School on a number of occasions, and having spent some time walking on the local streets with parents—the same streets on which their children walk to school—I can absolutely lend my support to the case being put forward by Mr Shuken, the members of the Highbury Primary School governing council and the nearly 600 people who have signed this petition over the last month or so, calling on the government to take action.

There is inadequate signage all around the school and there is inadequate road marking all around the school. As I brought to the attention of the house late last year in relation to Ridgehaven Primary School and its inadequate lighting for school crossings outside their school, this is a matter of the most serious concern. What is more important than the protection of our children in our community? It should be the most simple thing, that we have a reasonable expectation that our children should be able to walk to their local government primary school.

This is a serious matter that requires attention. The government has not given it that attention for two years and has refused to give it that attention. There is a new Minister for Road Safety, we probably have a new education minister since this matter started, and we still have the same Minister for Transport. On behalf of these 571 petitioners and the local communities in the north-eastern suburbs, I urge the government to take action. This does not need to be political matter. This should be just a commonsense issue that is dealt with as soon as possible.

SKIN CANCER

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:20): I rise today to inform the house about the impact of skin cancer in our community, and will share a personal story and also highlight some fantastic work being done in the community to help stop the tragic loss of life that occurs as a consequence.

I grew up on the lovely southern beaches and spent many long days at Christies, Porties (which is Port Noarlunga) and Moes (Moana). I lived at Morphett Vale and rode my bike, and on my

trip to the beach I used to gather more people in the peloton, more friends. We made it to the beach and then we would rub ourselves with oil of various concoctions when Reef Oil was far too expensive for our pockets—cooking oil, baby oil—and just absolutely fry. Very dangerous behaviour.

I went to school with a dear friend of mine called Nicky Kerr, who lived at Seaford, and we rekindled our friendship as intensive care nurses at Flinders Medical Centre. We were both really outdoor girls and she was from an outdoors kind of family. Her father—and she was a daddy's girl as well—Terrence Wayne Smallwood, was a fifth generation Australian with fair hair, blue eyes, fair skin, a target for the sun in which he grew up and with an unquenchable love for the beach and the great outdoors.

He spent most of his childhood at the beach during summer and on the footy field during winter. He loved his footy, loved sport, loved a kick and a catch. Despite that, he always said that his greatest sporting achievements were realised on the beach. He was a surf lifesaver and joined the club in his early teens. He spent every available moment practising his craft and years later trained and competed in the March Past. His surf lifesaving career spanned greater than 45 years. He is a surf lifesaving club, state, Australian and world champion in his craft. He is also an Australian skin cancer statistic.

Being the way he was, pale with blonde hair, he also suffered from baldness by his late 20s. He did adopt sun smart policies as they emerged, but by that stage he had already endured far too many long hours in the sun. Later in life, in 2008, he discovered a small, swollen lump on his head and was diagnosed with melanoma in his 60s. He had that removed and had a small skin graft, but almost a year to the day a small pimple appeared on the graft on his head.

He said it had been there a few days and all would be okay, 'Terry will be fine,' but his daughter insisted he ring the doctor urgently. He was shocked to discover that this pimple was, in fact, a regrowth of the melanoma. This time the melanoma had metastasised into his lymph nodes, brain and lungs and his diagnosis of metastatic melanoma was terminal. As friends we did all we could for Terry and our dear friend Nicky, but metastatic melanoma does not respond to chemotherapy. He tried alternate therapies as well and fought as hard as he could. He tried radiotherapy, steroids, oxygen, but the melanoma took hold and he lost his battle less than four months after diagnosis.

Despite sun awareness being more prevalent now, insidious skin damage still occurs despite our best efforts. Australia has the highest rates of skin cancer in the world, with two-thirds of Australians developing some kind of skin cancer by the time they are 70. If not detected and treated early enough, skin cancers can become fatal; more than 2,000 Australians die every year. Despite regular warnings, almost 14 per cent of adults, 24 per cent of teenagers and 8 per cent of children (scary) get sunburnt on the weekends in Australia. It happens while you are gardening, at the beach and pool, or having a barbecue. You can also get sunburnt on cool and overcast days.

If detected early enough, skin cancer can be treated and rarely becomes fatal. While many thousands of people have accessed the Lions' skin cancer screening over the past five years in SA and NT, it was known that a mobile screening unit was critical to the detection of skin cancer in the high-risk regions of South Australia. With the Lions Club International Foundation, \$200,000 has been raised and is now providing a mobile screening unit.

I, as a member of Aberfoyle and districts, together with the member for Reynell who is also a member, attended the launch a couple of weeks ago of their mobile screening unit. Thank you to the Lions Club. Well done and congratulations on the work you are going to do preventing skin cancers in our community.

POWER OUTAGES

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:25): I rise today to speak on a topic which has dominated the parliament's time this week and for some months prior to that, and that is electricity. Even though I have spoken on this topic before in this place, I will go right back to the statewide blackout on 29 September and the difficulty that we all experienced during that time. In relation to my electorate, Eyre Peninsula and the West Coast, it was particularly difficult because of the extended period of time that we were out. We also had the three generators which were contracted to supplement the

power supply into Port Lincoln fail on that occasion and we still have no reasonable answer as to why that occurred. I do not believe the Treasurer has received an answer to that query either.

Unfortunately, the West Coast has become all too used to power outages. In places like Elliston and Streaky Bay, it had become a regular occurrence even prior to the 29 September statewide blackout. In hindsight, I believe Eyre Peninsula had become the canary in the coalmine for the rest of the state and for the rest of the country. Ironically, on the very day that the smoke stack at the Port Augusta power station was brought down, which was covered widely in the popular press, yet another power outage occurred on the West Coast. I suspect the two were unrelated, but the irony was not lost on the people of Eyre Peninsula.

The story continues, because on 23 December I was in Cowell, in another part of my electorate, for their Christmas parade. I noticed lightning and a clap of thunder to the north-west. My worst fears were confirmed when, once again, Streaky Bay and Ceduna lost power, this time for around 24 hours, in what was the very busiest trading time of the year, midday of the 23rd to midday of 24 December. You can imagine the irate concerns of people who were preparing for Christmas, not only businesses but also households. Goodness knows how much Christmas preparation was upset and how much food was thrown out. I know hotels lost trade and all the rest of it; we have heard those stories before.

As a result, our leader, Steven Marshall, and I took it upon ourselves to write to the Premier requesting an urgent meeting with nine Eyre Peninsula mayors from nine district council areas. The Premier chose not to meet face to face, but at least had a phone hook-up with those mayors and they were pleased to have that opportunity. The Treasurer took it upon himself to visit Port Lincoln early in January, which gave all the mayors the opportunity to meet with the Treasurer face to face and put to him the situation that Eyre Peninsula found itself in.

There is no doubt that the mayors took the opportunity to bring home the unreliability of the power supply to EP. No doubt the Treasurer was somewhat surprised at that, given the never-ending nature of the blackouts in our part of the world. I suspect that some of the problem is not just generation capacity but also the condition of the poles and wires. The ElectraNet and SA Power Networks transmission lines obviously are not in a condition whereby they can withstand even just a clap of thunder.

I thank and congratulate the work crews who, often in difficult circumstances when the rest of the community are enjoying themselves, are out restoring power. For homes and businesses, it is not just the reliability but also the cost of our power supply which is impacted, so what to do to fix this? We need:

- a single national renewable energy target which encourages investment in generation and storage technologies that are reliable, affordable and clean;
- a well-functioning National Electricity Market which includes a broad generation mix capable of balancing demand and supply across the market; and
- reliable, affordable base load power to supply grid security and price stability, which could include gas and solar thermal generation along with other renewables capable of providing dispatchable electricity.

I know on the West Coast of this state, on Eyre Peninsula, we have one of the finest wind resources in the country if not the world. There needs to be further development and investment in storage and other enabling technologies to improve the quality of renewable generation already in place, and we have to enable customers and consumers to manage their own demand levels through differential pricing and improved storage and information.

COOBER PEDY

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (15:31): I rise today to talk about the community of Coober Pedy but, in so doing, I would like to touch on some of the issues that the member for Flinders has raised in relation to electricity security on the Eyre Peninsula. In my previous life before parliament, I used to go fishing a lot down on the West Coast, and power outages were a common occurrence.

The suggestions made by the member for Flinders are, in the main, sensible suggestions. There is a whole raft of technologies now that will enable us to have more secure electricity for those communities on the end of the grid. We need to be seriously looking at a range of options, and two of those options are the development of microgrids and the growth in distributed energy supplies. I am absolutely sure that that will come to pass.

Getting back to Coober Pedy, we have had a few hot days down here in the south, but they do not compare with the run of hot days in the north of the state in communities such as Coober Pedy. Those people who have dugouts are fortunate. As members probably know, a dugout is probably close to being the most thermally efficient form of housing that we have in Australia. It is a form of housing that responds very well to the climatic conditions that are found in Coober Pedy, and it is Coober Pedy's good fortune that the local rock formation is stable and workable.

The principle of building to suit climatic circumstances is something that is generally absent in our state and other states, given our lowest common denominator energy star ratings for houses built over the last decade or so. Spare a thought for those who do not live underground in Coober Pedy, especially during the long, hot days of summer. Our built form has still a way to go before it effectively responds to our climate, but the reward for responding to our climate will be cheaper electricity bills and a reduced environmental impact.

Not everyone lives in a dugout in Coober Pedy, but most people have had access to the swimming pool. The pool is on education department land. It is a combined department and community pool, and the cost of running the pool was shared between the council and the department. Late last year, the council decided to pull funding, putting at risk pool availability during the summer school break. I consider the closure of the pool over the summer school holidays to be unacceptable. There are already limited recreational options, and the closure of the pool in such a hot climate would seriously disadvantage many Coober Pedy residents.

I indicated to the Coober Pedy council CEO that I would attempt to secure interim funding for the summer school holidays to keep the pool open. Securing the funding would also provide an opportunity to negotiate ongoing funding. I made clear that any future funding should be fair to the council and the Coober Pedy community. We did provide the interim funding. I have made it very plain that I was deeply disappointed with the approach of the Coober Pedy council to negotiations, and I have expressed that disappointment publicly. Negotiations are meant to be about give and take, not just take.

On 24 January, the council made clear that it was not going to provide any support for the broader community's use of the pool. We bent over backwards to offer a very fair deal to the council. We offered to pick up all the recurrent costs, including the utilities, cleaning, chemicals and repairs. The only cost that we expected the council to meet was supervision outside school hours. We could have acted like the council and ignored the broader community, which would have meant the pool open during school hours for the use of students. We did not do that. We put the community first and provided funding to enable community use.

I mentioned the dugouts and energy efficiency at the start of the grievance. The electricity source for the Coober Pedy community is about to change, given the progress on the ARENA-supported renewable energy project. EDL are making solid progress on the construction of the hybrid renewable energy system, entailing wind and solar combined with batteries and diesel. To date, Coober Pedy has been almost entirely dependent on diesel.

It is always a challenge when it comes to significant up-front investment and the power purchase agreement to underpin that investment at a time when costs are rapidly falling for solar and batteries. Any approach needs to be seriously thought through so that people are not locked into prices that in years to come might be seen as excessive.

Parliamentary Committees

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills) (15:36): I move:

That the Hon. Paul Caica be appointed to the Natural Resources Committee in place of Ms Digance, who has resigned.

Motion carried.

Bills

STATUTES AMENDMENT (UNIVERSITIES) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (15:36): Prior to the adjournment, I was commenting that there is tension between our desire to ensure that the institutions that Adelaide and Flinders universities represent maintain the levels of representation they have had historically, while on the other hand wanting them to run as efficiently and effectively as possible. Obviously, as our universities are amongst our state's most significant employers, the decisions they make will have wide-reaching consequences, and we want their governance to be as strong as possible. If the changes sought by the university administrations are seen to improve those administrations and the impact those universities have on our state, that is the other side of the equation.

I note that the minister, in her second reading speech, made a couple of points in addition to those I made before the break. I will quote one very small section of her speech in which she identified these changes will be, and I quote:

...consistent with Universities Australia's Voluntary Code of Best Practice for the Governance of Australian Universities. Importantly, this will be achieved while broadly maintaining the existing proportions of staff, student and appointed independent members on university councils.

Extending the tenure of student representatives will similarly improve corporate governance by providing additional professional development opportunities.

Extending the tenure of those student representatives from one year would clearly have that outcome.

There has been a level of opposition to this aspect of the bill. It is something that a number of members have thought long and hard about and have met with a number of people about. The Leader of the Opposition and I, even prior to the bill's introduction to the house, met with representatives from the National Tertiary Education Union from both Adelaide and Flinders universities to discuss their points of view. I think it is important that, given the tension that exists between the two sides of the debate, that side of the argument be registered on the parliamentary record.

A number of members of parliament were also contacted by constituents whose correspondence was broadly similar. I will not say that it is just a form letter because I noted people putting some of their personal reflections in addition to the standard words. For the record, I will read one of the pieces of correspondence I received to give the house an idea of the alternative point of view. It states:

Dear [member for Morialta],

I am writing to you because I have become aware that the government is currently considering changes to the University of Adelaide Act. You will soon be presented with these changes in the Statutes Amendment (Universities) Bill 2016.

As a student and casual staff member at the University and a resident of your electorate I am seriously concerned about the content of these changes, and the secret process the University and Government have used to rush these changes through. I have contacted [the minister] and received inadequate response to date.

This Bill seeks to reduce the number of elected staff and student representatives on University Council—yet staff and students at the University have not been consulted over the changes, or, in fact even notified of them. This is most likely because the University knows that staff and students do and will oppose these changes.

For these reasons I ask that you vote against this bill when it enters the parliament.

We received some correspondence from some staff members, at least one student and the union. It is probably the union's correspondence that will take the bulk of the remainder of the time that I will share with the house this afternoon because I think it is fair that their points of view be presented.

I propose to read a piece of correspondence from the National Tertiary Education Union, dated 8 November 2016 and signed by Felix Patrikeeff, President of the NTEU, University of Adelaide Branch (and, I remember from my own distant past, a fine lecturer) and Andrew Miller, President of the NTEU, Flinders University Branch. They write to me as the member for Morialta regarding changes to the Flinders University and University of Adelaide acts. The letter states:

It is anticipated the Parliament will soon be presented with Bills to amend the Flinders University and University of Adelaide Acts. The primary objective of these Bills is to reduce the number of elected (staff and student) members on the Flinders University and University of Adelaide Councils. We ask that you oppose these changes.

The process with regard to this matter has been floored from start to finish. At Flinders University, the proposed changes went to Parliamentary Counsel without any staff or student consultation. It was only after written insistence from [the minister] that the University engaged in 'consultation'—the outcome of which revealed resounding opposition from staff and students to the reduction of elected positions on University Council. The changes proceeded regardless.

Consultation at the University of Adelaide has been non-existent, and in fact, the Chancellor Kevin Scarce, who requested the government make these changes, has not even announced the plan to University staff or students.

I skip forward to the next relevant part:

The [NTEU] is not a politically aligned union. As a result we pay attention to the positions that all MPs and parties take on issues that are important to our members and our sector with a view to working strategically with those that support higher education workers.

The preservation of current representation levels in South Australian universities is vital to the health of the university's themselves and the public more broadly. The peak university governance body is its council. To fulfil its responsibilities, a university council needs to be widely informed of the operations of the university. This includes having knowledge of and direct access to the perspectives of its stakeholders. Such knowledge is vital to the effective governance of complex public institutions like universities. It is staff and students who provide on-the-ground wisdom and the diversity of voices to university councils. Further, the removal of elected (rather than management appointment) councillors further reduces public accountability of a public, but highly autonomous, institution. Without accountability to the public, autonomous (yet publically funded universities) will be free to adopt policies that may not be in the interests of South Australia and families.

We urge you to block the passage of any changes to the University Acts that reduce staff and student presence on the two councils. The relevant changes may seem small but the consequences will be significant.

And so on. Then there is the correspondence they sent to Flinders University, which is largely of a similar nature. Subsequently, we received further correspondence that goes into the details of the drops in percentage of councils in each university from the various groups, which I went through prior to the interval. The union went on to argue in a letter dated 9 February—just last week—from Annie Buchecker, the NTEU Industrial Officer, which was sent to me by John Pezy from the NTEU:

There is no research that links a reduction in a university council's size to better performance. Indeed, research warns that given the complexity of public organisations like universities, any reduction that threatens stakeholder representation is likely to be counterproductive. Furthermore, research points to the fact that the application of a corporate model of governance based on shareholder interests is inappropriate for the governance of organisations that are stakeholder responsible.

She goes on to quote some other research. That is the argument that was put to us by the union. I think the most interesting correspondence that came to me actually came from one of those union representatives drawing my attention to a YouTube clip of the University of Adelaide Community's annual meeting. I thank them for passing that on. I thought it was useful, and I also applaud the University of Adelaide for putting that meeting online. I think that is a very positive step in community engagement by the University of Adelaide.

The Chancellor of the University of Adelaide, Kevin Scarce, and the Vice-Chancellor, Warren Bebbington, were presenting their strategic plan, talking about the building reviews and, of course, there was discussion about this piece of legislation. This was on 12 February, so a very recent meeting. I think it is worth sharing with the house some of that discussion, which probably brings us to our conclusion.

I acknowledge Adjunct Associate Professor Dr John Keeler AM, who raised a series of concerns relating to the self-referential nature of the council appointees, and Chancellor Kevin Scarce responded that, as the university's chancellor, he is not exercising his right to appoint one member because his view was that the council was too large and not able to carry out identified roles effectively—21 members is unwieldy.

Former governor Scarce went on to say that governance of a billion dollar enterprise is compromised by the size of the existing council. The quality of the discussion capable of being held about the complex issues that that billion dollar enterprise necessarily generates is compromised by having 21 people around the table. The reduction is across all aspects of council. Proportions of elected members are maintained. He went on to say that he makes no apologies for trying to get a more effective council.

Another question—and I took the time to make sure I got this as an exact quote—put to the chancellor was:

The minister told parliament that the universities put in place their own engagement processes to engage with their communities and explain the proposed amendments. I'm just concerned that what you're telling us is that the university council has gone ahead and made these decisions without actually consulting the community. So I'm wondering did the university mislead the minister or did the minister mislead the parliament?

Kevin Scarce responded:

I can tell you what we have done. I'll leave the minister to explain what she's done.

Of course, the minister may or may not take up that invitation in her response. He went on to say:

The governance responsibility of council is a responsibility of council. I don't see a need for coming back to the broader community to have a discussion on how council should go about its business....The very engaged discussion that we had at council about its governance responsibilities in my view was the appropriate place to decide how the council should go about its governance. I don't see a need to have to go to the broader community to have that engagement.

Later he went on to say in his conclusion:

Going towards the same size council as currently operates at UniSA. It's not a dramatic change in numbers. It's attempting to improve the dialogue and the contribution that council members can make at meetings.

The fact is, of course, that the union came to see the opposition some months before the minister introduced the bill into the parliament and described the bill fundamentally in the terms in which the bill eventually was presented to the parliament, so I am not convinced by the argument put in the question to Kevin Scarce that there was no community consultation at the University of Adelaide because clearly there must have been some level of community consultation. The union brought it to our attention three months before it got to the parliament. However, clearly there is a level of anxiety at the university that maybe could have been handled differently.

Fundamentally, I think this comes down to this: does the necessity to maintain a certain number of councillors from those representative groups at their current status outweigh the benefit of having what Kevin Scarce describes as a more efficient and less unwieldy council, a council capable of providing governance to a billion dollar enterprise? I am unconvinced, and the opposition is certainly at this stage unconvinced, of the union's argument that research only shows that large instrumentalities need to be governed by large representative stakeholder groups. I am not sure that is the purpose for which the university council goes about its business.

With that in mind, of course the opposition will be supporting this bill through the House of Assembly. In good faith, I should say that if amendments are proposed we will consider them in good faith, and that position may possibly take place between now and the Legislative Council. However, there is nothing that I have had presented to me at this stage that would indicate that the amendments would outweigh the benefits that might be put forward through this bill.

Fundamentally, our universities, the three significant public universities in South Australia, are to be cherished and encouraged. They employ tens of thousands of our people. They educate tens of thousands of our young people. They generate billions of dollars of economic activity for South Australia at a time when South Australia is gripped by nothing less than an unemployment

crisis. It is a situation where our very future is being challenged by the lack of confidence in that future.

Where there is a lack of investment in our economy and potential future jobs growth we really need to be looking at every opportunity to run our institutions that do generate jobs and growth efficiently. I am not sure that having a 21-member council is the right size. I think that the propositions put forward by the universities and that the government has also considered and put forward are potentially more compelling, and so the opposition will be supporting the bill through the House of Assembly.

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:52): I would like to make a brief contribution to the Statute Amendment (Universities) Bill for the primary reason that this area does touch on the relevance of my shadow ministerial role under trade and investment.

The bill specifically intends to reduce the size of the university councils and extend the tenure of student representatives on the councils from one to two years and to allow the tabling of annual reports in parliament by the Minister for Higher Education and Skills instead of the Governor. The bill will also strengthen statutory liability protections for council members and senior officers. What I would like to touch on is the State Strategic Plan to target international students at our universities. The target was 45,000 by 2014 and we were 15,000 short.

I would like to see the government focussing on what I see as a much more sustainable platform, particularly with international students at our universities. Obviously, the state government recently released an action plan, which states that, over the last five years, the overall Australian international student market has grown by 4.25 per cent, however the number of international students across all sectors studying in South Australia has decreased by 2,315 over the same period, equating to a decrease of 6.74 per cent. As a result, the South Australian market share has decreased from 5.57 per cent in 2010 to 4.98 per cent in 2015.

Over that same period, the increased market share for the ACT, New South Wales, the Northern Territory and Victoria has been broadly offset by falls in other jurisdictions, notably in Queensland, Western Australia and Tasmania. If South Australia had maintained its share of the international education market over that period approximately, there would be an additional nearly 3,800 students studying in South Australia. The fact is that South Australia must boost its international market share to assist in reinvigorating our economy and the state's largest service export sector.

The market is highly competitive. I have travelled recently to look at the way other states are procuring, incentivising and luring our international students to their universities. There is an absolutely stark contrast in that we have almost been prepared to allow the decline in international students coming to South Australia. A survey in a recent study revealed that of 1,200 students canvassed from 65 countries, 45 per cent intend to stay in Adelaide once they obtain their qualifications.

To use Victoria as an example, their programs, summer camps, scholarships and sponsorships are real sweeteners and incentives for international students to come over and 'try before you buy'. Those international students are not just coming over here to stay in accommodation and study. Their families are buying houses and they are buying real estate. They are coming over here and investing in our economy as well as studying at our universities. Our universities are first class, but decreasing numbers, whether domestically or internationally, reduce the size of the pie to reinvest into programs in universities. That is a direct result of the numbers.

The government announced funding cuts and then commissioned a report which told them that sustaining a funding cut would be the end of Education Adelaide. Thankfully, Education Adelaide was given a lifeline, and they are still in operation, but this is about whether the South Australian government and the South Australian universities are going to invest, in a bipartisan way, in the future viability of our universities. We all know that numbers, backsides on seats, programs, an ongoing mix of different subjects, and flexible subject matter are what lure students and university attendees to South Australia. As a state, I would like to think that we would look at further ways we could promote the lifestyle to international students.

My sister is currently hosting two Chinese students. I think she is doing a great job in not only promoting South Australia to those students but also endorsing belief in South Australia. Those students will go back to their home country and they will be great ambassadors for South Australia. That is what South Australia needs. The best form of publicity is good publicity, and the next best is free publicity. Having students who are going back to their home countries on social media, and having their families come out here and be part of our communities, is a great way to promote and make South Australia a real international destination.

I think it is a real draw card and, as I said, makes these international students ambassadors. It is also about giving them experiences and getting them out into our regions so that we can explain to the world that South Australia is not just a one-town state; it has more diversity than that. It has great regions not only to visit but also to study.

There are many different ways we can do that. We need to delve into how we can attract international postgraduate students and make South Australia more important. There have been some recent reports into how South Australia could become a better destination for international university students. I think these note that there may be a number of international students utilising low-cost accommodation. South Australia offers affordable accommodation options.

Victoria, which is one of the great university destinations, is starting to become very expensive. That is detracting from the package that many of our international students are using to justify coming over to Victoria. Now is the time for South Australia to step up and be part of that mix. But we have to invest. I urge our universities and the state government to invest in one of the great service sectors in South Australia.

We are an accepting culture, and we are an accepting community, but we need to do more. At the moment, what I am seeing is that we are not doing enough, and the numbers show the facts. We all know that the numbers do not lie. I thank the shadow minister for higher education (member for Morialta) for his work on this bill and commend it to the house.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (16:01): I rise to speak on the Statutes Amendment (Universities) Bill. I indicate that we on this side of the house express our appreciation of the work undertaken by the shadow minister for education in giving us sage and succinct advice to consent to the bill. I do not dissent from that, but I do want to say a couple of things in respect of the governance of universities in general.

Universities are academic institutions. They are a very important ground for an opportunity for people to undertake research and to ensure that we have not only a new generation of highly skilled people but also opportunities for research and innovation. They are not a business, they are not a school, and they are not a government department. They need to be treated with respect to the extent of their independence and the diversity of those who govern them.

In the time that I have been in this house, I have certainly been a contributor in respect of university governance reform on a number of occasions. The most significant of these reforms occurred about 10 years ago, where there had been a considerable downscaling of the contribution of academic and postgraduate representative and, at that stage, even an attempt to reduce student representative recognition in the governance structure.

One of the university chancellors of the three universities being reformed at the time—which of course needed our attention because they were established through state legislation—was to reduce it to a board of five. Even the minister balked at that, and with good reason: there is significant diversity of representation on our boards, and long should that remain. But, from time to time, the working operations need to be finetuned.

One of the other matters that I think is significant, whatever the future structure of the leadership in governance for the universities may be, is their responsibility to South Australians in respect of bequests. Indeed, as academic institutions I suppose they attract less resistance from those who might want to leave a public bequest for the benefit of South Australians than for other institutions. For example, they are not too keen to hand it over to the Treasurer or to governments usually, because they think it might get wasted on other activities not directly related or beneficial to the aspiration of the sponsor of the gift.

What happened with the University of Adelaide several years ago, when we amended the University of Adelaide Act and its governance, was they subsequently and immediately moved to sell off three major rural properties that had been bequeathed for the benefit of academic training and research in the area of agriculture, as well as food production in pastoralist country. At the time I, for one, was very concerned that the university should act in that matter, even though it was not strictly in breach of the trust, that they should give up such an enormous asset and resource.

However, the financial geniuses of the governance of the time decided that they were not in the business of owning properties. Even though we have a massive obligation to deal with the sustainability of food production—not just to feed Australia but also to consider what we produce for the world—they decided they were not in the business of farming or of asset holding, and that they should sell it. My private member's bill to try to stop it was like water off a duck's back because the government of the day, under the leadership of minister O'Brien, decided that it was up to the universities to do as they wished.

Following on from this very sorry saga, and even though the properties did sell and some \$50 million or \$52 million in funds was the result, I am pleased to say that in the end the governing body of the University of Adelaide decided that with the money it would establish the Davies research centre, and that those funds would be kept for the very specific purpose of the advancement of future agriculture and animal and veterinary science work in South Australia. A great outcome in the end, but not without a lot of pain along the way.

I think, as is reasonable in the circumstances, that those of us who were critical and concerned should at least recognise the then vice chancellor Warren Bebbington and his leadership in ensuring that the proceeds were held in this way. Indeed, I did write to him to congratulate the university on its decision to establish the Davies research centre.

I wish those in that enterprise well but, to make it perfectly clear to all the universities, if they have the privilege and benefit of someone's bequest, whether it is to sponsor a scholarship, build a building, or advance a particular course within one of the schools of the university, great. It should not be ignored or exploited to the extent that others will not give, because the most significant outcome of being disrespectful to those who leave bequests or who provide a significant gift to a university is that others will not do it.

I record my concern that all three universities need to be alert to the opportunity. Indeed, I am an old scholar of two of them and I regularly get requests to make a financial contribution. I am pleased to say that from time to time we do, as I am sure many in the house do, but no-one is going to give any reasonable lick of money or bequest to any institution, including the universities, if they do not make sure they properly look after it and ensure that it is applied for the benefit for which the gifter has given it. With those words, I support the bill.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SURROGACY ELIGIBILITY) BILL

Final Stages

Consideration in committee of the Legislative Council's amendments.

(Continued from 14 February 2017.)

Amendment No. 1:

The CHAIR: Do you want to agree to this amendment?

Ms HILDYARD: I have some brief comments. As the house is aware, this parliament recently passed a fairly significant suite of reforms that absolutely advance equality for lesbian, gay, bisexual, transgender, intersex and queer (LGBTIQ) South Australians. The reforms, importantly and rightly, include recognising the relationships and families of same-sex couples. Our Premier, with the support of the Leader of the Opposition, also recently offered an apology to LGBTIQ South Australians, indicating that he was sorry for the discrimination within the state's laws that LGBTIQ community members have experienced in the past.

Despite such significant progress, amendments have been passed by the other place which can only be described as discriminatory and which are contrary to the purpose of these reforms. The amendments have the effect of allowing for registered objectors under the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act of 1988 to refuse the provision of assisted reproductive treatment to a person on the basis of the person's sexual orientation, gender identity or marital status.

In circumstances where assisted reproductive treatment is refused on such a basis, the registered objector is required to take steps to refer the person seeking assisted reproductive treatment to another person who is also registered under the Assisted Reproductive Treatment Act. These amendments will require objectors to register as such and that register of objectors will be held by SA Health.

Notwithstanding the inroads to equality we have made thus far, the other place has now passed amendments that allow discrimination by providers of assisted reproductive treatment. The amendments allow providers, based on the provider's bias, to withhold their services from someone based on the person's sexual orientation, gender identity or marital status. This is precisely the kind of discrimination we are trying to expel from our legislation and from our community, and I believe that it has no place in our legislation.

Our legislation should always be inclusive, not discriminatory, and should be a positive statement of the values of our community. These amendments do not represent the views of the majority of South Australians. Not only are these amendments unnecessary and offensive but they also contemplate discrimination that could potentially be unlawful under the Sex Discrimination Act of 1984, raising the risk of their invalidity.

The Sex Discrimination Act provides that it is unlawful to discriminate against a person on the grounds of the other person's sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, intersex status, marital or relationship status, pregnancy or potential pregnancy or breastfeeding. These amendments aim to legalise exactly that form of discrimination. If these amendments were found to be inconsistent with the commonwealth legislation, then, pursuant to the constitution, the state legislation could be invalid to the extent of the inconsistency.

I have indicated my objections and concerns about these amendments; however, the passage of the bill is so important for our LGBTIQ community and indeed for many others. So, despite my personal objection at the passage of these amendments, I will be voting in favour of them as a whole, and I look forward to all members of our community and their families having access to all the services that support their families.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that, in respect of the amendments that have been passed in another place, I will not be objecting to them. The whole of this debate has been identified as one in which members have been invited to have no commitment to a party position so that they can vote according to their free will. I would say that, whilst I have supported the objective of the bill, there have been limitations in respect of it which I think have been outweighed by the importance of passing the bill, but what should also be understood is that this bill is and has been controversial, and there are divided and different views in the community about how it should be implemented.

We accommodate exceptions to discrimination law and other things to enable people not to be compelled into a situation of obligation, and let me just give one example. Not every medical practitioner in South Australia wants to or is prepared to undertake terminations of pregnancies. We do not need to go into all the reasons why. Not every medical practitioner is prepared to or wants to undertake prescriptions of morphine-based pain medication.

These are still areas of some controversy in the community. The consuming public who seek these services usually seek from their advisers someone who is sympathetic to that opportunity, and they then attend for those services. That is the way it works in a number of controversial areas, particularly in the medical prescription of drug administration or procedures which remain controversial today.

I imagine that there are others that would come forward, too. If there were some capacity to deal with female sterilisation or something of that nature, it would be controversial. At the moment,

we have genital mutilation prohibitions in the state, and indeed the whole country, but these things change from time to time and we need to deal with them.

The best way to deal with controversial matters is to have some accommodation of those who are concerned about these aspects. For that reason, whilst I do not consider the Legislative Council amendments to be in a form I would like or prefer—I would rather them be entirely the reverse, actually—if we are going to have some kind of notification to the world as to who is prepared or not prepared to do something, then this is one way of doing it.

In that environment, within that envelope, I indicate that I will accept those amendments, but I would ask members who, like me, have been positive in the passage of this legislation generally to have some continuing understanding and respect for the fact that there are a lot of diverse views across party lines within our leadership in the parliament. Making statements about things that might offend, fracture or come into tension with discrimination law or anything else does not help. I will accommodate the amendments.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendment be amended by deleting subclause (2)(4) from proposed new clause 3C.

The reason for moving this amendment, and contrary to those views posited recently by the member for Reynell, is that some of us do not see this as the ability to discriminate but, rather, to exercise one's good conscience according to one's religious beliefs and to operate in your chosen profession in a way that allows you to conform with your generally held religious beliefs. In fact, I share the very eloquently put views of the member for Bragg. I think these amendments are perhaps not perfect, but they are workable. My amendment seeks only to remove the publication on a website, the nature of the publication on a website, and otherwise makes no changes to the amendments as they have been received from the upper house.

Mr KNOLL: I am happy to second the amendment put by the member for Newland. It is interesting that in this debate we are being asked to respect the rights and freedoms of others, yet when we try to institute something that helps to respect the rights and freedoms of different individuals that becomes a little more problematic. I would be extremely worried about a bill that puts into law the requirement for those with a religious objection to anything to be named on a list on a website. I think that is an extremely dangerous precedent to set. I can think of a whole host of other situations where somebody's privately held beliefs should remain their own and do not necessarily need to be listed McCarthy-style, like some sort of witch-hunt, to out those who have what I think are quite widely held religious beliefs.

To have the details of a person's religious objection to registering their objection published on a website I think is a very retrograde step in religious freedom within this country. I think it is extremely important that this house knocks out this clause and protects people's right to religious freedom and the right to privacy and the privacy of people's own deeply held beliefs in this regard.

The mandatory nature of these requirements in the first place gives me pause. Again, as the member for Newland said, there has been an attempt by the Legislative Council to create a workable process through this. I do not think it is perfect. I think it would be much better if there were no need to register an objection in the first place but for someone to simply be able to make those feelings known to people as they come across them. The need for a more formal bureaucratic process I find unnecessary. Having said that, without unpicking the entire bill, removing this requirement for the public website to be maintained is an appropriate step.

I urge my colleagues in this house not to take this very dangerous and retrograde step and to respect freedoms and deeply held beliefs that have been the norm in this country for a long, long time. Whilst what is being sought to be done here is to move our society forward in the way that we deal with these very difficult issues, we have to be mindful and respectful of those who disagree. It is the hallmark of a democratic and cohesive society that we allow differences of opinion but also allow people to express their differing opinions without being punished or outed and potentially vilified for their deeply held beliefs.

I do not want to be alarmist, but I think a number of other times in human history people have been outed for their deeply held beliefs and have suffered all the consequences. Again, I do not want to be too alarmist in this regard, but I think it is extremely important that this house moves to knock out this very retrograde clause.

Amendment carried; the Legislative Council's amendment No. 1 as amended agreed to.

Amendment Nos 2 to 5:

Ms HILDYARD: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

LOCAL GOVERNMENT (BOUNDARY ADJUSTMENT) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 16 November 2016.)

Mr PISONI (Unley) (16:26): I move:

That it be an instruction to the committee of the whole house that it have power to consider amendments relating to local government rate increases and caps.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am informed by the table that the bill has to pass the second reading stage before you can do this. Are you going to speak to the bill as a whole and we will get to your contingency later?

Mr PISONI: Thank you, I misunderstood the instruction that I received earlier.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You are the lead speaker?

Mr PISONI: I am. The Liberal Party supports this bill. I flag that we intend to attempt to introduce some amendments in line with Liberal Party policy that will help tackle the cost of living that South Australians are experiencing at the moment—the high cost of living through council rates, water rates and electricity charges. Of course, that is compounded by the fact that there are so many South Australians who are now working part-time compared to, even five years ago, those working full-time.

The government has had this extraordinary situation where they have transitioned from a full-time economy to a part-time economy. The growth in jobs that we are seeing in South Australia are part-time, and that means that there is less money in people's pockets. At the same time, we are seeing a situation where there are unchecked increases in council rates throughout South Australia.

The opposition supports the bill that has been put forward by the Minister for Local Government. This bill follows on from draft legislation in a discussion paper released in August 2016 under a proposal to amend the provisions for boundary adjustments and amalgamations within the Local Government Act 1999. The boundary adjustment facilitation panel was abolished in 2014 as part of the state government's extensive review of boards and committees, and the panel's functions were transferred to the Minister for Local Government.

Consequently, the minister directed the Office of Local Government to work with the Local Government Association to undertake a full review of the legislation underpinning the boundary adjustments process, specifically, the initiation, assessment and decision-making process. Currently, South Australia is the only state that does not allow a minister to initiate a boundary adjustment proposal, relying on ratepayers and councils to put forward suggestions.

Over the past two decades only minimal changes have occurred to council boundaries, but it should be remembered that this period goes back to the late 1990s, when there was a statewide reduction from 118 councils to 68 councils, so I can understand that low activity to some degree. Public-initiated submissions require at least 20 eligible electors, which are submitted to the council, which the council can support or oppose. A submission, either initiated by the council or the public, is then lodged by the minister.

The bill introduces boundary adjustment reforms in line with interstate jurisdictions. It has been endorsed by the LGA Board and was the focus of the Premier's State/ Local Government Forum discussions. The key elements of the bill are:

- the introduction of a simplified pathway for administrative proposals (being those that correct historical anomalies and boundaries);
- a simpler and broader initiation process allowing proposals to be initiated by electors, two or more councils or a single council, the Minister for Local Government or by resolution of either house of parliament;

My understanding of the bill is that it gives the minister some discretion as to who pays for any work that needs to be done. There might be a council that is interested in pursuing a boundary change, but the adjoining council might not be interested in doing it. They could put a case to the minister and the minister could decide, 'Yes, I think it would unfair for the council that does not want to merge to actually pay the costs of this investigation and so the costs will be borne by the council that wants the investigation.'

Alternatively, the minister might even decide it is important for the broader government operations in South Australia and the minister may decide that the state government will pick up the bill, so there is some flexibility for the minister there, as far as I understand it. Is that correct, Geoff?

The Hon. G.G. Brock: We'll see how we go.

Mr PISONI: Okay, thank you. That is certainly what I heard in the briefing. I continue:

- the Local Government Grants Commission to undertake the initial assessment of proposals and to make recommendations to the minister;
- independent analysis of general proposals—significant boundary changes, amalgamations or significant structural reform—by one or more investigators with the relevant expertise for each proposal;
- the ability to recover reasonable costs for the review of proposals, other than those initiated by the minister or parliament—and that is what I touched on earlier;
- that it inserts principles at the request of the LGA to support regional collaboration to create efficiencies and therefore offer a viable alternative to structural change; and
- that the legislation commence 1 January 2019, following the November 2018 local government elections.

My amendments, which I hope to be able to introduce, actually bring that forward by a full 12 months, so that the 2018 elections can be considered on any boundary changes that may have facilitated before the election, rather than ratepayers maybe having to wait another four years before they see any change.

The bill provides for the commission to appoint one or more investigators to inquire into a proposal and consider:

- the financial implications and impact on resources that the proposal is likely to have on any council to which the proposal relates;
- appropriate community engagement;
- the level of community support for boundary reform in the area;
- the nature and extent of any plans for implementing the proposal;
- any guidelines published by the commission; and
- any other matters prescribed by the regulations.

The bill provides that the commission may recover reasonable costs on a fee-recovery basis. The LGA's position is for all reference to cost recovery to be removed from the bill. It believes that inserting

cost recovery into a new model for boundary adjustment will significantly deter take-up of the process by councils and is a considerable disincentive to reform.

As I said in my opening remarks, the opposition supports the bill and we will be attempting to introduce some amendments to the bill at the appropriate time, both in this chamber and in the Legislative Council if we are unsuccessful in this chamber. I am, of course, open to discussing amendments with the government between the houses and taking that back to the party room for further consideration. On those points, I commend the bill to the house.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (16:34): I rise today to also support the boundary adjustment bill, and in doing so I want to acknowledge the change in process that has been put on the table. I think that one of the reasons that this has been put forward is a way to try to make councils more efficient, more accountable, more representative of the people who elect them, and this is certainly one idea and one we are willing to support, but I think there are other ideas that can help to achieve the same aims, and one of those is rate capping.

In terms of ideas about how we can make our local government sector more accountable, more efficient and more representative of the people who look after them, we first have to understand that there is a problem in the first place, and that problem is summarised best by a man who I am fairly certain was a member of the Labor Party and a minister in a Labor government—a guy called Greg Crafter. He was part of the Local Excellence Expert Panel, in fact he was the chair, and he had this to say in relation to the local government sector:

To make no decisions and trying to continue in the same way as today will simply set local government on a path of steady decline.

What he meant by that is that there are deep-seated problems that exist within the local government sector, that there are problems around its structure and the way that it operates that need to be dealt with, and that for us to continue on the same path will lead to the overall, not demise, but reduction in the effectiveness and the efficiency of how that sector works.

We as Liberals like our government to be as close to the people as possible, and local government is the sector that is closest, most localised, to the people it seeks to serve. We are huge supporters of local government on this side of the chamber but, like any good coach, like any good mentor, like any good person who has a desire to see the sector thrive, we believe that we need to provide an impetus for the sector to change. One such way we can provide that impetus is by capping council rates here in South Australia.

We on this side of the chamber understand the value of local government, and we also want to be there to help the sector improve. Capping council rates is an extremely important mechanism to stop the unchallenged increases we have seen in council rates over the last number of years. I have previously made mention about the fact that the Minister for Local Government when he was mayor presided over increases of 6.76 per cent, when over that same period inflation ran only at 3.1 per cent.

It is the same when the member for Light was mayor of the Gawler council. He presided over average increases of 6.1 per cent, when inflation ran at only 3 per cent. What we can see here, if that is extrapolated, and we see those rises continue and see those rises happen more broadly, which we have done across the local government sector, is that council rates will become ever more—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Member for Schubert, if I could just interrupt you for a moment, I have just been advised that the issue you are talking about is not relevant at the moment. You can talk about it later on if it is successful later, but you cannot actually do that within the realms of this bill. Everyone is going to listen to the member for Unley who has a problem with that.

Mr PISONI: Point of order, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, we are listening to you.

Mr PISONI: This bill is about the configuration of council boundaries, and council boundary changes could have cost impacts when it comes to the running of a council, and rates are very much an important part of revenue.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I can only be guided by the advice of the table staff, and they feel that is a very long bow.

Mr PISONI: But it is your ruling.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Yes, and I am going to take their advice because, as they have said to me, you are quite at liberty to speak about that later on. It is not because we do not want to hear what you are saying: it is just not at this very moment. I hope that is acceptable to both the members.

Mr KNOLL: Can the Deputy Speaker rule on what opportunities there will be for members to speak more broadly on a contingent motion when it is debated? What are the time limits involved?

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I am advised general rates discussion, but not specifically capping because it is not part of the bill we are looking at at the moment. If you have a problem, perhaps the member for Unley can discuss it at the table while you continue with your not so specific remarks. That is the best I can do under the circumstances.

Mr KNOLL: There have been many opportunities in previous bills that have been debated in this place for us to present alternative ideas to solve the same problems or, for instance, to seek to change bills as they are put on the table, and that is fine.

I am happy to be more general and discuss the fact that, more generally, rate increases have been a problem across the country. In New South Wales, the state government has sought to intervene more generally in the way rates are set. In Victoria, over recent years they have had average increases of 4.98 per cent. In South Australia, the best figure we have is that 5.55 per cent is the unweighted average rate increase over the past four years. I think that is a key measure of how the sector is performing.

If I can speak more generally, in addition to the issue of council rates—their rises and falls and their general impact upon how the local government sector works, especially in relation to ideas around how boundaries are set and how that impacts upon the cost structure—we need to have a more broad conversation about the way the sector works. If there are alternative ideas that help to provide the impetus for that discussion, I think that they should be considered.

The local government sector, which I know is frustrated with some of the ideas out there about rate increases more generally, need look no further than this Labor government for some of the culprits as to why those large increases need to happen. A Labor government that continues to push costs, inefficiency, red tape and regulation upon the local government sector forces them to make changes to the way they set rates and the cost structure that exists for them. We in this chamber need to help and present ideas that change the nature of that conversation.

The bill before us does in some part change the nature of the conversation, but we need to start talking about how the local government sector can be more efficient. This is certainly one idea, but there have to be other ideas, whether it is dog and cat management, NRM levy collection or any number of ways—for instance, the latest idea is around planning changes and the fact that the local government sector now has to pick up the tab for the e-portal the government is seeking to put online as a result of the changes. There are so many different ways in which we here in this place make life harder for the local government sector.

If there are ideas to help stop at the top the level of increase that councils foist upon their ratepayers, that will help to spark a conversation about how we can actually change the local government sector and make it more efficient. If that helps to reduce the red tape burden, regulation and cost, then they are ideas we need to sit down and look at, but I think that can only be done through the prism of a more definite mechanism that helps to create impetus to have those conversations. The alternative is to continue, as Greg Crafter said, along the same path that we are on now; that is, we will see unfettered cost increases, we will see unfettered rate increases, and all that is borne by the South Australian ratepayer.

If we continue to ignore this problem, it will only get worse as time goes on. I think it is extremely responsible and prudent that we on this side of the house present ideas to the parliament about ways we can fix these issues and sit down and have an honest conversation about how the sector works.

Speaking more generally about the local government sector, it is different from state government. We sit in this chamber, we have a government and we have an opposition. Every day that this parliament sits, we come into this chamber and critique the government. I think we provide a very solid and robust critique of this government. The media sits here, they report what goes on and the South Australian public gets smarter and makes their own judgement. That does not happen to the same degree in the local government sector. There is not an adversarial system of government and opposition. Local government, via its very structure, is one that does not invite scrutiny, and—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: The minister has a point of order.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I believe that they are wandering away from the concept of this bill, which is allowing for easier amalgamation of boundary adjustments. I think they need to get back to the subject.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: We are going to listen very carefully and try to get back to the actual nub of the bill, if we can.

Mr KNOLL: Thank you, Deputy Speaker. As the member for Frome has pointed out, this bill is about trying to help make local government more effective, more representative, more efficient, and providing different mechanisms for how boundaries can be adjusted, and that is laudable. I am seeking to make a more general comment, as per the Deputy Speaker's previous advice, about the sector.

Whilst this bill seeks to try to make the local government sector more accountable to the people that it represents by making those boundaries fit more appropriately with the people that they seek to represent, there are other broader structural issues within the local government sector that also exist around how councils are constructed and formed. The outcome of those structures is that the local government sector is less accountable and transparent.

We only need look at the front page of today's *The Advertiser* to see the lengths to which the Onkaparinga council went to try not to disclose costs that it had incurred. We need to change the conversation. We need an impetus to change the conversation, and we need to look at the structural deficiencies that exist within local government. I believe the other manifestation of the lack of accountability of the local government sector is the fact that we have such low turnout rates at council elections, of around 30 per cent.

I believe that this bill, by making boundaries fit more closely to what people want to see, will help to potentially encourage and increase the rate of voting participation amongst councils. That would be a very good thing. It would be a good thing for people to buy in, get themselves involved and apprise themselves of what is going on within their council area, because things need to change. Whilst I think there are some difficult conversations to be had in the future with the local government sector, I do not think that councils should be scared of those.

Councils will find a willing partner in the Liberal Party, who will want to sit down and talk through existing issues and find practical solutions. If we can cut out red tape, waste and regulation, we can help to reduce the cost structure of local government. That lower cost structure can be passed on to South Australians and that frees up money that can be spent on better, more productive uses. It can help to reduce the cost of living for South Australians, which we know is hugely under threat. Look at the increases to our electricity prices and to our water prices. We see the government's continual crusade to increase the emergency services levy. South Australians are saying, 'Enough is enough.' The local government sector cannot be spared in the Liberal Party's crusade to reduce the cost of living for South Australians.

So whilst this bill is a very small step in the right direction, there are much bigger steps we need to take, and they need to happen on the expenditure and the revenue side of the aisles. I look forward to the Liberal Party prosecuting the case into the future regarding how we can achieve a sustainable local government sector that is strong, resilient, efficient and effective, representative and transparent so that we can provide better government here in South Australia.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (16:50): I rise to speak to the Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Bill 2016. This bill was introduced by the minister, the member for Frome, in November last year. It follows on from draft legislation and a discussion paper released in August

last year on the proposal to amend the provision for boundary adjustments and amalgamations within the Local Government Act 1999.

While this has been outlined so well by the shadow minister and the member for Schubert, I think there is always room for reform. As a local member, and as probably all members in this place do, I found myself looking at a lot of local government issues coming into my office. I have always questioned why, but sometimes people just cannot get the answers they want. I know that when I instigate meetings, whether it is with mayors and CEOs together or on separate occasions on their own, you sometimes see a look of angst on their face. However, I believe that no matter what level of government action people want to take, if I am approached as the local member I will take action one way or another to see if I can resolve the issue.

As has been discussed, rates is an issue that regularly comes into my office, and I am sure it comes into every MP's office. This is where boundary reform comes into play. I know how difficult this would be in areas I have represented in the past, including the Mallee—as long as I get through the processes I will hopefully represent the Mallee again after next election—and there is around the Murraylands, the Coorong and East Murray.

The issue is that different councils, some because of a low ratepayer base, charge higher rates. Landholders either in my electorate or, at the moment, just neighbouring my electorate, get up in arms because they have land, say farmland, in one council and they pay half the rates that they pay in the adjoining council. So it will not be as simple as it seems as far as the amalgamations are concerned. There will be a lot of technical issues to take into account.

I was shown the attitude once when some constituents wanted to move from one council to another. They were saying, 'Well, our roads aren't getting looked after,' and that kind of thing. They were not getting the services out that end of the relevant council, but I knew for a fact that part of the debate was not just about that but also that if all their property had been in the adjoining council they would be paying something like half the rates.

That is significant, and it is certainly significant for farmers who have had to get bigger over time as a matter of survival. There is an old saying in agriculture that you either get big or get out; you might have had someone operating 1,000 acres in the past, a fair while ago now, and being quite successful in the sort of country around the Murraylands and the Mallee, who now needs 4,000 or 5,000 acres—and a lot are operating more than that. Some of this can be leasehold arrangements or owned in their own right. The rates these people pay can be quite significant, and just because things are at a higher level does not mean people are better off when you amortise it over the amount of land they own. It does come in at regular intervals, whether you pay it quarterly or in one fell swoop.

There have been probably more informal discussions in my area. I would not be compelled to instil compulsory boundary realignment on anyone, but people could have a voluntary proposal. I can think of examples in my electorate and in some very close adjoining country with similar demographics and similar operations. There would be a massive impact on the rate change that would have to be instigated right across the board, if you amalgamated three or four council areas in or near my electorate. That is because of the simple fact that some of these councils have such a low ratepayer base, some have a bigger ratepayer base and obviously some have some bigger towns where they can spread the load.

Obviously, in a lot of instances the cheapest rates are in some of the better suburbs of Adelaide just due to the population. That is what provides a better outcome as far as the original ratepayer. However, when you are out in those far-flung areas where there is a lack of population and you are in a small local government area, you have to pay. This is a significant issue that has been put in front of me many times. There was a concerted effort a few years ago by some local residents to move part of their council boundary into the next council so that, essentially, as I indicated earlier, they could halve the rates that they pay.

There are a lot of proposals out there and, as the member for Schubert identified, the New South Wales state government has put a rate management process in place and we are certainly looking at it on this side of the house. It is a serious cost-of-living exercise. However, I also say that

councils have been forced to do a lot of things by state governments that they should not need to do. One thing I have raised in this place before is corella management. It breaks my heart—

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

Mr PEDERICK: Well, it is part of their job that they are doing, and this is put down on councils when it should be a natural resources management issue. However, when you go to the natural resources people they say, 'No, we have nothing to do with corellas'—even though they are birds and they fly through the environment and wreak a lot of havoc on our gum trees and other trees—'that's a council issue.' This is why I wonder why we have natural resources management, apart from the fact that there is a levy-raising base for the state government to pay their employees.

There are a whole range of issues like corella management. I must admit that the Coorong council has taken a more courageous stance than some councils in their relocation program for corellas, and I commend them for it. I know the Alexandrina Council, after many different attempts to save their trees, especially in the Strathalbyn area—which is just outside my electorate in the electorate of Heysen, but I used to represent Strathalbyn in my first term in parliament—has taken to lethal means to manage corellas, not so much as a culling exercise but as an exercise to scare them off. That is just one example, but there are so many other things.

In regard to natural resources management, they have to collect the levy through the rates notices, which impacts on what councils can deliver. It gets frustrating when you meet with councils as they sometimes seem to be on two different platforms: you have the elected members, and then you have the bureaucracy of council. On many occasions, they appear to me to be operating on two different playing fields.

In regard to the legislation, the boundary adjustment facilitation panel was abolished in 2014 as part of the current state government's extensive review of boards and committees, and those functions were transferred to the Minister for Local Government. At the time, the minister directed the Office of Local Government to work with the Local Government Association to undertake a full review of the legislation around the boundary adjustment process, and certainly around the initiation, assessment and decision-making processes involved.

South Australia is the only state that does not allow a minister to initiate boundary adjustment proposals, relying on ratepayers and councils to put forward suggestions. Over the past two decades, only minimal changes have occurred. I must say that when the changes were put to me about the two neighbouring councils I mentioned earlier, they were knocked back and I can understand why because it would have made a smaller council smaller again with less ratepayers, and then they would have had to inflict more pain on the ratepayers left in that community. You have to remember it goes back to the period of the mid to late 1990s when there was a statewide reduction from 118 to 68 councils.

A public-initiated submission requires a minimum of 20 eligible electors, and this needs to be submitted to a council, which can support or oppose. That submission, whether it is initiated by a council or the public, is then lodged with the minister. The boundary adjustment reforms in this bill are in line with interstate jurisdictions and have been endorsed by the LGA Board. The key elements of the bill are:

- the introduction of a simplified pathway for administrative or minor proposals, being those that correct historical anomalies in boundaries;
- a simpler and broader initiation process allowing proposals to be initiated by electors, two or more councils or a single council, the Minister for Local Government or by resolution of either house of the parliament;
- the Local Government Grants Commission to undertake the initial assessment of proposals and to make recommendations to the minister; and
- independent analysis of general proposals which involve significant boundary changes, amalgamations or significant structural reform. This is achieved in the bill by one or more investigators with the relevant expertise for each proposal.

There is the ability to recover reasonable costs of the review of proposals other than those initiated by the minister or the parliament. The bill also inserts principles that request the Local Government Association to support regional collaboration to create efficiencies and therefore offer a viable alternative to structural change. The legislation is targeted to commence on 1 January 2019, which obviously follows on from the local government elections in November 2018.

There were several options, I believe, considered by the government, but the involvement of the grants commission is the preferred LGA option as it already collects local government data. The bill also provides for the commission to appoint one or more investigators to inquire into a proposal and consider the financial implications and impact on resources that proposal is likely to have on any council to which the proposal relates. There obviously has to be the appropriate community engagement and a level of community support for boundary reform in the area, so there certainly needs to be a lot of discussion in regard to any council realignment or any council amalgamations.

I note that quite a few councils across the state have amalgamated some of the service delivery, and you can see this in the area of waste. Some of them have worked out how to manage plant, whether they do a hire-back proposal from one council to the other, with one owning big plant, such as a big bulldozer, for instance, a D8 or something like that. Those are things that can save significant money for councils as long as they are well managed and well accounted for.

This is a big process even with a minor change in some council areas, as you can inflict more pain if a small council decreases in size because of a boundary change, and that has to be taken into account. As I indicated earlier, if you have a situation where you are putting together councils that have a vast difference in their rate base and how the rates are charged, there will be some major issues to sort through. That needs full public approval before any boundary reforms take place. With those few words, I support the bill.

Mr SPEIRS (Bright) (17:06): It is a pleasure to be able to rise today to speak on the Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Bill 2016. As members would be more than aware, local government reform is certainly something I have a personal interest in, and I have raised it in this place on many occasions since my election in 2014. The issue of changing the boundaries of local council areas is something I have an interest in because of my general interest in local government reform, but I also have an interest at an electorate level within my community.

There are a couple of areas that I think could be tidied up within the electorate that I represent to make council boundaries work better. I have raised one of those matters with the minister. When I had my audience with him, I was pleased that he raised that the Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Bill would be coming up and that there would be an opportunity to make the process of changing council boundaries that little bit easier. That is what this bill seeks to do.

I want to go through the key elements of the bill and give an overview of the bill before I provide commentary on my local community. The key elements include the introduction of a simplified pathway for administrative minor proposals, being those that are correct, historical anomalies and boundaries and a simpler and broader initiation process, allowing proposals to be initiated by electorates, two or more councils, a single council or the minister for local government or by resolution of either house of parliament.

The Local Government's Grants Commission will be able to undertake the initial assessment of proposals and will make recommendations to the minister. It also includes independent analysis of general proposals, significant boundary changes, amalgamations, or significant structural reform by one or more investigators with the relevant experience for each proposal.

The bill will also include the ability to recover reasonable costs of the review process. It will insert principles to support regional collaboration to create efficiencies and therefore offer a viable alternative to structural change. That is something that the LGA is particularly supportive of and, I understand, has requested appear in this bill. The bill also seeks that legislation commences on 1 January 2019 following the November 2018 local government elections. That is something that the Liberal Party will seek to amend through this process.

Local government reform, as I mentioned, is something I hold dear to my heart, having served on the City of Marion council for four years, between 2010 and 2014. While I have said in this chamber before that that often makes me a champion of local government, my time on the City of

Marion council also opened my eyes to what could be done better in the local government sector. It has certainly made me a critic with regard to many aspects of the way local government operates in South Australia.

I have said here before that I have concerns about the way that councils set their rates. I believe it is often a backward process, with councils coming up with a wish list of activities that they would like to achieve during a particular year and then asking the finance officers within a local government to tell them how much those will cost. Once they have been able to calculate the cost of those particular projects and initiatives, they then ask the finance officers what council rate rise will be required to deliver the required money to make those projects happen, and then they jack up rates accordingly.

I think that is a very backward process. They are coming up with their wish list first, rather than looking to see how much money they have in the kitty before they go down that track. I have criticised that at length here, and I have criticised it publicly. I do not think it is the way that any organisation should operate—whether it is in the private, public or not-for-profit sector, and it is a matter of great concern. It should be a matter of great concern for South Australians that many councils, but not all, go about their budget-setting strategies in that way, and I remain very critical of that.

Because of that concern, I have been a strong and vocal advocate for council rate capping to be initiated in South Australia. It has been the Liberal Party's policy for several years to initiate rate capping should we form government, and it was announced shortly before the 2014 election that we would explore that. We renewed that commitment following the 2014 election, and we were able to undertake an inquiry through the Economic and Finance Committee, which I sit on, to investigate the impacts of rate capping in the local government sector. It was interesting to be part of that inquiry; there were clearly very mixed views.

Many of those who came to our committee and provided evidence were from the local government sector. Many councils were represented, through their senior staff or mayors, and the Local Government Association was certainly represented. It is fair to say that they have a strong position against rate capping—but they would, wouldn't they, because clearly they do not want to be told that they have to rein in their spending and to find efficiencies. They have to work better with what they have, and they have to cut their cloth accordingly. They have put forward a position that they do not support rate capping, but there are plenty of people out there in the community who do.

A number of people fronted the Economic and Finance Committee investigation and provided evidence in support of the rate capping policy. In particular, the Mayor of the City of Unley, Lachlan Clyne, spoke out in favour of rate capping, and there were a number of other people—I recall Councillor Martin Bray from the City of Onkaparinga, another elected member. I have spoken to elected members and senior staff within councils who did not come forward to the committee but who do support rate capping, and it is certainly not a 100 per cent position out there in the local government sector that this is a bad thing. Why would we cap council rates? Primarily, because it would help reduce a cost-of-living pressure that South Australian households are facing.

Too often, the largest bill a household will receive, the largest single bill in any given year, will be their local government rates bill, and those bills keep on rising year on year well above inflation in too many council areas. That is a significant cost-of-living pressure at a time when utilities are rising, at a time when fees and charges across government departments are rising, with the emergency services levy being doubled, or trebled, or quadrupled in the case of many South Australian households. We need to look at any opportunity we can to reduce the cost burden facing South Australian households, and we should not forget that local government imposes part of that cost burden, and that is through their imposition of council rates.

Local government has to be part of the solution as well, so it is timely to have the local government bill open at this time. It provides an opportunity for the Liberal Party to put forward its position in terms of rate capping and its desire to see the local government sector do its bit to reduce the cost pressures imposed by local councils with regard to unreasonable, year-on-year, higher than inflation increases to council rates. The Liberal Party's position is nuanced. It is not—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Before I let you go on, member for Bright, you might not have been in the chamber a bit earlier when we discussed the actual scope of this bill. Perhaps you were not here when we spoke about it, but it is actually about the boundary adjustments per se. If you want to talk about rate capping, it is contingent upon the member for Unley's motion afterwards. By the look on your face, you know exactly what I am talking about, so I do not have to tell you again, do I?

Mr SPEIRS: Just taking the opportunity to represent my constituents, Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: You know exactly what I am talking about. In your exposed position, do not make me look at you again.

Mr SPEIRS: I do feel rather exposed out here on a limb, but I will return to the substance, having put on the record my strong support for the introduction of a cap on council rates. With my remaining time, I will now start to reflect on the boundaries of the local councils which I represent, those being the City of Marion and the City of Holdfast Bay.

Although historically it has been quite difficult, it should be easier for councils to amend their boundaries or for communities to initiate boundary changes when they think that these are sensible options. I know the minister agrees because we have this legislation before us. In my own community, the City of Holdfast Bay and the City of Marion share a boundary, both in the northern part of my community and also along the eastern boundary and southern parts of my electorate as well. I have a particular interest in the suitability of the council boundary that lies between the suburbs of Marino, Kingston Park and Seacliff Park.

We have a situation at the moment where the suburb of Seacliff Park is divided between two councils, with the southern side of Arthur Street being in the City of Marion and the northern side of Arthur Street being in the City of Holdfast Bay. The suburb being divided across two councils really does not make any sense. That is on the east side of Ocean Boulevard. If you move onto the western side of Ocean Boulevard, you have a subdivision within Seacliff Park, which is also found wholly within the City of Marion.

Beside the subdivision, which is known as Oceana, there is a large area of brownfield industrial land, which has a long history of being rezoned. I hope that will be signed off in 2017 and stimulate the South Australian economy with a large development happening within that site. That site has a number of names. It can be known as Cement Hill. It can be known as the Lorenzin site or it is sometimes known as the Monier site, named after an old factory that was there. It is an ugly site. It is a blight on our landscape and it ought to be redeveloped. It is a perfect site for an urban renewal initiative.

The community is fully supportive of seeing that redevelopment go ahead, which is quite unique. It is also an ideal site for higher density, which obviously fits with much of the government's plans to see higher-density dwellings constructed in communities along the rail corridor. This site is a fairly comfortable walking distance from the Marino train station along the Seaford line. So, this site is an ideal site for urban renewal, redevelopment and higher density as well.

However, the rezoning of that site has been greatly complicated in that about three-quarters of that brownfield site lies within the City of Marion and about one quarter lies within the City of Holdfast Bay, and that has meant that the rezoning process has had to go through both councils in equal measure. The developer who owns that site has had to front up to both councils time and again through a very convoluted rezoning process.

As things currently stand, I hope that when that rezoning occurs—and, as I say, I hope that will occur during 2017 because it is a very positive project for my community and a very positive project for the South Australian construction sector—we will not be faced with the perverse situation where this site is divided between two councils. At this stage, there is a small shopping centre proposed within this redevelopment and, with the plans that I have seen, that shopping centre will be divided between two councils. That makes no sense at all and is a really good example of an area which I hope will benefit from the Local Government (Boundary Adjustment) Amendment Bill 2016.

The opportunity to realign that boundary and to ensure that that brownfield site and subsequent redevelopment are all within one council area also presents a broader opportunity to

discuss how the other communities around that site are located within particular councils. It is my view and it is the view of many residents in the area—and I am certain that it would be the majority view of those communities—that there is a need to look at whether the suburb of Marino and part of the suburb of Seacliff Park, which are currently located within the City of Marion, ought to be moved, using this large redevelopment as a catalyst, into the City of Holdfast Bay.

The residents who live in Marino—which is inextricably linked to the suburb of Kingston Park—recreate in the City of Holdfast Bay, they shop in the City of Holdfast Bay and the natural gravitation for residents who are living in the suburb of Marino is into the City of Holdfast Bay. In fact, to exit the suburb of Marino, many of them have to drive into the City of Holdfast Bay to get out into the wider community. If the community supports it, it is my view that it makes sense for a future state government, once this legislation is passed and initiated, to have a conversation with the residents of Marino, the City of Holdfast Bay and the City of Marion as to the more appropriate geographical and socio-economic location of Marino going forward.

As I mentioned before, the suburb of Seacliff Park is awkwardly divided across Arthur Street, and it makes sense to have a conversation in the future about where the suburb of Seacliff Park should be located in terms of its local government jurisdiction. Again, because most residents would recreate and gravitate into the City of Holdfast Bay, to me it makes sense to see the suburb of Seacliff Park entirely located within the City of Holdfast Bay. Equally, it is my view that this new brownfield development, which is split between Marion and Holdfast Bay, should also be entirely located within the City of Holdfast Bay.

This also goes to the hip pocket of residents living in these suburbs, because the rates that people pay in the City of Holdfast Bay are substantially lower, for a number of historic reasons, than in the City of Marion. So, it is my view that the local residents—and it is not just my view, it is a fact—living in Marino and Seacliff Park would be far better off if they were located under the local government jurisdiction of the City of Holdfast Bay in the future. It would make sense for a range of reasons and also from a cost-of-living point of view.

With that discussion about the local situation within my electorate and the boundaries of the City of Holdfast Bay and the City of Marion, I would like to say that the Liberal Party broadly supports this legislation. We will be looking to make a couple of amendments. We would like to see the commencement date of the act be from 1 January 2018, as opposed to 1 January 2019, but we do provide broad support to this bill. As foreshadowed by the member for Unley and other speakers and as supported heartily by me, we will be attempting to amend this bill to enable a cap on local council rates.

Mr HUGHES (Giles) (17:25): I think it is appropriate that I get up and say a few words about this particular bill. I note the opposition's support for the bill, but I also note that they managed to get in a whole raft of comments before the moving of the amendment about rate capping. If, later in my discussion, I happen to float gently by the issue of rate capping, I am sure the Deputy Speaker will indulge me.

I think this is a worthwhile bill. It introduces a number of changes which I think are overdue. The salient points are, firstly, that the bill provides a simpler and broader initiation process, allowing for submissions for boundary change to be initiated by a single council, a minister, the parliament or the public. I think that degree of flexibility when it comes to how we can initiate change is welcomed.

Secondly, the bill introduces a streamlined assessment pathway for less significant boundary change proposals. Once again, I do not think there is any point in overburdening systems with complexities. If we can simplify things for these minor changes to take place, then we should do so. I take on board some of the comments made by the member for Hammond. Sometimes what appear to be relatively minor changes can have a set of cascading impacts. It is not always a straightforward process, but it gives us that opportunity to simplify the process and have a look at what we are doing.

Thirdly, the bill establishes an independent commission, which is a recommendation that came from the grants commission. I think that initiative is also worthwhile, as is an independent analysis by those people with the necessary expertise. I think we all agree that the core of the bill passes the common-sense test. I have a number of councils in my vast electorate. Most of the electorate is in the unincorporated area. Not many people live in those areas, but it is still an incredibly

important part of the electorate. Responsibility for those unincorporated areas lies, to a degree, with the Outback Communities Authority, so what we are discussing here is irrelevant to those areas.

There is some clear relevance to the councils in my electorate, but nowhere near to the same degree as in the metropolitan area and those more settled parts of our state. I have the District Council of Kimba and the Flinders Ranges Council area. I have the District Council of Coober Pedy, the most northern of our councils in this state, and the biggest council of Whyalla.

Also within my electorate is that anomaly, if you like, of Roxby Downs. Roxby Downs does not have an elected council because it is a creature of the Olympic Dam indenture. It has been an organisation or a council, if you like, that has attracted some criticism over the years, given it is set up with an administrator that has some very significant powers. I am pleased to see some of the reforms that are taking place, and I am also pleased to see the extension to the contract of the current administrator who, in my view and I think in the view of quite a few people in Roxby Downs, is doing a good job.

We can put Roxby Downs to one side because it comes under the indenture. I sometimes get the perception that the Coober Pedy council does struggle, given the turnover in CEOs and mayors. They have a very small population base and not a huge number of people turn out to vote. There are some real challenges for a council in an isolated location like that in providing the sorts of services that people come to expect. When it comes to boundary amalgamations, they have absolutely nobody they can amalgamate with. Their nearest council—and, as I said, this place is an anomaly—is Roxby Downs, and that is a four-hour drive or so from Coober Pedy. They have absolutely nobody they could amalgamate with.

The last time Whyalla council looked at restructuring a few years ago, we put out the feelers to some of those smaller councils on Eyre Peninsula and to Iron Knob in the unincorporated area. Whyalla and Iron Knob mutually agreed that we did not want to amalgamate, and I think that was a very sensible approach for a whole range of reasons on the part of the Iron Knob and Whyalla communities. The councils on Eyre Peninsula have their own distinct communities of interest, so it did not make much sense.

The one council area that has done a little bit of work on changing its approach has been the Flinders Ranges Council. They were looking at an interesting model, and I will have to catch up to see the progress on that. They looked at having Port Augusta take over their administrative functions while retaining a local democratic governance. So you would still have the people of Quorn, Hawker and the surrounding areas electing a council and making decisions on behalf of their community, but you would outsource those administrative functions to a much bigger council which has that economy of scale. In some places, if it is fit for purpose, I think that might be a good, effective model.

Mr Griffiths: I did that in the Mid North in 1996.

Mr HUGHES: I am sure you were an excellent CEO. In response to some of the comments made about the member for Frome when he was mayor, and about the member for Light, I will be talking about your role when you were on the council at Goyder and the rate increases. I might as well get onto that now. I want to put this in some context because this is not about the opposition having a go at the member for Frome and the member for Light, which I actually think is pretty poor form. I have a far more nuanced approach to the issue of rate increases.

I know that after the removal of rate capping, Yorke Peninsula Council had some very significant rate increases. These were out of keeping with the parcel of goods that local councils use to look at their inflationary pressures and were significantly higher than the CPI. In mentioning that, I do so in a way not to score a point or get back at the opposition for the naming of the member for Frome and the member for Light. My exercise is a different one. I will qualify the statement: the CEO is ultimately not the person who determines the rate increase; the elected council does that. We all know that the CEO and the administration plays an important role in budget formation and makes recommendation, but ultimately, it is up to the elected members to decide.

I will say, in defence of the member for Frome when he was the mayor, and the member for Light when he was the mayor of his council, that it is not the mayors who make the decisions. Obviously they are involved in the process, but mayors do not have deliberative votes, so it is ultimately up to the council to determine what the rate increase is going to be.

Having highlighted that Yorke Peninsula Council had significant increases, a number of other councils did as well. You have to look at the context, you have to look at the individual circumstances of any given council. I will give an example of when I was on the Whyalla council in my much younger years, when we started some significant rate increases. When you looked at the rate increases over an extended period of time from the commencement of council in Whyalla in 1971, a lot of the early councils patted themselves on the back for not increasing rates. They thought they were doing a great job. They failed utterly to take into account the decay in the physical assets that they held in their trust. As result of what they did there had to be some significant rate increases.

A lot of councils in this state do face serious challenges when it comes to infrastructure backlogs. We know from the example in New South Wales, where rate capping was introduced, that there is a very large infrastructure backlog. We also know that user charges in New South Wales, because of rate capping, are significantly higher than in South Australia. In fact, 36 per cent of total revenue in New South Wales in most councils comes from user pays. In a number of ways that is an incredibly regressive form of raising revenue.

That is not to say that user pays does not have a role to play, but if it becomes a big role it ends up being very regressive and being an impost on the most socio-economically disadvantaged people in the community. So 36 per cent of total revenue raised in New South Wales is as a result of user pays, which is a direct result of rate capping. When you look at South Australia 18 per cent of revenue by councils is raised by user charges.

There are other examples I can point to, and once again I will use Whyalla as an example. When I was on council, there were some significant rate increases during the period of the mining boom. One of the issues we had was retaining staff. We had a range of staff, outdoor staff and others, who had transferable skills—

Members interjecting:

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: Order on my left! I can hardly hear the member for Giles.

Mr HUGHES: It is riveting. They had transferable skills that were sought after by the mining industry, and we had the mining community in our community cheek and jowl. We had people out in the Middleback Ranges whose pay increased very significantly, we had people down the road at Olympic Dam whose pay was significantly higher. In order to retain staff that decision had to be made. We could not match what the mining industry was doing, but we had to increase pay and improve our conditions. That does have an impact on rates.

My view is that rate capping is an incredibly crude tool. It is easy to package up in a way that can make it something popular. Who likes paying rates, who likes paying taxes, who likes doing this or that? The simple fact is that there is a whole range of services that governments at all levels provide, and that the community expect, that have to be supported one way or another.

I am up-front that I am not a big fan of minimising government because I think it ultimately leads to very poor results for the nature of the communities we live in. In fact, when you look at the countries that put this on a national and global scale, and at the countries that have the greatest tax take, they are usually those countries that rank consistently in the top five, six or seven countries in the world when it comes to the quality of the infrastructure they provide, the quality of the services they provide, the quality of their health systems, the quality of their educational systems.

My argument is that at the end of the day you get what you pay for. The societies that are generally the best to live in are those societies that are relatively egalitarian with really high-quality services. Australia is a good country to live in. We have not fully moved away from that egalitarian ethos, even though we are well on track to move away from it. There are always those people who will argue that government should be smaller and it should be minimalist government, but we know that the results of that in the long run are not positive results for the vast majority of the people who live in any society. With those few words, I commend this bill to the house.

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

STATUTES AMENDMENT (PLANNING, DEVELOPMENT AND INFRASTRUCTURE) BILL*Final Stages*

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

No. 1. Clause 10, page 8, after line 13 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 1]—Insert:

earlier Act means—

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

No. 2. Clause 10, page 8, line 26 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 3(1)]—

After 'repealed Act' insert:

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

No. 3. Clause 10, page 9, lines 19 and 20 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 4(7)]—

Delete subclause (7) and substitute:

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

No. 4. Clause 10, page 9, lines 35 to 38 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 4(9)(c)]—

Delete paragraph (c) and substitute:

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

No. 5. Clause 10, page 14, lines 12 to 19 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 9(3)(c) and (d)]—

Delete paragraphs (c) and (d)

No. 6. Clause 10, page 27, line 15 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 39(1)]—

After 'Act' insert 'or an earlier Act'

No. 7. Clause 10, page 27, line 21 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 39(2)(a)]—

After 'planning consent under this Act' insert:

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

No. 8. Clause 10, page 27, line 26 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 39(2)(b)]—

After 'building consent under this Act' insert

or a corresponding approval under the *Building Act 1971*

No. 9. Clause 10, page 27, line 34 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 40]—

After 'the repealed Act' insert 'or an earlier Act'

No. 10. Clause 10, page 27, line 41 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 41]—

After 'the repealed Act' insert '(or the repeal of a provision of an earlier Act)'

No. 11. Clause 10, page 28, line 5 [clause 10, inserted Schedule 8, clause 42]—

After 'the repealed Act' insert '(or to the repeal of any provision of an earlier Act)'

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. G.G. BROCK: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

Motion carried.

SUMMARY OFFENCES (DECLARED PUBLIC PRECINCTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

PUBLIC INTEREST DISCLOSURE BILL

Final Stages

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

No. 1. Clause 6, page 6, line 10 [clause 6(a)]—After 'information to a' insert 'journalist or a'

No. 2. Clause 9, page 8, after line 16—After subclause (3) insert:

- (3a) Subject to this section (and without derogating from any other law imposing vicarious liability on a person for the acts and omissions of agents or employees of the person), the Crown is, for the purposes of this Act, vicariously liable for an act of victimisation by an agent or employee of a public sector agency committed while acting in the course of their agency or employment.
- (3b) In proceedings brought against the Crown, in accordance with this section, in respect of an alleged act of victimisation by an agent or employee of a public sector agency, it is a defence to prove that the principal officer of the public sector agency took reasonable steps to ensure that the agent or employee would not act in contravention of this Act.
- (3c) Without limiting subsection (3b), a defence is established under that subsection in relation to an alleged act of victimisation by an agent or employee of a public sector agency if the principal officer—
 - (a) had complied with section 12 and, in particular, had ensured that the document required under section 12(4) had been prepared and was being maintained at the relevant time; and
 - (b) had taken reasonable steps to implement and enforce that document, including by—
 - (i) taking reasonable steps to make the employees and agents of the public sector agency aware of the requirements under the document; and
 - (ii) ensuring that action required under the document was taken promptly and in an appropriate manner.

No. 3. Clause 9, page 8, line 17 [clause 9(4)]—After 'a person' insert '(not being the Crown)'

No. 4. Clause 9, page 8, after line 23—After subclause (5) insert:

- (5a) A person who has made or who intends to make an appropriate disclosure of public interest information and who reasonably suspects that they will be subject to an act of victimisation by another person (the *respondent*) may apply to the Equal Opportunity Tribunal for an order requiring that the respondent refrain from the relevant act.
- (5b) An order of the Equal Opportunity Tribunal under subsection (5a) is enforceable, and may be appealed against, as if it were an order of the Tribunal under section 96(1) of the *Equal Opportunity Act 1984*.

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

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 17:45 the house adjourned until Thursday 16 February 2017 at 10:30.

*Answers to Questions***COUNTERTERRORISM**

284 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (22 November 2016). When did the minister appoint the SA Responsible Person, funded by the commonwealth government, to deal with countering violent extremism, and who was appointed to that position?

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 Youth Inclusion Officer commenced in the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion on 1 August 2016. I am advised the commonwealth has requested the person's name not be disclosed publicly at this time.

COUNTERTERRORISM

285 Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (22 November 2016). What organisations are represented on the SA task force for counter terrorism and if all positions have been filled, and how often the task force has met since being established?

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 agencies represented on the South Australian Countering Violent Extremism (CVE) Steering Group are:

- Department for Communities and Social Inclusion
- Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- South Australia Police
- Department for Education and Child Development
- Department for Child Protection
- Department for Correctional Services
- SA Health

The CVE Steering Group met for the first time on 22 November 2016. The group will meet quarterly and on a needs basis if urgent business arises.

HOUSING SA

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (2 November 2016).

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:

During the period 2015-16, 10,543 customers, who had not previously received a bond from Housing SA, were provided with bond assistance.

HOUSING SA

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (2 November 2016).

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:

Since May 2016, Housing SA has reviewed 100% of bond claims within the required Consumer and Business Services time frame. Accordingly, no bonds have been lost as a result of failure to review claims in time.

57 FILMS

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 November 2016).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I am advised:

1. The travel expenses are in addition to the value of the procurement.
2. The value of travel and accommodation costs paid by the Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) are:

China	May 2015	\$7,178.01	Paid outside contract arrangements
Europe	December 2015	\$39,797.39	Paid outside contract arrangements
China	April 2016	\$6,285.40	Paid within contract arrangements

3. No travel costs were incurred for members of the family of the Chief Executive, DPC.'

57 FILMS

In reply to **Mr SPEIRS (Bright)** (1 November 2016).

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I am advised:

1. The Department of the Premier and Cabinet (DPC) has developed and currently runs procurement information sessions open to all staff. These sessions promote procurement awareness, provide a range of information on procurement related matters, provide an overview of the departmental procurement framework and present information on the government's procurement reform strategy. Information sessions have been held during August to November 2016. DPC will continue to run these sessions as part of its ongoing commitment to the continuous improvement of departmental procurement practices and processes.

2. Ministerial staff who have attended these workshops are my Chief of Staff, Office Manager and Senior Administration/Accounts Officer.

3. Ingrid Haythorpe, Deputy Chief Executive has attended a workshop. Tahnya Donaghy, Deputy Chief Executive and Kym Winter-Dewhurst, Chief Executive are yet to attend a workshop.

Estimates Replies

DRIVERLESS CARS

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (28 July 2016). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier): I have been advised:

The South Australian Government remains committed to the Driverless Cars Initiative through the budget portfolio of the Minister for Transport and Infrastructure. On November 14, 2016 applications opened for the \$10 million Future Mobility Lab Fund to boost local testing, research and development of connected and autonomous vehicle technologies. This initiative builds on South Australia's achievements in the area of connected and autonomous vehicles including:

- Staging the first on-road trials in the Southern Hemisphere
- Hosting the first international driverless car conference in Australia
- Introducing Australian-first legislation to allow for on-road trials of autonomous vehicles

Additionally an agreement between the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the Australian Driverless Vehicle Initiative includes a financial commitment to the Australian Driverless Vehicle Initiative (ADVI) of \$0.450 million over three years, which includes the establishment of the national ADVI Centre of Excellence in Adelaide.

South Australia is leading the nation in embracing this new era in automotive technology we are home to world-leading companies such as Cohda Wireless, SAGE Automation and Sydac and the State Government is providing opportunities to further grow and keep building on these impressive success stories.

AGED-CARE WORKERS

In reply to **Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett)** (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:

1. As a result of the 2011 Australian Health Ministers' Advisory Council (AHMAC) national consultation on Options for the regulation of unregistered health practitioners, in 2013, the South Australian Government implemented the Health and Community Services Complaints Commissioner (HCSCC).

The HCSCC investigates any breach of that code of conduct and action as deemed appropriate pertaining to non-registered health practitioners, including aged-care workers. Prohibitions orders, either term or permanent, can be set in place as part of this process.

South Australia, through the Department for Health and Ageing is currently reviewing the Code of Conduct in line with the Australian Health Minister's Advisory Council agreement in 2015 for there to be a National Code of Conduct.

2. Other States are in the process of reviewing their legislation and considering various options.

GRANT EXPENDITURE

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):

Minister for Communities and Social Inclusion, Minister for Social Housing, Minister for the Status of Women, Minister for Multicultural Affairs, Minister for Youth, Minister for Volunteers.

The following information shows the projected budget over the forward estimates for Grants and Subsidies by Program. This is the lowest level of detail that the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion (DCSI) can provide across the forward estimates. The information in the out years is an estimate and may be subject to change.

Table 1: DCSI Grants and Subsidies Budget across the forward estimates

	2016-17 Budget \$000's	2017-18 Budget \$000's	2018-19 Budget \$000's	2019-20 Budget \$000's	2020-21 Budget \$000's
Total Grants and Subsidies—DCSI Controlled	281,577	374,578	388,952	401,249	411,345
Total Grants and Subsidies—DCSI Administered Items	198,992	202,897	206,406	210,183	215,437
Total Grants and Subsidies	480,569	577,475	595,358	611,432	626,782

	2016-17 Budget \$000's	2017-18 Budget \$000's	2018-19 Budget \$000's	2019-20 Budget \$000's	2020-21 Budget \$000's
DCSI Controlled					
1. Thriving Communities					
1.1 Community Connections and Support	2,610	2,688	2,769	2,852	2,938
1.2 Policy and Community Development	20,699	21,320	21,960	22,618	23,297
1.3 Youth Justice	99	102	105	108	111
1.4 Status of Women	973	1,002	1,032	1,063	1,095
1.5 Multicultural Services	3,259	3,357	3,457	3,561	3,668
1.6 Youth Services	1,813	1,867	1,923	1,981	2,041
1.7 Volunteer Services	924	952	980	1,010	1,040
2. Domiciliary and Community Care Services					
2.1 Domiciliary Care Services	54	56	57	59	61
2.2 Community Care	35,320	35,548	33,410	34,475	35,234
3. Social Housing					
3.1 Social Housing	215,826	307,686	323,259	333,522	341,860
Total DCSI Controlled	281,577	374,578	388,952	401,249	411,345

	2016-17 Budget \$000's	2017-18 Budget \$000's	2018-19 Budget \$000's	2019-20 Budget \$000's	2020-21 Budget \$000's
DCSI Administered Items					
Concessions paid to Public Non-Finance Corporations	47,826	48,572	49,058	49,880	51,127
Concessions paid to Non-Government entities	81,508	82,349	83,171	84,003	86,103
Public Transport Concessions	32,726	34,053	35,435	36,873	37,795
Concessions paid to General Government entities	6,481	6,568	6,634	6,700	6,867
Grants to private and not-for-profit sector	11,761	12,043	12,140	12,069	12,371
Community Service Obligations Payments paid to SA Water	18,376	18,995	19,646	20,333	20,841
Subsidies to other entities	311	314	319	322	330
Grants to other entities	3	3	3	3	3
Total DCSI Administered Items	198,992	202,897	206,406	210,183	215,437
Total DCSI Controlled and Administered Items	480,569	577,475	595,358	611,432	626,782

Table 2: Housing SA Grants and Subsidies Budget across the forward estimates

	2016-17 Budget \$000's	2017-18 Budget \$000's	2018-19 Budget \$000's	2019-20 Budget \$000's	2020-21 Budget \$000's
Private Rental Assistance	14,919	15,292	15,674	16,066	16,468
National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	7,113	3,895	9,583	-	-
Emergency Assistance	162	-	-	-	-
Total	22,194	19,187	25,257	16,066	16,468

Tables 3 to 7 provide a breakdown of expenditure on all grants for 2015-16:

- Table 3: DCSI Controlled Items—Grants to NGOs in 2015-16 (refer to note 8.1 in the DCSI Financial Statements 2016);
- Table 4: DCSI Controlled Items—Individualised Funding in 2015-16 (refer to note 8 in the DCSI Financial Statements 2015-16);
- Table 5: DCSI Controlled Items—Grants to Other Organisation Types (Non-NGOs) in 2015-16 (refer to note 8 in the DCSI Financial Statements 2016);
- Table 6: DCSI Administered Items—Grants in 2015-16 (refer to note A5 in the Administered Items Financial Statements 2016); and
- Table 7: South Australian Housing Trust Grants in 2015-16 (refer to note 11 in the South Australian Housing Trust Financial Statements 2016).

Details include the name of the grant recipient, the amount of the grant, the grant program and if the grant was subject to a grant agreement. Grants less than \$10,000 are summarised at the bottom of each table. Subsidies are shown at the bottom of each table to allow easier comparison to the above budget figures.

Total grant payments may vary depending on recoveries.

Table 3: DCSI Controlled Items—Grants to NGOs in 2015-16

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Aboriginal Family Support	\$1,030,600.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Aboriginal Legal Rights Movement Inc	\$10,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Aboriginal Sobriety Group Inc	\$233,186.00	Dry Zone Program	Yes
Aboriginal Sobriety Group Inc	\$594,200.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Adelaide Kurdish Youth Society	\$11,075.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Adelaide Tamil Association Inc	\$12,700.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Afghan United Association Inc	\$90,909.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
African Communities Council of SA Inc	\$32,664.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Aged & Community Services SA & NT Inc	\$82,518.33	Home and Community Care	Yes
Aged Care & Housing Group Inc	\$373,139.35	Home and Community Care	Yes
Alliance Francaise d'Adelaide Inc	\$15,260.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Alzheimer's Association SA	\$267,994.97	Home and Community Care	Yes
Anglican Community Care Inc	\$106,200.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Anglican Community Care Inc	\$793,179.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Anglican Community Care Inc	\$157,940.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
Anglican Community Care Inc	\$2,087,000.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$738,033.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$424,235.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$283,061.82	Home and Community Care	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$2,728,900.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$247,647.13	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Antwyn Pty Ltd	\$145,570.88	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Australia Day Council of SA Inc	\$15,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Australian Indonesian Association of South Australia Inc	\$20,400.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Australian Red Cross	\$47,000.00	Community and Organisational Support	Yes
Australian Red Cross	\$24,624.00	Community Youth Justice	Yes
Australian Red Cross	\$751,464.78	Home and Community Care	Yes
Australian Refugee Association Inc	\$133,934.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Australian South East Asian Women's Association Inc	\$31,930.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Baptist Care (SA) Inc	\$407,410.26	Home and Community Care	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Baptist Care (SA) Inc	\$110,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Baptist Care (SA) Inc	\$1,858,700.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Blind Welfare Association of SA Inc	\$34,234.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Boandik Lodge Inc	\$86,829.12	Home and Community Care	Yes
Bordertown Hockey Club	\$90,909.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Bosnian and Hercegovina Muslim Society SA Inc	\$101,169.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Brian Burdekin Clinic	\$141,531.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Bungala Aboriginal Corporation	\$35,194.61	Home and Community Care	Yes
Calvary Home Care Services Limited	\$74,893.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Calvary Home Care Services Limited	\$452,316.18	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Camden Community Centre Inc	\$17,633.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Camden Community Centre Inc	\$120,259.83	Home and Community Care	Yes
Carer Support & Respite Centre Inc	\$702,686.74	Home and Community Care	Yes
Carers Association of SA Inc	\$100,000.00	Community Care Innovation Fund	Yes
Carers Association of SA Inc	\$600,391.27	Home and Community Care	Yes
Carers Link Barossa	\$349,894.78	Home and Community Care	Yes
Catherine House Inc	\$890,000.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Catholic Diocese of Port Pirie	\$205,000.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Catholic Diocese of Port Pirie	\$118,348.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
Catholic Diocese of Port Pirie	\$1,357,900.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal High School	\$46,364.05	Home and Community Care	Yes
Centacare	\$10,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Centacare Catholic Family Services	\$243,433.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Centacare Catholic Family Services	\$5,951,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Central Eastern Domestic	\$45,455.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Central Eastern Domestic	\$2,477,100.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Child and Family Welfare Association	\$126,025.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Chinatown of Adelaide SA	\$10,000.00	CE Discretionary Fund	Yes
Chinatown of Adelaide SA	\$15,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Chinese Welfare Services of SA	\$54,812.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
City Care Network Inc	\$15,599.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Co.As.It. (SA) Italian Assistance Association Inc	\$15,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Common Ground Adelaide Ltd	\$591,600.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Community Accommodation & Respite Agency Inc	\$923,368.76	Home and Community Care	Yes
Community Centres SA Inc	\$406,019.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Community Centres SA Inc	\$57,920.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Community Food SA Inc	\$90,570.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Community House Port Lincoln	\$78,506.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Community Housing	\$480,400.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Community Living Australia	\$119,259.05	Home and Community Care	Yes
Coordinating Italian Committee Inc	\$75,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Coptic Orthodox Church SA Inc	\$90,909.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Council of Aboriginal Elders	\$11,782.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Country Home Advocacy Project Inc	\$112,812.78	Home and Community Care	Yes
Country North Community Services Inc	\$239,310.60	Home and Community Care	Yes
Croatian Care for the Aged Inc	\$30,009.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Cyprus Community of SA	\$69,545.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Disabled Peoples' Whyalla Inc	\$57,380.96	Supported Residential Facility	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Dulwich Centre Foundation Inc	\$58,418.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Eastwood Community Centre Inc	\$73,231.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
EBL Disability Services Inc	\$307,970.10	Home and Community Care	Yes
Elderly Citizens Homes Inc	\$128,480.73	Home and Community Care	Yes
Employment Options Inc	\$116,500.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Ethnic Broadcasters Inc	\$22,550.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Eureka Care Communities (Mount Gambier) Pty Ltd	\$153,928.32	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Eureka Care Communities (Salisbury) Pty Ltd	\$99,852.40	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Filipina Network of South Australia Inc	\$15,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Foodbank of SA Inc	\$250,000.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
G & M Mahon Holdings Pty Ltd	\$148,177.12	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Gawler Neighbourhood House Inc	\$62,604.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Glendi Greek Festival Inc	\$60,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Glenelg Supportive Care	\$202,282.08	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Good Shepherd Microfinance	\$1,113,000.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
Greek Orthodox Community of SA	\$67,311.98	Home and Community Care	Yes
Greek Orthodox Community of SA	\$10,785.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Greek Welfare Centre	\$86,557.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Guide Dogs Association of SA & NT Inc	\$326,793.69	Home and Community Care	Yes
Helping Hand Aged Care	\$469,463.88	Home and Community Care	Yes
Helping Hand Aged Care	\$664,090.84	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Hindmarsh Lodge SRF Pty Ltd	\$134,643.60	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Holdfast Bay Community	\$19,248.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Holdfast Bay Community	\$74,380.96	Home and Community Care	Yes
Holiday Explorers Inc	\$62,867.23	Home and Community Care	Yes
Homecare Plus	\$46,156.57	Home and Community Care	Yes
Hungarian Club of SA Inc	\$47,500.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Hutt Street Centre Ltd	\$364,278.60	Home and Community Care	Yes
Hutt Street Centre Ltd	\$1,052,800.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Inclusive Sport SA Inc	\$69,189.40	Home and Community Care	Yes
Indian Australian Association of SA	\$49,694.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Interchange Inc	\$303,923.22	Home and Community Care	Yes
Islamic Society of South Australia Inc	\$15,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Italian Home Delivered Meals and Services Inc	\$52,149.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Japan Australia Friendship Association	\$10,400.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Junction Australia Ltd	\$120,401.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Junction Community Centre Inc	\$120,622.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Koonibba Aboriginal Community Corporation Incorporated	\$85,000.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Kornar Winmil Yunti Aboriginal Corporation	\$270,600.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Kura Yerlo Council Inc	\$30,000.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Kura Yerlo Council Inc	\$58,712.05	Home and Community Care	Yes
Laziza Festival Inc	\$10,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Lemnos Association of SA	\$44,455.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Life Without Barriers	\$309,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	\$108,855.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	\$45,000.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
Lutheran Community Care	\$186,273.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Lutheran Community Care	\$343,195.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Lutheran Community Care	\$1,216,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
M.T Moroney & P.K Moroney & G Nedelkos & P Nedelkos	\$236,978.56	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Magill Lodge Supported Residential Care Pty Ltd	\$177,180.64	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Maltese Aged Care Association SA Inc	\$40,670.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Marra Murrangga Kumangka Inc	\$81,776.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Matrix on Board Pty Ltd	\$58,000.00	Social Inclusion	Yes
Meals on Wheels Inc	\$192,628.61	Home and Community Care	Yes
Mental Illness Fellowship of South Australia Inc	\$87,039.17	Home and Community Care	Yes
Messianian Association of SA Inc	\$62,818.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Mid Murray Support Service Inc	\$45,455.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Middle Eastern Communities Council of South Australia Inc	\$63,636.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Midway Road Community House	\$69,068.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Migrant Resource Centre of SA Inc	\$276,366.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Migrant Women's Support Service	\$545,200.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Milang & District Community Association Inc	\$78,405.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Multicultural Communities Council of SA Inc	\$190,997.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Multicultural Youth SA Inc	\$148,246.00	Dry Zone Program	Yes
Multicultural Youth SA Inc	\$206,598.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Multicultural Youth SA Inc	\$91,700.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Murray Bridge Community	\$40,332.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Murray Bridge Community	\$103,149.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
National Accreditation Authority for Translators and Interpreters Ltd	\$52,901.82	Multicultural Grants	Yes
National Shelter Inc	\$10,000.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Nexus Multicultural Arts Centre Inc	\$42,924.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council	\$1,228,800.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council	\$16,186.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Ngaanyatjarra Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara Women's Council	\$465,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Nganampa Health Council Inc	\$145,508.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Ngarrindjeri Land & Progress Association Inc	\$75,801.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Noarlunga Volunteer Transport Service Inc	\$22,829.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
North East Community House Inc	\$104,678.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Northern Area Community	\$420,621.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Northern Carer's Network Inc	\$978,965.99	Home and Community Care	Yes
Northern Community Legal Service	\$70,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Northern Domestic Violence Service Inc	\$1,403,700.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Northern Volunteering SA Inc	\$41,190.00	Office for Volunteers	Yes
Novita Children's Services Inc	\$284,672.00	Community and Organisational Support	Yes
Novita Children's Services Inc	\$944,815.49	Home and Community Care	Yes
Nunga Mimini Women's Shelter	\$707,400.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Offenders Aid & Rehabilitation Services of SA Inc	\$1,916,800.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Out of Reach Services (Domestic Violence)	\$597,300.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Overseas Chinese Association of SA	\$27,447.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
P and C N Sumner	\$72,916.48	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Parkinson's SA Inc	\$22,927.55	Home and Community Care	Yes
Pika Wiya Health Service	\$121,486.60	Home and Community Care	Yes
Plaza Youth Centre Inc	\$82,500.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Plaza Youth Centre Inc	\$191,980.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	\$82,500.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	\$97,036.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Port Augusta Youth Centre Inc	\$135,538.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Raising Literacy Australia Inc	\$10,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Raukkan Community Council Inc	\$58,400.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
Re-Engage Youth Services Inc	\$115,282.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Re-Engage Youth Services Inc	\$12,500.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Regional Development Australia Yorke and Mid North Inc	\$74,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Relationships Australia South Australia	\$1,161,700.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Riding for the Disabled	\$149,312.81	Home and Community Care	Yes
Royal District Nursing Service of SA	\$4,497,291.58	Home and Community Care	Yes
SA Council of Social Service	\$393,265.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
SAHMRI—South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute	\$18,000.00	CE Discretionary Fund	Yes
Seniors Information Services	\$89,677.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Shelter SA Inc	\$344,000.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Skill Teaching & Resources Inc	\$179,164.54	Home and Community Care	Yes
Sorento Care Ltd	\$191,283.77	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
South Australian German Association Inc	\$20,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Southern Domestic Violence Service Inc	\$1,662,200.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Southern Junction Community Services Inc	\$1,722,700.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Southern Volunteering (SA) Inc	\$46,190.00	Office for Volunteers	Yes
SPARK Resource Centre Inc	\$142,240.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
SPARK Resource Centre Inc	\$92,988.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
St John Ambulance Australia SA Inc	\$129,728.59	Home and Community Care	Yes
St Johns Youth Services Inc	\$2,605,200.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
St Michaels Trust	\$82,278.56	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
St Vincent De Paul Society (SA) Inc	\$997,300.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Survivors of Torture and Trauma Assistance and Rehabilitation Service	\$70,028.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
SYC Ltd (Formerly Service to Youth Council Inc)	\$149,500.00	Office for Youth	Yes
SYC Ltd (Formerly Service to Youth Council Inc)	\$1,792,172.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Tailem Bend Community Centre Inc	\$13,740.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
The Adelaide Day Centre for Homeless Persons Inc	\$106,276.96	Home and Community Care	Yes
The Adelaide Day Centre for Homeless Persons Inc	\$116,300.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
The Croatian Club Adelaide Inc	\$68,730.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
The Dutch Community (Dutch Social & Welfare Club)	\$56,624.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
The Hut Community Centre Inc	\$199,009.00	Family and Community Development	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
The Hut Community Centre Inc	\$21,981.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
The Oaks at Rosewater	\$24,533.60	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The South Australian Financial Counsellors Association Incorporated	\$85,000.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
The Suzanne Marshall Trust	\$297,766.56	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Thomas Riley Family Trust	\$81,172.00	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Auscare SRF	\$51,906.40	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Egoc Trust	\$318,412.64	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Heron Family	\$191,391.20	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for J&K Moroney	\$99,896.16	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Joyan Sunnydale	\$202,718.88	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Morton Family	\$74,474.40	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Ocean Grove	\$75,449.92	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for Supportive Care Trust	\$172,594.24	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
The Trustee for the Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	\$659,500.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
The Trustee for the Salvation Army (SA) Property Trust	\$3,031,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
The Trustee for the Scannell Family Trust	\$187,445.44	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Time for Kids Inc	\$78,630.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Time for Kids Inc	\$25,928.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Together SA Inc	\$70,000.00	Office for the Southern Suburbs	Yes
Torchio Trading Pty Ltd	\$112,301.28	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Trustee for Lambert Village	\$54,876.64	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Trustee for the Buckton Family	\$156,549.12	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Tullawon Health Services Inc	\$22,324.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Umoona Aged Care Aboriginal Corp	\$181,222.06	Home and Community Care	Yes
Uniting Church in Australia	\$23,470.34	Home and Community Care	Yes
Uniting Communities Inc	\$5,480,400.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Uniting Communities Inc	\$616,990.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Uniting Communities Inc	\$625,500.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
Uniting Communities Inc	\$1,544,291.01	Home and Community Care	Yes
Uniting Communities Inc	\$249,608.45	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	\$795,070.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	\$496,365.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	\$10,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Bowden Inc	\$1,113,100.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$895,235.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$192,267.00	Financial Hardship—Affordable Living Programs	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$149,500.00	Office for Youth	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$3,311,200.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	\$1,069,279.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	\$316,952.17	Home and Community Care	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	\$123,466.00	Office for Youth	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	\$2,702,000.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Port Adelaide Inc	\$244,067.83	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Unity Housing Company Ltd	\$376,900.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Victim Support Service Inc	\$346,000.00	Office for Women	Yes
Victim Support Service Inc	\$169,125.00	Policy and Administration	Yes
Vietnamese Community in Australia/SA Inc	\$32,094.00	Home and Community Care	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Vietnamese Community in Australia/SA Inc	\$20,000.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Vietnamese Community in Australia/SA Inc	\$93,169.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Vietnamese Women's Association SA Inc	\$31,299.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Volunteering SA&NT Inc	\$598,358.00	Office for Volunteers	Yes
Volunteering SA&NT Inc	\$40,000.00	Social Inclusion	Yes
Welcome to Australia Ltd	\$105,300.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Welfare Rights Centre	\$157,600.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
West Coast Community Services Inc	\$91,530.32	Home and Community Care	Yes
West Coast Youth & Community Support Inc	\$90,254.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
West Coast Youth & Community Support Inc	\$11,500.00	Office for Youth	Yes
West Coast Youth & Community Support Inc	\$652,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Workskil Australia Inc	\$100,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Yarredi Services Inc	\$522,800.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Yorke Peninsula Community Transport Inc	\$307,415.58	Home and Community Care	Yes
Young Men's Christian Association	\$186,138.79	Home and Community Care	Yes
Young Men's Christian Association	\$50,000.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Young Women's Christian Association	\$47,807.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
Young Women's Christian Association of Adelaide Inc	\$160,000.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Youth Affairs Council of SA	\$346,937.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Youthinc	\$78,364.00	Multicultural Grants	Yes
NGO grants < \$10,000	\$641,898.19		
Total Grants to NGOs	\$103,500,259.96		

Table 4: DCSI Controlled Items—Youth Portfolio Individualised Funding in 2015-16

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Individualised Funding	\$25,500	Office for Youth Grants	Yes

Note: Individualised Funding was paid to 21 individuals for amounts between \$200 and \$2,000. All payments from Individualised Funding are paid to individuals who manage their funds—these funds are subject to a Funding Agreement.

Table 5: DCSI Controlled Items—Grants to other Organisation Types (non-NGOs) in 2015-16

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Adelaide Hills Council	\$24,896.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Alexandrina Council	\$64,736.54	Home and Community Care	Yes
Attorney-General's Department	\$596,100.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Australian Housing	\$121,794.46	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Australian Institute of Health and Welfare	\$247,882.04	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Berri Barmera Council	\$148,447.63	Home and Community Care	Yes
CALHN Statewide Services	\$930,800.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
City of Burnside	\$65,756.50	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Charles Sturt	\$79,490.14	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Holdfast Bay	\$307,949.04	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Marion	\$315,915.63	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Marion	\$223,873.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
City of Mitcham	\$64,621.06	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Norwood Payneham & St Peters	\$55,222.75	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Onkaparinga	\$563,445.51	Home and Community Care	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
City of Onkaparinga	\$516,483.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
City of Playford	\$482,899.36	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Playford	\$50,000.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
City of Port Adelaide/Enfield	\$569,400.15	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Prospect	\$58,339.85	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Salisbury	\$198,167.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
City of Salisbury	\$145,095.39	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Tea Tree Gully	\$172,143.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
City of Tea Tree Gully	\$162,219.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
City of Victor Harbor	\$39,204.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
City of West Torrens	\$19,502.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Clare & Gilbert Valleys Council	\$152,174.63	Home and Community Care	Yes
Corporation of the City Campbelltown	\$55,204.35	Home and Community Care	Yes
Corporation of the City of Adelaide	\$38,500.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Corporation of the City of Adelaide	\$30,147.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
Corporation of the City of Port Augusta	\$48,865.91	Home and Community Care	Yes
Corporation of the City of Unley	\$349,451.58	Home and Community Care	Yes
Corporation of the City of Unley	\$42,354.00	Family and Community Development	Yes
Country Health SA	\$5,207,770.11	Home and Community Care	Yes
Department for Correctional Services	\$104,200.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Department of Education & Children Services	\$1,137,600.00	Specialist Homelessness Services	Yes
Department of Education & Children Services	\$766,727.91	Home and Community Care	Yes
Department of Health	\$974,535.62	Home and Community Care	Yes
Department of Social Services	\$112,950.00	Other	Yes
District Council of Coober Pedy	\$91,732.00	Aboriginal Community Benefit Grants	Yes
District Council of Mount Barker	\$280,609.04	Home and Community Care	Yes
District Council of Mt Remarkable	\$208,745.75	Home and Community Care	Yes
District Council of Victor Harbor	\$149,907.82	Home and Community Care	Yes
District Council of Yorke	\$90,009.58	Home and Community Care	Yes
Kangaroo Island Council	\$160,977.39	Home and Community Care	Yes
Mid Murray Council	\$160,852.84	Home and Community Care	Yes
Murray Mallee Community Transport Scheme	\$153,434.63	Home and Community Care	Yes
Rural City of Murray Bridge	\$17,890.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
South Australia Police	\$15,711.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
South Australian Housing Trust	\$73,477,209.65	National Affordable Housing Agreement (NAHA)	N/A
South Australian Housing Trust	\$72,092,300.00	Tax Equivalents Regime	N/A
South Australian Housing Trust	\$6,849,500.00	Other SA Housing Trust Grants	N/A
South Australian Housing Trust	\$2,426,000.00	SA National Rental Affordability Scheme Contributions	N/A
South East Regional Community	\$142,522.00	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Southern Adelaide Local Health	\$549,300.00	Other	Yes
The Barossa Council	\$248,181.76	Home and Community Care	Yes
The Coorong District Council	\$42,036.00	Home and Community Care	Yes
The Flinders University of SA	\$55,265.00	Office for Youth	Yes
The University of Melbourne	\$10,000.00	Supported Residential Facility	Yes
Town of Gawler	\$42,762.52	Home and Community Care	Yes
University of Adelaide	\$11,000.00	Other	Yes
University of South Australia	\$56,240.00	Office for Youth	Yes
Total Grants Non-NGOs < \$10,000	\$141,620.00		
Total Grants Non-NGOs	\$172,718,671.14		
Concessions and client payments	\$993,689.07		N/A

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Total Non-NGO items	\$173,712,360.21		

N/A – Not applicable to Treasurer's Instruction 15

Table 6: DCSI Administered Items—Grants in 2015-16

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
A.R.T. Services Inc	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Aberfoyle Community Centre Inc	\$23,450.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Aboriginal Family Support Services Inc	\$106,427.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Aboriginal Family Support Services Inc	\$399,563.38	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Act for Kids	\$83,451.76	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Active Elders Association Inc	\$20,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Anangu Ngangkari Tjutaku Aboriginal Corporation	\$42,730.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Anglican Community Care Inc	\$157,553.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Anglicare SA Ltd	\$126,960.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Animal Management in Rural and Remote Indigenous Communities Inc	\$18,400.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Arthritis Foundation of SA	\$15,760.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Asperlutely Autsome Inc	\$16,975.27	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Association of the Burundian Community of South Australia Inc	\$28,200.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Attorney-General's Department	\$61,380.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Australian Centre for Social Innovation Inc	\$45,560.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Australian Red Cross Society	\$173,752.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Australian Refugee Association	\$100,500.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Baptist Care (SA) Inc	\$17,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Barossa Enterprises	\$95,200.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Beach Road Artworks Inc	\$11,790.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Bicycle South Australia Inc	\$90,880.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Big Sunday Adelaide Inc	\$91,758.24	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Brinkworth Management Committee Inc	\$27,200.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Canteen—The Australian Organisation for Young People Living with Cancer	\$29,990.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Careship Coorong Ltd	\$37,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Catherine House Inc	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Ceduna Aboriginal Corporation	\$28,700.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal High School	\$173,726.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Ceduna Koonibba Aboriginal High School	\$55,751.99	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Community Accommodation and Respite Agency Inc	\$29,211.78	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Community Business Bureau Inc	\$49,910.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Community Centres SA Inc	\$53,916.32	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Community Centres SA Inc	\$18,000.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Community Health Onkaparinga	\$21,230.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Community House Port Lincoln	\$86,550.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Community Living Australia Ltd	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Conservation Council of SA	\$100,381.12	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Coonalpyn Community Hub Inc	\$15,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Cora Barclay Centre	\$54,450.66	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Country & Outback Health Inc	\$15,740.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Courts Administration Authority	\$25,180.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Cyprus Community of SA	\$15,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
District Council of Tatiara	\$49,740.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Eastern Health	\$223,726.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Ernabella Arts Inc	\$12,615.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Essentials for Women SA	\$31,990.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Feast Adelaide Lesbian & Gay	\$20,673.24	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Finding Workable Solutions Inc	\$44,110.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Foodbank of SA Inc	\$101,594.73	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Gowrie SA	\$49,800.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Guide Dogs Association of SA&NT Inc	\$45,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
Hare Krishna Food for Life Inc	\$41,291.21	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Hewett Community Function Centre Inc	\$42,830.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Inclusive Directions Inc	\$30,862.94	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Inman Valley Memorial Hall Inc	\$29,970.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Intellectual Disability Association	\$12,268.02	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Iron Knob Progress Association	\$39,300.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Junction Australia	\$100,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Justicenet SA Inc	\$68,818.68	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Kersbrook Public Hall Inc	\$23,860.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Lifeline Country to Coast SA	\$12,500.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Lifeline South East (SA) Inc	\$203,998.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Lions Club of Murray Bridge	\$10,660.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Loxton District Children's Centre	\$29,630.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Lutheran Community Care	\$40,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Mid Murray Council	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Mid Murray Support Service Inc	\$74,150.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Migrant Resource Centre of SA Inc	\$161,727.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Milang & District Community Association	\$30,430.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Minymaku Aboriginal Corporation	\$20,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Mission Australia	\$175,060.61	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Moorak Public Hall Inc	\$15,700.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Motor Neurone Disease Association	\$14,100.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Multi Purpose Media Inc	\$10,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Multicultural Communities Council of SA Inc	\$121,590.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Multicultural Youth SA Inc	\$10,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Murray Bridge Community Centre Inc	\$98,350.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Murray Mallee General Practice Network	\$28,610.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
National Aboriginal Cultural Institute Inc	\$45,580.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Nexus Multicultural Arts Centre	\$38,830.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
No Strings Attached Theatre of Disability Inc	\$25,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Noarlunga Community Children's Centres Inc	\$21,020.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Northern Area Community & Youth Services	\$90,405.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Novita Children's Services Inc	\$57,614.08	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Nunga Mi:Minar Inc	\$19,700.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Offenders Aid & Rehabilitation Services	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Offenders Aid & Rehabilitation Services	\$260,661.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Overseas Chinese Association of SA	\$136,904.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Oz Harvest Limited	\$62,395.60	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Paralowie R-12 Community Centre Inc	\$14,530.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Parkinson's SA Inc	\$34,760.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Parrakie War Memorial Hall Inc	\$37,720.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Plaza Youth Centre Inc	\$17,020.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Port Augusta Senior Citizens Club Inc	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Port Lincoln Aboriginal Health Services Inc	\$57,979.86	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Port Pirie Regional Aboriginal Community Centre Incorporated	\$12,341.48	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Prison Fellowship of Australia	\$82,335.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Re-Engage Youth Services Inc	\$165,546.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Refugee Advocacy Service of SA	\$61,230.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Relationships Australia SA	\$2,322,060.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Rotary Club of NYP Inc	\$10,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Royal Society for the Blind of South Australia Inc	\$124,428.24	Community Benefit SA	Yes
RSPCA (SA) Inc	\$51,377.46	Community Benefit SA	Yes
SA Council of Social Service	\$158,623.00	Consumer Advocacy Research	Yes
SA Country Women's Association	\$37,880.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Saint Pauls Lutheran Church	\$40,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Salisbury East Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$18,243.74	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Schools Ministry Group Inc	\$32,640.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Seaford Community Centre Inc	\$10,690.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Second Chances SA	\$97,079.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Seniors Information Services	\$92,920.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Shelter SA	\$40,540.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Shine SA Inc	\$41,390.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
South Australian Network of Drug & Alcohol Services Inc	\$16,284.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Southern Adelaide Local Health Network	\$1,428,778.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Southern Community Justice Centre Inc	\$15,331.17	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Southern Junction Community Services	\$155,109.50	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Spark Resource Centre Inc	\$11,277.09	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Spinal Cord Injuries Australia	\$29,227.21	Community Benefit SA	Yes
St Vincent De Paul Society SA	\$37,750.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Staeher Street Inc	\$46,650.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Stirling Community Early Learning Centre	\$25,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Strath Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$39,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Summerhill Inc	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Tailem Bend Community Centre	\$45,400.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Bantu Ethnic Community SA	\$10,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Burundian Drummers Club in South Australia	\$54,830.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Duke of Edinburgh's Award	\$50,000.00	Duke of Edinburgh	Yes
The Flinders University of SA	\$132,500.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
The Hut Community Centre Inc	\$49,080.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Leukaemia Foundation of Australia Inc	\$27,480.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Pines Community Children's Centre Inc	\$14,920.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Returned & Services League of Australia (SA) Inc	\$31,500.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The South Australian Financial Counsellors Association Inc	\$57,160.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
The Vietnamese Catholic Community in SA Inc	\$68,650.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Time For Kids Inc	\$93,182.02	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Together SA Inc	\$45,879.12	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Touched by Olivia Foundation	\$20,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Tutti Ensemble Inc	\$12,730.96	Community Benefit SA	Yes
United Way South Australia Inc	\$43,014.01	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Uniting Church in Australia	\$200,980.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley	\$22,000.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$34,540.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
UnitingCare Wesley Country SA	\$526,260.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Vietnamese Community Inc	\$44,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Vietnamese Community Inc	\$143,132.00	Gamblers Rehabilitation	Yes
Vietnamese Women's Association SA	\$41,880.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Welfare Rights Centre (SA) Inc	\$50,000.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
West Coast Youth & Community Support	\$218,873.59	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Westside Housing Association Inc	\$12,820.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Wirrulla Sports & Recreation Inc	\$17,690.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Wise Employment Ltd	\$25,917.16	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Women's Community Centre SA Inc	\$14,980.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Woodcroft Morphett Vale Neighbourhood Centre Inc	\$34,688.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Young Husband Hall Inc	\$13,650.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Youth Plus Foundation Limited	\$32,270.00	Community Benefit SA	Yes
Grants < \$10,000	\$449,509.98		
Total Administered Grants	\$13,752,551.22		
Concessions	\$161,045,783.81		N/A
Community Service Obligations	\$19,130,000.00		N/A
Personal Alert Rebate	\$1,690,529.32		N/A
Home for Incurables	\$460,000.00		N/A
Total Subsidies and Client Payments	\$182,326,313.13		
Total Administered Grants, Subsidies and Client Payments	\$196,078,864.35		

N/A – Not applicable to Treasurer's Instruction 15

Table 7: South Australian Housing Trust Grants in 2015-16

Organisation Name	Funding	Grant Program	Subject to Grant Agreement
APY Incorporated	\$31,582	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Not applicable
Baptist Community Services (SA) Incorporated	\$2,046,468	Crisis Accommodation Millers Court	Yes
Bereavement Grants (2 at \$10,000 each)	\$20,000	Emergency Management Grants	No
Big Issue in Australia Ltd	\$200,000	Homes for Homes Initiative	Yes
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	\$580,668	National Partnership Agreement: Homelessness	Not applicable
Department for Communities and Social Inclusion	\$14,179	Upgrade of Disability SA Housing	Not applicable
Dinah Line Inc	\$23,500	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Yes
Indulkana Community Inc	\$105,496	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Not applicable
Koonibba Community Aboriginal Corporation	\$11,000	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Yes
Oak Valley Community Inc	\$13,625	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Yes
Re-Establishment Grants (12 at \$10,000 each)	\$120,000	Emergency Management Grants	Yes
Subsidies and Client Payments	\$18,802,009	Private Rental Assistance Program and Emergency Accommodation Assistance	Not applicable
Sum of Grants to Various Communities Under \$10,000	\$23,500	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Yes
Sum of Grants to Various Individuals Under \$10,000	\$671,987	Emergency Management Grants	No
Sum of Grants to Various Individuals Under \$10,000	\$3,981	Emergency Management Grants	No
Ware Villa Inc	\$12,925	National Partnership Agreement: Remote Indigenous Housing	Yes
Grants Under \$10,000	\$7,903	Various grants	No
Total	\$22,688,823		

Minister for Ageing

Expenditure on Grants to NGO's for the Department for the Ageing portfolio for 2015-16 and the preliminary budgets over the forward estimates on an entity basis is highlighted in the table below:

Entity	Expenditure in 2015-16	2016/17 Budget	2017/18 Budget *	2018/19 Budget *	2019/20 Budget *	2020/21 Budget *
Department for Ageing	\$1,621,000	\$1,927,000	\$1,986,000	\$2,037,000	\$2,089,000	\$2,141,000
TOTAL	\$1,621,000	\$1,927,000	\$1,986,000	\$2,037,000	\$2,089,000	\$2,141,000

*It is important to note that forward estimates are indicative and work is continuing in the formation of the forward estimates based on discussions with NGOs and assessments of areas of focus.

Grant Program	Brief Description	Amount
Community Development Grants Grants for Seniors (GFS) Positive Ageing Grants Innovation in Ageing Challenge (IoA)	Annual round of small grants to community groups and organisations to support active ageing (Includes \$7,849 for advertising and communications)	\$417,849
Ethnic Ageing Grants	Annual grants to support older people in key CALD populations	\$279,104
Elder Protection Grants	Grants to support the work in raising awareness of the rights of older South Australians and addressing elder abuse	\$95,817
Peak Body Grant	Grant to support engagement with the community around key policies and programs, to share key messages, and develop the ageing sector capacity	\$175,255

Grant Program	Brief Description	Amount
Other	Grant to support the Every Generation Festival	\$71,750
Strategic grants projects	Strategic grants to support the 3 key priorities of the state ageing plan: Health, wellbeing and security, All-ages friendly communities and Social and economic productivity	\$755,000
Retirement Villages Advocacy Grant	Retirement Villages Residents Advocacy service ARAS Providing information and advocacy support to Retirement Village residents in matters relating to the <i>Retirement Villages Act</i>	\$132,225
TOTAL 2016-17 BUDGET		\$1,927,000

Department for Health and Ageing – Office for the Ageing

The following provides information with regards to grants of \$10,000 or more:

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Active Ageing Australia	\$40,000	Delivery of events as part of Active ageing week (\$25,000)	Y
		To raise awareness of and promote active ageing across South Australia's population (\$15,000)	Y
Adelaide Hills Council	\$15,000	Partnering to build a regional age-friendly South Australia (\$15,000)	Y
Aged Care and Housing Group Incorporated	\$50,000	D3 Challenge – Spare time (\$50,000)	Y
Aged Rights Advocacy Services (SA) Incorporated	\$270,706	Advocacy service for retirement village residents (\$129,000)	Y
		Delivery of resources to raise community awareness and promote messages to support older people to lead positive lives and prevent elder abuse (\$30,000)	Y
		Pilot phone line and support service (\$60,000)	Y
		Provision of information and education to older people relating to issues of abuse and support for individual advocacy (\$51,706)	Y
Associazione Nazionale Famiglie Degli Emigrati Incorporated	\$81,321	Ethnic Ageing grant program to support vulnerable older adults from CALD backgrounds (\$81,321)	Y
Australian Red Cross Society	\$15,000	Positive Ageing Grants program (PAG) – To provide seniors access to the internet in order to connect them to government services and information (\$15,000)	Y
Australian South East Asian Women's Association Incorporated	\$10,000	Grants for Seniors (GFS) program— Provide opportunities to increase social engagement and activities to improve wellbeing (\$10,000)	Y
Carers Link Barossa and District Incorporated	\$10,000	Grants for Seniors (GFS) program— Improve independence, social engagement, community awareness and inclusion of older people living with dementia (\$10,000)	Y
City of Whyalla	\$15,000	Partnering to build a regional age-friendly South Australia (\$15,000)	Y
City of Unley	\$15,000	Partnering to build an age friendly retail pilot project (\$15,000)	Y
Co-ordinating Italian Committee Incorporated	\$47,206	Ethnic Ageing grant program to support vulnerable older adults from CALD backgrounds (\$47,206)	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Council on the Ageing South Australia Incorporated (COTA SA)	\$240,980	Every Generation Festival (\$70,000) Prosperity for longevity: South Australia's ageing plan—strategy to safeguard the rights of older South Australians (\$170,980)	Y Y
Department of the Premier and Cabinet	\$10,000	Active ageing 3D innovation program (\$10,000)	Y
District Council of Mount Barker	\$15,000	Partnering to build a regional age-friendly South Australia (\$15,000)	Y
Federation of Polish Organisations in South Australia Incorporated	\$53,505	Ethnic Ageing grant program to support vulnerable older adults from CALD backgrounds (\$53,505)	Y
Festivals Adelaide	\$40,000	Support 10 arts festivals in Adelaide with knowledge and concepts to further aid their development of programs for active participation of the ageing population (\$40,000)	Y
Flinders University	\$90,000	Develop a framework for industry, state and non-government sectors to support economic opportunities for South Australia arising from its ageing population (\$90,000)	Y
Gallery One Mitcham	\$13,300	Positive Ageing Grants program (PAG) – Program designed to enable participants to research and document their individualised family history (\$13,300)	Y
Greek Orthodox Archdiocese of Australia Welfare Centre of SA	\$62,920	Ethnic Ageing grant program to support vulnerable older adults from CALD backgrounds (\$62,920)	Y
Greek Orthodox Community of South Australia Incorporated	\$27,544	Ethnic Ageing grant program to support vulnerable older adults from CALD backgrounds (\$27,544)	Y
Kura Yerlo Council Incorporated	\$25,509	Positive Ageing Grants program (PAG) – An intergenerational community project to develop a plan framework, transmission workshops, community art installation and community opportunity shop (\$25,509)	Y
Media Resource Centre	\$20,000	Seniors on Screen (\$20,000)	Y
Playgroup SA Incorporated	\$25,000	Positive Ageing Grants program (PAG) – Improve quality of life for socially isolated older people through participation in playgroups (\$25,000)	Y
Radio for the Third Age Incorporated	\$41,774	Delivery of a radio program providing ageing specific information (\$41,774)	Y
Royal Automobile Association of South Australia	\$60,000	D3 challenge – MARCO (\$60,000)	Y
RSPCA (South Australia) Incorporated	\$30,000	Positive Ageing Grants program (PAG) – Assist older people to take care of their pets at home with the help of community service providers (\$30,000)	Y
Catalyst Foundation (formerly known as Seniors Information Service Incorporated)	\$30,000	Positive Ageing Grants program (PAG) – Delivery of workshops to seniors covering skills needed to enter self-employment or establish a business (\$30,000)	Y
South Australian Health & Medical Research Institute Limited	\$75,000	Measure and build wellbeing and resilience in carers (\$50,000) Active Ageing and Wellbeing and Resilience Research Project—SAHMRI WRC 2015-16 (\$25,000)	Y Y
South Australian Makers Incorporated	\$20,000	Deliver digital fabrication technology seminars and workshops to participants over 55 years old (\$20,000)	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
The University of Adelaide	\$22,500	Develop and undertake a census of retirement village residents and operators (\$12,500) Develop a simulation learning tool for nursing students to recognise and respond to situations of elder abuse (\$10,000)	Y Y