

HOUSE OF ASSEMBLY

Tuesday, 14 November 2017

The **SPEAKER (Hon. M.J. Atkinson)** took the chair at 11:02 and read prayers.

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

Bills

SUMMARY OFFENCES (LIQUOR OFFENCES) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 27 September 2017.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (11:04): I rise to speak as the lead and possibly the only speaker on the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill 2017. I indicate that, whilst we will be supporting the bill, there are two areas of amendment that we consider need to be addressed to implement this reform. This bill was introduced on 27 September by the Attorney-General to amend a number of acts but essentially in respect of the legislation for the sale and supply of liquor in specific communities.

Much has been said about the operations that relate to the activities for the provision of alcohol in regional communities where there has been a restriction in respect of the supply and consumption of alcohol. Grog running is seen as an activity by others to obviously undertake the profitable enterprise of sale. The South Australian government currently has legislative restrictions to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related harm in these regional communities.

These restrictions are focused on Aboriginal communities predominantly, but they include conditions on high-risk liquor licences under the Liquor Licensing Act 1997, which limit the amount of specific liquors that can be purchased per person, per day and restrict the type of liquor sold completely for off-premise consumption. Secondly, they include specific communities being prohibited under the legislation from possessing and consuming liquor on the lands, with some exceptions. These communities include the APY lands, the Umoona community, near Coober Pedy, and Yalata Reserve.

It is noted that there are a number of other dry areas that have been prescribed for the purposes of having a prohibition. One of them is within Whyalla Norrie. A second is in the Port Augusta area. Adjacent to Port Augusta abounds public space that is under prohibition. Others are in Port Augusta West and the Ceduna and Thevenard areas, which provide for areas of prohibition. Essentially, the geographical parameters of these prescribed areas are identified. The nature of the prohibition is identified, usually in relation to the consumption of liquor being prohibited within the boundaries and, essentially, for the ones I have described, these are under continuous prohibition.

Metropolitan people have not been immune from experiencing dry zones or precincts. Some might recall that Victoria Square had been identified as an area of excessive consumption of alcohol and restrictions were put in place. Some, of course, would argue that all that does is transfer the problem, or the potential problems that arise out of people aggregating, consuming too much alcohol, getting into fights, causing disruption, being a public nuisance when someone goes to use an ATM facility and all those sorts of things, somewhere else when we introduce these prohibitions, but it is a process that is in operation.

Whilst there has been some concern expressed that this bill is almost anti-Aboriginal in its nature because of the prescribed areas in the APY lands, etc., it is a mechanism that has had the support of many in their own communities who want to prevent the destructive behaviour that

emanates from the use of alcohol and drugs. In this case, it is in relation to liquor licensing, so we are really talking about alcohol consumption.

In an effort to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related harm, this bill is being introduced, firstly, to create an offence in the Summary Offences Act 1953 relating to the possession and transportation of liquor for the purpose of sale into the area designated by the minister. It is also broad enough to cover taxi drivers, who could, of course, be in the business of alcohol running.

The bill also gives power to the police to stop, search and detain vehicles within a designated area without any reasonable suspicion of a grog-running offence. Proposed regulations are essentially indicated to be prepared to provide for a 100-kilometre limit to the application of this power but, from our side of the house, that is not adequate. We consider that there needs to be some geographic restriction in the act and, accordingly, I indicate a foreshadowed amendment to deal with that.

Certainly, from our perspective we see a 100-kilometre radius as being excessive and unnecessary. If we are going to have one, then it ought to be within a five-kilometre radius, and I will speak to that in due course. It is fair to say that the Law Society, having considered the effect of these things, is also concerned about aspects of the bill. They, like others, suggest that it is not appropriate to have a lower standard than 'reasonable suspicion' targeting Aboriginal people.

We agree that at the very least we need very much to confine this so that it deals with the issue of the problem and is not really a backdoor attempt to have an expanded area of power that may be used for other purposes, but it ought to be very clear that we are targeting a specific problem—in this case, dealing with the people who deliver and provide alcohol to the prohibited areas. In short, we will be saying that the police power to stop, search and detain ought to be the same for every other area in relation to the Summary Offences Act.

The bill also allows the minister to prescribe an area of land where the consumption and possession of liquor is prohibited under the APY, ALT and Maralinga Tjarutja Land Rights Act. The Law Society suggests that is discriminatory against Aboriginal communities. On this aspect, we do not agree with the Law Society to the extent that, yes, clearly this is targeted and there are times when that is for the benefit and protection of people living in those communities.

I have not consulted at length with a number of people in the communities specifically on this bill, but I can say that over the last 15 years there have been many occasions when I have consulted with particularly parents who are worried about their children's consumption of alcohol, loss of licences, getting into criminal activity and accessing drugs from marijuana to, in more recent years, ice and other drugs.

They recognise that the safety of their community, and particularly the women and children in it, is in high need when drugs or alcohol are available. They themselves have said, 'We need protection.' Whether that is to say, 'We need to be able to have our children go safely to school,' or, 'We want women and children in the household to be protected against domestic violence,' they are all aspects that can be exacerbated by the excessive consumption of alcohol.

Under the Liquor Licensing Act, there will be the creation of an offence for a licence holder to sell liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller intending to sell liquor, which is then sold on by the seller. The maximum penalty is \$20,000 for the first offence and \$40,000 for subsequent offences. It will also create an offence under that act for a person in charge of premises to permit the unlicensed sale of liquor on those premises. They are proposed strategies which are, in fact, endorsed by the Law Society.

The amendments to the Criminal Investigation (Covert Operations) Act 2009 extend the meaning of 'serious criminal behaviour' to include the new offences listed that I have referred to as contravening the Liquor Licensing Act and new offences under the Summary Offences Act. That is a reasonable extension.

The Criminal Law (Clamping, Impounding and Forfeiture of Vehicles) Act 2007 allows for the forfeiture of a vehicle of those persons found guilty of a designated liquor offence as created in the new offences under the Summary Offences Act. When I was reading that part of the bill, it reminded me that there was recently a publication made, I think quite proudly, of an artist on the APY lands

who had undertaken work to redecorate abandoned vehicles, turn them into dot paintings and light them up with candles and lighting to the extent of making them an art space, which I thought was an interesting, novel, recycling initiative.

It is fair to say that in relation to this type of reform the people who are doing the grog running need to be detained. Those who are receiving the product, with a view to onselling it to people in the communities, and the equipment they use, particularly vehicles, obviously all need to be targeted for the purposes of it being effective. So, in general principle, we support those measures.

As I have indicated, I will be foreshadowing amendments to bring the police search powers in line with procedures under sections 68 and 68A of the Summary Offences Act. That particularly is to ensure that the current proposed procedures do not solely target Aboriginal communities and, secondly, identify the prescribed area rather than identifying within 100 kilometres of an alcohol-free area, as proposed by the government. With those few words, I indicate that we will otherwise be supporting the passage of the bill.

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (11:16): I rise also to make a contribution on the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill. I find it sad that we have to discuss these things in this place. What we are seeking to do here—and this is not the first time and, unfortunately, I do not think it will be the last—is to create a separate set of laws for different parts of our state.

We all come into this place living in the one community of South Australia, and we all struggle with the concept of what we are seeking to do here. To the greatest extent possible, we all should abide by the principle that we all live by the same law, that we all have to abide by the same law and that none of us is above the law. I understand that we cannot always continue to have these principles stop us from making practical change where we see problems. I also understand that we cannot continue to expect different results by continuing to do the same thing.

If we are to indeed change the way that our society interacts with alcohol, we need to be practical in how we deal with the issues that confront us. It is why we need to try new and different approaches, and it is why we as an opposition will be supporting, in the broad, this piece of legislation. We know that there are issues. We know that the effects of alcohol-induced violence ravage many of our rural communities. We know that this leads to adverse outcomes, especially for children and their ability to have a safe upbringing, and the definite future flow-on effects that come as a result of those children not being able to have the same sorts of opportunities that many of the rest of us take for granted.

I look forward to the day when we can repeal these laws because they are no longer necessary, because we have solved the problem: that we have managed to bridge the cultural divide and that we have managed to help to change the way that remote communities look at alcohol. I look forward to hopefully still being in parliament on the day that we can repeal these laws. Unfortunately, that day is not today, and we need to continue to move on and do what we can.

Whilst we must put in place measures to reduce the abuse of alcohol, which is imperative, we must not lose sight of the broader goal, namely, a just, fair and safe society where we are all equal, where we have equal expectations and equal outcomes for each other and want as much for everybody as we want for ourselves. I had the same concerns in relation to another piece of legislation that we put through this place in Gayle's Law, where the government was admitting that nurses are less safe in these prescribed communities and that geography has as much to do with safety as many other things. Whilst, again, we supported that legislation wholeheartedly, it does not mean that we did so without a level of discomfort, and that same discomfort certainly applies to this legislation.

But, first and foremost, our responsibility is to those who cannot look after themselves, and in this case we are talking about the victims. We are talking about the children who are so often the victims of alcohol-induced violence. We are looking after the women, the partners, the wives, who are so often the victims of alcohol-induced violence and the people themselves who are harmed, as they seek to deal with the ravages of addiction to alcohol. It is why, again, we will be supporting this piece of legislation, broadly.

What the bill seeks to do is to create an offence in relation to possession or transportation of liquor for the purpose of sale into an area designated by the minister. That, again, we support in the practical, but it is frustrating that it needs to be specific rather than general. The bill also seeks to give police the power to stop, search and detain vehicles within a designated area.

The deputy leader has explained a number of concerns we have in relation to this clause, that essentially this is one in a series of measures in which the government has attempted to reduce the threshold by which vehicles in particular can be stopped and searched but which we have seen in a whole host of legislation over the past couple of months, whether it be in relation to drug testing or whether it be in relation to child exploitation material.

This is a consistent theme from the government, but we on this side believe there should be reasonable suspicion. We believe that there should be an accepted standard, and that standard should be consistent, and we will be seeking to ensure that these changes remain consistent with other search powers that police have. This will also allow the minister to prescribe an area of land where the consumption and possession of liquor are prohibited.

Again, I echo the words of the deputy leader that whilst the intent of this act, it seems quite clear, is to target Aboriginal communities and the APY lands, there are other prescribed areas already in place. I know every year I sign off on dry zones around New Year's Eve around Mannum. There are a number of dry zones even in my community that exist around the place, and I accept that in this case, whilst we are talking about predominantly Aboriginal communities, it is not restricted solely to them and that the minister has the power to make it much more broad.

An amendment to the Liquor Licensing Act also creates an offence for a licence holder to sell liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller intending to sell the liquor, which is then sold by that seller. There is a maximum penalty of \$20,000 for a first offence and \$40,000 for subsequent offence. I think this is at the heart of what this legislation is trying to do. We are taking that one step back from those who are consuming and abusing alcohol to those who seek to profit from that abuse. Again, this is something we wholeheartedly support.

The bill also creates an offence for a person in charge of a premises to permit the unlicensed sale of liquor on those premises. Again, the obligations we put on our licensed premises are strict and strong and we should be ensuring that everybody who seeks to sell alcohol works under the same conditions; in this case, we are going one step further around the prohibition in certain areas. The bill also extends the meaning of 'serious criminal behaviour' to include the offences we are seeking to enact here and also allows for the forfeiture of a vehicle if a person is found guilty of a designated liquor offence. These are all things that we certainly support.

In closing, can I say that it brings me no joy to be discussing this in this place, but we accept that it is an attempt to try new things to try to tackle this problem from different and new angles so that we can get a different outcome, that we all understand that we simply cannot accept the status quo and that we must look forward. That is why we will be supporting the legislation.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (11:24): I would like to put on the record a few words on behalf of the people of Stuart. I support wholeheartedly anything that will help people to deal with problems associated with substance abuse. We are dealing with alcohol here in particular. I have to also recognise that nothing is ever really going to work until the person in the middle of the problem takes some responsibility for himself or herself. That is a fact that we all know and, given that there are difficulties with that across the state, it is quite appropriate for the government to become more involved in these issues than it already is.

It is also important to say that, while this legislation need not apply only to Aboriginal communities, it is currently very focused on Aboriginal communities. I would like to put very clearly on the record that, while there is a great deal of difficulty with regard to the handling and consumption of alcohol in Aboriginal communities, it is not only Aboriginal people and communities who have these problems. Many communities all over our state, many people all over our state, have difficulty with regard to alcohol; it is not only Aboriginal communities, but this bill is very focused on Aboriginal communities.

I have what is a fairly unique insight, at least with regard to all my parliamentary colleagues: I have actually been a licensee in the outback. I have held liquor licences in my name. I have been

a director of a company that held a liquor licence from February 1999 through to October 2007. It was not a lifetime or a whole career, but it was a significant chunk of my working life. In fact, for a period of time I simultaneously held five different liquor licences, one of which is already categorised as a high-risk licence. I note the bill talks about high-risk licences, not necessarily high-risk licensees. They may be the same or they may be different, but this talks about high-risk licences.

I do not think for a second that when I ran roadhouses with liquor licences in the outback I did it perfectly. I know for a fact that I did it to the best of my ability. I know for a fact that, generally, I had good staff and we tried our very best. But, through trying our best, we did come in contact with the challenges that exist in this legislation. We dealt with those challenges every day, seven days a week and, at one roadhouse, 24 hours a day.

It is a very difficult issue to get the legislation just right and I support the government in their endeavour to do so. I accept the fact that it is almost impossible to get this legislation right, and I support the deputy leader, who is the lead speaker on this issue, in identifying some areas where it is not yet just right. For the sake of brevity, I will just touch on a few key issues.

Obviously there are already some conditions on high-risk licences and there are already some communities that are identified in existing legislation. This bill looks to create an offence relating to possession or transportation of liquor for the purpose of sale into an area designated by the minister, and I think it would be quite appropriate to make that an offence. It also gives police the power to stop, search and detain vehicles within a designated area without any reasonable suspicion of grog running. That is a problem for us. Without 'reasonable' suspicion is something that we will almost always balk at in just about any legislation.

This bill also creates an offence for a licence holder to sell liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller intending to sell liquor. Straightaway, we have an anomaly there. Police could search vehicles without any reasonable suspicion, yet, in relation to the liquor licence holder, there must be reasonable belief that there is inappropriate reselling. I think it would be important to match those two up. In all these issues, you need to have reasonable suspicion that an offence is being committed, or is about to be committed, to have some of these powers come into play.

Another key issue is that this bill allows the forfeiture of vehicles of persons found guilty of a designated liquor offence. I support that entirely. In fact, I think that penalty could be used in many other areas of law in our state, but I will go into that another time. I also want to highlight the fact that unintended consequences will play a part in this legislation, while recognising that it is up to the parliament to try to get it as good as possible. Of course, it is up to local police to try to enforce it as well as possible and then it is up to the courts, potentially, to try to rule on it as well as possible.

I really do understand that it will not be made perfect. There are some unintended consequences and I will give you an example. At the Marla Travellers' Rest, a fairly significant business which I used to manage with investment partners and other staff right on the edge of the APY lands, there was a rule in place with regard to selling takeaway alcohol to people coming and going from the lands. It was actually against our licence to sell takeaway alcohol to anybody who was coming from, going to or lived on the Aboriginal lands.

The way we had to deal with that was to get a piece of paper signed by the purchaser of the alcohol to state that he or she was not doing any one of those things or did not fit that category. It was a bit of a pain, it was pretty difficult and it was administratively awkward, but it was for a good cause—no problem at all. One of the reasons it was for a good cause was that for a very long time the Aboriginal elders from the APY lands had requested and supported that being the case.

There is a whole range of other issues that come out of running a liquor licence in that situation, which I will not go into at the moment. What I really wanted to use that example for was to explain one of the things that would happen. Everybody in the district knew this was how it worked. Locally, everybody fully understood and almost everybody complied, but occasionally a person who lived on the lands and who was not entitled to buy takeaway alcohol would go to an unsuspecting tourist. It was not always done this way, but I will give a real-world example that happened many times, and not the only example I can give you.

An Aboriginal person, who knew the rules very well and who had lived in the district all their life, would go to an unsuspecting, young couple from Austria who had pulled up to buy some fuel, some loaves of bread and sausages and continue on. The person would go up to this tourist couple and say, 'Do you know what a dreadful country this is? Do you know what a dreadful place this is? They refuse to sell alcohol to Aboriginal people in here. The people who run this place are racists. If I give you some money, would you go and buy it for me, please, because they will sell it to you and then you give it to me?' Let me just say again, this was not the norm, but it did happen.

The unsuspecting Austrian couple would say, 'Of course. This is just dreadful. This is completely unacceptable. Of course I will help you. You should never be allowed to be treated this way.' They would go in, buy the carton of beer or whatever it was, sign the sheet to say that they did not live on the lands, that they were not going to or from the lands and that the alcohol they were buying had nothing to do with that. They would go outside and give it to the person who asked them to buy it and that alcohol would then disappear somewhere it was not meant to disappear to.

That example is not a reason not to try to improve our laws in this area, but in that example the poor unsuspecting foreign couple would be breaking a very serious law. We need to be sure in the process that I stepped out before that in trying to get it as good as possible in parliament, in trying to have police enforce things as well as possible, in trying to have courts deal with things as well as possible, these types of issues can be taken into consideration.

The way that they will be taken into consideration best, and will have the best opportunity to be successful with regard to their development and their implementation, is if local Aboriginal leaders, the people who want the right thing for their people, are involved in the creation of these laws, as well as local licensees, local police, local business and community leaders, and, of course, people in Adelaide who have experience in this area.

I support this effort in principle, but I certainly have the same concerns as my colleagues in regard to identifying the prescribed area and also the capacity to undertake a search without having reasonable cause to believe that that search is warranted.

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (11:34): I rise today to speak on the Summary Offences (Liquor Offences) Amendment Bill 2017. As for a number of other members on this side, this relates to issues in my electorate, in particular to the west of the state where, of course, Yalata has been declared a dry zone. As other speakers on this side have indicated, we broadly support the intention of this bill and understand that the Attorney sees a need for this. The deputy leader and shadow attorney has foreshadowed some amendments, which we will be coming to in the committee stage, I am sure.

The bill was introduced this year to amend a number of acts that legislate the sale and supply of liquor in specific communities. The bill essentially aims to address grog running in regional communities. I am here to tell you, Deputy Speaker, and this house that grog running is a very significant, serious, damaging but also very profitable industry in some parts of the state.

The South Australian government currently has legislative restrictions to reduce the incidence of alcohol-related harm in regional communities. These restrictions are focused on the Aboriginal communities predominately and include conditions on high-risk liquor licences under the Liquor Licensing Act, which limit the amount of specific liquors that can be purchased per person, per day, and restricts the type of liquor sold completely for off-premises consumption.

A number of liquor retail outlets in the western part of the state have come under these conditions. The biggest, I am sure, is the Ceduna Hotel, but others include those at Thevenard, Purnong, Nundroo and, I understand, Border Village and possibly even Smoky Bay, so a really large geographical area is being conditioned by the government in relation to sales. It also includes specific communities being prohibited, under legislation, from possessing and consuming liquor on the lands, with some exemptions. These include the APY lands, the Umoona community and Yalata Reserve, Yalata being in the electorate of Flinders and some 200 kilometres west of Ceduna.

The bill seeks to make some amendments to the existing act, and it will create an offence relating to possession or transportation of liquor for sale into an area designated by the minister, as in one of those prohibited areas. This amendment is also broad enough to cover taxi drivers, which is a concern at the moment for the ALRM. Certainly, taxi drivers have been fingered in this, rightly or wrongly, as some who could potentially profit from grog running. However, it is not only that: it is also

members of the community who, I might add, are prepared to travel vast distances purely and simply to get grog to other people within their communities. It is profitable. If you can buy a carton of beer for \$50 and sell it for \$200, that is very profitable.

This bill also will give the power to the police to stop, search and detain vehicles within a designated area without reasonable suspicion of a grog-running offence. In other words, it increases the power of the police. I know for a fact that police have been looking for this authority for some time and will be pleased to see it. Proposed regulations will define designated areas as within 100 kilometres of an alcohol-free area; in fact, that regulation will cover most of the state. Our deputy has flagged the intention to propose an amendment to that. It will also allow the minister to prescribe an area of land where the consumption and possession of liquor is prohibited.

The Law Society's submission on this suggests that this is a discriminatory act against Aboriginal communities. The member for Schubert spoke on this very issue and, in fact, they are right, it is discriminatory. The reality is the dry zones are in place within Aboriginal communities, so it is already in, like it or not. It will also create an offence for the licence holder to sell liquor to a person reasonably believed to be an unlicensed seller intending to sell the liquor, which is then on-sold by that seller. The maximum penalty for this is \$20,000 for a first offence and \$40,000 for subsequent offences.

I have had correspondence, and I know the Attorney has also had the same correspondence, from the Ceduna Foreshore Hotel Motel, who feel they may at some point in time get caught up unwittingly in this legislation. They have had an incident in the past where they have had to defend accusations in court, accusations of racism. The risk is very real for the Ceduna hotel and other licence holders in the west of the state. I will talk more about that in a moment.

The legislation also allows for the forfeiture of a vehicle of those persons found guilty of a designated liquor offence as created in the new offences. In other words, police can pull over, search, detain and extract the liquor from the said vehicle, which is more than they are able to do at the moment, despite the fact that they may have very strong suspicions that grog running is occurring. There are concerns locally in the Ceduna area and the west of the state with this bill and how it might have an impact.

It is worth mentioning that there have been significant efforts made in recent times to combat alcohol abuse and substance abuse within the communities, particularly those of Ceduna and Yalata and other Aboriginal lands. Part of that has been the local liquor accord, and certainly all stakeholders have been involved with that, including the Ceduna Foreshore Hotel Motel, which I mentioned before, but also any number of service providers—both state and federal government and also NGOs—who all have a stake in this. Everyone is intending to do their very best.

Throughout that local liquor accord process a number of measures have already been implemented, including restricting the sale and supply of alcohol to all people, not just to vulnerable people. Records are made of all sales. If I bought alcohol at the Ceduna hotel, I would need to show my identification and a record would be made of that purchase. I do not believe myself to be a vulnerable person, but my point is that it is across the board. The community hotel, as a liquor licensed vendor, has concerns that the proposed legislation will again focus on what the staff reasonably believe (or ought reasonably believe) to be the case, and they are fearful that they may get caught up in that.

I talked about the local liquor accord, and underpinning some of those conditions is the ID Tech system recording the identity of each and every purchaser of alcohol, but there is also the cashless welfare card trial, which has been based in Ceduna. This, too, was not without its controversy and critics, but it had the support of the majority of people in Ceduna. It certainly had the support of the local mayor and the local council. By all indications, it seems to have been a success, so much so that the trial has been extended in time and has also been extended to other parts of Australia. The cashless welfare card allows welfare recipients who are unable to purchase alcohol with their welfare card and can only do so with a cash purchase. Essentially, it restricts the amount of money they have available for alcohol and gambling.

I was also talking last week with the manager of one of the non-government organisations in Ceduna and he had a slightly different slant on things. He felt that this legislation was reactive rather

than proactive and felt the need very much for us to still be more proactive within communities, to seek to educate and seek to give opportunities to residents of communities to develop a reasonable relationship with alcohol which has been very difficult to achieve. I will be quite frank: within the Ceduna township, there are those still who suggest that a wet canteen at Yalata might be a good idea.

I know that the police are very much opposed to this and, as a result, the government is very much opposed to this, but there certainly are those in the town who feel that it is worth considering. There are other Aboriginal communities around Australia that have a wet canteen, for want of a better term, where mid-strength beer may be served for a period of time on each and every day. Grog running occurs because the demand is there for the grog. As I said before, it is profitable, but it is essentially a supply and demand situation.

At the moment, grog is getting into Yalata and people are drinking and getting drunk at Yalata. People are also coming from Yalata into Ceduna to party. They spend a week or two in Ceduna to enjoy themselves and, essentially, drink. In making this contribution, it would seem that almost everybody in Ceduna has a drinking problem; that is certainly not the case. In fact, when the cashless welfare card was being introduced, the point was made by those in the know that really we were talking about a very small number of vulnerable people, maybe only 30 or 40, and that a lot of these restrictions are really focused on a very small number of people.

That said, the ramifications of alcoholism and drug abuse are significant because they extend to domestic violence, lack of money, lack of funding, neglect, abuse and all those other things that go with a community struggling with its identity. I understand the intention of the bill and we will be supporting it. We broadly support the intention of the bill. I have my reservations, obviously, about the overall impact of it and suggest ultimately that it is part of a bigger picture. As community leaders, we need to be far more proactive in the way we address some of these issues to find a long-term solution that is amenable and acceptable more broadly across our communities.

I listened to the member for Schubert's contribution, and he recognised the discriminatory nature of this legislation and hoped that he would be in this place when, someday, this legislation can be repealed. I have actually seen a big improvement in behaviour, amongst the communities in recent times, and more broadly over the last four decades, and the impact that it is had on the beautiful township of Ceduna. There are many, many services in Ceduna provided by non-government organisations, state government organisations and federal service providers—almost too many to count—and I suspect that there is a lot of overlap.

Effort has been made, certainly as a directive of this government—and I congratulate them on it—to have better delivery of services within Ceduna targeting the vulnerable people and to have a more concentrated effort and more agreement on the way services are provided. That work continues and will go on, I am sure.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (11:48): I thank those who have made a contribution in relation to this matter. I am genuinely pleased that everyone who has spoken on this is indicating general support, and that is heartening. I am disappointed that that general support is actually being undermined by a series of proposed amendments. I do not want to be overly critical of members who have spoken because I take them as being sincere contributions, but I must say that I have a different view.

My view is this: I am sick and tired of well-meaning people wringing their hands and saying what a terrible thing it is that this group or that group is suffering appalling circumstances and then they are not prepared to do anything about it except wring their hands or say, 'It's about time the government did something about it,' or, 'It's about time somebody else did something about it,' or, 'It's about time somebody,' other than them, 'stepped up, did something and solved the problem'. I am not in that camp. I am a kind of 'get stuff done' type of person, and if there is a problem I like to try to do something about it. I am not content to wring my hands and say, 'Isn't it a shame?' and then retire back and watch the telly.

In respect of this particular matter, what is the problem? I reject the assertion that this is a targeted attack or a singling out of Aboriginal communities. It is not, because there are dry areas all over the state. It could be schoolies down at Victor Harbor. It could be anything. I do accept that there are a large number of Aboriginal communities that are dry areas and they are dry areas because they want to be dry areas, but I reject the notion that it is a piece of legislation about Aboriginal people. It is not. It is a piece of legislation about spivs, parasites and crooks breaking the law by entering into dry areas and profiting off the vulnerable people who are there and at their mercy. Whether those people are Aboriginal, schoolies or anybody else, it is equally offensive to me.

The notion that spivs and profiteers are breaking through a regulatory framework that is designed to protect people and making a profit out of it, I find objectionable. I find it difficult to separate the spivs and parasites who are doing this from the people who are selling other substances that damage people's health, such as people who are selling illegal substances because they have equally little regard for the consequences of their actions as visited upon their victims. It is just appalling abuse for no better purpose than venal profit. I cannot think of anything more contemptible, quite frankly, so I do have a strong view about this.

Inasmuch as we are talking about Aboriginal communities, they want this. They want their communities to be protected from these spivs. They are asking us to help them. In that context, I then do not agree with the handwringers, who say, 'Yes, but what about five kilometres instead of 100 kilometres?' If you read clause 21OD, it states:

- (3) A notice under subsection (1) or (2) cannot include within a designated area land that is more than 100km from the boundary of a prescribed area.

Why would we say that? I will tell you why we say that. The north part of this state, as members opposite know well, is a very, very big place, and if you say five kilometres you are saying that the police have to sit five kilometres outside of every known entry point into a prescribed area if they want to catch these crooks. I do not think that is reasonable, quite frankly. Bear in mind what the offence is. If you have a look at 21OB(1), they are talking about people who are possessing liquor for the purpose of sale, transporting liquor for the purpose of sale, and so on.

Let's not beat around the bush. We know what we are talking about here. We are talking about the absolute scum of the earth who go somewhere and buy a large amount of alcohol so they can smuggle it into a place that is not supposed to have alcohol and sell it at a large profit—that is what we are talking about. I am not convinced in any way whatsoever that having the capacity for a buffer zone of up to 100 kilometres—not a mandatory 100 kilometres—around a prescribed area is unreasonable. I think it is reasonable and that is the first point.

The member for Flinders, who I know cares about this stuff a lot and is a very well-respected local member, spoke to the parliament a little while ago about what has been going on in Ceduna. Ceduna had a terrible set of circumstances operating there for some time. I congratulate the member for Flinders, who has been wholly supportive of what the state and federal governments have tried to do in Ceduna, which was to use state agencies, commonwealth agencies, cashless welfare, and intensive services being provided into the area, restrictions on alcohol consumption.

I think the member for Flinders would agree (and I think he did say) that there has been a substantial improvement in Ceduna, which is a lovely town and should be a great place to live. What I have been told, and the member for Flinders would know this, is that there has of recent times been a bit of backsliding there, not because the people of Ceduna have given up, not because the commonwealth stopped trying, not because the state government has pulled resources out, not because the cashless card is not working anymore, but because these parasites I am talking about are breaking through the cordon and mucking everything up—that is why.

I would have thought the member for Flinders would be able to talk to some of his colleagues and say how disappointed his constituents in Ceduna are that these crooks, these parasites, are working completely against all the good work the commonwealth, the state and the member for Flinders and other people have been putting into Ceduna for years, and these spivs are trying to ruin it and profit from it. Again, I cannot think of anything more contemptible, nothing more contemptible.

With regard to the question about 'reasonable suspicion', I understand that and I understand how a lawyer would view that, but I can tell members here—I know the member for Bragg would

appreciate this but others may not be quite so aware—that the significance of the words 'reasonable suspicion' ultimately play out in evidence in a court case.

Criminal trials are not about the truth, as I am often reminded by the law profession: they are about the evidence. They are about the evidence, and most of many criminal trials are occupied by trying to stop evidence being put before the jury or the judge. That is the job of the defence counsel. It is completely legitimate and I am not complaining about it but one of the things they say is, 'This evidence was obtained illegally. This evidence was obtained in a search where there was no search warrant. This evidence was obtained when you stopped the car and you did not have a valid reason for stopping the car.'

They have a subtrial, if you like, about the valid reason, and if the judge thinks there is not the valid reason, all the evidence goes. Just be clear that there is more to this particular little phrase than meets the eye. What this is about is actually saying, 'If the coppers catch these people, they are gone.' It will not help them to employ Clarence Darrow or Sir Garfield Barwick or somebody else to fight their case because they will not be able to get through it.

They will be caught red-handed and there is nothing they can do about it, and they will be pinched. That is what this is about. It is not about letting loose Mr Beria or somebody in the hinterland of South Australia. This is about enabling the evidence of these sorts of offences to be admitted in court—that is what it is about. Again, I understand the concern but I do not agree with you. I do not agree with you. Again, I will come back and be positive. I appreciate the indications of support from the opposition.

I know the member for Flinders in particular lives this thing and, of course, the member for Stuart as well, but the member for Flinders has Ceduna in his electorate. He has seen with his own eyes and has his own constituents who have seen what a terrible place that town has been to and how much improved that town is and how much hard work it has taken by so many people to get that to happen. My position is: how much should we tolerate people who want to muck that up? My answer is that I am totally intolerant of those people. I am completely, absolutely and totally intolerant of those people. I would not cut them an inch of slack.

So, to the extent that we are having a conversation about something which we all philosophically agree upon, can I just ask you all to please reflect on this and ask yourself a very simple question. Ask the member for Flinders: is Ceduna a better place now than it was five years ago? Is it a safer place? Is it a happier place? Is there less violence? What has changed there? What do these crooks I am trying to catch up with want to do with that peace and harmony that have descended upon Ceduna? We all know the answer to that: they do not care. They could not care less. All they want is filthy lucre.

I have zero sympathy for these people. I am interested in their being pinched and prosecuted and the message going out far and wide. I do not care whether it is at schoolies at Victor Harbor or on the lands or at Ceduna, I do not care where it is, but if the law says that you do not take grog in there—and I am not talking about the person who strays in there with a beer can accidentally, I am talking about the people who have cases and cases of Fruity Lexia packed into a truck—if that is what they are doing transparently for commercial gain, I think the parliament should make a very clear statement about how completely unacceptable we regard that as being.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 1 [Chapman–1]—

Page 5, line 19 [clause 4, inserted section 21OD(3)]—Delete '100km' and substitute '5km'

I can hardly believe what I have just heard from the Attorney-General. I can hardly believe it. For someone who is supposed to be Senior Counsel, Attorney-General, first law officer of the state, to give us all a lecture with his fake indignation about grog runners, when the opposition is actually supporting the bill, I think is utterly pathetic. It concerns me that he should then try to overlap that with some plea to us all to therefore reject the amendments we are proposing.

The amendments we are proposing deal with the area of operation for which there is going to be this very special provision that we are all agreeing to. What we are not agreeing to is the extent of the area. He treats us as idiots, as though we do not know that the APY lands are a long way off from the highway, a long way from Alice Springs, a long way from Port Augusta, and you have Marla sitting there. We agree that from Yalata, Oak Valley, and so on, you have quite a distance from Ceduna and other towns. We are not ignorant of the isolation of some of those remote areas.

What is offensive about his suggestion is that it is somehow or other necessary to have this special provision for up to 100 kilometres and not identify, having been able to research for the purposes of this bill, areas where there are adjacent towns and the like. I do not want a situation, and I do not think that there was the expectation, where the police would have the surveillance and enforcement of this legislation where they would be sitting outside the Ceduna hotel, the Marla tavern or anywhere else and pick up anyone they liked.

The presentation by the Attorney-General suggests that they are going to need these powers and that they be expanded not only to that extent but to very special powers of search and seizure, independent of any other operation they are doing, as though in some way we should be giving them this special provision for such a huge geographical area and for specifically these offences. I do not want a situation where a police officer is sitting outside Ceduna and has the power to pick up and stop any vehicle they feel like just because they want to check how much alcohol they have in the back of the truck or in the boot of the car or in the bus or the caravan, or, for that matter, in some trolley they are pulling behind a cycle.

I make this point: we have search and seizure laws in relation to police activity as a balance between the need for us to instruct and employ and provide for law enforcers and the rightful opportunity for ordinary people to go about their business—and he of all people, as the first law officer of the state, newly appointed senior counsel, ought to have some clue of the purpose of that. I find it offensive and rude that he should come in and try to give us a lecture in respect of that as though in some way we are impeding the actual motive and opportunity to deal with those who are grog running. We agree with it.

I could ask the question: why the hell have you taken 15 years to get on and do something about this? It is as though we are all ignorant of the fact that they have been pursuing their other interests and not actually dealing with this issue. It is not unreasonable that, as with other offences, we still require that there be some reasonable cause to stop, arrest, obviously take possession, and, if necessary, search for the purposes of dealing with these reprehensible people, as has been described by the Attorney. That is all we are asking for and that there be some limitation on that and in respect of it being the same powers as in relation to other offences, but we are giving special provision, obviously, within that narrow mandate.

I know in the briefings we have had on this bill and others that the police have given a long list to the government. In the last two weeks of the government—the dying days of this government, hopefully—I do not want to be trying to push through some sort of wish list. Of course the police want these things; they want lots of things, and in some cases it is quite reasonable that they get them, but in others it is completely unreasonable.

I know that the Mayor of Ceduna has said to the government, 'Good on you for getting on with this legislation.' We agree in that sense, but what we say is: how is Allan Suter going to explain this? He is the mayor out there at Ceduna. He is a decent bloke who works hard for his community and who has been prepared to take up lots of battles with the government—not that they have listened very often, but nevertheless he is a good person representing his community. He has worked hard to achieve good outcomes for the Ceduna district. Great, but how is he going to deal with it if local people are unreasonably pulled over and have their vehicle searched when they are on their

way to holiday in Western Australia? For goodness sake! We just want some reasonable management of the enforcement of this new legislation.

If there is a situation that prevails—and I have asked this question, and of course you can imagine what the answer was—how many times have you failed to successfully prosecute somebody in relation to pulling over a vehicle for the purpose of seizure? There are lots of actual opportunities to pull over a vehicle and search it when there is reasonable cause, especially in relation to drugs, but have there been any occasions when you had failed to successfully prosecute somebody because the evidence has been thrown out? Guess what? I have not had an answer.

The Attorney comes in here waving around his great knowledge about this area as though this is some major problem that we need to remedy in relation to this legislation for the police. Where is the evidence of that? Where is the truth of that, if you like? He wants to come in here and give us all lectures about what these processes are for. These processes are there for good reason, and we need to have some good, cogent reason if we are going to change those rules just to be able to support this effort in relation to the legislation. I would ask the Attorney to reconsider his position on this and to think carefully between the houses because, when he votes down this amendment, he can rest assured that it will be coming back in another place.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I am a bit exhausted from my second reading contribution, so can I just repeat that in parenthesis and not repeat it, if you know what I mean. I think I will leave it at that.

Amendment negated.

Ms CHAPMAN: I move:

Amendment No 2 [Chapman-1]—

Page 5, line 38 to page 7, line 23 [clause 4, inserted section 210E]—Delete inserted section 210E

Amendment No 3 [Chapman-1]—

Page 7, lines 25 to 35 [clause 4, inserted section 210F(1) to (3)]—Delete subsections (1) to (3)

Amendment No 4 [Chapman-1]—

Page 8, lines 6 to 9 [clause 4, inserted section 210F(6)]—Delete subsection (6)

Amendment No 5 [Chapman-1]—

Page 8, lines 13 and 14 [clause 4, inserted section 210F(7), definition of *seized property*]—Delete the definition of *seized property*

These amendments relate to section 210E and various lines of 210F, and deal with the question of reasonable cause to search, and the removal of the definition 'seized property' for the purposes of what we are requiring. In short, that is to ensure that the police have the same obligation in relation to search and seizure as they do otherwise under the Summary Offences Act for all the reasons I have outlined.

Amendments negated; clause passed.

Schedule and title passed.

Bill reported without amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:11): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

LIQUOR LICENSING (LIQUOR REVIEW) AMENDMENT 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 22, page 26, line 8 [clause 22, inserted section 40(8)(e)]—Delete '3 years' and substitute '5 years'

No. 2. Clause 26, page 27, lines 25 to 35—Delete the clause

No. 3. New clause, page 37, after line 4—Insert:

51A—Amendment of section 69—Extension of trading area

(1) Section 69(3)—delete 'An' and substitute:

Subject to subsection (4), an

(2) Section 69—after subsection (3) insert:

(4) If the licensing authority considers that a council is unreasonably withholding its consent or approval for the purposes of subsection (3)(d) or (e) in relation to a prescribed application, the licensing authority may grant an authorisation under this section in respect of the prescribed application without the council's consent or approval (as the case requires).

(5) In this section—

Adelaide CBD means the area of the City of Adelaide bounded—

(a) on the north by the northern bank of the River Torrens; and

(b) on the south by the northern alignment of South Terrace; and

(c) on the east by the western alignment of East Terrace and its prolongation north to the northern bank of the River Torrens; and

(d) on the west by the eastern alignment of West Terrace and its prolongation north to the northern bank of the River Torrens,

but does not include an area in the City of Adelaide determined by the Commissioner, by notice in the Gazette, not to be part of the Adelaide CBD for the purposes of this section;

prescribed application means an application relating to a relevant place that is in a prescribed area;

prescribed area means—

(a) the Adelaide CBD; and

(b) any other area determined by the Commissioner, by notice in the Gazette, to be a prescribed area for the purposes of this section.

No. 4. Clause 72, page 49, line 37 [clause 72, inserted section 110A(6), definition of *prescribed place*, (a)]—Delete 'public place; or' and substitute 'public place, other than—'

(i) a public place of a kind referred to in paragraph (d) of the definition of *regulated premises* in section 4; or

(ii) any other public place, or kind of public place, declared by regulation not to be a prescribed place; or

No. 5. Clause 95, page 62, line 36 to page 63, line 3 [clause 95, inserted section 135A]—Delete inserted section 135A

No. 6. Clause 98, page 64, lines 29 to 32 [clause 98(1), inserted subsection (1b)]—Delete inserted subsection (1b)

No. 7. Clause 98, page 64, after line 34 [clause 98, after subclause (2)]—Insert:

(2a) Section 138—after subsection (2a) insert:

- (2b) A regulation required to be laid before each House of Parliament in accordance with the *Subordinate Legislation Act 1978* that prescribes fees for the purposes of this Act may not prescribe or provide for any matter that is not prescribed in connection with such fees.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I indicate that whilst there are a couple of aspects of the returned bill which are deeply regrettable—in particular and most significantly the requirement that there should be a break in trade at some point in time to enable people the opportunity of sobering up—overall, were I to dwell upon that, I would not see the sunshine elsewhere. I think we always have to look for the sunshine rather than look at the rainclouds. I am going to look at the sunshine and say I will accept.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate, from the opposition's point of view, that we welcome the return of the bill with the amendments and thank those in another place for their contribution in the debates for the improvement of the reforms in relation to this area. I like sunlight, too; it is a great disinfectant. It is a pity the government did not exercise it more often in relation to the transparency of their government. Nevertheless, we are pleased to note that the government have recognised the significance of the reforms that need to pass this parliament with improvement.

Motion carried.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (SACAT NO 2) 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. New clause, page 43, after line 11—After clause 125 insert:

125A—Amendment of section 11BA—Commissioner may suspend or impose conditions on registration in urgent circumstances

Section 11BA(4) to (8) (inclusive)—delete subsections (4) to (8) and substitute:

- (4) A person whose registration is suspended or made subject to conditions under this section may seek a review by the Tribunal under section 34 of the *South Australian Civil and Administrative Tribunal Act 2013* of the decision of the Commissioner to suspend the registration (including the period of the suspension) or to impose the conditions.
- (5) Subject to subsection (7), an application for review must be made to the Tribunal within 1 month after the making of the relevant decision.
- (6) The Commissioner must, if so required by the person, state in writing the reasons for the Commissioner's decision.
- (7) If the reasons of the Commissioner are not given in writing at the time of making the decision and the person (within 1 month of the making of the decision) requires the Commissioner to state the reasons in writing, the time for making an application for review runs from the time at which the person receives the written statement of those reasons.

No. 2. Clause 219, page 69, lines 30 to 37 [clause 219(1)]—Delete subclause (1) and substitute:

- (1) A right of appeal under section 10, 14 or 42 of the principal Act in existence (but not yet exercised) before the relevant day, will be exercised as if this Part had been in operation before the right arose, so that the relevant proceedings may be commenced before the Tribunal rather than the Administrative and Disciplinary Division of the District Court.

Consideration in committee.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

That the Legislative Council's amendments be agreed to.

I just wanted to say that it is not always that the other place is not helpful, and this may well be one of those occasions.

Ms CHAPMAN: I indicate that the opposition supports the return of the bill with amendments and welcomes that.

Motion carried.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CHILDREN AND VULNERABLE ADULTS) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading.

(Continued from 28 September 2017.)

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:18): In this case, we, the opposition, indicate our support for the bill and so I will be brief. We may need to look at some amendments in another place. We have not had extensive consultation with others, and we appreciate that we may only have six sitting days left, so we are trying to hastily deal with as many of these bills as possible to accommodate the government's agenda. Where they are good, obviously we want to ensure that that is followed.

This was a bill introduced at the end of September by the Attorney to provide some extra protections under our law for vulnerable people, and largely that is children and vulnerable adults, as they are defined. The amendments relate to the offences of criminal liability being introduced for carers of children under 16 and vulnerable adults and the increasing of penalties. There is some clarification in relation to serious harm, which we think is necessary. We accept that as has been presented. In addition to that, there are some foreshadowed amendments, which I have had a brief look at this morning, and I thank the Attorney for bringing the matter to our attention. Essentially, they look in order. I will ask him to place on the record the reason for the amendments, and if there is any issue we undertake to let the government know before it is dealt with in the other place.

In relation to this bill, the government have outlined that there are a number of cases reported to police and the DPP over the last few years that have not been prosecuted or, indeed, have been withdrawn. The victims have not died, but, for example, they have had multiple broken legs, arms, ribs, etc., and healed quickly, particularly the children. Most of us understand the significance there—if you break a leg when you are 85, it is a pretty serious problem; when you break a leg when you are six, you might have a greenstick fracture and it may heal very quickly. The victims may miss out on being recognised through a prosecution process but, although they have had those serious injuries, they have not necessarily been protracted.

Child Protection Services in SA have also raised these concerns. We need to remedy it. We are here to assist in the swift passage of the legislation to do that. It is concerning to us that the government introduced this bill without any consultation, other than with its own advisers or departments; nevertheless, we accept that it needs to be remedied. If there are any matters that come to light, as I have indicated, we will follow them up between the houses.

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:21): Can I thank the deputy leader for her indication of support, and I note that she will reserve her position if there is some matter of detail that needs to be worked out. I indicate my availability, obviously, to discuss matters further with her. Rather than consume a lot of time in the second reading or the committee stage, can I just indicate very briefly there is a raft of amendments, which have just been filed in my name, to this bill.

I mentioned this earlier in the day to the deputy leader, but I will just put it on the record. One of the issues has been the terminology 'serious harm'. That is a threshold question, as to whether the harm is serious or not. The way the bill was shaping up originally, it was going to have three categories basically: there would be death (which is obviously very serious), serious harm and harm.

The problem is that the line between harm and serious harm, unlike the line between death and harm, is not clear.

Lawyers being what they are, there is ample opportunity for people to in effect litigate the substance of whether or not the particular injury the child is presenting with—children in particular—constitutes harm or serious harm, and that will have consequences for which charge applies. It may result in these absurd situations where somebody is charged with a particular offence and for technical reasons that offence is not proven because it is 'serious harm' rather than 'harm', and then the perversity of the circumstances results in their not being actually convicted of anything, which is just not acceptable.

I have discussed this with the Director of Public Prosecutions. He, for various reasons, I can inform the parliament, would still like to have the stratification between death, serious harm and harm. I disagree with him. I disagree with him because in my opinion it is far better to have simply 'death' as one set of problems, which are pretty clear—death is final and easily ascertainable as a matter of fact eventually—and to get rid of the stratification between 'harm' and 'serious harm', so that it is just 'harm'.

We put 'harm' in there with a maximum penalty of 15 years, and then we say to each judge who hears each case, 'You work it out. The worst you could possibly have in 'harm' warrants 15 years. You work out how badly you think this child was treated and you give it a number somewhere between zero and 15 years.' I know that there are some who say that does not give sufficient guidance to the courts, and I realise that is a risk. But there is also a risk in stratifying this into little subsets all the time—serious harm, harm, not very serious harm, very very serious harm and so on.

The amendments I have put in are to simplify the rules to make it very clear that if a child dies, that is one circumstance; if a child is harmed, that is another; and the prosecution would be able to lead evidence of the circumstances of the injuries, the nature of the injuries, and it would be a matter for the judge to determine what the appropriate response was having regard to the proven evidence. That is where those amendments are going. I think it is simpler, it is clearer and it will mean that we will be able to prosecute cases without having to worry about technical defences based on which tier of harm we are talking about.

Bill read a second time.

Committee Stage

In committee.

Clauses 1 to 3 passed.

Clause 4.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Amendment No 1 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 2, line 14—Delete ' , ill treatment'

Amendment carried; clause passed.

Clause 5.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Amendment No 2 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 3, lines 17 to 20 [clause 5, inserted section 13B(1), definition of *unlawful*] —

Delete the definition of *unlawful*

Amendment No 3 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 3, line 25 [clause 5, inserted section 13B(2)]—Delete 'subsections (3) and (4)' and substitute:
subsection (3)

Amendment No 4 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 3, line 28 [clause 5, inserted section 13B(2)(c)]—Delete paragraph (c)

Amendment No 5 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 3, line 33 to page 4, line 3 [clause 5, inserted section 13B(4)]—Delete inserted subsection (4)

Amendments carried; clause passed.

Clause 6.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Amendment No 6 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 4, lines 8 to 11 [clause 6(1) and (2)]—Delete subclauses (1) and (2) and substitute:

- (1) Section 14—delete 'serious harm' wherever occurring and substitute in each case:
harm
- (2) Section 14—delete 'unlawful' wherever occurring
- (2a) Section 14(1), penalty provision—delete the penalty provision and substitute:
Maximum penalty:
 - (a) where the victim dies—imprisonment for life; or
 - (b) in any other case—imprisonment for 15 years.

Amendment No 7 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 4, line 12 [clause 6(3)]—After 'delete subsections (3) and (4)' insert:

and substitute:

- (3) If a defendant is charged with an offence against this section in respect of a course of conduct—
 - (a) it is not necessary to prove that the defendant was, or ought to have been, aware that there was an appreciable risk that harm would be caused to the victim by each act making up the course of conduct; and
 - (b) the information need not—
 - (i) allege particulars of each act with the degree of particularity that would be required if the act were charged as an offence under a different section of this or any other Act; or
 - (ii) identify particular acts or the occasions on which, places at which or order in which acts occurred; or
 - (iii) identify particular acts as causing, wholly or partly, particular harm to the child.
- (4) A defendant may be charged with an offence against this section in respect of a course of conduct even if some of the acts making up the course of conduct occurred before the commencement of this section.

Amendments carried; clause passed.

Clause 7.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Amendment No 8 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 4, line 15 to page 5, line 23 [clause 7, inserted section 14A]—Delete inserted section 14A

Amendment carried; clause passed.

Clause 8.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I move:

Amendment No 9 [DepPrem-1]—

Page 5, line 32 to page 6, line 3—Delete clause 8

Clause negatived.

Remaining clause (9) and title passed.

Bill reported with amendment.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:29): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

I would like to thank in particular the deputy leader for her assistance with that matter.

Bill read a third time and passed.

Parliamentary Procedure

STANDING ORDERS SUSPENSION

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:29): I move:

That standing orders be and remain so far suspended as to enable, first of all, Private Members Business, Notices of Motion, No. 10, set down on the *Notice Paper* for Thursday 16 November, take precedence over government business at 5.40pm today, and the introduction of a bill without notice forthwith and passage through all stages without delay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: There not being an absolute majority present, ring the bells.

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

Motion carried.

Bills

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION LAW REFORM (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND RELATED AMENDMENTS) BILL

Introduction and First Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:33): Obtained leave and introduced a bill for an act to make transitional arrangements and related amendments to various acts consequent upon the enactment of the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016, the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016 and the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017. Read a first time.

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (12:34): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I seek leave to insert the second reading and explanation of clauses in *Hansard* without my reading it.

Leave granted.

The Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Bill 2017 (the Bill) makes the transitional arrangements and consequential amendments necessary to commence the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016* (the Prohibited Persons Act) and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* (the Safety Act). Neither the Safety nor Prohibited Persons Acts include transitional arrangements or consequential amendments to existing legislation. Therefore, before these two Acts can commence, further legislation must be passed.

The Prohibited Persons Act will strengthen background checks for people wanting to work or volunteer with children under 18 years old. It creates a stronger legislative scheme, ensuring that a person who is assessed as being of high risk to the safety of children will be prohibited from working or volunteering with them, and that it is an offence to allow this to occur. The Prohibited Persons Act will also eliminate the current two-tiered arrangement, whereby some organisations relied on a National Criminal History Check instead of a check undertaken through the Department for Communities and Social Inclusion's Screening Unit (the DCSI SU).

The Safety Act will provide the necessary powers for the Chief Executive of the Department for Child Protection (the DCP) to protect children and young people from harm and to make provision for the alternative care of children and young people under the custody or guardianship of the Chief Executive, amongst other measures. Once commenced, the Safety Act will repeal the *Children's Protection Act 1993* (the CP Act). The Bill also provides an opportunity to make a number of refinements to the Safety Act at the request of the DCP.

To support the commencement of the Prohibited Persons Act, the Bill provides for transitional arrangements whereby a DCSI SU screening will be recognised as a working with children check under the Prohibited Persons Act for a period of three years from the date it was done. This approach is supported by the recent initiative whereby persons who have undertaken a DCSI SU screening check are subjected to continuous monitoring, so that criminal convictions and child protection data is matched on a daily basis to the DCSI SU database. This recognition does not preclude the prescribed screening unit (the DCSI SU) from undertaking a working with children check and from finding the person to be a 'prohibited person' but it will mean that that a person who has had a DCSI SU screen is not required to re-apply for a working with children check until three years from the date of the DCSI SU screen.

People in the community who currently rely on a criminal history check to volunteer or work with children will also be actively encouraged to obtain a DCSI SU screen prior to the commencement of the Bill.

The registration of teachers is undertaken via the *Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004* (the TRS Act) by the Teachers Registration Board (the TRB).

In order to be employed as a teacher, a person must be registered under the TRS Act. The Bill makes amendments to require any person wanting to be registered as a teacher to have undertaken a working with children check and not be a prohibited person. However, in order to stagger the need for registered teachers to undertake a working with children check, this requirement will only apply at the time that a person applies for registration the first time or is renewing their registration, with registration occurs every three years.

Similar transitional arrangements have been put in place for the other persons, who will not be required to undertake a working with children check on commencement, but will be able to rely on a current criminal history check for a period of 3 years or until their accreditation or registration expires, including:

- persons who are employed in a children's services centre under the *Children's Services Act 1985*;
- registered health practitioners as defined under the Health Practitioner Regulation National Law (South Australia);
- employees in training centres established under the *Family and Community Services Act 1972* (the FACS Act) or the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*;
- persons who are the holder of a current accreditation for a passenger transport service operated by the person granted under section 27 of the *Passenger Transport Act 1994*, the holder of a current accreditation for a driver of a public passenger vehicle granted under section 28 of the *Passenger Transport Act 1994* or the holder of a current accreditation for an operator of a centralised booking service granted under section 29 of the *Passenger Transport Act 1994*.

To support the commencement of the Safety Act, a number of transitional provisions are required.

As mentioned, a number of refinements are proposed to the Safety Act in the Bill, in addition to related amendments to other Acts, for reasons I will now explain.

The Bill amends the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996* (the BDMR Act) by inserting a new provision which will apply specifically to children and young people under the guardianship of the Chief Executive of the DCP. Section 25 of the BDMR Act sets out how parents can apply to register a change of a child's name. Currently under section 25 of the BDMR, parents may apply to the Registrar if:

- (a) the child's birth is registered in the State; or
- (b) (i) the child was born outside Australia; and
- (ii) the child's birth is not registered in another State or Territory; and

(iii) the child has been resident in the State for at least 12 consecutive months immediately before the date of the application.

Section 25(2) of the BDMR Act prescribes the grounds for changing a child's name if there is only one parent provided that:

- (a) the applicant is the sole parent named in the registration of the child's birth under this Act or any other law; or
- (b) there is no other surviving parent of the child; or
- (c) the Court approves the proposed change of name.

Section 25(3) of the BDMR Act states that the Court may, on application by a child's parent, approve a proposed change of name for the child if satisfied that the change is in the child's best interests.

The amendment in the Bill seeks to exclude the operation of section 25 of the BDMR Act and establishes a separate scheme for children and young people under the guardianship of the Chief Executive. I am advised that this amendment is necessary as the current provisions of the Safety Act (yet to commence operation) and the CP Act are ambiguous in relation to whether the Minister or the Chief Executive can make such an application and whether the Court has power to make such an order.

I am advised by the DCP that children and young people under guardianship of the Minister and/or their long term guardians or carers make a formal request of the DCP to change the child's name approximately twice a year. Typically, such a request is made by the child or young person in question (with the support of their guardian), who is aggrieved and saddened by the fact that they do not share the same surname as their guardian and the guardian's family unit. This amendment makes sense to further strengthen the existing measures that promote permanence and a sense of belonging for children and young people under long term guardianship.

The amendment to section 25 of the *Births Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996* proposes to equip the Chief Executive with an own motion power and/or upon application of the guardian or guardians of the child or young person to the Chief Executive to change the child's name. The Chief Executive may, by notice in writing, direct the Registrar to register a change of the name of a child in relation to whom the section applies. This is a discretionary power of the Chief Executive and when deciding whether to exercise this power by own motion or in response to an application by a guardian, the Chief Executive must consider it whether it is appropriate and in the best interests of the child to do so and must take reasonable steps to notify the parents of the proposed change of name; and have any regard to the any submission made by a parent of the child in respect of the proposed change of name. The same power will also be given to the Court, when considering long term guardianship applications to ensure this matter can be dealt with at the same time if required.

As mentioned, a number of refinements are proposed to the Safety Act in the Bill, which I will now explain. Section 107 of the Safety Act currently states that 'a person must not be employed in a licensed children's residential facility unless the person has undergone a psychological or psychometric assessment of a kind determined by the Chief Executive.' Contravention of section 107 of the Safety Act by an individual or employer attracts a significant monetary penalty.

Pursuant to section 103(d) of the Safety Act, a residential facility or a training centre established by the Minister pursuant to section 36 of the FACS Act is expressly excluded from the definition of 'children's residential facility' set out in section 103 of the Safety Act, thereby omitting these staff from the scope of such testing. To correct this inconsistency, a new provision is required to be added to the Safety Act to capture persons employed in a residential care facility established by the Minister under section 36 of the FACS Act and to make it an offence to employ a person without having undergone such testing. A mirror provision is proposed to be inserted into the *Youth Justice Act 2016*, to capture persons employed in training centres, where a number of young people under the guardianship of the Minister are also detained..

Another reform measure contained in the Bill is to clarify that that once a long term guardianship order is made pursuant to sections 89 to 91 of the Safety Act, a long term guardian will not be subject to the requirement to obtain a WWCC. This amendment has been drafted to ensure that an exemption from a WWCC is tied to a prescribed child only, so that if the said child leaves the care of that guardian and assumes care of another child under the guardianship of the Chief Executive, a WWCC will again be required.

One of the consequential amendments of the Bill is to delete section 74 of the FACS Act, a provision addressing assistance to persons caring for children, as a result of this matter being dealt with at 112 of the Safety Act. Since the passage of the Safety Act, some have expressed concern that s112 of the Safety Act is not broad enough to capture the breadth of payments made currently by the DCP to support children and young people, which includes carers continuing to care for children who are 18 and over for example. The Bill corrects this.

Another amendment is required to section 164 of the Safety Act, which addresses confidentiality for persons engaged or formerly engaged in the administration, operation or enforcement of the Safety Act. It is proposed to amend section 164 to include an exception which allows the Chief Executive to authorise disclosure of personal information.

A final amendment to the Safety Act concerns liability. As the Safety Act does not contain a provision providing blanket immunity to the Crown, there is a possible argument that the Crown would nevertheless be

vicariously liable for the negligent acts of an employee who is responsible for the operation, enforcement or administration of the Safety Act. In order to mitigate this, the Bill amends section 58 of the Safety Act to expressly prescribe that no liability in tort attaches to the Crown, the Minister, the Chief Executive or any other employees of the Department.

Finally, the Commonwealth has identified that the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006* requires amendment to capture four Commonwealth offences related to child exploitation material, namely section 233BAB of the *Customs Act 1901* (Cth) and sections 273.5 to 273.7 (inclusive) of the *Criminal Code Act 1995* (Cth).

I commend the Bill to Members.

Explanation of Clauses

Part 1—Preliminary

1—Short title

2—Commencement

3—Amendment provisions

These clauses are formal.

4—Interpretation

This clause defines terms used in the measure.

Part 2—Transitional provisions relating to *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*

5—Interpretation

6—Expiry of Part

7—Certain applications for assessments of relevant history taken to be application for working with children check

8—Recognition of certain assessments of relevant history as working with children checks

9—Transitional provisions—teachers

10—Transitional provisions—persons employed under Children's Services Act 1985

11—Transitional provisions—health practitioners

12—Transitional provisions—foster parents

13—Transitional provisions—licensed foster care agencies

14—Transitional provisions—licensed children's residential facilities

15—Transitional provisions—employees in training centres etc

16—Transitional provisions—passenger transport services

17—Evidentiary provision

These clauses make transitional provisions in respect of the commencement of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*.

Part 3—Transitional provisions relating to *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016*

18—Interpretation

19—Expiry of Part

20—Continuation of members of Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee

21—Continuation of chair as presiding member

These clauses make transitional provisions in respect of the commencement of the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016*.

Part 4—Transitional provisions relating to *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*

22—Interpretation

23—References to working with children checks and the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016* etc

24—Chief Executive to be guardian of certain children and young people

25—Chief Executive to have custody of certain children and young people

26—Continuation of voluntary custody agreements

- 27—Continuation of approved foster parents as approved carers
- 28—Continuation of licensed foster care agencies
- 29—Continuation of licence to maintain children's residential facilities
- 30—Notifications of abuse or neglect and investigations etc under repealed Act to continue
- 31—Continuation of family care meetings under repealed Act
- 32—Orders relating to access to child or young person to continue as determination of Chief Executive
- 33—Continuation of certain delegations under Family and Community Services Act 1972
- 34—References to Families SA
- 35—Application of Chapter 7 Part 8 of Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 to certain children and young people
- 36—Certain policies and procedures taken to satisfy Chapter 8 of Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017
- 37—Certain persons the subject of interim registration taken to be approved carers under Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017
- 38—Certain commercial carers taken to be approved carers under Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017

These clauses make transitional provisions in respect of the commencement of the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 5—Amendment of *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996*

- 39—Amendment of section 25—Application to register change of child's name
- 40—Insertion of section 25A
- 41—Amendment of section 38A—Notification by court appointed guardians

These clauses make related amendments to the *Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act 1996* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 6—Amendment of *Carers Recognition Act 2005*

- 42—Amendment of section 5—Meaning of carer

This clause makes a related amendment to the *Carers Recognition Act 2005* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 7—Amendment of *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*

- 43—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation
- 44—Amendment of section 8—Meaning of assessable information

These clauses make related amendments to the consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 8—Amendment of *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006*

- 45—Amendment of Schedule 1—Class 1 and 2 offences

This clause makes a related amendment to the *Child Sex Offenders Registration Act 2006* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 9—Amendment of *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016*

- 46—Insertion of section 13A
- 47—Amendment of section 26—Functions and powers of Guardian
- 48—Amendment of section 37—Functions of the Committee

These clauses make related amendments to the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 10—Amendment of *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*

- 49—Amendment of section 28—Chief Executive to prepare case plan in respect of certain children and young people
- 50—Amendment of section 32—Chief Executive must assess and take action on each report indicating child or young person may be at risk
- 51—Amendment of section 33—Chief Executive may refer matter
- 52—Amendment of section 53—Orders that can be made by Court
- 53—Amendment of section 90—Long-term care plan to be prepared
- 54—Amendment of section 103—Interpretation
- 55—Insertion of Chapter 7 Part 7A
- 56—Insertion of section 112A
- 57—Amendment of section 163—Protection of identity of persons who report to or notify Department
- 58—Insertion of section 166A
- 59—Amendment of section 170—Regulations
- 60—Amendment of Schedule 1—Repeal and related amendment

These clauses make related amendments to the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 11—Amendment of *Coroners Act 2003*

- 61—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

This clause makes a related amendment to the *Coroners Act 2003* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 12—Amendment of *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935*

- 62—Amendment of section 5—Interpretation
- 63—Amendment of section 49—Unlawful sexual intercourse
- 64—Amendment of section 50—Persistent sexual exploitation of a child
- 65—Amendment of section 57—Consent no defence in certain cases
- 66—Amendment of section 63B—Procuring child to commit indecent act etc

These clauses make related amendments to the *Criminal Law Consolidation Act 1935* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 13—Amendment of *Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011*

- 67—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation
- 68—Amendment of section 13—Meaning of certain terms in Education and Care Services National Law (South Australia) for the purposes of this jurisdiction
- 69—Insertion of section 13A
- 70—Amendment of section 22—Composition of Board
- 71—Amendment section 23—Conditions of membership
- 72—Amendment of section 27—Registrars of Board
- 73—Amendment of section 28—Staff of Board

These clauses make related amendments to the *Education and Early Childhood Services (Registration and Standards) Act 2011* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 14—Amendment of *Family and Community Services Act 1972*

- 74—Amendment of section 6—Interpretation
- 75—Amendment of section 8—Delegation
- 76—Repeal of Part 2 Division 3

- 77—Repeal of Part 2 Division 5
- 78—Amendment of section 23—Special welfare funds
- 79—Amendment of section 36—Establishment of facilities and programmes for children
- 80—Repeal of Part 4 Division 2 Subdivision 3
- 81—Repeal of Part 4 Division 2 Subdivision 4
- 82—Repeal of Part 4 Division 2 Subdivision 8
- 83—Amendment of section 98—Liability of near relatives for maintenance of child
- 84—Amendment of section 99—Issue of summons for maintenance
- 85—Amendment of section 104—Order for payment of preliminary expenses
- 86—Amendment of section 105—Where order made during pregnancy
- 87—Amendment of section 111—Power of Chief Executive to accept settlement in full
- 88—Amendment of section 117—Order for payment of medical and like expenses
- 89—Amendment of section 142—Evidentiary provision
- 90—Amendment of section 145—Variation of order against near relative of child
- 91—Amendment of section 151—Orders may direct mode of payment
- 92—Amendment of section 156—Order for delivery of attached property
- 93—Amendment of section 158—Liability of persons contravening order
- 94—Amendment of section 159—Collection by police of money due to Chief Executive
- 95—Amendment of section 160—Caveats
- 96—Amendment of section 161—Warrant to enforce payments under orders
- 97—Amendment of section 163—Sale under warrant
- 98—Amendment of section 164—Assurances to purchaser
- 99—Amendment of section 165—Issue of warrant without previous demand
- 100—Amendment of section 166—Effect of payment under warrant
- 101—Amendment of section 176—Application for attachment of earnings order
- 102—Amendment of section 177—Employer to make payments under order
- 103—Amendment of section 179—Discharge, suspension or variation of order
- 104—Amendment of section 180—Cessation of attachment of earnings order
- 105—Amendment of section 183—Notice to defendants of payments made
- 106—Amendment of section 189—Payments by Crown etc
- 107—Amendment of section 195—Proof of payment or non-payment under maintenance order
- 108—Amendment of section 197—Collector of Maintenance, Deputy Collector of Maintenance and Assistant Collectors of Maintenance
- 109—Repeal of section 236
- 110—Amendment of section 236A—Hindering a person in execution of duty
- 111—Amendment of section 240—Evidentiary provision
- 112—Amendment of section 242—Chief Executive may require report
- 113—Repeal of section 250
- 114—Repeal of section 250A
- 115—Amendment of section 251—Regulations

These clauses make related amendments to the *Family and Community Services Act 1972* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 15—Amendment of *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009*

116—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

117—Amendment of section 10—Principles for intervention against abuse

118—Amendment of section 16—Inconsistent Family Law Act or State child protection orders

119—Amendment of section 20—Application to Court for intervention order

120—Amendment of section 23—Determination of application for intervention order

121—Amendment of section 26—Intervention orders

These clauses make related amendments to the *Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 16—Amendment of *Mental Health Act 2009*

122—Amendment of section 86—Minister's functions

This clause makes a related amendment to the *Mental Health Act 2009* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 17—Amendment of *Residential Tenancies Act 1995*

123—Amendment of section 89A—Termination based on domestic abuse

124—Amendment of section 105UA—Termination based on abuse of rooming house resident

125—Amendment of section 112—Restraining orders

These clauses make related amendments to the *Residential Tenancies Act 1995* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 18—Amendment of *Spent Convictions Act 2009*

126—Amendment of clause 13—Exclusions

127—Amendment of clause 13A—Exclusions may not apply

128—Amendment of Schedule 2—Provisions relating to proceedings before a qualified magistrate

These clauses make related amendments to the *Spent Convictions Act 2009* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 19—Amendment of *Summary Offences Act 1953*

129—Substitution of section 66V

This clause makes a related amendment to the *Summary Offences Act 1953* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 20—Amendment of *Summary Procedure Act 1921*

130—Amendment of section 99AAC—Child protection restraining orders

131—Amendment of section 99KA—Special restrictions relating to child protection restraining order proceedings

These clauses make related amendments to the *Summary Procedure Act 1921* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 21—Amendment of *Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004*

132—Amendment of section 3—Interpretation

133—Amendment of section 9—Membership of Teachers Registration Board

134—Amendment of section 10—Terms and conditions of membership

135—Amendment of section 21—Eligibility for registration

136—Amendment of section 22—Application for registration

- 137—Amendment of section 24—Conditions of registration
- 138—Insertion of section 24A
- 139—Amendment of section 28—Register
- 140—Amendment of section 30—Special authority for unregistered person to teach
- 141—Amendment of section 31—Register
- 142—Amendment of section 33—Cause for disciplinary action
- 143—Insertion of section 33A
- 144—Amendment of section 37—Employer to report dismissal
- 145—Insertion of section 52A
- 146—Amendment of section 61—Regulations

These clauses make related amendments to the *Teachers Registration and Standards Act 2004* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 22—Amendment of *Youth Court Act 1993*

- 147—Amendment of section 7—Jurisdiction

This clause makes a related amendment to the *Youth Court Act 1993* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Part 23—Amendment of *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016*

- 148—Amendment of section 3—Objects and guiding principles
- 149—Amendment of section 4—Interpretation
- 150—Amendment of section 10—Official visitors
- 151—Amendment of section 14—Training Centre Visitor's functions
- 152—Amendment of section 43—Community programs
- 153—Insertion of section 21A

These clauses make related amendments to the *Youth Justice Administration Act 2016* consequent upon the enactment of the *Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016*, the *Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016* and the *Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017*.

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (12:34): I rise to speak on the Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Bill 2017. Essentially, the government requested a meeting yesterday to advise that they would seek to introduce this bill and further undertake procedural orders, as we have just done, to progress it through the House of Assembly forthwith on the basis that, firstly, we have somewhere between six and nine days left of parliamentary sitting for this session and, secondly, it is necessary to pass this legislation to give sufficient workable operation to primary legislation that has been passed in respect of child protection and child safety in the preceding few years. For that reason, we note some urgency if the bill is to have an application that is of some benefit to children as soon as practicable.

I thank those advisers in the Attorney-General's Department who attended yesterday's meeting for the information on a number of transitional matters, but, as we would expect with the government, of course, there are many more amendments that they want to progress from their perspective to make improvements to the legislation. Some we do not necessarily accept as urgent, but, obviously to deal with other aspects, they seek to have them included.

Our party room has not yet seen any advice as to the detail of the bill. The reason for this bill coming in has been explained to them. It is always disappointing to us, obviously, when governments seek that matters be dealt with on the run, but we accept that there may well be some delay in application otherwise and, therefore, we think it is prudent to acquiesce to the government's request on the clear notice that we will consider this matter in more detail over the next week. Now that I have the government's formal detail as to the reason for each of the amendments and the transitional provisions, we will examine those, but there are a few aspects I wish to address while we are here.

The first is part 2, which contains the transitional provisions relating to the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act 2016. Essentially, clauses 5 to 17 in this part, we are told, are designed to allow a staggering of the working with children checks. This is the new description to apply to the procedure that people need to undertake when they are working with children or before they can lawfully commence their employment. This is essentially to be able to deal with the fact that DCSI (Department for Communities and Social Inclusion) is already swamped with the check procedures necessary for people seeking employment and those who are doing volunteer work and the like.

In support of the government, over the years we have set up a process to identify or better identify, as a precautionary measure, and ensure that, where possible, children who may be exposed to someone in a working environment—a local school camp or the like—or volunteers, are protected. This is one measure whereby we can do that. What has been shamefully ignored by the government is that, when you set these rules up and make it a comprehensive application, it actually requires a significant amount of resources.

We have been very disappointed with the government's desire to come in here and make the legislative reform but not actually provide the services to ensure that there is a timely approval of these types of processes to ensure that volunteers do not get bored, in the sense of too lengthy a period of time to be properly processed, and go off and find some other activity. In a voluntary situation, you might lose that person. Even worse off still are people who want to commence employment. They cannot hang around for weeks or months. They have to get on and get some work. The process is unreasonably delayed and they therefore miss out on the opportunity of that employment.

I think the government has to understand that when you go out and make grand statements about protecting children, which we are happy to support, you have to make sure that you put the resources behind it in order for it to happen. Nevertheless, we know that there is a huge backlog, and the whole purpose of these transitional provisions is to allow the government to progressively introduce the new regime up to a period of three years.

Obviously, the logical question from us was: in the meantime, how do you protect those children who are in an environment where we are relying on the old system for their protection? The answer essentially from the government is that there will still be a continual monitoring on a daily data exchange basis. That works on the basis that if somebody is convicted of an offence which may interrupt their capacity to be able to lawfully undertake employment with children, that data is transferred on a daily basis to the relevant unit and they can then notify the employer and set in place a process where there will be a termination or at least a suspension of their employment, and some action can be taken.

We note with some reassurance that that is the general objective, to still be able to protect children while the government gets its act together and makes sure that there is some process. As usual, the government has not consulted anybody other than the Teachers Registration Board, or the Department for Health, or the Department for Child Protection, or the Department of Transport in relation to these areas of employment that are covered—teachers, health practitioners, passenger transport services, etc.

That is always disappointing because the government has to understand that government departments are not the reservoirs of all information, and they are certainly not the repositories of all things that are relevant to this type of reform. It is important that they consult with agencies that deal with children in vulnerable situations—the NGOs and the like. I just do not understand why it is that if legislation passed last year needed transitional provisions—and we are a year or so down the track—that at the very least other agencies have not had a chance to consult about this.

Obviously, because the government are now facing an embarrassing situation near the end of the legislative and calendar year, they have to progress this. We are not here to hold that up, but I make the point that they need to get their act together. They need to understand that they do not know everything in government and that there are other people who can make a sensible contribution to the development of legislation and ought to have an opportunity to do so. As best we can, we will obviously have a look at that in the meantime.

Part 3 relates to transitional provisions relating to the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016. I almost choked when I saw that in this bill—almost choked—because the government say, 'Look, we need to have a continuation of term of office of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee and the continuation of the chair.' Absolutely—if, in fact, this bill was even operational at all.

As the government well know, after we had had a very long legislative debate (three years in fact) dealing with the question of the appointment of a commissioner for children and young people, with investigative powers—which was the sticking point over a number of years, notwithstanding that Commissioner Nyland and every other body that was relevant to this issue across the care and protection of children had strongly recommended it—the government resisted it to the eleventh hour. Ultimately, when the legislation passed in November last year it proclaimed that almost every operative part of that bill would be suspended.

I almost choked with laughter when I saw that we needed this transitional amendment to be able to get on with that legislation. Well, they have taken a year and still they do not have the regulations in place. Remember that the bill we are talking about, which now has to have these transitional provisions, provided for the appointment of a children's commissioner. Just about every other state in the country has one, so why we needed to take a year to do the regulations is totally beyond me. I will come to what the minister said here in the house.

I am not sure that the Attorney-General was actually available to listen to her answers to questions a week or so ago on this matter, and we are aware that he was attending to some other matters. Of course, they are always available, we recognise that, and I do not in any way make adverse comment on whether he might have been otherwise engaged at the time these particular questions were asked.

The government's excuses for the delay in the implementation of the bill—and, in fact, the reprehensible action of suspending almost every operative part of this act for which they now want a transitional clause—are utterly disgusting, especially when the parliament had made a decision about what should happen not just in the appointment but in the reform of areas of responsibility for the Guardian for Children, for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee (for which they now want to ensure a transitional clause for the continuation of the membership of that committee until their term of appointment has terminated under the current act and the legislation that was to be then redundant) and for an upgrading in relation to a council for children, which I think they were going to give another name. In any event, the substantive legislation of that act, passed over a year ago, has been suspended.

One of the most contemptible aspects—other than in relation to the Commissioner for Children and Young People, which has been almost everything other than her appointment (it happens to be 'her' now that they have been appointed) and their power to have staff and resources and employees and delegation of powers, and they have absolutely no powers to do anything else which this parliament has vested them with—of the proclamation to suspend the operation of this act was to suspend the obligation of all the state authorities to seek to give effect to the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child. I cannot even understand why that is necessary.

I cannot understand why any state government that has signed up to the obligation of the United Nations convention that permeates other legislation would move to suspend it. It currently has an obligation under section 5:

Each State authority must, in carrying out its functions or exercising its powers, protect, respect and seek to give effect to the rights set out from time to time the United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child and any other relevant international human rights instruments affecting children and young people.

It is beyond belief. I am almost shocked into silence at the government's decision to suspend that provision.

Since then, I see that an early intervention bill has been tabled in another place to deal with prevention of harm to children. I cannot remember the full name of the bill, but they want to insert in it a very watered-down obligation in relation to the charter—and, again, I am disgusted at that—but nevertheless we will deal with that bill in due course. What is concerning to me is the government's decision to suspend the operation of this legislation.

It has been in prior legislation. It ought to be in the conversion into this principle bill of which we are being asked to do transitional clauses today, and it has not been. So far, we have had no satisfactory explanation from the government as to why they would suspend their commitment to that obligation, and I am appalled by it. I am so appalled that I have written to the Australian Human Rights Commission, and I have raised this with them because I am so utterly disgusted at the government doing such a thing, to not honour that and not even have the decency to come to the parliament and tell us why they did it.

When the minister stood up here like a stunned possum in the spotlight the other day to tell us her pathetic excuses on some other matters, she did not even give an answer to it. She said, 'I haven't had a response. No, I have not had any requests from the human rights commissioner. I do not know anything about that.' I am so utterly disgusted. In the 15 years I have been here, I have never been so disgusted with the government's conduct in contempt of the parliament—never.

It is not going to go away. When I see a bill that has been raced into the parliament to deal with transitional clauses in an act of parliament that has been passed here a year ago, of which they have suspended almost every operative clause, I almost have to choke with indignation at the appalling gall of this government to ask us to do that when they have so disgracefully suspended its operation.

With that, I indicate that overall it is reasonable that we are going to upgrade the rights, obligations, powers and responsibility of the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee and the continuation of its chair, Ms Dymphna Eszenyi, who I think does an excellent job. Every year, I read the report and, sadly, about 100 people die in this state. About a third of them are known to welfare agencies. Some die tragically in swimming pool accidents and some have post-birth conditions. Some of them are preventable, in the sense of being accidental, and some children are murdered.

Very sadly, it is a committee that has to trawl through the records and identify whether there are areas of reform or protection that we can enact or whether there are resources that the government should contribute to try to ensure that where possible, where children die or have a serious injury, we do something to try to reduce that risk. Every year, when I read this report, they outline concerns they have about not even having enough resources to get into the list of serious injury. What we end up seeing are reports year after year, which came from the Layton inquiry, probably circa 2003, in which Robyn Layton QC recommended we have a committee of this standard.

Since its operation in around 2004, we get these annual reports and they do an assessment largely focused on the deaths of children because they do not even have enough resources to actually deal with serious injury. Nevertheless, they do a good job. We passed legislation, which was to upgrade their areas of responsibility and protection against interference and all sorts of things, in line with the Nyland inquiry. Obviously, we will be supporting the transition, but mark my words, I am not happy that, a year later, they have not been upgraded.

There are transitional positions in relation to the Children and Young People (Safety) Act 2017 and, again, we are talking about this whole question of working with children checks and the existing DCSI screening services to be able to then deal with the continuation in relation to voluntary custody arrangements, approved foster-parents, licensed foster care agencies, and the licensing continuation for those who are already in a children's residential facilities. The notification processes are to continue.

The family care meetings are to continue. Orders in relation to access to children that were the court's are now to be the chief executive's. There is the continuation of certain delegations under Families SA, certain policies and procedures to satisfy chapter 8, and also some interim registration and the continuation of certain commercial carers being approved carers. These are genuine transitional requirements, on my assessment of the briefing that has been provided, and I do not expect that there will be any issues with those.

Part 5 is the beginning of the amendments, in this case, to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. The government suddenly decided that they want to have provisions where children or a carer are able to make an application, reviewable via SACAT, to change the name of a child. I am told that they have a couple a year that come forward to seek negotiation with the Births, Deaths

and Marriages Registration Act. Under their procedure, they have the capacity at an administrative level to hear a request, be satisfied of certain things and grant them.

I do not yet have any detail as to whether that has ever been rejected. On the face of it, it does not appear to be, so I am not sure why it is necessary to introduce that. However, some information is to be provided and we will consider it in due course. The assessable information under part 7 adds in new offences and largely, as I understand it, it is to deal with areas of offence such as bestiality, which has accidentally been left out, and some child pornography and overseas offences which quite properly should be incorporated.

I refer to part 9, which is the amendment to the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act 2016. Most of the operations of this act have been suspended. In this case, they want to be able to deal with the functions and powers of the guardian. There is some material we will need to look at, including the reporting obligations. I am stunned to find that, here we are in mid-November, and we still have not had the report of this newly appointed Commissioner for Children and Young People for April, May and June of this year. She has obligations.

In this bill, the government are asking to bring the commissioner's reporting obligations to the parliament in line with others who report, which is usually in October each year. I think I am right in saying that under the commissioner's provisions she has to report by September; she wants to be in line with everyone else. That might be perfectly reasonable, but for goodness sake, it is November and we still have not seen a report. The commissioner has been operating with no powers of investigation—and not much else, actually. She has been working around the state, going to high schools and visiting and interviewing children, and she has raised an issue in relation to cyberbullying at one of the southern schools.

The commissioner is probably doing quite good work in that regard, but nothing like the extent of obligation and responsibility we invested in her within the act. In any event, if we need to be able to refine that for the purposes of the ultimate implementation of the principal act, ultimately the government can expect that they will have our support. Frankly, they should start complying with the rules that are already in place so that we make sure that we see the material that these people are obliged to produce.

The office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People has been operating since April. It has staff, it has an office and it has a website, which means there is the capacity to be able to tell us what they have been doing. When members look at this issue—which I am sure they will—I am sure some of them will be as disgusted as I am. When you go to the website, you will see the commitment to the obligation of the office of the Commissioner for Children and Young People to recognise United Nations Convention on the Rights of the Child.

It is disgraceful that the government has issued a proclamation to suspend the state authority's obligation on that, yet they parade a commitment to it across their website. I would be very interested to read the commissioner's report on what she and her staff have been doing over the past few months. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting suspended from 13:00 to 14:02.

ENVIRONMENT PROTECTION (WASTE REFORM) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

WORK HEALTH AND SAFETY (REPRESENTATIVE ASSISTANCE) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

CRIMINAL LAW CONSOLIDATION (CRIMINAL ORGANISATIONS) AMENDMENT BILL

Assent

His Excellency the Governor assented to the bill.

*Petitions***COOBER PEDY DISTRICT COUNCIL**

Mr HUGHES (Giles): Presented a petition signed by 169 residents of Coober Pedy and greater South Australia requesting the house to urge the government to take immediate action to replace the Coober Pedy Council with a public administrator.

*Parliamentary Procedure***ANSWERS TABLED**

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

PAPERS

The following papers were laid on the table:

By the Speaker—

Local Government Annual Reports—

Playford, City of 2016-17

Port Augusta City Council Annual Report 2016-17

Parliament of South Australia—Minutes of Joint Sitting of the Two Houses for the Choosing of a Senator to hold the place rendered vacant by the resignation of Senator Nicholas Xenophon

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

Remuneration Tribunal, Report and Determination of the—Conveyance Allowance—
Judges, Court Officers and Statutory Officers Report No. 9 of 2017

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Mutual Recognition (South Australia)—Temporary Exemption

Trans-Tasman Mutual Recognition (South Australia)—Temporary Exemption

By the Minister for The Arts (Hon. J.W. Weatherill)—

Country Arts SA—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Attorney-General (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Legal Services Commission of South Australia—Annual Report 2016-17

Public Advocate, Office of the—Annual Report 2016-17

Public Trustee—Annual Report 2016-17

South Australian Classification Council—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Planning (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Development Plan Amendment—Adelaide Hills Council Heritage Places (Stage 1),
Interim Operation Report

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Development—Miscellaneous No. 3

By the Minister for Industrial Relations (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Industrial Relations Court and Industrial Relations Commission—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for the Public Sector (Hon. J.R. Rau)—

Freedom of Information Act 1991—Administration of the Annual Report 2016-17

Regulations made under the following Acts—

Freedom of Information—Exempt Agency No. 4

By the Treasurer (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Essential Services Commission of South Australia—
Inquiry into the licensing arrangements for generators in South Australia Final
Report August 2017
Inquiry into the reliability and quality of electricity supply on the Eyre Peninsula
Final Report October 2017
Treasury and Finance, Department of—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Finance (Hon. A. Koutsantonis)—

Electricity Industry Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2016-17
SA Metropolitan Fire Service Superannuation Scheme—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries (Hon. L.W.K. Bignell)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Aquaculture—Fees No. 4

By the Minister for Education and Child Development (Hon. S.E. Close)—

Coast Protection Board—Annual Report 2016-17
Gawler Ranges National Park Co-management Advisory Committee—
Annual Report 2016--17
Native Vegetation Council—Annual Report 2016-17
Premier's Climate Change Council—Annual Report 2016-17
Stormwater Management Authority—Addendum Annual Report 2016-17

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

Across Government Asbestos Risk Reduction—Annual Report 2016-17

By the Minister for Police (Hon. C.J. Picton)—

Regulations made under the following Acts—
Controlled Substances—Miscellaneous

The Hon. A. Koutsantonis interjecting:

The SPEAKER: I call the Treasurer to order. The Deputy Premier.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Can I say, you look radiant today, Mr Speaker. Is it a national day?

The SPEAKER: I am wearing the vyshyvanka, the national shirt of Ukraine, because it is three years since the Russian army invaded Ukraine. People die in Donetsk and Luhansk every day, and it should not be forgotten.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: I thought there was a very good reason, Mr Speaker. Thank you for helping. I did say to the Treasurer that I thought it was Ukraine but it could have been Belarus.

Ministerial Statement

RETURN TO WORK SCHEME

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:08): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Three years ago, this parliament enacted the Return to Work Act 2014. The new Return to Work Act was the biggest reform of our state's work injury insurance scheme for nearly 30 years. It replaced the old WorkCover scheme, which almost all people agreed was not working. That scheme did not deliver effective return-to-work outcomes for workers and its costs were not acceptable. The new Return to Work scheme has already delivered significant benefits for South Australians. It is a scheme that is 120 per cent funded and supports workers to recover and return to work in a safe, durable and timely manner. Return-to-work outcomes have improved significantly.

On the expiry of three years from the commencement of the Return to Work Act, the act requires that I must cause a review of its administration and operation. As the Return to Work Act commenced on 4 December 2014, 4 December 2017 is the date on which the review will commence. The Hon. John Mansfield AM will conduct the review assisted by a project team. The Hon. John Mansfield AM is an eminent silk recognised for his extensive commitment and service to the law, judiciary and wider community. His Honour served for nearly 20 years as a justice of the Federal Court before retiring in August last year.

The Return to Work Act requires that the review must include an assessment of:

- the extent to which the scheme, the dispute resolution processes and the South Australian Employment Tribunal Act 2014 have achieved a reduction in the number of disputed matters and a decrease in the time taken to resolve disputes;
- whether the jurisdiction of the Employment Tribunal under the act should be transferred to the Civil and Administrative Tribunal;
- the extent to which there has been an improvement in the determination or resolution of medical questions arising under the act; and
- any other matter I consider to be relevant to a review of the Return to Work Act.

I have determined the following matters are to be included in the review:

- the performance of ReturnToWorkSA in managing claims, including return-to-work outcomes in reducing instances of work injury;
- the performance of self-insured employers, including outcomes in reducing instances of work injury;
- changes in return-to-work rates at key milestones outlining factors influencing any improvement or deterioration;
- factors contributing to non-seriously injured workers failing to achieve return to work within two years;
- any additional factors regarding reskilling services to assist return-to-work outcomes;
- whether the scheme has yet achieved financial stability and, if not, when the scheme is likely to be mature and stable; and
- any other recommendations consistent with the objects of the Return to Work Act.

The review is required to be completed within six months. The results of the review will be a written report. This will be laid before both houses of parliament within 12 sitting days after its receipt. The review will be authorised to commission relevant actuarial support and any necessary social or economic impact statements required to properly inform its deliberations and those of the government. The review may invite written submissions from the public and other interested parties at its discretion. The review will produce a final report with any recommendations ultimately for government consideration.

AGED-CARE HOUSING DEVELOPMENTS

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection

Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (14:11): I seek leave to make a further ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: The ageing demographic in South Australia is rapidly growing. It is predicted that there will be a 90 per cent increase in the people over 65 years old in South Australia in 30 years' time. Currently, much of the aged-care and retirement living options in South Australia are dated and do not meet the standards we would expect for our own families. However, there is inconsistency in how development plans across the state recognise retirement and aged-care living. The nature of the current planning system does not readily recognise leading and modern methods for delivering aged-care services.

Under the new planning system recently introduced by the state government, we will overcome such inconsistencies and rigidity through the introduction of the statewide Planning and Design Code and new assessment pathways. This new system is currently being implemented over a three to five-year program. In an attempt to address the increasing need for retirement and aged-care living in the interim, by gazettal on 19 April this year, I declared retirement and aged-care living proposals over \$20 million in value could be assessed through the major development assessment pathway. This was always contemplated to be a transitional option.

During this transition to the new planning system, the intent of the declaration for retirement and aged-care living was to allow significant proposals to undergo a rigorous assessment process which involves responding to any public submissions and to be considered on their merits. Given the transitional nature of the process, I imposed an end date for the declaration of 30 June next year. On 10 November this year, Life Care advised the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure that they would withdraw three applications lodged under the declaration for aged-care facilities at Glen Osmond, Joslin and Norwood.

Based upon preliminary advice and community feedback on applications lodged under the declaration, it has become clear that the broader community engagement in delivering aged-care services is necessary. Accordingly, I have decided to revoke ahead of time the major development declaration for retirement and aged-care living. There is one live application remaining which was lodged pursuant to the declaration and I am seeking advice from the Crown Solicitor's Office with respect to the effect of revoking the declaration and how that application may best be dealt with.

However, I remain of the firm view that South Australians deserve leading and modern retirement and aged-care living options, provided they respect their local context. I have therefore requested that the independent State Planning Commission prioritise consideration of how the planning system will allow for improved living options for older South Australians, particularly as part of the development of the Planning and Design Code. The community will be engaged in the development of the Planning and Design Code over the next one to two years. This will involve extensive engagement with our community and other interested parties under the Community Engagement Charter.

PARLIAMENTARY BUDGET ADVISORY SERVICE

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:16): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The state government has formally established the Parliamentary Budget Advisory Service (PBAS) as an attached office of the Department of Treasury and Finance. The service will make experts available to all parties contesting the 2018 state election and allow them to have their policy decisions tested and costed.

This government honours the arrangements it makes. The PBAS is a key outcome of the agreement between the Premier and the member for Frome in 2014 which led to the formation of the stable, efficient and dynamic government which has led the state since then. The member for Frome called for the establishment of the PBAS as a means of giving the voting public a greater degree of comfort in the accuracy of costings announced by political parties in an election campaign.

This government is committed to improving the accountability and transparency of political decision-making and therefore welcomed the member for Frome's suggestion. It complements other accountability and transparency initiatives by the government, such as the establishment of the ICAC; the proactive disclosure of expenditure by ministers and senior staff; the creation of the Data SA website, which has more than 1,200 datasets freely available to the public; and the globally recognised initiatives of the YourSAy agency. The PBAS costing service will be made available to the current parliamentary leaders, Independent members of parliament and all other leaders of registered political parties and nominated Independents after the election is called.

I would also like to take the time now to announce the appointment of Mr John Thomas Hill to the position of parliamentary budget officer, the chief executive of the PBAS. Mr Hill has a strong background in leadership and executive roles within the Department of Treasury and Finance, including extended periods of service as deputy under treasurer and acting under treasurer between 1990 and 2003. During his distinguished career as a public servant, Mr Hill demonstrated exemplary leadership and commitment to service, as well as highly developed subject matter expertise in areas directly relevant to the core requirements of his new position, including economic, taxation and accounting policy; intergovernmental financial relations; government asset disposal processes; as well as insurance and risk management.

The PBAS will be located at 45 Grenfell Street. It is anticipated that the office will operate until 30 June 2018 to enable a review of PBAS operations following the state election on 17 March. To enable the PBAS to provide confidential costing services to political parties and Independents, cabinet approved regulations to exempt the PBAS, and information held by other agencies in relation to the PBAS costing services, from the operation of the Freedom of Information Act 1991 (FOI Act). This will ensure that political parties and Independents using PBAS services can have confidence that their information will remain confidential and not be subject to FOI requests, both during and after the election period.

The parliamentary budget officer will not make public comment on costings, publish any matters related to costings undertaken by the PBAS, or disclose any requests made by parties or Independents, except under the circumstances where the PBO is of the opinion that a material misrepresentation has been made of the PBAS position. This includes where a party or Independent makes a misrepresentation in relation to a publicly announced policy, or releases the costing advice provided by the PBAS prior to announcing the policy as a commitment of that party.

I would also like to inform the house that, to strengthen the independence of the office, Mr Hill's contract requires him to report to the Commissioner for Public Sector Employment in the first instance. While the Premier will be the employer of the PBO and I will have ministerial responsibility for the PBAS, the PBO will be required not to divulge to the Premier or any minister, including myself, information pertaining to election policy costing requests, other than those submitted by the Premier or their nominee.

The PBAS will be staffed with appropriately skilled secondments from the Department of Treasury and Finance and other government departments as required. Employees appointed to the PBAS will possess experience in the provision of economic and fiscal advice to government, the evaluation of government expenditure proposals and government budgeting.

The PBAS will help provide more accurate, comprehensive and consistent costings of the policies developed by political parties, ensuring that political parties understand the cost of their policies and the public can have confidence in the information provided to them during the election process. This government believes in a robust democracy. The PBAS initiative is one more step in enhancing the democratic system in South Australia.

INDIA BUSINESS MISSION

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Health Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (14:21): I seek leave to make a ministerial statement.

Leave granted.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Last week, I led the state government business mission to India. I was accompanied by around 50 delegates looking to do business with their counterparts in Mumbai, Delhi, Jaipur and Bengaluru, and to further develop trade and investment opportunities for South Australia. We were also joined by Multicultural Affairs Minister Zoe Bettison and His Excellency the Hon. Hieu Van Le AC, Governor of South Australia.

India is South Australia's fourth largest trading partner, with two-way trade valued in Australian dollars at \$1.12 billion in 2016. The latest trade figures show that, in the 12 months to September 2017, the value of South Australia's goods exported to India totalled \$945 million. This was an increase of 55 per cent, or \$334 million, on the previous 12 months.

Thousands of jobs hinge on the India trading relationship right here in South Australia. Recognising the importance of the India region, the South Australia-India Engagement Strategy is a 10-year plan to grow strategic partnerships with India through investment, trade and business, education, sport, culture, the arts and sciences, and through exchanging people, skills and ideas.

The delegation's key areas of focus included the trade sectors where we can principally influence outcomes. Commodities are important in our trading relationship. They tend to look after themselves to a degree, but the areas based around the SME sector that we can help with include education, skills and training, premium food and wine, beverages, defence and advanced manufacturing, health, water and environment management, culture, tourism and the arts.

India is South Australia's second largest source of international students, with 3,563 enrolments in 2016. South Australian delegate, Ironwood Careers and Training, signed an MOU with the International Horticulture Innovation and Training Centre to train students in both Rajasthan and Adelaide.

To assist in growing our wine exports to India, I was pleased to announce our appointment of an in-market wine professional, Mr Rajiv Singhal, who over the next two years will build awareness, educate and create knowledge about the South Australian wine industry in India through the Wine Education Program. I was encouraged by the degree to which wine is now being taken up in India as an opportunity.

The launch of the Rajasthan Centre of Excellence in Water and Resources Management is an outcome that I am extremely proud of. This centre will facilitate investment in and access to South Australian water research, policy and technical capabilities in several areas such as groundwater research, managed aquifer recharge, water quality management services, including the establishment of laboratories, agricultural reform, and education, training and capacity building.

Further, Hydro-dis, a South Australia-based water treatment company that was represented on the mission, delivered a water treatment pilot project to prove its technology. Can I commend the Minister for the Environment in the other place for his support and also the involvement of the former minister for water Ms Karlene Maywald, who has been very active in assisting South Australian businesses to leverage off these opportunities.

I was also pleased to support the signing of a new partnership between South Australian suspension maker Supashock and an Indian automotive manufacturer. Supashock will design and develop prototype suspension technology to be trialled by the manufacturer. If the trials prove successful, Supashock will supply shock absorbers for the current production and modification of existing vehicles. This will be an extremely big contract, if it comes off. The partnership is a direct outcome of last year's India trade mission and will see Supashock extend its research and development and export capabilities, creating new jobs for South Australians here at home.

Our Adelaide Festival Centre conducted talks with the organisers of the Jaipur Literary Festival to explore the potential for Adelaide to host a satellite of the literary event, which resulted in the signing of an MOU. I will be very nice to the Treasurer over the next six months to see if we can fund that. This highlights our sister-state agreement with Rajasthan, which goes beyond the usual economic and trade portfolios, as does our art engagement program. We want India to be part of South Australia's future growth and we want to be part of India's. Encouraging and engaging with India will create further opportunities to access new markets to enable South Australian businesses to remain globally competitive.

In 2017, a record number of businesses, particularly businesses looking to trade for the first time, have taken part in business missions to the Middle East, South-East Asia, Europe, India and China. New markets were targeted in Scandinavia and the USA, and there has been additional focus on France from a defence perspective. International engagement is the future for jobs and enterprise in South Australia. The number of new exporting businesses has now grown by more than 200 in the last couple of years. Value and volume of exports are up and the outlook is very bright. More than 72,000 South Australian jobs are now linked to export activity. That is meals on the table every night and it is a big win for South Australian families.

Parliamentary Committees

ENVIRONMENT, RESOURCES AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (14:29): I bring up the 79th report of the committee, entitled Annual Report.

Report received and ordered to be published.

NATURAL RESOURCES COMMITTEE

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:29): I bring up the 127th report of the committee, entitled 'Sustainable prawns fisheries management in South Australia: trawling through the evidence'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PARLIAMENTARY COMMITTEE ON OCCUPATIONAL SAFETY, REHABILITATION AND COMPENSATION

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (14:31): I bring up the 30th report of the committee, entitled 'Final report into the referral for an inquiry into the Return to Work Act and scheme'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

PUBLIC WORKS COMMITTEE

Ms VLAHOS (Taylor) (14:32): I bring up the 586th report of the committee, entitled Kingston Bridge Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms VLAHOS: I bring up the 587th report of the committee, entitled Lobethal Freight Access Upgrade.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms VLAHOS: I bring up the 588th report of the committee, entitled 'Old Royal Adelaide Hospital site: preliminary redevelopment works'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Ms VLAHOS: I bring up the 589th report of the committee, entitled 'Market to riverbank link: Adelaide laneways revitalisation'.

Report received and ordered to be published.

Question Time

STATE ENERGY PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:34): My question is to the Minister for Energy. What is the expected cost of purchasing, relocating and augmenting the nine diesel generators the government is currently leasing from APR?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:35): We will detail the cost, but of course the energy plan as announced has always been part of the plan. What we announced—

Mr Marshall: Why won't you tell us what's going on?

The SPEAKER: I call the leader to order.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: What we announced was that we would bring in—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Morialta is called to order for quoting AC/DC lyrics where they are not strictly relevant.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: When we announced Our Energy Plan, part of the plan was to procure temporary generation for this summer and then to find a permanent solution in terms of a backup reserve for the state to have to call on. What we budgeted for within Our Energy Plan was to use backup generation for the summer and then to procure a larger generator at a permanent site.

What we have been able to do is to actually procure nine brand-new aeroderivative gas-fired turbines that can run on dual fuels—that can run on a number of fuels, actually—that can run on more than diesel, that can run on LPG and that can run on gas. Of course, what we have done is circumvent the necessity for having temporary generators and we have gone to the final solution, which is our permanent generation. What we have now is our final solution at two temporary sites and then we will be locating these at one central site, which will be announced very soon.

It's important to note that every single part of Our Energy Plan—every single part—whether it's our procurement of the world's largest lithium ion battery, whether it's our renewable technology fund, whether it's our procurement, every single part has been on time and on budget. There are no additional costs to those previously announced. There are no additional costs to the cost of procuring these new generators.

Mr MARSHALL: Point of order: relevance. I ask that you bring the Treasurer back to the substance of the question, which is about the cost of this new relocated service.

The Hon. J.M. Rankine interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: It is not new. It has been announced—we announced it in March. We announced in March the cost of our intervention into the market. We announced in March that we would be purchasing a state-owned generator.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: We announced in March new powers. We announced in March our PACE gas grants. We announced in March our procurement. We made all these announcements. There is nothing new about this. The only thing that is new about this is a Liberal Party policy to sell the generators. They want to privatise the generators. You can see the panic in their eyes. You can see the panic. The costings are what they are worried about because they have a secret plan to privatise generators before we have even bought them.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order.

The SPEAKER: I take points of order from people who come to those points with clean hands. The member for Stuart has been continually interjecting and now rises to interrupt his interjections just for a moment to say that the content of the Treasurer's answer is offending him.

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Mr Speaker, the purpose of my interjections was to bring the Treasurer back to the substance of the question. Now I ask you to do that.

The SPEAKER: I will bring the Treasurer back to the substance of the question. Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I have answered it, sir.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, the member for Unley is called to order because the Speaker is able to pull a free kick out of any melee, and the member for Wright is warned.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:39): Supplementary: given that the Treasurer has been unable to provide the detail that is required, can he at least confirm that in fact the Under Treasurer, who reports directly to the Treasurer in South Australia, has belled the cat and told the people of South Australia the cost is actually going to be \$301 million?

The SPEAKER: That question is of course entirely out of order, and the leader would know that it's contrary to standing orders, but the Treasurer is pawing the ground wanting to answer it; he will have a lot of scope.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:40): When we announced our \$550 million energy intervention—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Again, the leader asks questions and then just interjects with what he thinks is the answer. The facts are that these General Electric aeroderivative generators, the TM2500—a beautiful piece of kit which I inspected yesterday and kicked—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —many tyres—these are beautiful pieces of equipment. They are gas-fired generators that can operate on a number of fuels.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Screaming, shouting and interjecting is not a substitute for a failed policy.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Yelling out abuse across the chamber is not a substitute for policy. We have always said we were going to procure a brand-new, state-owned generator and temporary generator. What we have done is skip the temporary part and go on to the final solution. Within the \$550 million package, what we have done is that we have been able to procure not only our temporary generation but our final solution to our backup within our budget. And not only is it within budget—

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —ultimately it's early because we planned for this generation to be available by 1 December: it is available from today. It is available from today. If we relied on the market that the members opposite created by privatising ETSA, we would be waiting on AGL, we would be waiting on Origin and we would be waiting on Simply to provide us with power for the summer. And how would that go? Instead, we got our generator up and running, ready to go, and the tragedy—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is that history repeats itself.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: History repeats. The members opposite are going to make the same mistake they made when they sold ETSA: they are going to sell our only backup reserve.

The SPEAKER: Before the supplementary, I call to order the Premier, the member for Chaffey and the member for Mitchell, and I warn the leader, the member for Unley and the member for Morialta. Leader.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:42): Supplementary, sir: will the Treasurer be taking action against the Under Treasurer for leaking against the Treasurer and embarrassing this government?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:43): We announced the cost of Our Energy Plan the day we announced it.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: You get a sense of what kind of Premier he would be by threatening public servants. You can tell how his mind thinks. The moment he thinks a public servant says something that he doesn't like, his first instinct is to sack them. Talk about getting an insight into his thinking. Now—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —I know members opposite don't like the idea of publicly owned assets. They don't like the idea of publicly owned generation. No matter how much the opposition breach standing orders and just scream abuse into the parliament, it shows that their energy plan—which they refuse to talk about now. They refuse to talk about it, so much so that now the spokesperson on energy is the deputy leader rather than the shadow minister for energy

It was the deputy leader who went out yesterday, not the shadow minister. The question is: why has he been benched? Could it be because he told the truth about what the actual benefits are of their plan? How humiliating must it be that the best outcome that they could have out of their energy plan, the biggest effect, is the do nothing option. The do nothing option gives you a better benefit than anything they do.

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

STATE ENERGY PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:44): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Will the minister now apologise to the people of South Australia for lying to them last night on the news when he said he couldn't disclose the cost of purchasing the new generators?

The SPEAKER: Although the Hon. Michelle Lensink has managed to get a ruling in the other place that calling someone a liar or accusing them of lying is parliamentary, that is an innovation we don't have in the House of Assembly, so the leader will immediately rise and withdraw and apologise.

Mr MARSHALL: I withdraw and apologise, sir.

The SPEAKER: Thank you. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts) (14:45): The only apology due to the people of South Australia is from the Liberal Party for privatising ETSA. That is the root cause of all of the problems that we have with the South Australian part of the energy market. A second apology is owed by the federal Liberal government for prevaricating over putting a price on carbon and presiding over, essentially, the dysfunction of the national energy market. What the South Australian government is doing, in the interests of this state, is standing up for the people of South Australia and taking charge of our energy future.

Mr Marshall interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Premier will be seated. I give the Leader of the Opposition as much scope as possible, as I say, to be the locomotive of the opposition, but that does not involve screeching at the top of his voice across the divide between the government and the opposition. So if the leader interjects one more time, I will name him. I won't remove him under the sessional order: I will name him. Premier.

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: Thank you, Mr Speaker. An important piece of information is that straight after the media conference, where we were pressed to disaggregate the various elements of the energy plan, the representatives from APR came up to both the Minister for Energy and myself and thanked us and expressed their gratitude for not revealing the commercial-in-confidence nature of that material. This of course—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: We gave, of course, the overall—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: As is our responsibility, we gave the overall budget—\$550 million. Of course, the funding is within that overall envelope, but to disaggregate it would put this company at a competitive disadvantage as it seeks to bid across the nation. The truth is we got a great deal and other places may not get the same deal that we got. They want to reserve their rights to be able to bid into other contractual arrangements. The truth is the message is getting through to the other jurisdictions that there is trouble all around the National Electricity Market. Their services are in high demand, let me tell you, and that is because we have a dysfunctional National Energy Market, where unfortunately temporary measures are necessary to deal with the reserve shortfalls.

The one advantage I had yesterday was that I was able to announce my energy plan here in South Australia. If the Leader of the Opposition wanted to announce his energy plan, he would have to go to Sydney, because it involves plugging into an interconnector in Sydney. Let's just see how Sydney goes during this summer. We are taking steps to secure South Australian energy for South Australians. We will have a publicly owned power plant—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL: —and those opposite will sell it at the first opportunity.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition) (14:48): My question is to the Minister for Energy. Is the cost of purchasing this new plant increased by completing the purchase after one lease cycle rather than two?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:48): No, sir, that is not my advice. It was an interesting interjection by the Deputy Leader of the Opposition calling the state-owned generator a white elephant. We will see this summer if it's a white elephant. We will see in a drought if the desal plant is a white elephant. Every time this government invests in infrastructure, for the members opposite, a little part of them dies. Every time we invest in crucial parts of essential services, their first instinct is to sell it. Their first instinct, whenever we have any public institution, is to close it or sell it.

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: the Treasurer is descending into debate, contrary to standing order 98, with no provocation so far in this answer.

The SPEAKER: Just refresh my memory as to the substance of the question.

Mr GARDNER: The question was whether the cost of purchasing the generator was greater after a one lease cycle rather than two.

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I've answered that, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton.

SOUTH AUSTRALIAN ECONOMY

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (14:49): Thank you very much, sir.

Mr Whetstone: Wake up.

The Hon. P. CAICA: I was wide awake, Tim, and grow up, Tim. Sir, my question—

The SPEAKER: The member for Colton is called to order by referring to the member for Chaffey, not once but twice, by his diminutive.

The Hon. P. CAICA: Yes, and that he is, sir. My question is to the Treasurer. Can the Treasurer inform the house about any new data on the state of business in the South Australian economy?

The SPEAKER: Can the Treasurer help the house with that?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:50): Sir, I will do my best to assist. Today, two surveys have been published, which I know the member for Colton is keenly interested in, which give an encouraging picture of business in South Australia and completely contradict those critics who seek to undermine our economy and undermine jobs growth in this state.

First, the National Australia Bank monthly survey for October shows a six point lift in business confidence. South Australia and New South Wales were the only states to record an increase in the survey. In level terms, confidence in South Australia is on a plus 12 measure. It now has the strongest level of business confidence in the nation, ahead of New South Wales and Queensland—both are plus 9. Victoria are plus 5. Western Australia are plus 4.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Notice members opposite laughing and mocking? Tasmania are plus 2. The trend result for business confidence also improved for South Australia. While the monthly measure of conditions slipped in trend terms, business conditions improved to put South Australia second only to our largest state, New South Wales. The NAB monthly survey result is in accord with Business SA's statewide super survey, also published today, that showed a 4.1 point lift in the confidence index compared to the last survey taken in the previous quarter—and then they wanted to talk it down.

Interestingly, when asked about general business conditions in South Australia, the survey respondents said the September quarter had actually turned out to be better than they thought it was going to be and that they expected the December quarter to be even better again. These are extraordinary results, given that the survey reflects a period in this state's history when we have undergone one of the most severe economic shocks ever with the closure of the automotive manufacturing and assembly at General Motors Holden in Elizabeth.

Ever since the closure of Holden was announced, following the public goading of the company's leadership, the doom and gloom merchants have been out there spreading fear and forecasting disaster for South Australia. In contrast, the government have been working tirelessly to confront the problems head-on, providing assistance and incentives to business to work in collaboration with us to create jobs and grow the economy.

Our tax reforms, our incentives for homebuyers, our jobs accelerator grants and our other programs are working well. This government is getting on with the work of building a stronger, more diverse and robust economy, and this result shows that our work is paying off. Members opposite laughing about a great result like this is indicative of what they were really hoping for, which was a slump.

The SPEAKER: That does seem to be imputing improper motives to a group of people who seem strangely silent. The member for Stuart.

GENERATORS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:53): My question is for the Minister for Energy. Why has the minister not advised the public that, under all three operational scenarios modelled for the government, diesel generators failed with regard to residential emissions standards? Vipac Engineers produced a report—temporary generator air quality assessment report—provided to the government on 5 December, which modelled three operating scenarios, and the generators failed residential emissions standards on all three of those scenarios modelled.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:53): The member is quoting a report on testing of generators in December. September or December?

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: The report was provided to you in September.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: September. The advice I have is that the generators that will be operating at the two sites, even while they are operating on diesel, can have lower emissions than Torrens Island. If the opposition is saying what I think they are saying, that any generator that breaches these conditions should not operate, I had better call AGL about Torrens Island.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Now the prevarication again. This is a bit like when they said that their energy plan would save \$300 when it was actually only \$70, in two elections' time. Is the opposition really saying to us that on the basis of these reports, we should not operate these generators? Are they really saying to us that these generators should not be used in summer periods? Should we put out a notice that the opposition don't believe these generators should be operating?

I will check on the report and the veracity of what the shadow energy minister has made, and I will check, but it is my understanding—and I stand to be corrected—that our diesel generators, our gas-fired generators, our aeroderivative turbines are the most efficient available on the market. If that is the case, and the member has evidence to the contrary, that these generators breach emission conditions for other generators operating in the National Electricity Market, that would be a very interesting hypothesis that the shadow minister is putting, and I will check and get back to the house.

GENERATORS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:55): A supplementary, sir: based on the information that the Treasurer has just given to the house, why did the government ask for these three models to be studied if he says that the generators are going to be operated in a different way?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:55): The generators will not be operating in a different way. The generators will be operating in accordance with AEMO's national operation platform to make sure that the generators can dispatch at times of high need, just like any other generator. The only difference is we are not competing in the National Electricity Market. We are not out there trying to get a return. What we are trying to do is stabilise the grid and make sure we have power when we need it. If the member opposite is actually saying to me that the opposition does not support any generator operating in the NEM that increases these emissions—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Now it's debate. Now the hands are thrown in the air and the same nod of the head we had at the press conference where he didn't know what was going on. We will see exactly what these emissions standards are, and I will get back to the house very quickly.

GENERATORS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:56): Supplementary, sir: can the Treasurer tell the house exactly what emissions will be produced under his forecast use of these generators?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:56): Hopefully the generators won't be needed, hopefully they won't be, and if they are needed, they will be needed at very minimal levels because we want to make sure that the market provides the services we need. If they don't, we are there to back it up. These generators will not be operating all the time. The advice that I have is that our generators are some of the most efficient in the world.

GENERATORS

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN (Stuart) (14:57): Supplementary, sir: is the Treasurer really telling the house that the emissions from these diesel generators will be at an acceptable level because he doesn't expect to use them?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (14:57): That is not what I said at all; that is not what I said at all. What I said—

Mr Gardner interjecting:

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

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: —is that the opposition is setting a new standard now for emission acceptability of generators. I will inform AGL of the opposition's new policy as we are heading into the election about what they want to do for emissions out of Torrens Island, out of Osborne, out of Pelican Point, and we will see what those emissions are and I will come to the shadow minister and we will see if he stands by his comments.

TRAMLINES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:58): My question is to the Minister for Transport. Has the government been advised as to whether the King William Road bridge will need any structural work in order to extend the tram north of the Torrens River?

The SPEAKER: Very good question, if I may say so.

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:58): My understanding is that it would require strengthening work.

TRAMLINES

Mr PISONI (Unley) (14:58): Supplementary: has the government been advised as to the cost of the structural work needed to extend the tram beyond the River Torrens? If so, are you able to advise the house of that cost or at least an estimate?

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development) (14:58): I thank the member for Unley for his question. My understanding is the Adelaide city council has come up with an estimate of approximately \$10 million, so I could suggest to the member for Unley that he either asks the council for further and better particulars or he could approach the newly established Parliamentary Budget Advisory Service.

PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:59): My question is to the Minister for Disabilities. Did the minister receive the report from the Principal Community Visitor, as required under the Disability Services (Community Visitor Scheme) Regulations 2013, on or before 30 September this year?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:59): I thank the member for his question. I will take that question on notice.

PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (14:59): Supplementary: minister, do you recall reading the report which you will take on notice and bring back to the house?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (14:59): Thank you to the member for that supplementary question. I refer to my previous answer.

PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:00): Supplementary to the Minister for Disabilities: can the minister confirm for the house that she does not recall reading this community visitor report?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:00): I couldn't actually hear that.

The SPEAKER: Could the member ask the question again.

Mr DULUK: Minister, can you confirm for the house that you don't recall reading this report?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you to the member for his question and I refer to my previous answers.

Mr DULUK: Supplementary, sir.

The SPEAKER: A question, the member for Davenport.

PRINCIPAL COMMUNITY VISITOR

Mr DULUK (Davenport) (15:00): Minister, given you are required under the regulations to have copies of the report laid before both houses of parliament within six sitting days after receiving the report, which was meant to be received by your office by 30 September, when can we expect this to happen?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD (Reynell—Minister for Disabilities, Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport) (15:00): Thank you to the member for that question. I will bring further information back to the house.

TRADE MISSIONS

Mr ODENWALDER (Little Para) (15:01): My question is to the Minister for Investment and Trade. Can the minister advise the house on feedback his agency has had regarding the effectiveness of international trade and business missions?

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH (Waite—Minister for Investment and Trade, Minister for Small Business, Minister for Defence and Space Industries, Minister for Health Industries, Minister for Veterans' Affairs) (15:01): I thank the member for Little Para for the question because it is timely, given recent claims based on comparisons of survey data from 2015 and 2016. The effectiveness of the international engagement strategies of the government is judged against several benchmarks. New markets, new companies exporting and new jobs created are the three most important criteria we apply.

We consider the data released by the Australian Bureau of Statistics and Austrade. We value very highly the feedback from the now record number of businesses coming on trade missions and from the buyers, sellers, freight forwarders and industry associations. By all these benchmarks, we have responded to calls for support from the business community and we are succeeding in our aim to enable those businesses to grow international connections and opportunities. But it hasn't stopped the pessimists, or should I say the lone pessimist, the member for Chaffey, who consistently peddles—and has in fact been caught out peddling—distorted data to *The Advertiser*. Before I get on to the honourable member's misunderstanding of survey data—

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Mr PISONI: By referring specifically to statements made by the member for Chaffey, the minister is entering debate.

The SPEAKER: No, he was asked about what feedback his agency had and he is sharing that with us.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: Thank you, Mr Speaker. Before I get on to the honourable member's misunderstanding of the survey data, I advise the house of the following: South Australia is exporting more than ever, reaching a new high of \$15.643 billion in the 12 months to June 2017. The latest value data on individual commodity categories shows massive growth in the areas that are the focus of trade mission activity.

In the year to September 2017, vegetables and fruit, up \$307 million (55 per cent)—well done to the minister for primary industries. Wheat is up \$259 million (24 per cent). Wine is up \$259 million (24 per cent). We export more wine than copper now. Services exports also continue to rise, with the latest ABS figures showing an 11 per cent increase, faster than the national rate of 9 per cent. I know they missed the mining boom; they don't realise it happened.

Our target markets are showing good growth—China is up 5 per cent, India is up 71 per cent, ASEAN 26 per cent and Japan 27 per cent—yet the member for Chaffey went on the record earlier this month to claim that it was all terrible. He compared the results from the 2016 exporters survey that showed 70 per cent of mission delegates found it effective, down, he said, from 79 per cent in a 2015 survey. He said that there are no strategies. Of course, he hasn't read all the strategies everyone else has read for each particular region, but we will put that to the side for a moment,

because he actually compared oranges to lemons, because they don't add up. In the 2015 result, 79 per cent applied to those who participated in an outbound mission—

Mr GARDNER: Point of order: by providing analysis on the feedback that he has received—

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: —but the 2016 result he quoted applied to companies that have participated in—

The SPEAKER: Minister, please be seated.

Mr GARDNER: —the minister is debating.

The SPEAKER: By?

Mr GARDNER: By going further than the leniency that you gave him before and providing analysis on the feedback, he is clearly debating.

The SPEAKER: Full marks for trying. I will listen carefully to the minister.

The Hon. M.L.J. HAMILTON-SMITH: He is comparing a set of figures from one year to another on a completely separate dataset. One was an outbound mission and one was inbound and outbound. They can't even add up. If you don't know the difference between an inbound and an outbound mission, then trade might not be the portfolio for the member for Chaffey. We might need to find somebody who understands the facts and the figures, someone like the member for Schubert maybe or—well, after that, I start to run out of ideas.

Our benchmark data and feedback shows increasing support and appreciation for our strategies. In 2016, we led missions to 14 countries. We have lifted that to 23. The number of jobs is up to 72,000 and there are 202 new exporters. If only someone opposite understood what was going on out there with business, maybe we would get some bipartisan support for that.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE CONTROL CENTRE

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:06): My question is to the Minister for Emergency Services. When will the backup generator for the State Emergency Service state control centre be replaced?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurua—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:06): I thank the member for his question. It is an important question, in terms of the generator for the state emergency centre, which is obviously in the Weymouth headquarters, which is the site that has the CFS headquarters, the SES headquarters and also SAFECOM. As the member is alluding to, this was obviously something that was raised in the SES internal report, in terms of their analysis of what happened following the statewide blackout event in September last year.

One of the issues, obviously, in that case was that the generator capacity that the SES had available to it was limited in that time, and that meant that there were only a certain number of workstations that were able to be operated in the headquarters. The control centre stayed operational during that period, but it is obviously not an ideal situation to have a small number of workstations being operated, and that was obviously one of the recommendations of that report.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Similarly, it was also one of the recommendations of the Burns report, which was the look across the whole government response to the blackout scenario, that the government needs to consider new control centre arrangements for our emergency services agencies. The government, since the Burns report, has been working to look at all the different options, in terms of potentially upgrading the existing SES and CFS site, potentially moving to a new site or potentially building a brand-new site purpose designed.

In terms of the specifics of the generator at that site, that is something the SES have looked into as to whether it is worth upgrading that particular facility. I understand, and I am advised by the chief of the SES, that there are a number of difficulties in terms of doing that. One is that the generator is on the top floor of the building, which obviously makes access to that site very difficult.

Obviously, generators come with costs on their own, but also getting access to that area of the building would probably involve quite a construction project to enable it to go into that site and potentially quite a lot of upgrading to the facilities to be able to have a heavier generator on that floor, so that is another one of the issues. There are also a number of significant wiring issues that would need to be looked at in the building itself.

All of those would need to be considered if you went down the path of staying in the building and upgrading the generator. All of those matters and a few more, as I understand, would need to be considered, which is why it is not the advice of the SES to go down that path at this point. They want to focus their attention on the long-term solution in terms of trying to get to either a new site or upgrading the existing site to deal with a whole range of different issues that have been raised through the Burns report and also the internal report that the member alludes to.

That's why, in terms of that generator, it's not as easy as just saying, 'We'll bring in a new generator.' There are a number of significant building issues in terms of that site, which is why it's not an ideal site. Certainly, the CFS has been there since the year 2000, and it has obviously served its purpose but it does not have the up-to-date facilities that we would want to see in a modern control centre, and that's what the government is working through at the moment.

The SPEAKER: I call to order the deputy leader and the member for Stuart because they just shouted continually at the Minister for Emergency Services when he offered no provocation: he simply provided information.

Mr van Holst Pellekaan: But to a different question, sir.

The SPEAKER: The member for Stuart is warned.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE CONTROL CENTRE

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:10): Supplementary: is the minister now suggesting that he is reversing the government's decision to reject the proposal from the Burns review into having a multi-agency state control centre?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:11): As the member alludes to in his question, a recommendation of the Burns report was to have a new facility into which all of the emergency services would move. I am advised that at the time the recommendation came out that it was not the will of the emergency services to all move into one new centre. That creates a whole range of other issues that they were concerned about.

At the time, the government said that, in terms of that specific site in Waymouth Street, it acknowledged that work needed to happen at that site, given a number of the issues that had been identified and we have discussed already. That is where, since that time, a lot of the work has been focused, in terms of considering the future of that site and the long-term future in terms of whether we would upgrade it where it exists and continue the lease there or whether to build a new purpose-designed site or whether to lease another existing building and upgrade that to have the capabilities needed for those agencies in the future.

It definitely is not the intention of the government to bring all of the agencies, including SAPOL and ambulance and others, as was referred to in the Burns report, into one central control centre, but it absolutely is something that we are looking at in terms of the long-term future of the SES and CFS in terms of the Waymouth Street site.

STATE EMERGENCY SERVICE CONTROL CENTRE

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:12): A further supplementary: when will a decision and progress be made to deliver a new state control centre, or an upgraded state control centre, and will it be in time for this bushfire season?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:12):

Obviously, these are long-term infrastructure projects. Even if the day that the Burns report had come out we announced a plan to build a new site, it would probably take many years to do. To have a new site is going to be a significant long-term investment in building a new facility. Our agencies have been based at the Waymouth Street site, particularly the CFS as I understand, since the year 2000. Those facilities have been used through all the major bushfire campaigns that we have had since then.

There are redundancy plans in place for a range of scenarios that might occur, but I think that there is an acknowledgement that we need to be working on a longer term solution that looks at a more significant range of redundancy features such as, for instance, if we had a one in 500 year earthquake in Adelaide, considering a building that would be able to withstand that sort of scenario. That is what the government is doing at the moment.

No-one is going to be able to promise that a building infrastructure project happens at the click of a finger, but it is something that we need to consider carefully. We need to work with those agencies, as well as with our partner agencies across government, including DPTI, to come up with the right solution that is going to serve the people of South Australia and those agencies long into the future.

The SPEAKER: Supplementary.

Mr KNOLL: Not a supplementary, but a further question, Mr Speaker.

EMERGENCY MANAGEMENT DOCUMENTS

Mr KNOLL (Schubert) (15:14): My question is again to the Minister for Emergency Services. When will the 12 out of 20 key emergency management documents relied upon by the SES that are either in draft or concept form be completed?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse) (15:14): As the member alludes to in that internal report that the SES did, there were a number of different operational documents that they identified that needed to be updated, or more work had needed to be done, or the documents were still in draft form or that there were new documents that were envisaged of being written in the future that hadn't been done yet. So a whole lot of work was identified from their internal perspective, and I congratulate the SES on going through that process of looking at their own response to that emergency situation and that flood event across South Australia as well as the storms event that happened last year, because it was the busiest year on record for the SES.

In terms of those specific issues about the policies and procedures, I am advised by the SES that work to address the recommendations related to incident management doctrine and policies is well advanced, with five of those already completed. Additional planning and coordination officers, recruited as part of the Towards a Flood Resilient SA program, will be commencing within the next few weeks and contribute to the agency's capacity to undertake additional planning across the state.

Two of the recommendations relate to development of response plans relevant to catchment areas, and those are specific pieces of work that are underway and expected to be completed early next year. I understand one of them is the Gawler River catchment, which has obviously had significant flood events that have happened over previous years. To develop a management plan obviously is something more than just the SES. There is a whole range of different agencies and councils and stakeholders that need to be involved in that process, so that work is underway.

RENEWABLE ENERGY TARGET

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:16): My question is to the Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy. Could the minister please update the house regarding the target for renewable energies?

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS (West Torrens—Treasurer, Minister for Finance, Minister for State Development, Minister for Mineral Resources and Energy) (15:16): I thank the member for her question and her keen interest in renewable energy. In 2014, we introduced a target to achieve

50 per cent renewable energy in South Australia by 2025. I can now officially advise the house that we have almost reached that target eight years ahead of schedule—eight.

Last week, the Australian Energy Market Operator (AEMO) released its annual South Australian Electricity Report for 2017. The figures in that report confirm that in 2016-17, 48.9 per cent of energy produced in our state came from renewable resources. This is up from 43 per cent in 2015-16. It is a significant achievement for South Australia and places us miles ahead of other mainland states. It is not only an achievement in terms of emissions reductions, but it has also created significant economic opportunities for our state.

As of 30 June this year, the cumulative investment in low-carbon generation in South Australia was approximately \$7.6 billion, and in that same year there were 2,135 people employed in our renewables sector. This is why our Future Jobs Fund identifies renewable energy as one of the key growth sectors in our state. It presents significant opportunities for employment and industry growth in South Australia. We have also developed a Hydrogen Roadmap designed to secure a leading position in one of the great energy sources of the future, opening up the possibility of exploring renewable energy in liquid hydrogen form and then exporting that energy around the world.

Meanwhile, wholesale electricity prices in South Australia are falling. This financial year to date, wholesale prices in South Australia have been approximately 18 per cent lower than the average for 2016-17. They are 3.5 per cent lower than Victoria's, which is a complete reversal of previous trends. Despite all those achievements, there are some who want us to abandon any renewable energy ambitions and all of the employment, and all of the industry growth, and all of the investment and opportunities that come with it.

We are now four months from the next state election, and our opponents have said they want this to be a referendum on renewable energy. Bring it on. Let's absolutely have a referendum on renewable energy. While we are being recognised as global leaders in renewable energy, the centrepiece of the woeful policy being given to South Australia by members opposite is an extension cord into New South Wales—

Mr VAN HOLST PELLEKAAN: Point of order: clearly debate.

The SPEAKER: The Treasurer will be seated.

Mr Pederick: Chuck him out.

The SPEAKER: The member for Hammond, the Treasurer is only on one call to order.

Mr Pederick: That's enough, sir.

The SPEAKER: Really? Is that enough for members of the opposition?

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The Speaker tries to be normative. Treasurer, that was debate.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: I apologise for upsetting the opposition by reminding them about the impotence of their own plan.

Members interjecting:

The SPEAKER: Treasurer.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: The thing about renewable energy that is sourced here in South Australia is that we are not reliant on other states. It is important to be self-sufficient. Greater interconnection is always plan B. Plan A is always to source and secure more generation in your own state and not be reliant on other jurisdictions. Plan A is always to make sure that we are masters of our own destiny. Plan A is to make sure that we have generators here—wind, solar thermal, pumped hydro, gas, batteries—taking advantage of our own resources, not being reliant on other jurisdictions for our power, like others opposite plan for us.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:21): My questions are to the Deputy Premier, in his role as Minister for the Public Sector, regarding the WARP contract (Workplace and Related Products) and the Industry Participation Plan (IPP):

1. What proportion of the \$50,700,000 total contract value of the WARP government business contract has actually been acquired by the three local businesses on the five-member panel?
2. What sales value percentages of the contract have the three local businesses on the panel each reported in the first six months of being included in the WARP?
3. What will the minister do to ensure all departments affected by the WARP contract undertake proper evaluations and price comparisons to fulfil their obligations to ensure appropriate levels of local content in stationery and office supply procurements?

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) (15:22): I thank the honourable member for her question. I came prepared to answer a number of questions and that is one of the few that I am not able to answer just like that, but I do know where I can go to get an answer to that question because it deserves a comprehensive answer. I know this is an issue—Mr Speaker knows this as well—that the member for Florey has found herself very interested in for some time. I should have anticipated this might have happened and I apologise for not seeing that coming. I will make the appropriate inquiries. It is a detailed question and it deserves a detailed and comprehensive answer.

GOVERNMENT PROCUREMENT

Ms BEDFORD (Florey) (15:23): A supplementary: while the minister is busy doing that, could he also make sure that all barriers that can be removed have been removed to ensure greater success for local businesses, especially for supply of stationery to all government departments and offices with regard to the WARP and the IPP?

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) (15:23): Yes, I will. I should say that the government has been very keen to be supportive of procurement from local sources generally. With regard to this particular topic, again, she has asked me the second or third question that I wasn't ready for today. But if you had asked me what is our general policy about procurement, I would say to you that we have done a great deal to try to ensure that not only is the government procuring from South Australian companies where possible but we are also asking the companies with whom we do enter into contracts to have subcontractors and suppliers who are South Australian.

That is something that we have been quite keen to try to pursue and I see other ministers here who know more about the details of this than I do, but we even have, I think, Mr Nightingale, who spends a great deal of his time getting into this. I do know that Mr Nightingale pops up frequently when there are discussions about procurement, and is a very fierce advocate for local South Australian producers, contractors and so forth. Again, I will get the detailed answer for the member, along with the answer to the first question.

AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:25): My question is to the Minister for Regional Development. Will the South Australian taxpayer be footing the bill for the clean-up of the failed abalone farm in Anxious Bay should no moneys be available from the former directors of Ocean Abalone Australia?

Mr Pisoni interjecting:

The SPEAKER: The member for Unley is on a full set of warnings. The member for Unley will retire for the remainder of question time under the sessional orders.

The honourable member for Unley having withdrawn from the chamber:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:25): Thank you, Mr Speaker. I thank the member for Flinders for the question and for his interest in that area around Anxious Bay where a leasehold was there on an aquacultural lease that was held by a company—

Mr Knoll interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Sorry; this is a serious matter, but the member for Schubert of course tries to make a joke about everything.

Mr Pengilly: Stop sooking and get on with it.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Mr Bean from Backstairs Passage has weighed in. They're just disappointed they didn't get the chance to vote you off the island.

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Yes, I know. Ocean Abalone Australia No 1 Pty Ltd previously held five marine-based subtitle abalone aquaculture leases and corresponding licences in Anxious Bay. The company took over the operation of the sites in 2014. It was placed into receivership on 3 February 2017. The receivers, the McGrathNicol partnership, were unable to sell the business and assets. On 15 June this year, they advised PIRSA Fisheries and Aquaculture they had retired in their capacity as receivers and the company would be wound up, deregistered, and the assets liquidated.

The responsibility of the day-to-day activities of the company reverted back to the sole director and company secretary, Mr Ben Jayaweera. On 24 July this year, PIRSA cancelled the aquaculture marine leases and licences held by Ocean Abalone Australia No 1 Pty Ltd due to prolonged non-payment of aquaculture fees and failure to comply with the requirements of the Aquaculture Act 2001.

PIRSA engaged with the former licence holder to facilitate the timely rehabilitation of the marine sites and issued a series of directions to carry out work to remove all stock and equipment from the site and remediate the sites as required by the Aquaculture Act 2001. I am advised the former lease and licence holder failed to comply with the directions to remediate the sites, and as a consequence, all equipment and stock was forfeited to the Crown.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Mr Speaker, I am giving an answer to a member of parliament who—

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —has a very genuine interest in that area.

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

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: The member for Bragg thinks she knows everything about everything. Honestly—very, very rude. A very rude person.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order, Mr Speaker.

The SPEAKER: Point of order.

Ms CHAPMAN: The question was very clear. For 3½ minutes, the minister has gone on some historical wandering and not answered the question. Will the government underwrite the creditors in relation to this collapse? That is the question. Yes or no?

The SPEAKER: Very well; we will see what the minister does in the last 40 seconds.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: I have actually lost over a minute of the answer because of the interjections of the opposition. PIRSA has engaged a supplier who will begin removing equipment from the former sites in the very near future. The site rehabilitation is expected to be completed by the end of the year.

Ms CHAPMAN: Point of order: again, he is just going on about the government's interest in getting rehabilitation—nothing to do with the question. Is the government going to underwrite and pay out the creditors in relation to the collapsed company? It's very simple.

The SPEAKER: Is it not passing strange that the member for Flinders isn't taking these points of order as the author of the question, rather than the member for Bragg?

Ms CHAPMAN: With respect, because, firstly, I am the deputy leader. Secondly, I have been listening patiently for 3½ minutes to this dribble about information—nothing to do with the question.

The Hon. A. KOUTSANTONIS: Point of order: an impromptu speech.

The SPEAKER: Yes, it was an impromptu speech, but I'm feeling merciful today. The member for Flinders.

AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:30): Supplementary, and the temptation is to repeat the earlier question, but I won't.

The SPEAKER: No, resist temptation.

Mr TRELOAR: Supplementary: what due diligence was undertaken by the government (1) in relation to the site itself, given there were three companies involved at various stages all going broke, and (2) in relation to the companies involved?

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL (Mawson—Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries, Minister for Forests, Minister for Tourism, Minister for Recreation and Sport, Minister for Racing) (15:31): I again thank the member for Flinders for the question and acknowledge his genuine interest, as opposed to the member for Bragg, who just wants to get up here—

The SPEAKER: The minister is called to order. I will deal with any misconduct by the member for Bragg. It is not for the minister to comment on the conduct of the member for Bragg.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: For two of the four minutes that I was trying to answer the previous question, I had them yelling out at me.

The SPEAKER: Yes, I—

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: —so if you provide no protection to the person who is on their feet—

The SPEAKER: —will accept that the minister was sorely provoked by the member for Bragg, but would he now address the question without reference to the member for Bragg.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Thank you, sir. PIRSA has engaged a supplier, who will begin removing equipment from the former sites in the very near future. The site rehabilitation—

Mr TRELOAR: Point of order: my supplementary question was about the due diligence the government undertook on the site and the companies involved.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: This is news—

The SPEAKER: It's leading into the answer.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Absolutely, and it actually tells the story of what is happening over there and the work that PIRSA has done to get this—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Well, I think the most important thing is that we get the mess cleaned up over there. That is the most important thing. The most important thing—

Members interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Look at all the experts. The most important thing is that there is an environmental mess over on Eyre Peninsula, and that's my priority—to get that cleaned up.

Ms Chapman interjecting:

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: Your priority is to come in here and play politics; mine isn't. My priority is to clean up this mess. PIRSA has engaged a supplier, who will begin removing equipment from the former sites in the very near future. The site rehabilitation is expected to be completed by the end of this year. PIRSA will actively pursue the former lease and licence holder under the provisions of the Aquaculture Act in relation to the failure to rehabilitate the site and to recover any costs incurred by PIRSA to rehabilitate the site. In addition, PIRSA has called in bank guarantees held against the aquaculture leases to partially offset the costs to rehabilitate the sites.

PIRSA has also been advised of debris from Ocean Abalone Australia No 1 Pty Ltd's marine-based aquaculture sites being washed up on local beaches near Elliston and nearby Waldegrave Island. Fisheries officers are conducting regular beach and sea patrols of the area, including Waldegrave Island, and have removed debris and/or secured debris for removal as soon as weather and transport—

Mr TRELOAR: Point of order: I would ask that the minister return to the substance of the supplementary question I asked.

The SPEAKER: Which is the question of due diligence.

Mr TRELOAR: Due diligence.

The Hon. L.W.K. BIGNELL: As I said, our priority is to get in and clean this up by the end of the year—that's our priority. We will have a look at those other issues as time goes by, but our priority is to get in there and clean up.

The SPEAKER: The motion before the house is that the house note grievances. The Standing Orders Committee is delighted to see that the member for Finniss has the first grievance speech.

Grievance Debate

FINNISS ELECTORATE

Mr PENGILLY (Finniss) (15:35): Thank you, sir, and I hope it is interesting for you. I would like to talk about the four shows that were held in my electorate over the last four or five weeks, commencing with the Yankalilla Show on AFL Grand Final day.

I have to tell you, sir, the results from the Yankalilla Show were a bit better than the Crows produced on that day. It was interesting that an enormous crowd was in place, and they were in place early. It was a stunning day. The show was opened by Mr John Hutchinson, who is a local identity and a former shearer. We also had the presence of the leader, the member for Dunstan, and he spoke eloquently during the course of the opening ceremony. As with all four shows, a small group of people put these shows together to produce a great community event every year.

I will move on to the two-day Port Elliott show. Last year, the Port Elliott Show was washed out, which was a financial disaster and a disaster for the hardworking committee. However, this year we certainly had two great days, with enormous crowds. One little thing that was interesting on the first day was that we had a Liberal Party stand there, and three or four stands up was the Xenophon team stand, SA-Best, with their candidate for Finniss, who had been proudly announced in the paper that morning. Well, we got rid of him by 1 o'clock that day. I reckon that was a pretty good outcome.

The member for Mayo, Rebekha Sharkie, was proudly introducing their candidate for the state election to everybody, all and sundry, handing out apples and all sorts of things. I left at 1 o'clock to go to the opening of the Goolwa Regatta Yacht Club. I got a text on the way over, and when I got there and looked at it I saw the candidate was gone, so that was the highlight of the day, really. The Port Elliott Show did go over two days. They do it particularly well. On the first day, they had dogs and all sorts of things performing on the oval, and on the second day they held horse events. It is a great show and one that I will miss, as I will the Yankalilla Show, in my capacity as the member for Finniss.

I also attended the 100th show of the Kangaroo Island Agricultural and Horticultural Society, and it was a great day. They put an enormous amount of work into the show, and once again we had

a stand there. It was interesting that SA-Best had a stand as well, with the candidate for Mawson, but she never really did much circulating. The member for Mawson tried to chack the member for Bragg about people talking to her and what was going on. The member for Bragg said, 'Yes, of course, you were speaking to my aunty Val,' so I do not think he drew too many points there. That was also amusing, quite frankly. That show went on into the night, with a fireworks display. In 100 years of shows, given that there have been breaks particularly over the years during World War II, which was pretty common everywhere, they put on a superb effort and draw a big crowd.

Last Saturday, the 58th Parndana Show was held in the centre of the island and they had the honour of having the Governor-General in attendance. He flew in from Canberra for the Remembrance Day ceremony and appeared at the show in the afternoon. Once again, Andy Gilfillan and I had a stand there on behalf of the Liberal Party which was very well received. The crowd out there was big. It was a pretty warm day. There were shearing competitions, dog jumping competitions, cricket on the oval and horses in action, so it was all in all a pretty wonderful occasion.

I am very pleased to say that the member for Bragg was also there on that occasion and, coming from the western end of the island, she was particularly welcome. I was pleased that I could introduce Mr Dean Stanton DFC to the Governor-General during the afternoon. He won his DFC for flying bombers over Europe during World War II and is the last of a vanishing breed. They were four good shows, not to be missed, and they were great community events in their own right.

WILFRED TAYLOR RESERVE

Ms COOK (Fisher) (15:40): I rise today to discuss a great piece of community and recreational infrastructure in my southern suburbs community, the large multipurpose Wilfred Taylor Reserve. Located in Morphett Vale, Wilfred Taylor Reserve is a diverse recreational hub for the many children, families and budding athletes of Morphett Vale—

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I've been there.

Ms COOK: I'm sure you have visited many times, Madam Deputy Speaker.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I've played there recently.

Ms COOK: —and the surrounding suburbs. Wilfred Taylor Reserve is home to 11 regular user groups utilising both indoor and outdoor facilities, hosting thousands of participants and visitors every week year round, from the chilly August mornings of soccer through to the sweltering December evenings of netball.

These user groups include Basketball SA, whose stadium also houses the Southern Tigers Basketball Club and hundreds of social competitors; Southern Table Tennis; Noarlunga United, as well as now the Southern United Women's and Girls' Soccer Club; Onkaparinga Rugby Union Club; Southern United Netball Association and the many clubs that compete at the courts; Morphett Vale Miniature Railway; Southern Vales Archery Club; South Coast Sports and Social Club; Southern Districts Kennel and Obedience Dog Club; Southern District Model Car Club; and Morphett Vale Riding Club.

Of course, many of these associations, including Southern United Netball Association, Southern Table Tennis and Basketball SA, utilise Wilfred Taylor Reserve as a venue for state carnivals and events, drawing visitors from across the state and beyond to Wilfred Taylor Reserve in our southern suburbs community.

I started playing at Southern United Netball Association as a junior, in the 1970s shall we say, for Morphett Vale Netball Club. I played representative netball for the association and later played there for Southern Stars. I still attend regularly to support many local junior and senior clubs. My children and husband have been players at the basketball stadium, the soccer pitch, the rugby club and so on over decades.

Along with thousands of southern residents, I have regularly visited and enjoyed the miniature railway, only recently riding on the trains with my five-year-old, Sid, and my husband. My boys have had birthday parties there. We have also attended many celebrations for other children and families. Of course, Wilfred Taylor Reserve is more than the sum of its parts, with playgrounds, barbecue facilities and community areas scattered throughout.

Wilfred Taylor Reserve continues to play an important role in our family as lifetime locals of Morphett Vale and Woodcroft communities. It is one of the central heartbeats of the community. But, as good as the reserve is, it can be improved upon to deliver better amenities and more cohesive community infrastructure to the residents of Morphett Vale and the surrounding suburbs.

This has been my focus this year. As soon as I was sure of my selection to stand in the new seat of Hurtle Vale, to which Wilfred Taylor Reserve is central, I began considering how I could support the community and its use of this space. I first spoke in March with members from the City of Onkaparinga regarding this in terms of opportunities for improved open spaces, and I have spent time with experts in the field of outdoor play.

I have conducted a community round table, discussing with community stakeholders and users of Wilfred Taylor Reserve regarding what could be improved or added to the reserve from their own perspective. Along with my team, I have been busy speaking with thousands of local residents, house by house, street by street, learning what features of Wilfred Taylor Reserve they utilise, what matters to them and perhaps what could be done better.

I have spent this time engaging with the City of Onkaparinga, sharing my vision for Wilfred Taylor Reserve and drawing on my extensive community consultation and my own deep connection over decades to this space in order to help deliver improved facilities and amenities to the Wilfred Taylor Reserve local community. The abundance of outdoor space Wilfred Taylor Reserve provides is an extraordinary privilege and, while I have been and will continue to fight hard for new and improved facilities at Wilfred Taylor Reserve, its beauty lies in its open access and abundance of space, both of which must be protected so that there is a balance.

I am pleased that the state government continues to support, make plans and invest in many local community facilities such as Wilfred Taylor Reserve not just in my area but statewide. The Fund My Neighbourhood program, which still has voting open for a week, is one such initiative that puts the control of public spaces like Wilfred Taylor Reserve back in the hands of the local community. There are projects up for voting around that area and in other areas of the southern suburbs.

I have been and will continue to fight for improved community services in Wilfred Taylor Reserve; it is a lifetime commitment for me. I have been involved with and committed to the improvement of the southern community, including Wilfred Taylor Reserve, for years and in fact decades; I am in it for the long haul. I look forward to continuing to work hard with stakeholders, clubs, organisations and the local community to improve Wilfred Taylor Reserve for the years and generations ahead.

OPERATION FLINDERS

Mr WHETSTONE (Chaffey) (15:45): I rise today to speak about one of South Australia's great organisations, Operation Flinders. Last Friday, I had the opportunity to attend a presentation at the Loxton Waikerie council chambers at Waikerie to celebrate the 5A/17 group that attended Operation Flinders from Waikerie High School. They had an experience that they will remember for life. They visited Yankaninna Station up in the northern Flinders Ranges just next to Balcanooka. They were ably assisted by Phil Valentine and Tim Hensel from Waikerie High School to accommodate those nine young lads who went up there to experience the program.

It is an eight-day trek, which is an experience that they will refer to as they go through adolescence and into manhood. When I talked to the group after the presentation, their experience was much like my own when I visited Yankaninna not long after I was elected. I learnt that that young group of boys created quite a unique bond. They now know one another better and they support one another more than they ever have before. While they were on the trek they got out of their comfort zone, they slept rough and they had nowhere to go but to embark on that program.

The program instils self-belief, decision-making, strengthens their ability to cope in isolation, enables them to live without a handheld device and to work as part of a team. They learn about and begin to understand what responsibility means. As I said, there is nowhere to hide up there. It is a program that has really changed these boys' lives. I was able to relate to these boys because, as I said, I have been up to Yankaninna and done the Operation Flinders program.

I was up there with Steven Marshall, the opposition leader. We embarked on that experience and we have come back to spread that message and to raise money. We have started up chapters of our own in our electorates of Dunstan and Chaffey. We are very proud to support our local communities and those adolescent boys and girls who are in some ways a little wayward so they can go up there and experience what Operation Flinders offers them as a life experience.

The story that the boys told during that presentation really did hit home to many people in the council chambers because they came back with an experience that they will remember for the rest of their lives. They came back with an experience that they will tell their friends and their families. One day they might even tell their children about this great experience. The program only happens with the support of local service clubs.

Many of the Riverland local service clubs have been outstanding supporters of Operation Flinders, as have local businesses. Of course, this time, thanks goes to the Berri Lions Club and the Barmera Bakery. The Barmera Bakery had a collection tin in the bakery and that tin was filled many times by people who put in donations to support Operation Flinders. A thankyou goes to a philanthropist, who is a very strong supporter of Operation Flinders, for an anonymous donation and, of course, the Loxton Waikerie council for their outstanding and ongoing support of this great program.

I must say that Jonathon Robran, the liaison officer I have worked with for seven years, did another outstanding job in rounding everyone up, making sure their funding was there and making sure that Heather and Jim Maywald provided the transport to get those young boys up to Yankaninna. I would like to thank Operation Flinders, their staff, commanders and support staff. I thank the people who support this institution and thank the people of the Riverland for sending those boys for that experience.

RAMSAY, PROF. E.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (15:50): It is my great honour to have been a friend of and fellow activist with the late Professor Eleanor Ramsay, honorary professor at the University of Tasmania, former pro vice chancellor of equity, adjunct professor in the Hawke Research Institute of the University of South Australia and co-founder, with her husband, Emeritus Professor Michael Rowan, of Education Ambassadors Tasmania.

Professor Ramsay was a lifelong activist on many fronts as a country teacher and a feminist activist in the teachers' union, and held senior public policy positions in the state education system in South Australia, Queensland and, more recently, Tasmania. Her work also had an international focus in more recent years in New Zealand, China, Austria and, in earlier times, the UK and Spain. That is to name just a few countries that I can think of. Her ongoing work meant that she was recognised with a Centenary Medal by the Australian government for ongoing and lifelong work in education and an honorary doctorate by the University of South Australia for her contribution to education equity on a state and national level.

On a more personal note, though, Eleanor was great fun. She was a party girl, certainly in days gone by—weren't we all party people—through wonderful dinner parties. I must say that I benefited from the many fundraisers that she organised for me as a member of parliament and as a candidate and also the events that she organised with regard to being a foundation member of EMILY's List.

She was a fantastic cook. I hate to be rude to anyone else, but she was probably the best cook I have ever known and, in more recent times, it was interesting to see that she had become a dedicated gardener. Eleanor and Michael were also very happy for the time they spent on their yacht, *Matilda*, on which they sailed to many places and managed, for at least a couple of years, to make their home.

Later on, of course, as probably the most beautiful builder's labourer who has ever drawn breath, Eleanor worked with Michael and tradespeople on their forest house at Kettering. Deputy Speaker, you will remember our special visit to this house just after the house was built. There was an absolutely beautiful design and feeling to the house. Of course, both Eleanor and Michael were big supporters of the Muriel Matters Society. One of the reasons why we got to see the house was

the support that we had from Eleanor and Michael with regard to talking about Muriel Matters in Tasmania and the research that we did there.

Eleanor was naturally very glamorous and kept very fit by exercising and jogging on a daily basis, so we were understandably shocked when she died all of a sudden on 9 October. I think about all the times that I have had with her. I remember some of the early campaigns.

One of the reasons why sexual harassment is seen as an issue and was incorporated in the Equal Opportunity Act in South Australia was the work that Eleanor and a few of us did on the South Australian Coalition Against Sexual Harassment. The downside of that activity was that you got to speak everywhere on the issue of sexual harassment, but I am very pleased that Eleanor was able to be one of the initiators of that change.

I would like to finish by saying one of Eleanor's quotes, and there are many:

Education simply transforms lives. There is no other more powerful tool to disrupt intergenerational poverty and disadvantage; there is no other more powerful tool to unlock the potential for a successful, happy, worthwhile life than education.

Vale, Eleanor Mary Ramsay.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: I probably should not, but I want to put on record one of Eleanor's famous quotes, too. She was being given a very hard time by a gentleman harassing her. He said to her, 'What is the difference between gender and sex?' She halted for a moment, according to Michael, and said, 'One is a lot more fun.'

AQUACULTURE INDUSTRY

Mr TRELOAR (Flinders) (15:55): A memorable quote.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: She was a ripper.

Mr TRELOAR: I might use that myself one day. I rise today to speak about an unfortunate situation, I guess, about something that is unfolding at Anxious Bay near Elliston following the collapse of the Ocean Australia Abalone aquaculture venture. This particular venture goes back a long way, and it all began in 2007. The member for Colton may remember from his time in the ministry that this venture was about to embark. There was great excitement around this venture that promised jobs and opportunity for those in Elliston, where I think, at its height, it was probably employing about 30-odd people. They are people who live, work, have families and children going to school, and all those things in a small town are very important.

It began with Australian Bight Abalone and finished with Ocean Abalone Australia. I think there was probably another company in between but, 10 years on, the venture has failed. The latest company has gone broke and simply walked away from the venture. There are a number of reasons why ventures such as this fail. There were concerns raised at the time about the site itself. Obviously, Anxious Bay is particularly productive for the wild catch abalone sector and I guess those who were looking with interest at aquaculture thought that it could also be productive for an abalone farm.

There were certain concerns about the site. I have no doubt there were management issues along the way. In fact, most recently, when it all began to come apart, the Abalone Industry Association—most of the divers fish on the West Coast and around Kangaroo Island—raised issues with PIRSA back in March this year.

Aquaculture is an important sector. We have successful oysters, kingfish and mussels. Tuna is a slightly different situation. It is referred to as 'ranching' but, effectively, it is aquaculture. Land-based abalone also has proved successful, but something is problematic about wild catch abalone, particularly in this situation.

Ultimately, the licences were cancelled by PIRSA in July 2017 with the owners simply walking away and abandoning the site. What occurred after that was that—and I have always wanted to use this term in parliament—flotsam and jetsam began to arrive on the beaches and shoreline, not just adjacent to Elliston but up and down the entire West Coast and even adjacent islands. That was an indication that things were beginning to fall apart out there.

I am going to give credit where credit is due and congratulate the PIRSA Fisheries staff working out of Port Lincoln. They have made a concerted effort to clean up that flotsam and jetsam and keep the beach tidy. Certainly the locals were concerned, and they spoke to me and other members in this place about their concerns, but PIRSA staff have been keeping the beaches clean. The issue that remains is that there is infrastructure still out on the lease and some of it is down on the bottom now so it needs removing.

My question today to the Minister for Agriculture, Food and Fisheries was around that. Ultimately, who is going to pay for its removal? I understand that a call for tenders has been made by the government. I also understand that there are court proceedings underway against some of the management of the previous operator. Should the government pursue the former directors for the cost of removal, and I am sure they will, my question is: if that money is not there, is it then for the South Australian taxpayer to foot the bill? We will wait and see how it unfolds.

The Hon. P. Caica interjecting:

Mr TRELOAR: I am just flagging it as an issue, member for Colton. What do you think? It would be disappointing if ultimately the taxpayer had to foot the bill and due diligence were not undertaken at the outset—due diligence around the site itself, the companies involved and the investors who were looking to put money into the scheme. It was a managed investment scheme, but these things are fraught with sad stories all over the place—not just here but also in relation to blue gum forests on Kangaroo Island and down in the South-East. There are many more examples of how managed investment schemes look attractive, and probably are to the investors at the outset, but ultimately end in tears.

MURRAY RIVER

The Hon. P. CAICA (Colton) (16:00): I enjoyed that contribution by my friend the member for Flinders. Last week, I was very pleased to hear the fantastic reports that the salt levels in Lake Albert have returned to pre Millennium Drought levels, thanks to water level cycling and several high-flow events in recent years.

You would recall—and I do not like saying this because I hear others say it—that as a former minister for the River Murray during the Millennium Drought and the aftermath I am all too aware of the high salinity levels across the Murray River and the environmental and ecological disruption that this has caused. At the time of the Millennium Drought, Lake Albert salinity reached more than 20,000 EC—sea water is approximately 35,000 EC—and the water was not fit for any purpose whatsoever at that stage.

The news that, after many years of work by the dedicated Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources staff, scientific experts and the surrounding community, salinity levels are now below pre Millennium Drought levels is welcome news—welcome news, indeed. The lowering and raising of water levels (known as water level cycling) has been carried out by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources since the Millennium Drought ended in 2010, helping to reduce salinity in Lake Albert to about 1,500 EC.

I recall a lot from the opposition complained about this, saying that it was too slow, but this was a process that was a very good process. I guess when the research was done there was some confidence that it would make a bit of a difference. I understand that the reduction in salinity has improved water quality for the environment, economic and social uses. As you would be aware, Deputy Speaker, Lake Albert is one of the two South Australian freshwater lakes, known as the Lower Lakes, located where the River Murray meets the ocean.

I have been told that a year-long Lake Albert scoping study was carried out in 2013-14 to pinpoint the best management option to improve and maintain water quality and ecological health. The study recommended that water level cycling, being cost neutral and timely—and that is an important issue—be adopted to reduce salinity in Lake Albert. It is probably far more effective than what we saw when the member for Hammond and the member for MacKillop went down there with their strong-arm T-shirts and started trying to remove the stuff from the temporary weir. This was far more effective than the work they were attempting to do, which was purely for the purposes of media attention. Now I digress.

In addition to the high flows in recent years, the delivery of environmental water has also assisted in removing salt from the lower River Murray and Lower Lakes as this has increased the volume of water available for release over the barrages. Environmental water was delivered by the Commonwealth Environmental Water Holder, the Murray-Darling Basin Authority's The Living Murray program, the Victorian Environmental Water Holder and the New South Wales Office of Environment and Heritage.

Salinity management is one of the most significant environmental challenges facing the Murray-Darling Basin. If it is not managed properly it has serious implications for water quality, plant growth, biodiversity, land productivity and the supply of water for critical human needs. South Australia established the River Murray Salinity Zoning Policy in 2003 to manage the long-term salinity risks arising from new irrigation development as part of an overall program to manage salt levels in the River Murray. I understand that the River Murray Salinity Zoning Policy is being reviewed, taking into account considerable changes in irrigation and land and water management through the years.

Maintaining low River Murray salinity levels underpins the health of the environment, the productivity of the region's \$2.2 billion food and wine industry and is critical to providing good quality water to up to 90 per cent of South Australia's population who rely on the water from the river. We need to have strong policies and programs in place that effectively manage salinity while also supporting sustainable irrigation development. Deputy Speaker, you yourself would admit that, of all the states, it is South Australia that has continued to ensure that we do whatever we can to make sure that the river system is managed properly.

We need to have strong policies and programs in place to effectively manage salinity, as I have said, while supporting sustainable irrigation development. After consultation with irrigators and communities, the government is considering changes to the current River Murray salinity zoning policy. The proposed changes seek to provide a good balance between supporting irrigation development and meeting our obligation to manage salinity under the Murray-Darling Basin agreement.

The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources has been working with the South Australian Murray-Darling Basin Natural Resources Management Board and a review panel of key experts and stakeholder representatives to consider community feedback and identify opportunities to improve the policy. I want to commend the work done by the Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources in managing the salinity levels in Lake Albert and across the Murray-Darling Basin and long may they continue their very good work.

Auditor-General's Report

AUDITOR-GENERAL'S REPORT

In committee.

(Continued from 2 November 2017.)

The CHAIR: We are looking at the Minister for Education and Child Development and the Minister for Higher Education and Skills. The member for Adelaide, you have questions. Is there any particular portfolio area that you are going to ask questions on?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes, my questions will be coming from the Auditor-General's Report on the Department for Child Protection, Part B, Agency audit reports, starting at page 59.

The CHAIR: Are they all on that section?

Ms SANDERSON: Yes. My first question refers to page 61, communication of audit matters. Given that until recently the department was not complying with the drug testing required in section 20, part 2, of the now repealed Children's Protection Act 1993 or the reporting requirement to parliament as referenced in the inquest regarding Chloe Valentine, with all the new legislation that affects the department, without a legal compliance process in place how will the minister ensure staff on the ground are firstly aware of the changes and are correctly implementing them?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We appointed a head of legal services in May, which was a crucial appointment to make sure that we are being adequately responsive on legal compliance. There is a draft legal compliance framework currently under discussion in the department and about to be considered for finalisation by the executive of the department. We expect that to be in place by the end of November.

Ms SANDERSON: I now refer you to page 72, expenses. Can the minister explain why there has been a huge increase in the cost of commercial care, from \$37 million in the 2013-14 year to \$126.6 million three years later, representing a 242 per cent increase?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As the member will be well aware, we have seen a large increase in the number of young people who are unfortunately in out-of-home care due to the incapacity of their families to look after them. To give some sense of the scale of the increase, from 2014-15 to 2015-16 we saw a 14.3 per cent increase in the number of young people in out-of-home care, and from 2015-16 to 2016-17 a further 8 per cent increase.

While we have seen a steady increase in the number of young people who are able to be placed in kinship or foster care, that has not been able to keep pace with the number of young people who have come into out-of-home care. In addition, while I do not have figures here with me, the length of time that a young person stays in out-of-home care has extended, so unfortunately we are picking up children younger and they are under longer orders.

What that has all combined to do is put enormous pressure on placements. Without having been able to increase the number of placements in family-based care to the extent that we would have liked (although, as I said, it has increased), the only alternative is to pay people to care for children. That has been largely through the residential care facilities run by the department. There are some residential care places that are run by non-government organisations, and of course we have resorted to the use of shift-work commercial care in some instances. We are working very hard on reducing the extent of that.

The answer to why we are spending more is evident in the increased demand and the need for us to continue to increase the number of foster care and kinship care family-based placements. We have been working very hard to do that. As I say, we have seen increases, but unfortunately as yet not sufficient to more than compensate for the number of additional young people coming into our care.

Ms SANDERSON: Does the minister think that, as you have just outlined, an increase of 14.3 per cent in one year and then 8 per cent, totalling 22.3 per cent, should then give a 242 per cent increase in the cost of commercial care? Whilst there is an increase, they do not seem comparable in any way.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: You are not comparing apples to oranges. There is an increase in the overall pool of the number of kids in care. The relatively small number of young people who were in residential care has absorbed a disproportionate amount of that increase of 22 per cent; therefore, you have seen a dramatic increase. I am not sure what other explanation there could be for this increase. We are not spending more on paying our staff. We are not using the money for other purposes; we are using the money to house young people.

There is an additional expense associated with young people who have significant disabilities, and there are some young people in that situation who are expensive. I do not for a minute—and I am sure no South Australian would for a minute—not want to spend the money on those young people who need nursing care around the clock. Depending on the composition of the young people who are in non family-based care, that can significantly change the amount of money being spent on that part of our budget from year to year.

Ms SANDERSON: On 6 February 2016, the minister announced an investment of \$9 million to increase the number of foster carers by at least 130 and reduce the need for temporary commercial accommodation. That was 21 months ago. Almost two-thirds of the way through that policy, what is the net increase in foster carers since the \$9 million was announced?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Because I have given you figures on the increase in the number of young people in care over the period from 2014 to the end of June this year, I will do the same with

the increase in kinship care and in foster care to give a sense of the increases that we have seen. These are not foster carers or kinship carers: they are placements of children, so there are two ways of measuring. From 2014-15 to 2015-16, we saw an increase of 16.5 per cent of placements in kinship care and from 2015-16 to 2016-17 a further 6.7 per cent increase. With foster carers, we have seen from 2014-15 to 2015-16 an increase of 8.9 per cent and from 2015-16 to 2016-17 a 6 per cent increase. So we have seen a steady increase.

The last figures I have for the number of carers who had a placement are not up to date, so I am not able to give you the final figures. Forgive me, I am misreading my own notes. The number of foster carers we had as at 30 June 2016 was 688. In 2016-17, so the end of 2017, the number was 730. So we have seen an increase in carers, both in the placements of children and in the number of carers. What we need, as everyone I think understands, are more and more children in placements where that is appropriate and safe for the children.

Ms SANDERSON: That is a net increase of 42 extra foster carers. Given that your goal is 130 in three years, how will you make up the difference? You are nearly 90 behind.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We are a third of the way through, but the fact is that our target is the target to have all children who can possibly live in family-based care in family-based care. That needs to increase. We should pay attention to the number of carers who are kinship carers. Being with kin, with people the children know, is very important and we have seen an increase in those numbers also—in fact, a larger increase in the number of placements with kinship carers.

We have recently, again, worked on attracting more people to the idea of being foster carers. We have gone to all public servants through a SAGEMS message and also a targeted message in the education department. We will be following that up. We think that people who are already working with children are more likely to consider using their skills to be foster carers.

Importantly, one of the challenges we have had is making sure that we are treating our foster carers in a way that means that they will speak well of the experience of fostering. There are foster carers who have not had a good experience, but they love the kids. They care, but they do not necessarily promote the idea to their friends, family and extended networks. It has been very important for us to work much more closely with foster carers and we have been working through the legislation that went through earlier this year on increasing the rights of foster carers.

We have recently appointed four people who are placed in the department to be liaisons for foster carers so that when they have a problem that they can not deal with with their immediate case manager, they will get the support that they need. We are also working with the non-government organisations who recruit foster carers on the ways in which we contract with those organisations to make sure that they are getting the right incentives to get more foster carers, but to get quality foster carers, and that they themselves are supporting carers. It is a multiple prong. The money that the member refers to was an advertising campaign and is part of it but is by no means the full effort that we are going to increase both kinship and foster care placements.

Ms SANDERSON: Certainly I note that there have been a lot of ads and I am sure they have cost millions of dollars out of the \$9 million. As you have identified, it is actually the treatment of the foster carers that is the issue. As recently as yesterday, I was notified of another foster carer who relinquished a child and was very upset to do so. I wrote to your office, and there has been no extra support. All the mother needed was support for that child, and now that child has been relinquished.

The child has a sibling who is also in danger if your department does not get onto this very quickly. I will resend it to you, as you look unsure. Issues have been raised, I bring them up with your office, and they need urgent attention. If you have two or four liaison people in the department, they have a lot of work cut out for them. It costs far more money for that breakdown in relationship if you do not put the supports in place and it is a lot worse for the child.

I am still on page 72. Given that in 2015-16 commercial care expenditure was \$82.9 million, what miracle was the minister expecting when she budgeted for only \$25.2 million for commercial care, which then ended up being \$126.6 million?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It was not the accurate figure to the budget, and that has subsequently been revised and dealt with. The department, in preparing a budget, tries to take account of what it believes will occur in demand and also what kind of options there are to meet that demand. We had engaged in a contract for 100 residential care places with non-government organisations, and there was hope that that would take the majority of the commercial care placements.

What became apparent over a period of time, though, was that that twin impact of more children needing to be placed in out-of-home care and children staying longer, which maximises the effect, was miscalculated. I say that not in criticism but in the recognition that it is very difficult to predict, in child protection, what will be required when, and also how often you will be able to place children with kinship.

The number of children who may have disabilities or significant behavioural disorders varies from year to year. Both of those triggers will often require accommodation and care that is not within a family. We rectified the amount of money that we needed to spend. The Treasurer has worked very closely with us to make sure that we were able to offer the services that we need to offer.

Ms SANDERSON: Is this the first time the minister has ever had to access money from the Governor's appropriation fund in any of your portfolio areas and, if so, how much?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I will take that on notice.

Ms SANDERSON: Does the minister also know how much is in the Governor's appropriation fund? I am not sure if that would be in your area.

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I imagine that is the province of the Treasurer.

Ms SANDERSON: I now refer to page 68, incidental payments. Can the minister explain how incidental expenses could possibly add up to \$19 million in one year? What is the minister doing to ensure foster carers are receiving the correct loadings so the incidentals account is not used to this extent?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: As the member points out, the Auditor-General has drawn attention to incidentals and they cover a very wide variety of expenditure. The department is preparing to develop a policy in order to give better shape to that. I think the second question the member asked was about the carer payments and that has been the subject of very detailed work by the incoming chief finance officer as the new department has been formed in working with the contract arrangements with the non-government organisations to make sure that the payments are accurate and not causing grief and irritation to foster carers. An enormous amount of work is being done in the department at present.

Ms SANDERSON: Also on page 68 under 'Advance account previously used to provide a loan to a carer' regarding the \$10,000 loan given to a carer, has the documentation now been found regarding the nature and circumstances of the loan? If so, what are they? What is the current balance? What are the processes now in place to ensure this does not happen again?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We do not have the figures, so we will take that on notice.

Ms SANDERSON: Has the documentation at least been found, if you do not have the figures? Do you know what the loan was for?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I believe the department still has not found the original documentation. It dates from some time ago. They are seeking it, but the main thing is that we will give you a comprehensive answer on notice.

Ms SANDERSON: Page 68, as to the management of DCP's advance accounts needing to improve, have the 11 of the 20 advance accounts now been closed, as mentioned in the Auditor-General's Report? What policies has the minister put in place to ensure this also never happens again?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that those advance accounts are being progressively closed and that a credit card system is being put in place so that there will be no need for that kind of accounting.

Ms SANDERSON: Page 65, under 'Controls over payments to NGO service providers need to improve', related to the 10 non-government organisations, three of which were double paid when children moved out of commercial care into residential care. Can the minister guarantee that no children are being paid for twice at the moment? What systems are in place to ensure that does not happen?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: I am advised that we now have a database constructed so that we are able to track every expenditure related to an individual child so that this should not happen again.

Ms SANDERSON: Page 64, as to invoices not being reviewed and checked for validity, regarding the sample done of six commercial care payments, it was found in five cases (which is a huge percentage) that the rates charged by service providers were not checked to contracted or quoted rates for accuracy by either the case worker or the business support officer before payment. Has this now been rectified? If so, how?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We have instituted a program of extensive training for our staff and we have also instituted random checks to ensure quality.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to page 69. A number of split transactions were paid using DCP purchase cards. In the Auditor-General's Report, people were splitting invoices so that they would be below the threshold so that they could use a credit card. What has the minister done to ensure splitting of transactions no longer occurs, who is checking this and how many cards have been cancelled since this due to misuse?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The member will see in the last paragraph on page 69 that the Auditor-General has noted a number of improvements that have been made by the department in order to ensure that we have a sound system. While I understand that no credit cards have been revoked, there have been a number of warnings issued.

Ms SANDERSON: I refer to page 70, the ineffective review of key payroll reports. I note that ever since I have been doing this, since 2014, the bona fide reports and the annual leave have been mentioned in 2014, 2015, 2016 and again in 2017. What is the minister doing to ensure that changes are made?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: The department acknowledges that this is a real issue. It is one that occurs in some agencies, but obviously not all. They have been working hard not only to provide the right training environment or the right training effort so that the management is operating in a way that is consistent with the Auditor-General's requirements but also to improve the processes within the department.

The department has been in existence for just over a year and in that time has had to form the part of the department that is responsible for the corporate management. As those leaders have come in place and as staff have been appointed, there has been a very big effort to make sure that there is a diligent response to all issues, particularly those that have previously been raised by the Auditor-General. This is one that is still in process.

As the Auditor-General has noted in the report, there are interim measures that have been undertaken by the department, which is really about making sure that the managers are aware of their obligations. We will be working very hard over the next year so that when you are asking me questions next year or I am asking you questions next year there will be a more satisfactory response for the management of bona fides.

Ms SANDERSON: Just to be clear, in 2014 the agency's response to why the bona fide reports had not been checked as well was that the department would continue to remind managers and supervisors of the requirement to review outstanding BFRs in a timely manner. It was the same response in 2015. In 2016, it was noted that it still was not occurring, and there was a need to print out the reports. Are they still paper reports that are having to be printed out, or has it moved to online as it was expected to?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: We are moving at some stage in the not too distant future, sometime in the next several months, to fully implement CHRIS 21, which will enable us to be fully online. It is important, particularly for a very geographically dispersed department such as ours with many

part-time workers, that we are automated as much as possible. We are expecting that that full implementation will make a significant improvement to our management of bona fides.

Ms SANDERSON: Last year, the response from the department was that existing procedures would be updated to include an internal escalation process and more frequent reviews of noncompliant sites and also to advise that sites would be informed that the process of certifying these reports can be delegated to other staff. Were those done and there is still a problem, or have these not been implemented yet?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: Those actions, I am advised, have been undertaken, but it will be when we are fully automated that you will see a significant improvement in the quality.

Ms SANDERSON: Still on page 70, the report for this year states:

Where BFCs and MLRs are not promptly checked, DCP has no assurance that only valid employees are paid, that employees are paid correctly or that leave balances recorded in Chris21 are accurate, impacting the reliability of associated liability balances.

Were they audited for the sake of the end-of-year balances that the Auditor-General has checked?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE: It is standard for the Auditor-General to audit in order to be accurate in reporting. As I have said, there is no question that this is an issue for this department and that we have made progress, but not sufficient yet to be clear of concerns from the Auditor-General. We will be working diligently over the next year to improve that as this department gets on its feet as an independent department.

The CHAIR: The time having expired, we thank the member for Adelaide for her questions and the minister and her advisers for making themselves available. We ask that the Minister for Disabilities and the Minister Assisting the Minister for Recreation and Sport move into position with her advisers as soon as possible.

Mr SPEIRS: This is on Part B of the agency reports, pages 79 to 81, and all my questions will come from those pages. This refers to the National Disability Insurance Scheme implementation. The following extract is from page 79:

NDIS related expenditure was forecast to total \$51 million for the year ending 30 June 2017 and will rise significantly in 2018-19 to \$723 million. Actual NDIS and service reform program related expenditure for the year ended 30 June 2017 was \$70 million, which included employee benefit expenses of DCSI employees.

Minister, what is the reason for the increase in predicted NDIS-related expenditure in 2016-17, from \$51 million to \$70 million?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you very much to the member for Bright for his question. As he said, the Auditor-General's Report, Part B, correctly states that NDIS contributions were, indeed, forecast to total \$51 million for the year ended 30 June 2017 and were predicted to rise significantly in 2018-19, to \$723 million, as a result of our transition to the NDIS and as per bilateral agreements. The Auditor-General's Report, Part A, also states that forecast NDIS expenditure for the year was \$121 million and that actual NDIS program expenditure for the year ended 30 June 2017 was \$70 million, which included employee benefit expenses for DCSI employees.

The figures quoted in Part A do not solely relate to NDIS expenditure. In addition to staffing expenses, the amounts quoted in the report also include payments in relation to the national aged-care reforms and, as such, those numbers are not comparable with the bilateral estimate of \$51 million.

Mr SPEIRS: Minister, in relation to the additional \$19 million, is that all connected to aged care?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: It does not all relate to aged care. In relation to aged care and disability services reform, payments to the commonwealth of \$59.4 million consist of \$23.2 million budget neutrality payments allocated to NDIS service reform and \$36.2 million of payments related to cross-billing allocated to the Disability SA program.

Mr SPEIRS: Also on the NDIS, the bilaterals between South Australia and the commonwealth contain a range of data for the scheme. NDIS quarterly reports attract the actual

numbers. The bilateral agreement predicted that, at 30 June 2017, 12,887 South Australians would be part of the NDIS. The NDIS quarterly report shows that in South Australia the actual number in the scheme at 30 June was 12,116. My question is: is the minister concerned that the NDIS timetable was too ambitious and rushed people into the scheme?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: It is a really exciting time to be the Minister for Disabilities as we transition to the NDIS. As the member would know, the NDIS is the biggest social reform in Australia since Medicare and I think we can all be very proud here in South Australia that South Australia was the first state to sign up to the NDIS. As I said, that is something we can all be proud of. Our youngest South Australians began transitioning to the NDIS over the past few years: 15 to 17 year olds from 1 January this year, and 18 to 64 year olds from 1 July this year.

We know that there is a lot changing in terms of this transition to the NDIS. It is a time of immense opportunity to ensure that people with disability finally have choice and control about the sorts of services and supports they need. Fundamentally, this reform is absolutely about empowering people with disability but, as I said, we know that there is a lot that is changing, and with a reform of this size of course come challenges. The NDIS is, as you know, a federal entity, and I am certainly doing all that I can to call on the federal government to work with us to make sure that there is a smooth transition and that, through that transition, no South Australian falls through the cracks.

Through the implementation of the NDIS, we are doubling funding to the disability sector. Total funding to our disability sector will equate to \$1.5 billion every year at full rollout. Of this, our South Australian government has really very proudly committed \$723 million every year. As well as doubling funding, we anticipate that almost double the number of people with disabilities will receive support.

Around 32,000 South Australians will receive support through the NDIS and, really importantly, 9,000 people who have not received services and supports before will do so for the very first time at full implementation. The NDIS is absolutely focused on better care, choice, control and participation in everyday life for people living with a disability, and the NDIS, and certainly our government, is focused on ensuring that every community member through that transition to the NDIS can fully participate in every aspect of community life and also in our economy.

The other really important thing to mention as we transition to the NDIS is that the NDIS will also bring almost double the number of jobs to the disability sector. The disability sector currently has about 6,000 full-time equivalent jobs within it and we think that at full implementation of the NDIS there will be around 12,000 jobs in the disability sector. Work in the disability sector is incredibly rewarding and gives people the opportunity to work very closely with fellow South Australians with disabilities, to empower them to engage in community life.

Certainly, as Minister for Disabilities, I am very much looking forward to and am enjoying working with our many community organisations to make sure that we are ready for these new jobs. Those jobs are being created in personal care, of course, but there are also jobs in allied health, including in occupational therapy, in speech pathology and in physiotherapy. There are also jobs in areas like transport, IT, management and administration.

As just a couple of examples of the new jobs that we are creating through our transition to the NDIS, we have recently seen a not-for-profit community organisation, a wonderful organisation that operates in many communities across South Australia, Cara, announce 40 full-time jobs in Adelaide and across the regions. Recently, when I was in Whyalla, Community Support Incorporated announced with me alongside them that they would be creating 25 new jobs in that region. Minda is about to announce 100 new jobs in Mount Gambier.

Our government is really focused on making sure that we transition people well to the NDIS so that those 9,000 new people who will receive services and supports for the very first time have the choice and control about those supports that we want them to. That is fundamentally at the core of the NDIS. We are very focused on making sure that those jobs come to fruition as well.

As I said, in relation to your question, our investment of \$723 million put together with the commonwealth's investment takes us to a \$1.5 billion investment in disability, which equates to around double the funding in the sector. I give you all those figures just to make the point that our

transition to the NDIS is an absolutely huge exercise, but an exercise that is absolutely the right one for us to engage in. Of course, change of that scale does come with its challenges, but we are very much committed to working through those challenges, to calling on the federal government to work with us to meet those challenges and also to calling on the NDIA to work with us to make sure that transition happens well.

Mr DULUK: Minister, in your statement you just said that the new NDIS project will create about 6,000 new jobs. What modelling and benchmarking has your department undertaken to give veracity to that figure?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Those figures were first produced through the NDIA's market vision statement, which they produced for each state and territory in Australia. Also, we engaged KPMG to produce a report which took a much deeper dive into the South Australian context. The other thing we are doing that I have had the pleasure of being involved in—

Mr Duluk interjecting:

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: To table the KPMG report? I will just get some advice on that. I will just check where that is up to in terms of the tabling. I will take that question on notice and get back to you on that point. The other thing I want to mention in talking about those job numbers, which is a wonderful thing to be able to talk about, is that we are holding 23 expos in communities right across every corner of South Australia. I have had the pleasure of attending some of those expos and will be attending more of them.

The expos have provided a really wonderful opportunity for people with disabilities to come and meet providers and to hear from the department and a number of speakers about the transition to the NDIS, either for themselves or for their loved ones. It has been a great way—and I have seen it for myself—for them to find the information they need, to have any questions answered, and to connect with service providers.

The expos have also provided an excellent opportunity for people who are either looking for a career change or seeking work to find out about those estimated 6,000 jobs in the disability sector. When I visited those expos, it was wonderful to see people getting the information about those jobs. As I said before, I think these jobs are incredibly rewarding, working with people with disabilities and empowering them.

The other great thing that has come from those expos is that the many service providers who have attended have had the opportunity to connect with one another and to talk about their readiness for those new jobs and their readiness around the transition to the NDIS. I wanted to add that information in relation to your question. They have been wonderful. It was great to see the member for Flinders at the Ceduna expo last week. I encourage anybody who is wanting to know more, either members of parliament or their constituents who might be interested in finding out about the jobs to come along to one of the expos. I would certainly be happy to provide information about where the remainder of those 23 expos will be held.

We also have six disability workforce hubs across South Australia, which are great places for people to find information. As people are approaching us in those hubs and through the expos, we are also finding out more about the sort of information they need to make their decisions, whether that be about employment or the services and support they need for themselves or their loved ones.

Mr SPEIRS: Looking back to the intake numbers for the NDIS, on the same reference as my earlier questions, a recent report by the Productivity Commission stated that the NDIS's 'focus on participant intake has compromised the quality of plans and participant outcomes'. Does the minister agree with this statement?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: As I said in an earlier answer, the NDIS is significant reform. In fact, it is the largest social reform here in Australia since the introduction of Medicare. Because of the volume of people we want to see transition well to the NDIS, because of the new jobs that are being created and because of doubling the amount of funding, it does come with enormous challenges and opportunities. I am not happy with any delays, but I am very happy that around 13,000 South Australians have transitioned to the NDIS. We are certainly well down the path

compared with some other states, as we should be, given, as I said before, we were proudly the first state to sign up to the NDIS.

I will be raising these kinds of issues when I attend the Disability Reform Council next week. They are also issues that I have raised with the federal minister and directly with the NDIA. Any issue that comes across my desk, in terms of any delays or particular problems that people encounter as they transition, obviously we take very seriously and we are working very closely with South Australians with disabilities, their families, their carers and the organisations that support them to make sure that they get the support they need to transition well. I certainly will be continuing to advocate for the federal government to work with us to make sure that South Australians transition well and that we continue to positively move people to the NDIS.

Mr SPEIRS: Moving to page 80 of the report, under the audit recommendations to DCSI and the fourth dot point, which looks at addressing NDIS work program slippages, it is my understanding that existing Disability SA clients have priority in terms of entering the NDIS, as agreed through the bilateral process, because they already have established their eligibility for disability support.

Disability SA provides a transition summary to the NDIS outlining their existing supports, which should help the NDIS with its own assessment of the individual. It is my understanding that there have been cases where some individuals who were Disability SA clients, including one who is dependent on a wheelchair for mobility, have been rejected by the NDIS. Is the minister or her department aware of this situation?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you to the member for that question and certainly for bringing that particular issue to my attention. It is a really important issue, and I would appreciate receiving details about that person so that I can work with my office and the department to follow up once we receive those particulars about that individual.

Mr SPEIRS: Thank you, minister, and I will ensure that those specifics are passed on to you and your office. As a related question, are you or your department aware of how many Disability SA clients have been unable to transition to NDIS?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: What I can give you are some statistics about the number of decisions that have been made by the NDIA in relation to South Australians and how many in total have been determined as eligible. To give you information about the number of Disability SA clients as opposed to people generally, I will have to bring back more information about that particular element. The total number of access decisions made by the NDIA in South Australia is 15,764, decisions determined as eligible is 14,848, decisions deemed ineligible are 916 and decisions deemed inactive by virtue of the application being withdrawn by the person, closed or revoked is 471. The statistic as at 30 June 2017 in terms of the number of eligible participants with approved plans is 11,634.

That was as at 30 June, but I can say—and I said it in an earlier answer—that we estimate that around 13,000 South Australians have now transitioned to the NDIS. We anticipate that, at full scheme transition, around 32,000 South Australians with disability will be able to access services and supports that come with much greater choice and control through the NDIS. As I also said in a previous answer, really pleasingly 9,000 South Australians, through their transition to the NDIS or through the implementation of the NDIS, will receive services and support for the very first time, which is a really pleasing aspect of the implementation of the NDIS.

Mr SPEIRS: If there was a client of Disability SA who for some reason or another found themselves rejected from transitioning to the NDIS, is there a process of appeal that Disability SA will support them through?

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you for that really important question. There are a few elements in terms of people's access to a review of decisions. Firstly, there is a review process through the NDIA. Of course, people can also go to the Administrative Appeals Tribunal. The commonwealth has also provided some funding to the Brain Injury Network to support people with reviews of particular decisions. As always, my department would, is and has been available to people if they require support to have questions answered, to get further information, to find information

about the sorts of review processes that are available but also in terms of any other information that they need about the services and supports that will be available to them through the NDIS.

Mr DULUK: Minister, relating to one of your previous answers about providers, what systems do you have in place to make sure that providers are not price gouging or charging the NDIS or clients an inflated price? It has been raised with me a few times that receivers of services are seeing an increased price compared to previous times.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Thank you to the member for that question; I think that is a really important question. At this point in time, the NDIA is setting fixed prices for particular services. It is my understanding that when there is a much more mature market the NDIA will deregulate but is not doing that now because they are also worried about the issue of price gouging, inappropriate pricing around particular services. So right now the NDIA is setting prices for particular services.

Mr DULUK: That has not come into force yet.

The Hon. K.A. HILDYARD: Yes.

The CHAIR: I thank the members for Bright and Davenport for their questions and the minister and her advisers for attending. We now move to the Minister for Police and all the other things that he has attached to him and ask him to move into position with his advisers. The member for Schubert, I believe, is taking the helm for this. Member for Schubert, you are in charge. What page will you be looking at?

Mr KNOLL: We will look at corrections first, dealing with Part B, page 90. Minister, what was the total budget over spend for 2016-17?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am able to advise that the figure was \$0.068 million, which I think is \$68,000. In the scheme of the quite significant DCS budget and its variable intake in terms of who it has to deal with, that is quite a small figure.

Mr KNOLL: How much was the actual spend on police cells for 2016-17?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I understand that the total spent on police cells across the City Watch House, Sturt and Holden Hill was in the order of \$4.9 million.

Mr KNOLL: Can the minister outline what the budget is for police cells for the 2017-18 year?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I understand that is something that is managed within the department's resources and is not a specific budget line, nor do I believe it is necessarily referred to in the Auditor-General's Report that we are asking questions on. Certainly, with the additional capacity that he and I saw yesterday at Port Augusta with the Saltbush unit opening with 128 extra beds, that will significantly reduce the demand on the department needing to use police cells in the way they have done in previous years.

Mr KNOLL: What happened up until the middle of 2015 is that essentially police cells were unbudgeted and that any police cell expenditure came as an overrun for which DCS had to go back to Treasury for an extra allocation. It was decided, at least for the 2016-17 financial year but potentially the year previous, that there was going to be an allocated budget. Is there an allocated budget for police cells in 2017-18 or is the approved budget zero?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As I just explained, this is not something where there is an allocated budget in 2017-18. If there are police cells that need to be used in this financial year, that is something the department will have to either wear within its own budget or make a request. However, as I explained, we do have the benefit this financial year of a very significant increase in terms of capacity through the new Port Augusta facility and we have not seen—that is not to say that there has been zero—the demand in terms of police cells that we have had in previous years. Also, Chair, I am not quite sure where we are in terms of what reference this is in the Auditor-General's Report.

Mr KNOLL: DCS spends money on police cells; it is in expenses and there will be a few more specific questions on that afterwards. I refer to Part B, page 93, in relation to expenses. The graph there shows that in 2013, 2014, 2015 and 2016 growth in prisoner numbers roughly equated—at least looking at this graph—to the increase in expenses. Why is it that in the 2017 year the increase in expenses outstripped the increased number of prisoners?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Could I clarify what graph the member for Schubert is referring to?

Mr KNOLL: I refer to page 93, expenses. It says here that there is a 44 per cent increase in expenses by \$98 million, yet there was only a 35 per cent increase in prisoner numbers to 790. This is over the five-year period. Essentially, the report outlines the fact that, even though there has been a consistent corollary between prisoner numbers and expenses—it has roughly been about \$100,000 per year—this year that has changed.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I might have to get some more exact information because it is a bit hard to provide too much detail in terms of the analysis of this graph. Essentially, as I understand it, there is additional spending that the department is now undertaking as part of our 10 by 20 project, which I think is quite positive. I know the member for Schubert is supportive of lots of the elements as well.

Those elements where we might be spending money would not necessarily align with our previous line, where the only thing that the department is doing is spending money in terms of how many prisoners you have, therefore you might see a more direct relationship in terms of how many prisoners there are to exactly what the budget is. There are obviously a number of factors that go into that. I would not want to suggest that that is the only factor that goes into it.

Obviously, as the increase in budget has gone up, a part of that is to do with the increasing number of prisoners we have in the system. It has been widely noted that that has increased significantly over the past decade, but there are also follow-throughs in our previous enterprise bargaining agreements that lead to increased costs as well and there are also different programs that the department might undertake. I understand that some of them involve things like home detention and also the alternatives to custody project. I would be happy to discuss them further in more detail, but there are obviously a number of factors that go into the department's budget, not just prisoner numbers.

Mr KNOLL: Would the minister accept that, given the 10 by 20 strategy was only outlined in the 2017-18 budget, it was impossible for all but the consulting spend to actually be in the 2016-17 financial year?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: That is right. A very small amount would have been in that financial year. What I am outlining is that there are a lot of other things, in terms of what the department has been spending money on, in terms of programs. I understand there are new criminogenic programs, which have resulted in 19 staff working on that. There is also home detention implementation and the alternatives to custody project, as well as the addition, in terms of our accommodation, in staff across those sites that are expanding, such as Port Augusta, that we saw yesterday, as well as our enterprise bargaining obligations that we need to meet in terms of REB pay rises to staff as well.

There is obviously a broad range of things the department does. I am happy to get more information in terms of exactly what those increases have been in the 2017 year and in terms of that graph point. In terms of 10 by 20, I am pointing to the fact that, over coming years, we are going to see less of a relationship directly to prisoner numbers because we are doing other things that are hopefully going to lead to reduced numbers of people reoffending and coming back into our system, which I think is a good thing to do.

Mr KNOLL: I refer to Part A, page 32. It says here that prisoner numbers, as at 30 June 2017, increased by 96 people, or 3 per cent, to 3,050. That was the number as at that date. It talks about improved beds being taken on, but in the budget, which was released on 22 or 23 June, the department actually says that the average prison population is going to be 3,001. I assume if we are saying 30 June is 3,050 that 1 July can be the same. Given that we are starting basically 50 people above where the department thinks the average prison population is going to be for the 2017-18 year—I apologise, it is worse; 2,989 is the projection for 2017-18—does the minister stand by the budget and the estimates that are provided in the 2017-18 budget?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As I understand it, the member is comparing two different things: one is a point in time number of how many prisoners were in the system as at 30 June, and the other figure is an average over a period of 12 months. It is hard to compare an average over 12 months to one point in time. I think that what is assumed in his question is that the numbers always go up in a

linear line whereas, as I understand it—and I was advised when I came into this portfolio—there are seasonal changes that happen from time to time in our prisoner numbers, and that is why the budget figures that are produced go to an average figure across the whole year rather than one particular day.

Mr KNOLL: Sure, except that in the last sitting week the minister gave us an answer that the current average prison population is around 3,050. That was a question I asked and I am just getting the exact details of it. However, we have seen, at least over the past five years, an increase in prison population between 3 per cent and 7 per cent every year, and that 3 per cent is a long-term trend over the last 10 or 15 years. Is the minister suggesting that this will be the first year in the last couple of decades where we are actually going to see a population decrease?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: With respect, that is not quite what I was saying. We have projections in terms of our increase in prisoner numbers, and that is something that the department does on the best advice of trends that are happening within the criminal justice system, what is happening in our legal system, what laws we pass and things like that as well. We are certainly seeing a long-term trend in terms of increasing numbers. What I was pointing out was that you cannot necessarily compare one particular day with what the average over a year is going to be. Just because one particular day was at a higher figure than what you might expect over the year does not necessarily mean that the average projection is going to be false.

These are obviously the best endeavours of the department to come up with these estimates and there is a lot of work behind that. There are a lot of variables in terms of what the inevitable result might be. However, that figure represented in the budget is certainly the best projection that we have. Those projections obviously include a lot of the programs that the department has underway in terms of things like home detention and basing them into those projections as well to come up with those figures.

Mr KNOLL: Minister, in relation to 10 by 20, which you referenced before, when do you believe that contracts will be signed for both the New Foundations program and for the Work Ready, Release Ready, which I think GCS is undertaking the majority of the work for? When will both of those programs begin?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: We are certainly expecting the contracts to be signed very soon. Exactly how soon obviously depends upon the remaining elements of the procurement process. I will certainly be excited to tell the member for Schubert the outcome of that procurement as soon as it is available.

Mr KNOLL: Minister, are you expecting that to be done by the end of the year, or by the middle of next year? Is it months or is it 12 months away?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I think it is fair to say that it is within the next few months that we hope to have that procurement finished and be able to let you know the good news.

Mr KNOLL: I move on to Volume 1, page 476, expenses. In relation to accommodation and lease costs, there has been a 10 per cent increase, from \$8.1 million to \$9.4 million, and also in the second part of that, from \$3.5 million to \$3.6 million. Can the minister outline what the cause of the increased cost from the 2016 to the 2017 year was?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I see the figure that the member for Schubert is referring to, which does have an increase in terms of the accommodation and associated lease costs. I would have to double-check what exactly has gone into those figures. I understand that it does include our office accommodation, but exactly what has led to that increase I will take on notice and get back to the member as soon as possible.

Mr KNOLL: Minister, I just got an update. Your answer on 11 November was that 3,080 prisoners was the daily average prison population. Do you still stand by your comments, minister, that, from the average that has existed over the past three months, we are going to see a 3 per cent decrease? Well, actually it would have to be double that to get to an average of three, but essentially we are going to see 160 fewer prisoners in the system by the middle of next year?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: Once again, I will just have to try to explain the figures here. The 3,080 is about that particular day. Every day we know how many prisoners are in our system, and

that day it was 3,080. The figure in the budget is an average over the 12 months in terms of the number of prisoners in our system. There might be some days when it is more than that average in the budget, and there might be some days when it is less than that average. The average figure across the 12 months in the budget represents our best efforts at determining what our demand on the system, and hence our demand on resources, is going to be across the year with a number of different factors that have gone into those calculations.

Mr KNOLL: If I can go back to Part A, page 32, minister, are you able to provide a total project cost for the opening of the extension to the Port Augusta Prison?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: From my memory yesterday, when we announced the project as a \$57 million project, we only have the figures for what we had spent up until 30 June this year, which was substantially lower than that, at \$26.7 million. Exactly how much as at this point in time we have spent, I will have to take on notice to get that answer. I am advised that we are expecting that it is going to be within the budget that was set for the project.

Mr KNOLL: Minister, on the same reference, do you have an opening date yet for the expansion down at Mount Gambier?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am advised that the opening of the new facilities at Mount Gambier is expected to be in June 2018 but not a particular date at this point in time, but somewhere in June 2018.

Mr KNOLL: Can we move on to SAFECOM.

The CHAIR: What page will you be talking to, member for Schubert?

Mr KNOLL: Part B, page 372. There are quite a number of references in all the emergency services agencies in relation to the Burns review and the separate recommendations that belong to each of those departments. In relation to the CFS, recommendation 26 asked for systems for automatic vehicle location and this was not accepted. Essentially, I assume what this recommends is that there is an AVL upgrade across the CFS fleet; it could be SES, I assume, as well. Can I ask why this recommendation was not accepted?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: As the member outlined, there was a recommendation in the Burns review about automatic vehicle location for appliances, such as CFS trucks, and this was one of the recommendations that was not proceeded with. Essentially, as I understand it, that was a decision across the government. This is a whole-of-government report at that time based on the cost benefit of implementing that. However, I am advised that the CFS are working with Western Australia on a pilot of a number of vehicles testing this, so this might be something that we look at in the future as more funding becomes available as to whether we invest in this sort of technology on the basis of the work we are undertaking at the moment, looking at how it could be rolled out most effectively.

Mr KNOLL: In the same report, it talks about an options paper. Do you have any time line on when the options paper is going to be completed and put out for consultation?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: For AVL?

Mr KNOLL: Yes.

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am not sure in terms of the exact timing on the paper that the member refers to, but I am happy to take that on notice and get back to him.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Madam Chair, I am just mindful of the time and the programming issue that confronts us. I am just wondering whether the member for Schubert might wish to take advantage of the next couple of minutes to read in anything that he has so that when something happens in about two minutes he will not be in any way compromised.

Mr KNOLL: This is the last question I have and, if this is the last question, potentially SAPOL or SAFECOM can answer. As part of the Burns review, recommendation 34 talked about a designated control agency for black system events and major power outages. It is a recommendation that has been handballed to SAPOL, but I am wondering if that decision has been made?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON: I am happy to advise the member that SAPOL has accepted the role, and has been designated as the control agency for black system events, as part of our response to the Burns report. A hazard plan is being completed and then a formal designation of that change will occur. This will allow the control agency (SAPOL) to undertake any further planning required that arises from the actions identified in the risk assessment and hazard planning processes.

The CHAIR: The time having expired, we thank the member for Schubert for his questions and the minister and his advisors for attending. The committee has examined ministers on matters contained in the Auditor-General's Report referred to it and has completed its examination.

Bills

FAMILY RELATIONSHIPS (SURROGACY) AMENDMENT BILL

Second Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (17:41): I move:

That this bill be now read a second time.

I will be very brief because this is one of those matters that has been floating around for a while. It was originally a bill that passed through the parliament some time ago. Basically, it passed through on the voices, and it certainly was not looked at in any great detail here. As it turns out, that bill was extremely difficult, if not impossible, to give practical effect to.

I had discussions with Mr Dawkins from the other place about that bill, because it is a matter of considerable interest to Mr Dawkins. As a result of those discussions, he and I went away and he agreed to put forward some changes to the legislation as it presently exists. I undertook that if he did that I would do two things for him. The first thing was that, without necessarily endorsing the bill or otherwise, I would be prepared to move the second reading and so forth of the bill, which I now do. I also undertook to him that I would make every attempt to find some government time within which to finish it before the end of the parliament, which I have now done.

The only thing I would say for my own part is that the present act is completely unworkable. If anybody cares about this issue, this is the only way to progress it and make it practical. If people are not supportive of the issue altogether, then whether they support this or not is entirely a matter for them. Absent this amendment being passed by the parliament, we are going to be left with the ruinous shambles that we presently have, rather than something that is potentially a bit orderly. I do not wish those remarks to be an indication of my support or otherwise for the concept of surrogacy or anything else. I am merely trying to give a fair and accurate representation of my discussions with Mr Dawkins and to fulfil my undertakings to him.

Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (17:43): I am interested in the Attorney-General's remarks. While I have undertaken to be brief, he has said some things that cannot go without response. The Attorney-General says that a bill went through the parliament some time ago—the original bill to which this amendment bill makes further changes. In fact, it was the original act, because this parliament passed that bill. The Attorney said it 'passed on the voices' and was not really addressed here. I had carriage of that bill, which was of course of interest to Mr Dawkins, as the Attorney said. That is because it was Mr Dawkins' bill, as is this.

Mr Dawkins took that bill through the Legislative Council, where it was fully debated. It was considered by caucus, and it was considered by the Liberal Party's party room. The Attorney-General had the opportunity in caucus, or indeed in the parliament, to give weight to his considerations. He thinks it is unworkable legislation, yet his party was happy enough to support it, and it was allowed through the parliament. I do not know if the Attorney-General is aware, but in this chamber the government has the numbers and he is the Attorney-General.

If the Attorney-General is so certain that the current act of parliament that passed through this parliament was so inferior that it was not deserving of support, then perhaps he could have used his weight as the Deputy Premier to convince his party colleagues and caucus not to support it. He

did not and the bill went through the parliament. At the time, he had the opportunity to put all these things on the record. He is the Attorney-General, he has lots of staff giving advice on these things, and he did not.

However, he did, in good faith, engage with Mr Dawkins so that these improvements to the bill, as he has outlined, could go through. He has made government time available, which I know Mr Dawkins appreciates, as do I. We want the bill to be workable. Anyone interested in my views or the views of other members on surrogacy and the principles themselves can go back to those original debates and consider them. The particular concern of Mr Dawkins was to ensure that a situation such as baby Gammy would not be countenanced or able to happen. The opportunity to make regulations was left with the government by that act. Now, the government not having done so, not having put regulations in place, has requested that the bill be brought forward as well.

I am supportive of the bill. The Hon. John Dawkins MLC has been working for many years toward enabling surrogacy provisions to be available for families in South Australia. He has worked very hard and we are very close to the end. I hope that the bill will enable that to take place in a sensible manner. I commend the Hon. Mr Dawkins for the work he has done over that time. Hopefully, we will see some of those South Australian families have much better outcomes in the years ahead.

The Hon. S.W. KEY (Ashford) (17:46): I rise to support the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill 2017. I also supported the previous bill in this house. I am very pleased to note that there has been a lot of work done to make sure that the bill is practical. I think we have taken some guidance from legislation in New South Wales to make sure that people will be able to access surrogacy services on a non-commercial basis and also to make sure that we look after the product of such surrogacy, to make sure that the baby, the child that eventuates from this process, has information about their origins that they may need in future life.

I congratulate the Hon. John Dawkins on his work in this area over many years. I understand that he was very much assisted by the Hon. Ian Hunter in the other place. There was certainly support shown by the Hon. Tammy Franks and the Hon. Kelly Vincent, as I understand it, and the Hon. Stephen Wade.

Having read that more recent debate, I feel very comforted by the fact that the Attorney has spent a lot of time making sure that this is a practical application. I note his non-view, as he puts it, on the actual topic itself, but I am very pleased that we have something before us that the Attorney believes will work and will be of use to South Australians. Hopefully, this will stop people having to go interstate, where there are proper surrogacy provisions, to access that service, which is what I understand people are doing now from South Australia.

Also, hopefully, this will stop people operating outside the law. I do not have any examples that I can put forward, but there are people who are operating without any regulation or support in South Australia at present. I commend the bill and I thank the Attorney, despite his position on this issue, for making sure that we have legislation that may work.

Mr PEDERICK (Hammond) (17:49): I rise to speak to the Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill 2017 and also note the great work of the Hon. John Dawkins from another place for his championing of this cause of surrogacy. Back in 2006, I was involved with the Social Development Committee inquiring into surrogacy and I note that legislation was passed in 2009. There was another Family Relationships (Surrogacy) Amendment Bill in 2014 that was passed in 2015, and we have this current legislation before us.

Part of what will happen under this legislation is that entering into a commercial surrogacy agreement is punishable by imprisonment of up to five years, and entering into or offering to enter into a surrogacy agreement other than one permitted by the bill is punishable by imprisonment of up to 12 months. It is an offence to act as a surrogacy agent, with imprisonment of up to 12 months, and it is an offence to induce another for payment or other consideration to enter into a surrogacy arrangement, with imprisonment of up to 12 months. This bill will also allow altruistic surrogacy agreements to be entered into in certain circumstances and allow these agreements to have the operation and effect of a binding contract between the parties.

Most of the other items in this bill have been covered. This brings us to a matter of where surrogacy has progressed as far as the legislative component over the years. It was ridiculous when, way back in 2006, we heard at the Social Development Committee about people paying \$50,000 to go to Victoria to make surrogacy arrangements. This bill stops people going into commercial arrangements, like the baby Gammy case, where people do not take on a child with birth defects.

I commend the work of the Hon. John Dawkins in the other place and commend the bill's speedy passage through the house.

Mr SNELLING (Playford) (17:51): I will be a lone voice in opposition to this bill. I appreciate what the Attorney-General is attempting to do. He is faced with a dog's breakfast that has come down from the Legislative Council that has not had the appropriate scrutiny that it should have had. It has gone through on the voices and has proved to be impossible to implement, and the Attorney-General is now trying to clean up the mess. I think it shows very bad form on the part of the member for Morialta to criticise the Attorney for actually trying to clean up the Liberal Party's mess when it comes to this particular bill.

I appreciate what he is trying to do; however, I would state that my view is that the first thing we should do is repeal the original Dawkins bill and then we should properly consider a bill to in some way regulate surrogacy. I think trying to do a patch-up job on a bill that was given improper scrutiny in the first place is not a good way to go. I think we would be far better off repealing the Dawkins bill, have a vote on that, and then properly deal with this very complex issue.

I know that people enter this debate with the best of intentions; however, this is a very fraught area and a very difficult area. We are attempting to prevent or stop commercial surrogacy. It is my view that commercial surrogacy would be almost impossible to prevent if we allowed this practice. People will find ways around the law, and in the end it will be women who will be exploited.

I also have very grave concerns about making surrogacy arrangements contractually binding on the parties. What happens when a surrogate mother, a relinquishing mother, changes her mind partway through the pregnancy and decides that she does not want to relinquish the child to the couple for whom she is carrying the baby? Are we going to forcibly remove children from mothers, who have just given birth, in those sorts of circumstances?

I think this is a very fraught area. It should be getting far greater and closer scrutiny than being debated in the dying minutes of a parliamentary sitting day, having already been dealt with by the parliament and given improper scrutiny. I think this is a very fraught bill that deserves far greater scrutiny than it has been given by the parliament.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON (Newland) (17:54): I have a rough memory of the original bill coming through, but I cannot remember whether it was early in this parliament or towards the end of the last parliament. I certainly remember speaking in opposition to it, and I do so again now in opposing this bill. I agree with member for Playford in that the original bill was rushed through in unseemly haste, moving through on the voices, and there is an attempt again to do it now. In the last 20 minutes, we have had very little notice that it was coming on. I do not even believe it is listed.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: It's on the back page.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: There you go: it is on the back page.

The DEPUTY SPEAKER: A lot of people didn't see the big PTO in the corner.

The Hon. T.R. KENYON: So it was listed, but I did not see that. But it was only at the last minute. I do not think it was in the notices of business which went out, which makes it hard for people to prepare for something which is, for some of us, and I imagine for most people in this parliament, quite an important topic. There would be very few people who would not think that.

I reiterate my opposition to the very concept of surrogacy and surrogacy agreements in that it brings about the commodification of childbirth where it becomes a transaction amongst people for the procurement of children. Obviously it is a much more normal process than other ways, but the very idea that there can be commercial arrangements which we were told there would not be under the previous one. I remember raising that very issue and being told in that semblance of debate that may even have occurred at another time that there would not be commercial agreements.

One of the reasons we are discussing this bill here now is to outlaw commercial agreements that we were told last time would not happen and could not happen. Yet, here we are again, rushing a bill through that is supposed to outlaw something that was already supposed not to be available under the previous bill. The only good thing about that is that it is obviously the clear intention of the parliament not to allow commercial arrangements for surrogacy and childbearing which in my view is a good thing.

It talks about reasonable medical expenses. On my very quick reading of the bill just now, it looks like they are stepped out in division 2, clause 10I—Lawful surrogacy agreements—which steps out what an agreement should look like and that it must comply with the following provisions: 18 years old, be domiciled in the state, commissioning parents must be in a qualifying relationship which is defined. I seek leave to continue my remarks.

Leave granted; debate adjourned.

Sitting extended beyond 18:00 on motion of Hon. J.R. Rau.

CHILDREN'S PROTECTION LAW REFORM (TRANSITIONAL ARRANGEMENTS AND RELATED AMENDMENTS) BILL

Second Reading

Adjourned debate on second reading (resumed on motion).

Ms CHAPMAN (Bragg—Deputy Leader of the Opposition) (17:59): The issue relating to part 9 again identifies the significance of having some response from the commissioner for children, in particular in respect of her obligation to file her annual report. I look forward to receiving it in the next five sitting days. The other matter related to the Criminal Law Consolidation Act and amendments are there in part 12 and appear to be in order. They are to deal with unlawful sexual intercourse, persistent sexual exploitation, consent being no defence in certain cases and procuring a child to commit an indecent act. I expect the incorporation of foster-parents there to appropriately deal with the defect.

Other amendments largely claim to be consequential, and they are matters we are currently investigating. There is provision under part 15 of the Intervention Orders (Prevention of Abuse) Act 2009 to maintain the principle of where the priority is to lie with the inconsistency between the Family Law Act and state child protection orders and of course the prevailing of the intervention order. Of course, at times a judge may be called in to deal with the consequences of any conflict.

They all appear to be quite within the reasonable remit of amendments consequential to legislation, but let us be under no illusion here: we need to have the principal acts actually operating. That is the priority of the opposition and it is almost insulting to come in and say, 'We demand to have urgent attention to transitional matters and extra amendments,' when in fact the principal acts have been frozen into inaction. That is completely unacceptable. With that, my colleague the shadow minister for child protection wishes to make a contribution.

Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide) (18:02): I also would like to make a few quick comments regarding the Children's Protection Law Reform (Transitional Arrangements and Related Amendments) Bill of 2017. This bill affects the Child Safety (Prohibited Persons) Act of 2016, the Children and Young People (Oversight and Advocacy Bodies) Act of 2016 and the more recent Children and Young People (Safety) Act of 2017.

The member for Playford talks about fixing up a mess. These are three bills that are already enacted that clearly cannot work without this transitional bill. I find it very disappointing and annoying that we only received this bill late yesterday. Unlike the surrogacy bill, which has actually been listed and worked on for years, from what I know, this is really just presented at the last minute. I have not had a briefing. The briefing to our shadow attorney-general was after our joint party met, so our joint party has also not been able to have a full briefing, so any amendments or any changes will have to be dealt with in the upper house.

This bill is of great interest to me. Not being a lawyer, being given 44 pages of legislation the night before is really not enough time. However, I did ring a couple of key stakeholders I thought must have been involved in the process and neither of them were, so I am unsure who was consulted

and whether people actually know the effects of this. I believe it is really about fixing up and enabling legislation that has already been presented, so I am not going to stop that at all from going ahead.

However, I note that for years there has been a series of issues with the working with children checks and police checks. It has been all over Leon Byner for years and years. The department has been unable to get these done in an adequate time. It has been a completely flawed process, and it looks like even their updated version is not capable of fixing the problems and we now have to have transitional arrangements in place.

I have had constituents contact me regarding name changes. I thought that would have been a separate bill, which I have been looking out for, but it has been included in this generic bill that covers many, many things, and that is the amendments to the Births, Deaths and Marriages Registration Act. I am in favour of that on behalf of one of my constituents, who has for years been advocating on behalf of her granddaughter, who is under her care and the guardianship of the minister.

The granddaughter has been in her care since a very young child and she has five of her siblings. There is one child who has what you could deem maybe as a joke name the mother made up, which has no reference to either the birth mother or the father. This grandmother has for quite some time been trying to get it changed, and I am told that this legislation will enable that, so I am very supportive of that. Hopefully, this will fix up a few issues, and with more time, when it goes to the upper house, if there are any amendments I will get them put through there.

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) (18:05): I thank the contributors to the debate. For the member for Adelaide's benefit, predominantly this bill is about purely mechanical, technical arrangements consequent upon the other bill having passed in July. One has to follow the other and not the other way around because until we have done the main bill we cannot do the transitional arrangements because we do not know what the main bill will finally look like.

Most of the bill is of that nature. There are, as the deputy leader pointed out, a couple of discrete elements in there that are different things, for example, the name change. I perfectly understand that members of the opposition would like to have an opportunity to reflect on those matters, in particular, between now and next week or whenever it is dealt with in the other place, and that is fine. I place on the record my preparedness to facilitate briefings for whomever may require them in the hope that this can be passed in the next week of sitting, or even earlier if possible, so that we can let the necessary works get on with being done.

The only thing I will mention briefly also is that the deputy leader mentioned in the course of her lengthy contribution—although not as lengthy as sometimes, so let's call it a moderately lengthy contribution—that she was 'choking with indignation', I think were her words, because this was not done last year. As much as I do not like to see any other human suffer, I can relieve that choking indignation feeling to some degree because it actually passed this year in July. To the extent that the—

Ms Chapman: It was suspended last year; that is what I said.

The Hon. J.R. RAU: Okay, to the extent that last year was the relevant time, I would like to relieve the symptoms somewhat by just pointing out that a lot happened this year. Never mind, the point is that there is a positive feeling in the air. I am picking it up and it is a welcome feeling. I think it is called a frisson, although I do not speak a foreign language, so I do not know what I just said, but never mind. Whatever it is, there is that feeling and it is positive. I am ready, willing and able to provide further information to anybody who requires it, and I thank everybody for their excellent cooperation in allowing this matter to proceed.

Bill read a second time.

Third Reading

The Hon. J.R. RAU (Enfield—Deputy Premier, Attorney-General, Minister for Justice Reform, Minister for Planning, Minister for Industrial Relations, Minister for Child Protection

Reform, Minister for the Public Sector, Minister for Consumer and Business Services, Minister for the City of Adelaide) (18:08): I move:

That this bill be now read a third time.

Bill read a third time and passed.

STATUTES AMENDMENT (COURT FEES) BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

POLICE (DRUG TESTING) AMENDMENT BILL

Final Stages

The Legislative Council agreed to the bill without any amendment.

At 18:10 the house adjourned until Wednesday 15 November 2017 at 11:00

*Answers to Questions***COMMUNITY EMERGENCY SERVICES FUND**

318 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 August 2017). In relation to the Community Emergency Services Fund in 2015-16 and 2016-17:

1. How much additional income has been received into the fund?
2. How much money has been paid out in total for workers compensation payments?
3. How many people have received workers compensation payments from the fund?
4. Of those who have received workers compensation payment from the fund, how many were emergency services employees and how many were volunteers?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised:

1. Income received in the Community Emergency Services Fund in 2015-16 was \$279.7 million and in 2016-17 was \$297.8 million. The increased revenue was predominantly due to delayed emergency services levy revenue from 2015-16 of \$11.0 million; \$4.3 million to offset the budgeted increase in 2016-17 expenditure; and \$2.8 million cash recoup for 2015-16 costs related to the Pinery Bushfire.
2. The Community Emergency Services Fund does not make any direct payments for workers compensation costs. The direct costs of workers compensation are met by the emergency services sector agency in which the individual affected works or volunteers. The Fund provides funding to the emergency services sector agencies for operational and investing activities including the costs of workers compensation.
3. There were no workers compensation payments from the fund.
4. Refer to response to question 3.

EMERGENCY SERVICES

324 Dr McFETRIDGE (Morphett) (9 August 2017). How many existing fire trucks will be retrofitted with safety systems across the emergency services in 2017-18, what safety systems will be installed and what is the average cost per system?

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kaurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised:

The Country Fire Service (CFS) has planned for 48 tankers to be retrofitted with safety systems up to June 2018.

The safety system installations will include, where required, In Cab Breathing Systems, Cabin Deluge/Tyre Sprays, In Cabin Pump Start and Under Body Heat Shields. The average cost for safety system installations is anticipated to be approximately \$12,000 per tanker, subject to vehicle variances.

Due to the production capacity of the successful tenderer, it was jointly agreed that the CFS vehicles would be granted priority fitting in preparation for the coming fire season. As a result, it is planned that South Australian Metropolitan Fire Service (MFS) appliances will commence retro-fitting in January 2018; although this timeframe is subject to change dependent on the predicted weather forecast. The MFS plan to meet again in November this year for a prototype scope.

I also understand that six (6) new MFS appliances will arrive in November this year fitted with Burn Over Protection (BOP) systems.

STEM EDUCATION

373 Mr GARDNER (Morialta) (16 August 2017). In relation to the total list of STEM Works projects across all sites—

- (a) How much was spent on consultancy fees, project management fees, and other non-building related expenses;
- (b) How much was retained within DECD;
- (c) How much was retained within DPTI; and
- (d) What is the full breakdown of any other expenses related to this project?

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

As work is still underway on the STEM Works project, a breakdown on the final amounts allocated and spent cannot be provided at this point in time.

All funding allocated for the STEM Works project will be spent on schools and the Department for Education and Child Development will not be retaining any of the funding.

At the conclusion of the project it will be possible to provide a breakdown on what was spent, including general expenses and those incurred by both the Department for Planning, Transport and Infrastructure and the Department for Education and Child Development.

Estimates Replies

BUDGET EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised:

The projected expenditure and net cost of services for the Department of the Premier and Cabinet for the forward estimates are as follows:

	Amount \$000s	Amount \$000s	Amount \$000s	Amount \$000s
	2018-19	2019-20	2020-21	2021-22
Total Expenditure	345,448	345,379	347,687	354,261
Net Cost of Services	204,756	202,441	201,394	204,319

PREMIER'S COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY GROUP

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that the Auditor-General's recommendations were respected and carefully considered.

The Premier's Communications Advisory Group (PCAG) reviews all submissions against the various marketing communications guidelines and not as representatives of their respective departments.

All PCAG Members are already well qualified and experienced communication professionals that are able to objectively assess, and make sound judgements, on important government communications and the prudent use of public funds.

PREMIER'S COMMUNICATIONS ADVISORY GROUP

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that the Premier's Communications Advisory Group (PCAG) includes a membership of five. As with all government communications campaigns that are presented to PCAG, the group ensures a strategic, planned and coordinated approach is undertaken.

At the time, the group who assessed all government communications presented, including the Energy Communications Plan, was:

- Director Communications, Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Director Communications and Media, Office of the Premier
- Government Communications Manager, Department of the Premier and Cabinet
- Marketing Manager, Adelaide 500, South Australian Tourism Commission.

The fifth member of the Group, being the Director of Marketing at the South Australian Tourism Commission, was an apology at this time.'

STATE ENERGY PLAN

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that Cummins Hybrid developed the communication materials for the Energy Plan campaign. To the best of my knowledge they have not undertaken any paid work for the Australian Labor Party.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that not all of the \$2 million allocated for the energy plan communications strategy for 2017-18 has been committed.

STATE ENERGY PLAN

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that subsequent Premier's Communications Advisory Group approval requests were made for the energy plan campaign on 23 March and 14 April 2017.

BRAND SA

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that additional funding was provided to supplement the original funding allocation to support Brand South Australia's operations and initiatives.

NORTHERN TERRITORY PARTNERSHIP AGREEMENT TASKFORCE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that in December 2016, two task forces were established, comprised of senior officials from both jurisdictions, as follows:

- Treasury, efficacy and service delivery task force.
- Tourism, arts and culture task force.

BRAND SA

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that a 12 month funding agreement with Brand South Australia has been approved ending 30 June 2018. The value of the agreement is \$1,106,000. The funding agreement was agreed by both parties.

STATE ADVERTISING BUDGET

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that the Future Jobs Campaign promotes major policies from the 2017-18 state budget to help secure working futures of South Australians in emerging industries such as defence, energy, tourism food and wine, health and hi-tech.

The investment in the campaign as at 26 July 2017 is \$1.3 million (excl. GST).

As a result of the promotion of the Future Jobs Fund, more than 400 South Australian businesses have applied for grants and loans to help them expand their operations and create jobs.

The value of the projects proposed by businesses is almost \$10 billion, while the amount of grants and loans sought through the fund is about \$850 million. If all proposed projects were to go ahead almost 23,000 direct jobs would be created.

FRENCH ENGAGEMENT STRATEGY

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (26 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised:

1. The estimated cost and scope are:
 - South Australian Representative: \$254,000 (estimate subject to exchange rate movements).
 - Operational Expenses: \$100,000.
 - Total budget for 2017-18 as currently allocated is \$354,000.

The Representative for France will take a lead role in the coordination of projects and promoting awareness of South Australia, its economic credentials and pro-business operating environment amongst French corporate decision makers in priority sectors identified in the French Strategic Plan, the Agent-Generals Office's Business Plan and South Australia's Economic Priorities.

As the Representative for France the position will provide sophisticated project management, implementation delivery, protocol advice and general leadership in maximising opportunities for South Australian companies to participate in the value chain opportunities from Australia's shipbuilding programs. The position will also be responsible

for advancing broader trade, investment, social and cultural opportunities in partnership with relevant Government agencies in South Australia and establish the South Australia Club in Paris.

2. Yes. It is intended that there will be a permanent presence in Paris to replace the South Australian representative Ms Corinne Namblard, who is no longer in the role. The Agent-General's office will ensure a presence in France as well as identification and support for South Australian economic opportunities in France until this time.

FUND MY NEIGHBOURHOOD

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (27 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. J.W. WEATHERILL (Cheltenham—Premier, Minister for the Arts): I have been advised that:

1. Grants provided through Fund My Neighbourhood cannot be used for ongoing operational and maintenance costs. Fund My Neighbourhood provides once off funding only. Operational and maintenance costs will need to be funded through other means.

2. Schools are eligible to apply for funding through Fund My Neighbourhood, provided the project is of benefit to the broader community, not just its students. Therefore, lighting at the school would be eligible if the facility is used in the evenings for events accessible to the broader community and playgrounds on school grounds are eligible provided they are able to be accessed by the broader neighbourhood after school hours.

3. The same eligibility criteria apply to non-government schools as government schools. The full guidelines including eligibility criteria are available at fundmyneighbourhood.sa.gov.au.

TRAMLINES

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (27 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

1. As part of the detailed design process for the City South tram stop, consideration will be given to providing right turn access from King William Street into Sturt Street and Halifax Street. The Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure will continue to work with the City of Adelaide.

ROAD MAINTENANCE

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (27 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised of the following:

Budgeted spend for the \$70m in additional funding for the Critical Road Maintenance programme is as follows:

2015-16—\$10m

2016-17—\$15m

2017-18—\$25m

2018-19—\$20m

GRANT EXPENDITURE

In reply to **Mr PISONI (Unley)** (27 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.C. MULLIGHAN (Lee—Minister for Transport and Infrastructure, Minister for Housing and Urban Development): I have been advised:

For the Transport and Infrastructure areas of the Department of Planning, Transport and Infrastructure, for each year of the forward estimates:

- a) Grant programs are an annual allocation from our approved budget.
- b1) Budgeted expenditure for 2017-18 is as follows:

Name of Grant Program	BUDGET
	2017-18 \$'000
Service SA – Revenue management services on behalf of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles	35,432
Subsidies made under the South Australian Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATSS)	12,180
Kangaroo Island Airport Upgrade project	5,336
Country and Provincial Concessions	4,903
Future Mobility Lab – driverless vehicles	3,100
Municipal Services on Aboriginal Lands	2,710

	BUDGET
Bridge renewal program	2,239
Property Interest Report	2,136
Local Government – Marine Facilities Improvement	1,853
Asset Improvement program	1,482
Boating Safety Unit service delivery	1,074
National Transport Commission – national road, rail and intermodal transport reform	504
Great Southern Rail – Overland rail services	360
Australasia Rail Corporation	172
Rejuvenation of the Port	153
Jobs for Youth Program	93
KESAB Road Watch Program	82
Community Rail Corridor Program	77
National Vehicle theft reduction	65
Rail Industry Safety Standards Board	41
Sylvia Birdseye and Women in Engineering	40
Local Government Association Aviation Payment	38
Rip It Up – SA Government Digital Initiatives	31
Other grants	25
TOTAL GRANTS BUDGET	\$74,126

Total indicative grants forecast for the forward estimates (\$'000) are:

- 2018-19: \$66,587
- 2019-20: \$64,007
- 2020-21: \$65,512
- 2021-22: \$67,150.

Note that:

1. Not all grant funding is allocated to a specific grant program. Allocations are made during the financial year as a result of the finalisation of agreements between the department and relevant stakeholders.
2. Budgets for the forward estimates are not allocated to individual grant recipients as the majority of grants are provided / allocated to recipients during the financial year in which the grant is applied for. Budgets are subject to the annual budget process and final Cabinet endorsement.

b2) Actual grants paid during 2016-17, greater than \$10,000 were:

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$'000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Department of the Premier and Cabinet – Service SA	34,335	Funds provided to the Government Services Group for the services on behalf of the Registrar of Motor Vehicles	Y
Various Taxi Service Providers	8,959	Taxi subsidies payable to individual with limited mobility SA Transport Subsidy Scheme (SATSS)	N
Provincial City and Regional Bus Operators	4,009	For passengers eligible to travel at concessional rates	Y
Various community agencies/organisations	2,662	Provision of Municipal Services	Y
Department of Treasury and Finance	2,348	Land Tax Equivalent—Flinders Port	Y
Kangaroo Island Council	1,746	Kangaroo Island Airport Upgrade	Y
Department of Treasury and Finance	1,200	Funding claim for Revenue SA for work on Australian Taxation Office (ATO) Reporting Project. As legislated by the <i>Taxation Administration Act 1953</i> , revenue collection agencies are required to collect and report information about all transfers of freehold or leasehold interests in real property transactions to the ATO.	Y
District Council of the Copper Coast	702	Redevelopment of the Port Hughes Boat Ramp	Y

Name of Grant Recipient	Amount of Grant (\$'000)	Purpose of Grant	Subject to Grant Agreement (Y/N)
Port Pirie Regional Council	571	Solomontown Boat Ramp upgrade	Y
Various Councils	570	Bridge Renewal Program	Y
National Transport Commission	483	To contribute to the national road, rail and intermodal transport reform agenda	N
Great Southern Rail	340	To assist with the operation of the Overland Rail service between Adelaide and Melbourne	Y
Australasia Railway Corporation (ARC) – Northern Territory Government	150	Annual Grant to assist with ARC to provide services to the community	Y
The Department of Environment, Water and Natural Resources	144	Land management for the construction of groundwater wells between Pukatja (Ernabella) and Iwantja (Indulkana), Anangu Pitjantjatjara Yankunytjatjara (APY) Lands in remote South Australia	Y
Sage Automation/University of Adelaide	141	Future Mobility Lab Funding	Y
Mid Murray Council	127	For the construction of riverbank wharf at Mannum	Y
South Australian Freight Council	100	1 of 2 payment under the Funding Deed to promote the welfare and development of freight industry in SA	Y
Mimili Maku Accommodation Centre	100	Establishment of vehicle recovery program as part of the APY Land Fills project	Y
City of Victor Harbor	96	Lay-by berth and additional parking facilities at the Encounter Bay boat ramp	Y
Mid Murray Council	90	For the upgrade of the Cadell boating facility	Y
Various	85	Greening and arts projects associated with metropolitan train and tram neighbourhoods	Y
Keep South Australia Beautiful Incorporated	80	Delivery of the Road Watch program	Y
Rail Industry Safety and Standards Board (RISSB)	75	Annual payment to the RISSB to provide Rail Safety Standards to the community	Y
District Council of Cleve	64	Remote Airstrip Upgrade Program 2015-2016, resealing of Cleve Aerodrome, Taxi Way and Apron Surfaces	Y
District Council of Grant	61	To replace the existing landing structure with a floating pontoon at the Donovan's River Wharf boating facility at Donovan	Y
District Council of Mount Remarkable	46	For the construction of a Boat Launching Facility at Weeroona Island (Port Flinders)	Y
Local Government Association Mutual Liability Scheme (LGAMLS)	40	Contribution to LGAMLS Aerodrome Risk Management Programme for the provision of services to Councils and Outback Areas	Y
University of Adelaide	33	Payment for the Engineering Scholarship	Y
South Australia Police	33	Funding contribution for National Motor Vehicle Theft Reduction Council	Y
Wattle Range Council	25	Resurface and formalise parking and traffic movements within the Beachport boat ramp and trailer park	Y
University of South Australia	22	Sylvia Birdseye Undergraduate Engineering scholarship for women and DPTI scholarship in Civil Engineering	Y
Mid Murray Council	19	For the provision of river vessel mooring facilities in the Ngaut Conservation park	Y
TOTAL GRANTS PAID 2016-17			\$59,456

c) Grants paid are funded either via an appropriation or revenue received specifically for the purpose of providing the grant. These revenues form part of the approved annual budget.

- d) No carryovers have been approved in the financial years requested.
- e) Refer to sections b1) and b2).

CHILDREN IN OUT-OF-HOME CARE

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

In 2015-16, 20 children aged 15-17 years were reunified with their families. Of these, 19 are still with their family.

In 2016-17, 20 children aged 15-17 years were reunified with their families. Of these, 17 are still with their family.

This program is planned for four years to 2018-19 and its outcomes are subject to review.

COMMISSIONER FOR CHILDREN AND YOUNG PEOPLE

In reply to **Ms SANDERSON (Adelaide)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The Commissioner for Children and Young People incurred expenditure of \$0.241 million in 2016-17.

The approved expenditure budget for 2017-18 is \$1.572 million.

Initial set up costs were incurred in 2016-17 and are included in the figure above. The balance of costs will be incurred in 2017-18.

SHINE SA

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

Information on the Shine SA Safe Schools initiative is clearly outlined on the Department for Education and Child Development website.

INDEPENDENT EDUCATION INQUIRY

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised:

The procedure is administered by the Department for Education and Child Development, with the Crown Solicitor making the decision on whether it is necessary or appropriate for a governing council to obtain funds for independent legal advice.

If the Crown Solicitor grants a request to obtain funding for independent legal advice, the department automatically covers those legal costs. No separate fund was established.

To date, there is no record of a governing council requesting funds through this process.

CHILD PROTECTION SYSTEMS ROYAL COMMISSION

In reply to **Mr GARDNER (Morialta)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee A)

The Hon. S.E. CLOSE (Port Adelaide—Minister for Education and Child Development, Minister for Higher Education and Skills): I have been advised of the following:

The \$5.3 million relates to the increase in funding allocated to DECD in 2017-18, compared to the 2016-17 estimated result, for the government's response to the Nyland royal commission. The increase in funding for 2017-18 is for the following:

- Child and Family Assessment and Referral Networks (\$2.1m)
- Family by Family Program (\$1.1 million)
- Office for Commissioner of Children and Young People (\$0.9m)
- Community Visitor Program (\$0.7m)
- Additional funding for the Guardian of Children and Young People (\$0.3m)
- Child Development Council (\$81,000)

- Additional funding for the Child Death and Serious Injury Review Committee (\$62,000)

MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS

In reply to **Ms REDMOND (Heysen)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse): I am advised:

The estimated cost of road crashes is based on an economic model of valuing human life known as 'willingness to pay'.

The National Road Safety Strategy 2011-2020 (page 50) outlines the benefits of the willingness to pay approach and identified a need for Australia to develop and adopt suitable willingness-to-pay estimates.

Investment decisions are informed by the estimated value of expected safety benefits. However, such estimates are influenced by the particular methods used to place an economic value on human life. Best practice in this area favours the use of a valuation method known as the willingness-to-pay approach, which tends to produce higher estimates than other, more traditional, methods such as the human capital method of human life which treats individuals as a productive entity.

Willingness to pay is constructed on an ex-ante basis, or before the fact. Estimates are based on the amounts that individuals are prepared to pay for reduced risk (or to accept in compensation for bearing risk). For a particular type of risk, a value for society is generally calculated by aggregating and averaging values obtained from a representative sample of individuals conducted by New South Wales.

Using the willingness to pay values estimated by New South Wales, the estimated cost of road crash casualties in 2016 was over \$1.5 billion in South Australia, with 38 per cent of these costs due to fatalities.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Ms REDMOND (Heysen)** (28 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. C.J. PICTON (Kurna—Minister for Police, Minister for Correctional Services, Minister for Emergency Services, Minister for Road Safety, Minister Assisting the Minister for Health, Minister Assisting the Minister for Mental Health and Substance Abuse):

South Australia Police

a)

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	25	\$3,530,088

b)

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	25	\$3,618,000
2018-19	25	\$3,709,000
2019-20	25	\$3,802,000
2020-21	25	\$3,897,000

c)

- i. Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response
- ii.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
\$111,302

Department for Correctional Services

a)

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	1.8	\$197,923

b)

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	1.6	\$186,839
2018-19	1.6	\$189,641
2019-20	1.6	\$192,486
2020-21	1.6	\$195,373

c)

i. Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response

ii.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
\$125,000

SA Fire and Emergency Services Commission

a)

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	-	-

b)

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	-	-
2018-19	-	-
2019-20	-	-
2020-21	-	-

SAFECOM officers whose main duties involve operations, public warnings and/or community engagement also undertake communication and promotion activities.

c)

i. Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response

ii.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
\$103,000

SA Metropolitan Fire Service

a)

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	-	-

b)

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	-	-
2018-19	-	-
2019-20	-	-
2020-21	-	-

SAMFS officers whose main duties involve operations, public warnings and/or community engagement also undertake communication and promotion activities.

c)

i. Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response

ii.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
-

SA Country Fire Service

a)

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	1	\$112,000

b)

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	1	\$116,000
2018-19	1	\$118,000
2019-20	1	\$120,000
2020-21	1	\$121,000

c)

i. Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response

ii.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
\$690,000

SA State Emergency Service

a)

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	-	-

b)

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	-	-
2018-19	-	-
2019-20	-	-
2020-21	-	-

SASES officers whose main duties involve operations, public warnings and/or community engagement also undertake communication and promotion activities.

c)

i. Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response

ii.

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
\$382,000

DISABILITY EMPLOYMENT HUB

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

A total of \$4 million was approved for the Disability Workforce Hub program in northern Adelaide over 2016-17 and 2017-18. In 2016-17, \$0.9 million was spent, leaving unspent funds of \$3.1 million, which includes contracted commitments of \$0.9 million for continuing activity in 2017-18 and \$2.2 million for new activity in 2017-18.

UPPER SPENCER GULF AND OUTBACK FUTURES PROGRAM

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The South Australian government established a package of support to assist the Upper Spencer Gulf in addressing immediate challenges and prepare for the future. The package included:

- Establishing a Steel Taskforce, to respond to the changing environment in the steel industry and the broader implications for Whyalla;
- Establishing the Upper Spencer Gulf and Outback Taskforce, to recommend policy and programs for regional adjustment, which includes work on the Leigh Creek township transition, Leigh Creek mine rehabilitation, Port Augusta Power Stations rehabilitation, and support for affected workers;
- Establishing an Economic Transition Forum to drive economic transformation of the region in collaboration with the commonwealth government and local governments, as well as the Regional Development Australia (RDA) network;
- Appointing a Regional Coordinator for Whyalla to engage with the community, including businesses, workers and their families, local government and local associations to understand their needs and ensure that appropriate services are being delivered to the community;
- Offering interest-free business loans, free financial counselling and free legal advice to Whyalla businesses affected by the Arrium operation; and
- Providing career services and re-training to retrenched workers in the Upper Spencer Gulf in Alinta's business supply chain.

These initiatives supported community resilience and capability for individuals and businesses in the region. They are underpinned by partnership between state, commonwealth and local governments, community representatives and industry. As such they are not initiatives designed to directly create jobs, though jobs growth and increased economic activity can be expected as a consequence of state government-led community and economic development.

OYSTER INDUSTRY

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The grant to the South Australian Oyster Growers Association was provided to support employment in the industry.

This is a grant to develop an information technology based management system to assist growers understand and address unexplained increases in oyster mortality.

The collection of data at the farm scale, through the use of this system, will assist with the economic development of the industry, improving productivity and profitability and ultimately creating jobs.

PREMIER'S RESEARCH AND INDUSTRY FUND

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

In 2013-14 there was an additional allocation to the Premier's Research and Industry Fund made for the period ending 2015-16.

APPLIED RESEARCH ENGAGEMENT PROGRAMS

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The number of participating companies in applied research engagement programs has been revised upwards since the time of preparing the budget papers.

The number of companies expected to participate in 2017-18 is now 13.

GOVERNMENT ADVERTISING

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

a) Department of State Development

Year	No of FTEs employed in Communication and Promotion Activities	Employment Expense
2016-17	14.0 FTE	\$1,742,303

*includes employee on costs

b) Department of State Development

Year	No of FTEs budgeted to provide Communication and Promotion Activities	Estimated Employment Expense
2017-18	14.0 FTE	\$1,768,438
2018-19	14.0 FTE	\$1,794,964
2019-20	14.0 FTE	\$1,821,889
2020-21	14.0 FTE	\$1,849,217

*includes employee on costs

c)

i. (Response to be provided by Department of the Premier and Cabinet—Comms)

Total Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2016-17
Refer to the Premier's whole-of-government response

ii. Department of State Development (excludes Arts SA and Health Industries)

Budgeted Cost of Government-paid Advertising (all mediums) in 2017-18
\$400,000

DIGITAL ECONOMY

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

Specific Digital productivity activities such as BroadbandSA and support for FabLab Adelaide concluded in 2013-14. Digital Economy activities now fall within the Science, Technology and Information Economy program.

The whole-of-government R&D expenditure refers to figures from the Australian Bureau of Statistics Government Expenditure of Research and Development survey. These numbers include support for agencies including, but not limited to, the South Australian Research and Development Institute; which in turn support the pillars of the Investing in Science Action Plan.

TECHINSA

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The costs for re-branding TechInSA were \$41,790.

MINERAL AND ENERGY RESOURCES

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The ICT Roadmap for Minerals and Energy Resources Project concluded in 2012-13 and all reports have been published on the Department of State Development's website.

PREMIER'S RESEARCH AND INDUSTRY FUND

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The nine projects that have been supported through the Premier's Research and Industry Fund are as follows:

1. Wire by Click Group
2. Common Sense Surf Company
3. Cunninghams Balaklava
4. Glaciem Cooling
5. Australian Orthopaedic Fixations Pty Ltd (Austofix)
6. Enzo's at Home
7. South Australian Health and Medical Research Institute
8. Science Alive
9. Flinders University Medical Device Partnering Program

The estimates for the Premier's Research and Industry Fund is as follows:

	2015-16 \$000	2016-17 \$000	2017-18 \$000	2018-19 \$000	2019-20 \$000	2020-21 \$000
Revised budget	6,659	6,335	4,630	4,105	4,925	4,975

PREMIER'S RESEARCH AND INDUSTRY FUND

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

Since 2004-05, \$63.3 million has been committed from the Premier's Research and Industry Fund (PRIF), and its previous iteration as the Premier's Science and Research Fund. Since the inception of the program, 179 projects have received funding.

COMMONWEALTH FUNDING

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The Department of State Development gathers information on South Australian success rates on commonwealth grant funding programs routinely.

In 2016, of the 946 competitive projects awarded nationally by the national Health and Medical Research Council (NHMRC), South Australia secured 62 grants, from a total of 467 applications made, totalling \$40 million in funding.

The other main avenue for funding from the commonwealth is the Australian Research Council (ARC) funding. In the most recent round, a total of 989 research projects received \$416.6 million in funding, of this South Australian universities received \$26.8 million for 59 projects, from a total of 335 project applications submitted.

TECHINSA

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

A company needs to have an ABN and have commenced active company operations to be deemed eligible for assistance.

The majority of companies were assisted under the South Australian Early Commercialisation Fund program which commenced on 18 November 2016 and is focussed on early stage and start-up companies. The 26 companies receiving grants up to June 2017 have forecast 341 jobs will be created by 30 June 2019.

INDUSTRY AND INNOVATION FUNDING

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

Workshops were held in May and June 2016, to bring together the innovation community in South Australia which included businesses, investors, university and government representatives. The cost of the workshops was \$16,600.

The Innovation for Jobs Statement was released on 11 July 2016. The cost to develop this initiative was \$38,000.

Total cost was therefore \$54,600.

TECHINSA

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The 26 companies that received grants between November 2016 and June 2017 have forecast 341 jobs will be created by 30 June 2019.

DIGITAL ECONOMY

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

In 2016-17, \$341,000 was spent on the Digital Economy program.

There is no budget allocated in the Digital Economy program for 2017-18. A \$300,000 grant to the City of Adelaide will fund projects to be developed in 2017-18.

GRANTS AND SUBSIDIES

In reply to **Mr WINGARD (Mitchell)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

The following grant and subsidy programs are included in total expenses for science and technology:

	2016-17 Estimated Result \$000	2017-18 Budget \$000	2018-19 Budget \$000	2019-20 Budget \$000	2020-21 Budget \$000
Adelaide GigCity	1,936	1,386	2,261	436	0
Defence and Stem Scholar and Internships	325	325	325	325	325
Digital Economy	335	0	0	0	0
Mobile Black Spots	200	1,221	579	0	0
PRIF	6,035	4,630	4,105	4,925	4,975
Stem Skills and Entrepreneurship	400	400	400	407	366
UniSA Future Industries Institute	1,500	3,000	3,000	0	0
Overheads	-50	154	0	0	0
	10,681	11,116	10,670	6,093	5,666

APY LANDS, GOVERNANCE

In reply to **Mr MARSHALL (Dunstan—Leader of the Opposition)** (31 July 2017). (Estimates Committee B)

The Hon. K.J. MAHER (Minister for Employment, Minister for Aboriginal Affairs and Reconciliation, Minister for Manufacturing and Innovation, Minister for Automotive Transformation, Minister for Science and Information Economy): I have been advised:

A supplementary election was required for female members of the APY Executive Board in the electorates of 'Pukatja, Yunyarinyi, Anilalya and Turkey Bore', 'Mimili' and 'Iwantja, Amuruna, Railway Bore, Witjintitja and Wallatinna'.

The supplementary election scheduled for 2 August 2017 was not required, following the declaration of nominations for that election. In 'Mimili' and 'Iwantja, Amuruna, Railway Bore, Witjintitja and Wallatinna', the sole candidates, Ms Theresa Campbell and Ms Ebony Benson respectively, were elected unopposed. No nominations were received in 'Pukatja, Yunyarinyi, Anilalya and Turkey Bore'.